

# VII

---

## BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 72B-76B

### 7:1

- A. And these are meal offerings [from which] the handful is taken, and the residue of which belongs to the priests [Lev. 7: 7-9]:
  - B. (1) the meal offering of fine flour [Lev. 2:21,
  - C. and (2) [the meal offering prepared in] a baking pan [Lev. 2: 9, 7:8],
  - D. and (3) [the meal offering prepared in] a frying pan,
  - E. and (4) the loaves,
  - F. and (5) the wafers [Lev. 2: 9-10],
  - G. and (6) the meal offering of gentiles,
  - H. and (7) the meal offering of women,
  - I. and (8) the meal offering of the offering of the first sheaf of barley [Lev. 2:16],
  - J. and (9) the meal offering of a sinner [Lev. 5:12],
  - K. and (10) the meal offering of a woman accused of adultery [Num. 5:26].
  - L. R. Simeon says, “[From] the meal offering of a priest who was a sinner [Lev. 7:16], the handful is taken [even though the whole of it in any case is offered on the altar], and the handful is offered by itself, and the residue [thereof] is offered by itself.”
- I.1** A. *Said R. Pappa, “All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes.”* [Cashdan: the first four meal offerings listed above must be baked into ten cakes, so that even the fourth kind of meal offering, the one baked in an oven, for which an alternative is allowed, must be either ten cakes or ten wafers, but not five and five.]
- B. *That judgment then excludes the position of R. Simeon, who has said, “One may present half of the meal offering in cakes, half in wafers.”*
  - C. *So he teaches us that that is not so.*
- II.1** A. ...and the residue of which belongs to the priests:

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this position?*
- C. *How do we know it? But where it is expressly stated in Scripture, it is expressly stated, and where not, there is the verse that generalizes: "And this is the law of the meal offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it...and that which is left over Aaron and his sons shall eat" (Lev. 6: 7, 9).*
- D. *With the meal offering that is made of wheat we have no problems, where we raise the question is in regard to the meal offering that is made of barley.*
- E. *But with respect to meal offerings presented of barley, obviously the remainder will be assigned to the priests, since the handful is taken up from that meal offering as well! [Cashdan: since if the residue does not go to the priests, why take the meal offering at all?]*
- F. *With regard to the position of rabbis, we have no problem. Where we have a question, it is within the framework of the view of R. Simeon, who has said, "There is a meal offering from which a handful is taken up, but which is not eaten. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **R. Simeon says, "[From] the meal offering of a priest who was a sinner [Lev. 7:16], the handful is taken [even though the whole of it in any case is offered on the altar], and the handful is offered by itself, and the residue [thereof] is offered by itself."** What is the scriptural basis for this position?*
- G. Said Hezekiah, "Said Scripture, 'And every meal offering mixed with oil or dry the sons of Aaron shall have' (Lev. 7:10). If this verse, obviously, is hardly required to address the case of meal offerings made of wheat mingled with oil, it should be referred to the case of meal offerings of barley mingled with oil, and if this verse is hardly required to explain the rule governing meal offerings of wheat that are kept dry, then it should be referred to the case of meal offerings of barley that are kept dry."
- H. *But does the cited verse really serve the stated purpose? In point of fact, it is required in the following connection, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. **How do we know that the priests do not divide meal offerings as counterparts to sacrificial meat [with the result that one party of priests gets meal offerings and the other party gets meat]?**
- J. **[73A] Scripture says, "And every cereal offering...shall be for all the sons of Aaron." [The division cannot result in this group's getting only meal offerings while that group gets only meat.]**
- K. **Might one then maintain that while the priests should not take portions of meal offerings prepared in an oven in place of meat of sacrifices, since in the case of poverty they do not have to make them up [Cashdan: the meal offering does not take the place of an animal offering in ordinary cases of poverty but only in extreme poverty, while the meal offering replaces the bird offering in ordinary poverty], they may divide up other meal offerings as offsets against offerings of fowl [Sifra: animal offerings]?**
- L. **Scripture says, "all that is prepared on a pan or a griddle shall belong to the priest who offers it. And every cereal offering, mixed with oil or dry, shall be for all the sons of Aaron."**

- M. Might one suppose that they may not divide up meal offerings against animal offerings, but they may the meat of bird offerings against meal offerings?**
- N. Scripture says, “all that is prepared on a pan or a griddle shall belong to the priest who offers it. And every cereal offering, mixed with oil or dry, shall be for all the sons of Aaron.”**
- O. Might one suppose that while they may not the meat of bird offerings against meal offerings, they may divide up meal offerings of one sort as offsets against meal offerings of another sort?**
- P. Scripture says, “And every cereal offering, mixed with oil or dry, shall be for all the sons of Aaron.”**
- Q. Might one suppose that while they may not divide up shares of meal offerings prepared in a pan as against meal offerings prepared in a griddle, or meal offerings prepared in a griddle as against meal offerings prepared in a pan, they may divide up meal offerings prepared in a griddle as against other meal offerings prepared in a griddle, or meal offerings prepared in a pan as against other meal offerings prepared in a pan?**
- R. Scripture says, “And every cereal offering, mixed with oil or dry, shall be for all the sons of Aaron.”**
- S. Might one suppose that while they may not divide up Most Holy Things as offsets against other Most Holy Things, they may divide up Lesser Holy Things in that way [so that one party gets one species of offering, the other a different species]?**
- T. Scripture says, “all alike” (Lev. 7:10), and then, “If he offers it for thanksgiving, he shall offer together with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes with oil mixed in, unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes of choice flour with oil mixed in, well soaked” (Lev. 7:12).**
- U. Just as they may not divide up Most Holy Things as offsets against other Most Holy Things, they also may not divide up Lesser Holy Things in that way [so that one party gets one species of offering, the other a different species] [Sifra LXXXIII:I.3].**
- V. “all alike:”**
- W. [Since the Hebrew has, “a man like his brother,”] we conclude that a man takes a share even though he is blemished.**
- X. But a minor does not take a share even though he is unblemished [Sifra LXXXIII:I.4].**
- Y. *That is derived from the use of “every” [and Hezekiah’s derives from “meal offering” (Cashdan)].***
- Z. *But was not that phrase required for the position of R. Yosé b. R. Judah [R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that he who says, ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is an offering of a baked meal offering,’ he may not present 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 belong to the priest who offers it. And every meal offering mingled with oil or dry shall all the son so f Aaron have’ (Lev. 7: 9, 10).***

Just as ‘every’ in the second set speaks of two distinct kinds, so ‘every’ in the first set speaks of two distinct kinds”].

AA. [Yosé’s] lesson derive from “and every.”

**II.2.** A. *Rabina said, “The fact that the residue of the offering of first barley and of the meal offering presented by the woman accused of unfaithfulness, both of which are made of barley, is eaten by the priests,] derives from the following Tannaite statement of Levi, for Levi taught as a Tannaite statement:”*

B. *“This shall be yours...every offering of theirs’ (Num. 18: 9) — this encompasses even the log of oil that is presented by the person healed of the skin ailment.*

C. *“Might you have supposed that I should say that the Torah has stated, ‘reserved from the fire’ (Num. 18: 9), while this is not reserved from the fire [since no part of it was burned at all]? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

D. *“Even every meal offering of theirs’ (Num. 18: 9) — this serves to encompass the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley and the meal offering of jealousy.*

E. *“Might you have supposed that I should say that the Torah has stated, ‘And they shall eat these things wherewith atonement was made’ (Num. 5:12-15), while the purpose of the meal offering of the new barley crop serves to permit the use of new grain, while the meal offering of jealousy serves to establish guilt? The verse then shows us that these arguments are null.*

F. *“And every sin-offering of theirs’ (Num. 18: 9) — this serves to encompass the sin offering made of fowl.*

G. *“You might have supposed that since this is carrion [not having been properly slaughtered the way a beast is], [it may not be eaten]. The verse then shows us that that is not the correct conclusion to be drawn here.*

H. *“And every guilt offering of theirs’ (Num. 18: 9) —this serves to encompass the guilt offering presented by a Nazirite at the end of the span of his uncleanness and the guilt offering presented by the person healed of the skin ailment.*

I. *“You might have supposed that these are presented so as to render each party suitable [in the case of the Nazirite, to resume the observance of his Nazirite vow, in the case of the person healed of the skin ailment to partake of Holy Things, so no atonement is involved here]. Therefore the verse tells us that that is not a valid conclusion.*

J. *“But in point of fact, Scripture explicitly states that the guilt offering presented by the person healed of the skin ailment is eaten [Lev. 14:13]!”*

K. *“It serves only to extend the law to the guilt offering presented by the Nazirite, showing that it falls under the same rule as the guilt offering presented by the person healed of the skin ailment.*

L. *“Which they may render” (Num. 18: 9) — this extends the law to what is stolen from a proselyte [if a proselyte died and left no heirs, property unlawfully taken from him goes to the priest].*

M. *“Shall be for you’ (Num. 18: 9) — it shall be yours even so that you may use the property in order to betroth a woman.”*

**III.1** A. **[And these are meal offerings [from which] the handful is taken, and the residue of which belongs to the priests [Lev. 7: 7-9]: and (6) the meal offering**

**of gentiles:]** Said R. Huna, **[73B]** “Peace offerings of gentiles are to be classified as burnt offerings.” [Cashdan: no part may be eaten, they are wholly burned; their meal offerings also must be wholly burned.]

- B. *“If you wish, I shall prove this on the basis of reasoning, and if you wish, I shall prove it on the basis of a verse of Scripture:”*
- C. *“If you wish, I shall prove this on the basis of reasoning: the gentile in his heart has only Heaven in mind [and does not possess the intentionality of planning to eat part of the offering himself or have the priest eat any of it; he does not know that such distinctions are feasible].”*
- D. *“and if you wish, I shall prove it on the basis of a verse of Scripture: ‘Which they will offer to the Lord for a burnt offering’ (Lev. 22:18 — whatever they present shall be classified as a burnt offering.”*
- E. *Objected R. Hama bar Guria: “**A gentile who volunteered to present peace offerings, if he gave them to an Israelite, the Israelite eats them. If he gave them to a priest, the priest eats them [T. Sheq. 3:11A-C].**”*
- F. *Said Raba, “This is the sense of the statement: ‘if it was on the stipulation that an Israelite might achieve atonement through them, then the Israelite eats them; if it was on the stipulation that a priest may achieve atonement through them, then the priest eats them ”*
- G. *Objected R. Shizbi, “**And these are meal offerings [from which] the handful is taken, and the residue of which belongs to the priests [Lev. 7: 7-9]: and (6) the meal offering of gentiles.**” [Cashdan: so it is not entirely burned, and the same is the case with his peace offerings.]*
- H. *Said R. Yohanan, “That really is no contradiction, for the one statement represents the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, the other, of R. Aqiba, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- I. **[“And the Lord said to Moses, Say to Aaron and his sons and all the people of Israel, When any one of the house of Israel or of the sojourners in Israel presents his offering, whether in payment of a vow or as a freewill offering which is offered to the Lord as a burnt offering to be accepted you shall offer a male without blemish, of the bulls or the sheep or the goats. You shall not offer anything that has a blemish, for it will not be acceptable for you. And when any one offers a sacrifice of peace offerings to the Lord, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, from the herd or from the flock, to be accepted it must be perfect; there shall be no blemish in it” (Lev. 22:17-21).]**
- J. **“Israel:”**
- K. **these are Israelites.**
- L. **“sojourners:”**
- M. **this refers to proselytes.**
- N. **“the sojourners:”**
- O. **this encompasses wives of proselytes.**
- P. **“in Israel:”**
- Q. **this includes women and slaves.**
- R. **“Then why does Scripture refer to ‘any one’?”**

- S. “that encompasses gentiles who may give sacrifices through making vows or as freewill offerings [“whether in payment of a vow or as a freewill offering”] like Israelites.
- T. “‘whether in payment of a vow or as a freewill offering which is offered to the Lord as a burnt offering:’
- U. “I know that the law at hand applies only to a burnt offering. How do I know that peace offerings also are subject to the same rule?
- V. “Scripture says, ‘in payment of a vow’ [which may be for a peace offering].
- W. “How do I know that the law covers a thanksgiving offering?
- X. “Scripture says, ‘or as a freewill offering.’
- Y. “How do I know that the law encompasses birds, meal offerings, libations, frankincense, and wood for the fire?
- Z. “Scripture says, ‘in payment of a vow,’ covering all the vows that people may make to contribute to the temple, ‘or as a free will offering,’ covering all the things that they may contribute as free will offerings.
- AA. “If so, why does Scripture make explicit reference to the burnt offering: ‘which is offered to the Lord as a burnt offering’?
- BB. “This excludes offerings brought by Nazirites,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean [Sifra: Aqiba].
- CC. Said to him R. Aqiba [Sifra: Yosé], “Even if you spend the whole day adding to the arguments, still, here we have a reference only to burnt offerings alone. ‘...which they will offer to the Lord for a burnt offering’ means that gentiles may present only burnt offerings” [Sifra CCXXIII:I.1-2].

**III.2.** A. *But does the rule that a gentile may not present a Nazirite offering derive from the stated source? Surely it derives from the following:*

- B. “Speak to the children of Israel and say to them, When either man or woman shall clearly utter a vow, the vow of a Nazirite, to consecrate himself to the Lord” (Num. 6: 2) — Israelites take a vow, and gentiles do not take such a vow.
- C. *If the proof had derived from that source, I might have concluded that it is an offering that he may not present, but that the Nazirite vow does apply. So the passage before us teaches us that that is not the case.*

**III.3.** A. *In accord with which authority is the following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: Said R. Simeon, “Seven rules did the court ordain, and this (1) [foregoing one] is one of them. A gentile who sent his burnt offering from overseas and sent drink offerings with it — they are offered from what he has sent. But if not, they are offered from public funds. And so too a proselyte who died and left animals designated for sacrifices — if it has drink offerings, they are offered from his estate. And if not, they are offered from public funds. And it is a condition imposed by the court on a high priest who died, that his meal offering [Lev. 6:13] should derive from public funds” [M. Sheq. 7:6].*

- B. *May we then say this rule [which allows gentiles to present drink offerings] is in accord with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, not with R. Aqiba?*

- C. *You may even maintain that it represents the position of R. Aqiba, for the sense is, burnt offerings plus everything that goes along with them.*

**III.4.** A. *In accord with which Tannaite authority is the following, which our rabbis have taught as a Tannaite statement:*

- B. *“All who are native shall do these things in this way, in offering an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the Lord” (Num. 15:13) — but then a gentile does not present drink-offerings.*
- C. *Might one suppose that his burnt-offering will not require drink offerings?*
- D. *Scripture states, “...in this way....”*
- E. *Now in accord with whom is that formulation? For it cannot be either R. Yosé the Galilean or R. Aqiba!*
- F. *It cannot be R. Yosé the Galilean, for lo, he has said, even wine a gentile may not present, nor can it stand for R. Aqiba, for lo, he has said that a gentile may present a burnt offering but nothing else!*
- G. *If you like, I shall tell you that it accords with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, and if you like, I shall tell you that it accords with the position of R. Aqiba.*
- H. *If you like, I shall tell you that it accords with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean: just remove from the formulation reference to wine.*
- I. *And if you like, I shall tell you that it accords with the position of R. Aqiba: he holds that the gentile may present not only a burnt offering, but burnt offerings plus everything that goes along with them.*

**IV.1** A. **R. Simeon says, “[From] the meal offering of a priest who was a sinner [Lev. 7:16], the handful is taken [even though the whole of it in any case is offered on the altar], and the handful is offered by itself, and the residue [thereof] is offered by itself:”**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this position?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **“It shall belong to the priest, like the meal offering” (Lev. 5:13) —**
- E. **The meaning is that the performance of the meal-offering rite of a priest [who has inadvertently sinned] is assigned to that priest [so that he may perform his own rite and retain possession of the residue of the meal offering that he himself has presented].**
- F. **Or might the intent not be to declare permitted [to the priesthood the residue] of the tenth ephah of fine flour that has been brought by a priest? [Cashdan: the verse then tells us that a priest’s obligatory meal offering is like the meal offering of an Israelite that is eaten by the priests after the handful has been taken out.]**
- G. **How then shall I interpret the statement, “Every meal offering of a priest shall be wholly burned, it shall not be eaten” (Lev. 6:23/Heb.: 6:16)?**
- H. **This then would refer to a meal offering that the priest has brought as a free will offering, and as to the tenth ephah that he has presented, that may be eaten.**



- I. But [contrary to that line of argument] Scripture states, “It shall belong to the priest, like the meal offering:”
- J. lo, it is in the status of the meal offering that he presents as a free will offering, with the result that just as the free will offering of meal that he presents does not yield a residue that may be eaten, so the tenth ephah of fine flour that he presents may not be eaten.
- K. Said R. Simeon, “And is it written, ‘and it shall be the priest’s as his meal offering’? What it says is, ‘It shall belong to the priest, like the meal offering:’
- L. **[73B]** “lo, the tenth ephah of fine flour that a priest has brought is in the classification of the tenth ephah of fine flour that an Israelite presents.
- M. “Just as the tenth ephah of fine flour that an Israelite presents yields a handful, so a handful is taken up from this offering as well.
- N. “But might one then say, just as the handful is taken from the meal offering presented by the poor sinner who is an Israelite, and the remainder may be eaten, so when the handful is taken from the poor sinner’s meal offering presented by a priest, the residue may be eaten?
- O. “Scripture states, ‘the priest’s as the meal offering:’ in what regards the priest, it is like the meal offering of a sinner who is of the Israelite caste, but in respect to what concerns the fire on the altar, it is not like that meal offering.
- P. **“The handful that is taken up is presented by itself, and the residue is presented by itself” [Sifra LXII.I.16].**

**IV.2.** A. *But is the rule that the rites of the priest’s meal offering may be carried out by the priest drawn from that exposition? Surely it derives from the following:*

- B. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that a priest may come to present his offerings at any occasion and at any time that he wants?
- C. Scripture states, “And come with all the desire of his soul...and minister” (Deu. 18: 6).
- D. *Had I derived the ruling from that verse, I might have suppose that reference is made to something that is not presented by reason of sin, but as to something that is presented by reason of sin, I might have said that that is not the case.*

**IV.3.** A. *But is the rule that the rites of the priest’s meal offering may be carried out by the priest drawn from that exposition? Surely it derives from the following:*

- B. “And the priest shall make atonement for the soul that errs, when he sins through error” (Num. 15:28) — this teaches that a priest may make atonement for himself through his own act of service.
- C. *Had I derived the ruling from that verse, I might have suppose that that rule pertains only to offerings that are presented for a sin committed in error, but not for offerings presented for a sin committed deliberately; so we are informed that that is the case as well.*
- D. *So are there really offerings that are presented for sins committed deliberately?*
- E. *Yup: deliberately taking a false oath [Lev. 5: 1].*

**IV.4.** A. *There is a further Tannaite statement on the matter:*



- B. R. Simeon says, "As to the meal offering of a poor sinner deriving from a priest, the handful is taken, and the handful is offered by itself, and then the residue is offered by itself."
- C. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "The handful is offering by itself and the residue is scattered on the ash heap"[cf. T. [Sot. 2:6](#)].
- D. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, "R. Yohanan reflected on this matter, raising the following question: which ash heap? If it is the one on top on the altar, then that is what his father says anyhow. If it is one at the bottom by the side of the altar, then someone must ask, is there anything that is ever presented below?"*
- E. *Said R. Abba, "Maybe it's exceptional when the stuff is to go to waste."*
- F. *Everybody burst out laughing: "So is there anything that is offered up in such a way that it is meant to go to waste?"*
- G. *The father of R. Abin presented as a Tannaite statement: "And every meal offering of the priest shall be wholly burned, it shall not be eaten' (Lev. 6:16) — I have then treated the sin offering of meal brought by a priest with the high priest's meal offering only in the matter of eating but in no other way." [Cashdan: for as regards the offering there is a distinction: the high priest's meal offering must be burned on the altar, while the residue of the sinner's meal offering brought by a priest is to be scattered on the ash heap.]*
- H. *What is the sense of this statement? [If the offering is wholly burned, how can the remainder be scattered?]*
- I. *Said Abbaye, "This is the sense of the statement: "Every meal offering of the priest...shall not be eaten" refers to an obligatory meal offering; "it shall be wholly burned" refers to his free will meal offering."*
- J. *Said to him Raba, "A sharp knife is cutting up that verse!"*
- K. *Rather, said Raba, "This is the sense of the statement: "Every meal offering of the priest...it shall be wholly burned" refers to his free will meal offering.' "It shall not be eaten" refers to his obligatory meal offering."*
- L. *Maybe I should reverse matters?*
- M. *It is more reasonable to encompass his meal offering brought out of free will, since like the one of the high priest it is the more frequent, it is not brought by reason of sin, and it serves to create a sweet odor.*
- N. *To the contrary, it is more reasonable to encompass the obligatory meal offering, since it is like the high priest's in that it is made of a tenth ephah of fine flour and it is obligatory.*
- O. *The former are more numerous points in common.*
- IV.5.** A. *And as to rabbis, how do they interpret the verse, "and every meal offering of the priest shall be wholly burned, it shall not be eaten"?*
- B. *They require it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority.*
- C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **I know only that the meal offering deriving from the superior priest is to be wholly burned up, and the meal offering deriving from the inferior priest is subject to not being eaten. How do I know that the meal offering of the**

superior priest is subject to not being eaten, and the meal offering of the inferior priest is subject to being wholly burned up?

- E. Scripture uses the language of “wholly burned up” to establish an appropriate analogy [thus imposing the rule governing the one upon the other, since they are declared to be like species in a common genus] [Sifra LXXVI:I.6]. Just as in the former case the meaning is that the offering is wholly burned, so in the latter case it means that it is wholly burned.
- F. [Sifra: R. Eliezer says,] “‘Every cereal offering of a priest shall be wholly burned; it shall not be eaten’ serves to yield the rule that whatever is subject to being wholly burned up also is subject to the negative commandment concerning not being eaten.”

- IV.6.** A. *Rabina raised this question: “If a priest ate the sacrificial parts of an offering, which are supposed to be burned up, what is the law? As regards the non-priest, [74B] I have no problem [and the priests are like non-priests in that neither class of person may eat parts of the offering that are supposed to be burned on the altar]. Where I have a problem it pertains to his being liable to penalty for having violated the law, ‘it shall be wholly burned.’”*
- B. *Said R. Aaron to Rabina, “Come and take note, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘R. Eliezer says, “‘Every cereal offering of a priest shall be wholly burned; it shall not be eaten’ serves to yield the rule that whatever is subject to being wholly burned up also is subject to the negative commandment concerning not being eaten.””*

## 7:2

- A. The meal offering of priests [Lev. 7:15-16] and the meal offering of an anointed priest and the meal offering brought with drink offerings [Num. 23:20, 24:9] [belong] to the altar [without the removal of the handful].
  - B. And the priests have no [portion] in them.
  - C. In this regard the right of the altar is greater than the right of the priests.
  - D. The two loaves of bread [Lev. 23:20, 24:9] and the showbread belong to the priests.
  - E. And the altar has no [portion] in them.
  - F. And in this regard the right of the priests is greater than the right of the altar.
- I.1** A. [The meal offering of priests and the meal offering of an anointed priest and the meal offering brought with drink offerings belong to the altar without the removal of the handful. And the priests have no portion in them:] *are there no other instances? What about the burnt offering!*
- B. *There is its hide, which is assigned to the priests.*
  - C. *And lo, there is the case of the burnt offering of a bird!*
  - D. *Its crop and feathers are not offered, so here is an offering that is not wholly burned up on the altar].*
  - E. *Lo, there is the matter of drinking offers!*
  - F. *These flow down into the pits.*

- G. *So what is the meaning of In this regard? It serves to exclude the opinion of Samuel,*
- H. *for said Samuel, “He who presents a freewill offering of oil — a handful must be taken from it and burned on the altar, and the residue is eaten by the priests.” [So we are informed that that is not the case.]*

**II.1 A.** **The two loaves of bread [Lev. 23:20, 24:9] and the showbread belong to the priests. The two loaves of bread [Lev. 23:20, 24:9] and the showbread belong to the priests. And the altar has no [portion] in them:**

- B. *Are there no other instances? What about the sin offering presented of a bird.*
- C. *But there is its blood [which is sprinkled on the side of the altar].*
- D. *So what about the log of oil of the leper?*
- E. *There there are sprinklings.*
- F. *So what is the meaning of In this regard?*
- G. *It serves to exclude the position of him who says, “The two loaves, if presented on their own [without the lambs of Pentecost] are to be burned.” So we are informed that in that regard the priests enjoy a perpetual right to them.*

### 7:3

- A. **All meal offerings that are prepared in a utensil [a baking pan or a frying pan] require three applications of oil:**
- B. **(1) pouring [oil into the utensil],**
- C. **(2) stirring [the meal into the oil],**
- D. **and [then again], (3) putting oil into the utensil prior to their preparation.**
- E. **“And as to the loaves [baked in an oven], one stirs them [with oil] ,” the words of Rabbi.**
- F. **And sages say, “The fine flour [alone was mixed with oil.]”**
- G. **The loaves require stirring.**
- H. **The wafers are anointed.**
- I. **How does one anoint them?**
- J. **In the form of a chi [an X] [that is, in the form of a cross].**
- K. **And the remainder of the oil is eaten by the priests.**

**I.1 A.** **[...that are prepared in a utensil:] what is excluded by this qualification?**

- B. *Said R. Pappa, “It is meant to exclude a meal offering baked in the oven.” [Cashdan: 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].*

**I.2. A.** **Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:**

- B. **“If your offering is a meal offering on a griddle, [it shall be of choice flour with oil mixed in, unleavened. Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering:]”**
- C. **This teaches that the offering requires the use of a utensil [for its preparation and presentation].**
- D. **[75A] Reference is made twice to the word “your offering” [“If your offering is a meal offering on a griddle, it shall be of choice flour with oil mixed in,**

unleavened. Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering. If your offering is a meal offering in a pan, it shall be made of choice flour in oil.”]. This serves to establish an analogy.

- E. Here “your offering” forms the basis for a classification. Just as ‘your offering’ here involves adding oil and saturating the meal with oil, so “your offering,” used later invokes the requirement of adding oil and saturating the meal with oil.
- F. And, further, just as the classification of “your offering” noted below involves putting on oil in a utensil prior to the preparation of the offering, so “your offering” in the present instance also involves putting on oil in a utensil prior to the preparation of the offering [Sifra XXI:I.1-2].

**II.1** A. “And as to the loaves [baked in an oven], one stirs them [with oil] ,” the words of Rabbi. And sages say, “The fine flour [alone was mixed with oil:]”

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “it shall be of choice flour with oil mixed in:”
- D. “...choice flour with oil mixed in:”
- E. This teaches that one mixes the oil into the fine flour. E. Rabbi says, “And as to the loaves [baked in an oven, one stirs them with oil (M. [Men. 6:3C](#))] [“In the case of loaves, they stir oil into them...as it is said, ‘Loaves mixed with oil’” (Lev. 7:12) [=T. [Men. 8:7B-C](#)].”
- F. They said to him, “But in connection with the cakes that accompany the thank offering, is it not said, ‘Flour mixed with oil’ (Lev. 23:13)” [=T. [8:7C](#)]?
- G. “And it is possible to stir in only with flour. [B. Men. 75a: It was not possible to mingle the cakes with oil but only the flour.]
- H. “How does one do this? One puts oil into the flour and stirs it in, then oil into a utensil and prepares it, and stirs it, and mixes [the flour] with oil.” [Tosefta’s version: “How does one do this? He puts oil into the utensil and fries it. Then he puts oil into the flour and stirs it and breaks it up. And he then pours oil on it as one pours oil on pounded beans” (T. [Men. 8:5C-D](#)].
- I. Rabbi says, “One puts oil into a utensil and prepares it, and stirs it, and then mixes the flour with oil, and then goes and pours oil on it” [Sifra XXI:I.1].
- J. “How does one do this? To begin with one puts in oil into the utensil, then puts in flour, kneads it, bakes it, breaks it into pieces, adds oil to it, mixed the two together, adds more oil on it, and then takes the handful from it.”

**II.2.** A. [Following Cashdan’s version of the text:] That was a good argument that sages addressed to Rabbi.

- B. *What was it?*
- C. Said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “Since there was only a quarter log of oil, how was it possible to spread it among so many cakes?”

**III.1** A. The loaves require stirring. The wafers are anointed:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “unleavened cakes with oil mixed in:”
- D. But not wafers are saturated in oil.
- E. Now is the contrary to that proposition not a matter of logic?

- F. If cakes, which do not require to be spread with oil, do require saturation in oil, wafers, which do require to be spread with oil, should surely require saturation in oil!
- G. [Accordingly, it is necessary for] Scripture [to make the point explicit, when it says,] “unleavened cakes with oil mixed in:”
- H. But wafers are not saturated in oil.
- I. “...unleavened wafers spread with oil:”
- J. But cakes do not have to be spread with oil.
- K. Now is the contrary to that proposition not a matter of logic?
- L. If wafers, which do not have to be saturated in oil, do have to be spread with oil, cakes, which do require saturation in oil, surely should have also to be spread with oil.
- M. [Accordingly, it is necessary for] Scripture [to make the point explicit, when it says,] “...unleavened wafers spread with oil:”
- N. But cakes do not have to be spread with oil [Sifra XX:III.2-5].

**III.2.** A. *What is the exegetical reasoning that yields this conclusion?*

- B. Said Raba, “Scripture should not have left out at least one time the phrase “cakes anointed with oil and wafers mixed with oil” [Cashdan: the fact that Scripture always speaks of cakes mingled with oil and wafers anointed with oil indicates that the manner of applying the oil is exclusive in each case].

**IV.1** A. **How does one anoint them? In the form of a chi [an X] [that is, in the form of a cross]:**

- B. *What is the meaning of in the form of a chi?*
- C. Said R. Kahana, “In the form of the Greek letter Chi.”

**IV.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. In the case of a meal offering baked in the oven that is made up half of cakes and half of wafers [as Simeon has said it may be], one brings along a single log of oil and divides it up, half for the cakes, half for the wafers.
- C. The cakes are mixed with the oil, the wafers anointed.
- D. As to anointing the wafer, it must be done over the whole of the surface, with the residue put into the caies.
- E. R. Simeon b. Judah in the name of R. Simeon says, “One anoints it in the form of a Chi, and the residue of the oil is eaten by the priests.”

**IV.3.** A. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. As to wafers that are presented on their own, one brings along a log of oil and anoints them, and then does the same until all of the oil in the log is used up.
- C. R. Simeon b. Judah in the name of R. Simeon says, “One anoints it in the form of a Chi, and the residue of the oil is eaten by the priests.”

**7:4A**

**A. All meal offerings that are prepared in a utensil require breaking up [for the taking of the handful].**

**I.1** A. [that are prepared in a utensil:] *what is excluded by the qualifying language?*  
B. *Said R. Pappa, "The language is meant to exclude the two loaves of bread and the show bread."*

**I.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*  
B. **"Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering:"**  
C. **This serves to extend the rule of breaking up to all meal-offerings.**  
D. **Might one suppose that that same rule extends also to the two loaves and the show bread?**  
E. **Scripture says, "it...."**  
F. **How come you encompass all meal offerings but exclude the two loaves and the show bread?**  
G. **[Sifra adds:] After Scripture has used inclusionary language, it has then made an exclusion.**  
H. **Just as these are distinguished in that part of the offering is placed on the altar-fires, so excluded are the two loaves of bread and the show bread, none of which is put on the altar-fire [but all of which is given to the priests to eat].**  
I. **"Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering:"**  
J. **This serves to extend the rule of pouring oil on the offering to all meal-offerings.**  
K. **Might one suppose that that rule extends also to a meal-offering that is baked?**  
L. **Scripture says, "on it."**  
M. **I shall then exclude the loaves, but not the wafers?**  
N. **Scripture says, "it is [a meal offering]," [encompassing wafers under the rule of applying oil] [Sifra XXI:IV.1-2].**

**I.3.** A. *What is the exegetical reasoning that yields this conclusion?*  
B. *Ought I not exclude the meal offering of the priests?*  
C. **[75B]** *Said Rabbah, "Which is the offering that has to be excluded by two distinct formulations? You have to say it is the meal offering baked in the oven."*  
*[Cashdan: for it consists of two kinds, cakes and wafers, so two exclusionary expressions are required to exclude it].*

### **7:4B-H**

B. **[As to] the meal offering of an Israelite: one folds it one into two, then two into four [parts], and divides it [at each fold].**  
C. **[As to] the meal offering of priests: one folds it one into two, then two into four [parts] but does not divide it.**  
D. **[As to] the meal offering of the anointed priest: one did not fold it up.**  
E. **R. Simeon says, "The meal offering of priests and the meal offering of an anointed priest are not subject to [the requirement of] breaking up.**  
F. **"For they are not subject to the taking of a handful.**  
G. **"And anything which is not subject to the taking of a handful is not subject to breaking up."**

H. **And all of them are to be broken up into pieces at least the size of olive's bulks.**

**I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. "You shall break..." (Lev. 2: 6):

C. Might one suppose that it is into two parts?

D. Scripture says, "in pieces."

E. Since it says "in pieces," might I suppose that it is to be into crumbs?

F. Scripture says, "it."

G. "It" must be broken into pieces, but the pieces are not to be further broken up.

H. So how is it to be done?

I. **[As to] the meal offering of an Israelite: one folds it one into two, then two into four [parts], and divides it [at each fold]. [As to] the meal offering of priests and of the anointed priest: one folds it one into two, then two into four [parts] but does not divide it.**

J. *But have we not learned in the Mishnah, [As to] the meal offering of the anointed priest: one did not fold it up?*

K. Said Rabbah, "One does not fold it into four parts, but one folds it into two."

**II.1** A. R. Simeon says, "The meal offering of priests and the meal offering of an anointed priest are not subject to [the requirement of] breaking up. For they are not subject to the taking of a handful. And anything which is not subject to the taking of a handful is not subject to breaking up:"

**So far as I can see, the following has no relationship to our Mishnah-paragraph**

B. *Said R. Joseph, "As to habisa, if it contains pieces of bread an olive bulk in size, to begin with one says the blessing over it, 'Who brings forth bread from the earth.' [B. Ber. 37B adds:] And at the end one says [the Grace after Meals consisting of] three blessings.*

C. *"If it does not contain pieces of bread the size of an olive, to begin with one says the blessing over it, 'Who creates various kinds of food.' [B. Ber. 37B adds:] And at the end one says the single blessing that abbreviates the three [of the Grace after Meals]."*

D. *Said R. Joseph, "How do I know it? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. *"If [a priest] was standing and making meal offerings in [The Temple in] Jerusalem, he says the blessing, 'Blessed... who has kept us in life and sustained us and brought us to this season.'*

F. *"When he takes them to eat them, he says the blessing, 'Who brings forth bread from the earth.'"*

G. *And it has been taught in connection with this statement: "And all meal offerings are chopped up to the size of an olive's bulk. [So if the crumbs are the size of an olive's bulk, one says, 'Who brings forth...', but if not, one says the alternate blessing.]"*



H. *Said to him Abbayye, "But from the viewpoint of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael, who has said, 'One chops up [the pieces of meal-offering] until they revert to the status of flour,' in such a case also does a person not have to say the blessing, 'He brings forth bread from the earth'?"*

I. *"And if you say that is indeed the case, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority, 'If one gathered together among bread crumbs so much as an olive's bulk in size and ate them [on Passover], if it is leavened bread, one is subject to the penalty of extirpation, but if it is unleavened, then a person fulfills his obligation to eat unleavened bread on Passover through what has been scraped together. [And in that case, one has to say the blessing, "Who brings forth bread from the earth."]"? [That is so even though the bread crumbs themselves are not of the volume of an olive. So the position of Joseph would be contradicted by the Tannaite authority at hand.]"*

J. *Under what circumstances [does the rule just now stated apply]? It is to a case in which one rekneaded the crumbs [and made them into a compact mass].*

K. *If so, then let us proceed to the next clause [of the same Tannaite teaching]: "And the stated rule applies in a case in which one ate them [that is, the crumbs] in the interval of time sufficient for eating a half-loaf of bread. But if we deal with a case in which one has kneaded the crumbs into a compact mass, the phrase, "ate them" should be, "ate it."*

L. *Rather, with what situation do we deal? It is with crumbs that come from a large loaf of bread. [Some of the bread remains unbroken, even though the crumbs were not rekneaded. In such a case, the blessing, "Who brings forth bread from the earth" applies on account of the origin of the crumbs.]*

M. *What is the upshot of the matter?*

N. *Said R. Sheshet, "As to habisa, even though it does not contain pieces of bread an olive's bulk in size, one says the blessing before eating it, 'Who brings forth bread from the earth.'"*

O. *Said Raba, "But that is the case only if the bits of bread still look like bread."*

## 7:5

- A. [76A] As to all meal offerings [the flour used therefor] require three hundred [acts of] rubbing [to remove dirt] and five hundred [acts of] beating [to remove husks].
- B. And rubbing and beating [apply to grains of] wheat.
- C. R. Yosé says, "Also: [to the] dough."
- D. "All meal offerings [of loaves or wafers] are brought ten at a time,
- E. "except for showbread [Lev. 24: 5: twelve] and the baked cakes of a high priest [Lev. 7:13-15], which are brought twelve at a time," the words of R. Judah.
- F. R. Meir says, "All of them are brought twelve at a time,
- G. "except for the loaves of the thank offering [M. 7:1] and of the Nazirite [M. 7:2], which are brought ten at a time."

- I.1** A. [As to all meal offerings the flour used therefor require three hundred acts of rubbing [to remove dirt] and five hundred acts of beating to remove husks:] a Tannaite statement:
- B. one rubs once, beats twice, rubs twice, beats three times [and does that sequence of actions a hundred times, yielding three hundred rubbings and five hundred beatings].
- I.2.** A. R. Jeremiah raised this question: “Does the movement of the hand to and fro count as one rubbing or as two?”
- B. That question stands.
- II.1** A. And rubbing and beating [apply to grains of] wheat. R. Yosé says, “Also: [to the] dough:”
- B. The question was raised: is the intent “also to the dough but not to the grounds of wheat,” or is it, “the dough too”?
- C. Come and take note of what has been taught on Tannaite authority:
- D. Rubbing and beating apply to grains of wheat. R. Yosé says, “Rubbing and beating apply to the dough [but not to the wheat] [T. Men. 8:14B-C].
- III.1** A. “All meal offerings [of loaves or wafers] are brought ten at a time, except for showbread [Lev. 24: 5: twelve] and the baked cakes of a high priest [Lev. 7:13-15], which are brought twelve at a time,” the words of R. Judah.
- B. In respect to the show bread, this is explicitly stated [at Lev. 24: 5].
- C. With respect to the griddle cakes presented by the high priest, the same rule derives from the verbal analogy provided by the appearance of the word “statute” both in this context and in the context of the show bread [Lev. 24: 9, 6:15].
- D. But how on the basis of Scripture do we know that all other meal offerings are to be made up of ten cakes?
- E. The lesson derives from the rule governing the cakes of the thank offering: just as these must comprise ten cakes ], so all meal offerings must comprise ten cakes.
- F. What about the show bread: just as there are twelve cakes, so all meal offerings should be twelve cakes?
- G. It is more reasonable to adopt the analogy of the cakes of the thank offering, for [like the cakes of the thank offering, all other meal offerings] are presented by an individual, are free will offerings, have to have oil, are invalid if left overnight, may not be offered on the Sabbath, and may not be presented in a condition of uncleanness.
- H. To the contrary, it is more likely to adopt the analogy of the show bread, for like the show bread, all other meal offerings fall into the classification of Most Holy Things, require frankincense, are made up wholly of unleavened cakes, and may be presented by themselves.
- I. The former considerations are more numerous.
- J. But if we take the view, as we do, that a rule that is derived by an argument a fortiori may go and teach a lesson through an argument based on the congruence of other shared traits [but not verbal ones in context], then we should adopt as our governing analogy the griddle cakes presented by the high priest:

- K. Just as in that case they are twelve, so here they should be twelve.
- L. *It is more reasonable to adopt the analogy of the cakes of the thank offering, for [like the cakes of the thank offering, all other meal offerings] are presented by an individual, are free will offerings, are not presented in halves, are subject to the law of refuse, and may not be offered on the Sabbath, and may not be presented in a condition of uncleanness.*
- M. *To the contrary, the governing analogy should be supplied by the griddle cakes presented by the high priest, for like that offering, other meal offerings are made of a tenth ephah of fine flour, have to be sanctified in a utensil, fall into the classification of Most Holy Things, have to have frankincense, are made up entirely of unleavened cakes, may be presented entirely on their own, have to be brought near, and are offered on the altar fire; and these considerations are more in number than those just now proposed!*
- N. *It is better to derive the rules governing an offering of an ordinary person from those governing an offering of an ordinary person [rather than those governing the offering of the high priest].*

**IV.1 A. R. Meir says, “All of them are brought twelve at a time:”**

- B. *What is the premise of this position? If it is that a rule that is derived by an argument a fortiori may go and teach a lesson through an argument based on the congruence of other shared traits [but not verbal ones in context], then he should adopt as the governing analogy the griddle cakes presented by the high priest, for the indicative traits of resemblance are the more numerous.*
- C. *If it is that a rule that is derived by an argument a fortiori may not go and teach a lesson through an argument based on the congruence of other shared traits [but not verbal ones in context], then he should adopt as the governing analogy the rule governing the show bread.*
- D. *He prefers to derive the rule governing Most Holy Things from that governing other, pertinent Most Holy Things.*

**V.1 A. “...except for the loaves of the thank offering [M. 7:1] and of the Nazirite, which are brought ten at a time:”**

- B. *With respect to the cakes of the thank offering, that is explicitly articulated,*
- C. *and as to the cakes of the Nazirite, that is in line with what a master has said: “his peace offerings” (Lev. 7:13) serves to encompass the peace offerings of the Nazirite.”*

**V.2. A. Said R. Tobi bar Qisma said Samuel, “Cakes for the thank offering that one baked as four [instead of forty] serve to carry out one’s obligation.”**

- B. *But lo, we require forty!*
- C. *That is simply a definition of the best way in which to carry out the religious duty.*
- D. *But does not heave offering have to be taken up [from each set of ten cakes, one from each to the priest]?*
- E. *And should you say that one takes a peace from each of the four cakes for that purpose, the All-Merciful has stated, “one” (Lev. 7:14), meaning, one that is whole and not broken!*
- F. *The heave offering was taken up when the dough for the cakes was being kneaded.*

- G. *An objection to this proposition was raised: All meal offerings of which too many or too few cakes are presented are valid except for the show bread, the griddle cakes of the high priest, the cakes of the thank offering, and the cakes of the offering of the Nazirite.*
- H. *He [76B] concurs with that which the following Tannaite authority stated, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: All meal offerings of which too many or too few cakes are presented are valid except for the show bread, the griddle cakes of the high priest. And there are those who say, "Also the cakes of the thank offering, and the cakes of the offering of the Nazirite."*
- V.3.** A. Said R. Huna, "If a meal offering baked in the oven was baked as only a single cake, it serves to carry out one's obligation.
- B. *"What is the scriptural basis for that position? It is that the word 'unleavened' (Lev. 2: 4) is written without the vowel-letter and so is interpreted as though in the singular."*
- C. *To that proposition objected R. Pappa, "If the scriptural basis for that position? It is that the word 'unleavened' (Lev. 2: 4) is written without the vowel-letter and so is interpreted as though in the singular, then if the word had not been written that way, would it not be the rule? But lo, the same word is not written in that manner when it comes to the cakes of the thank offering, and nonetheless, said R. Tobi bar Qisma said Samuel, 'Cakes for the thank offering that one baked as four [instead of forty] serve to carry out one's obligation'!"*
- D. *So that statement differs from this one! [Big deal.]*

### 7:6

- A. **The [meal offering of] the offering of the first sheaf of barley was offered of a tenth [of an ephah of flour] taken from three seahs.**
- B. **The two loaves of bread [come from] two tenths taken from three seahs [Lev. 23:17].**
- C. **The showbread comes from twenty-four tenths taken from twenty-four seahs [Lev. 24: 5 twenty-four loaves, each of two tenths].**
- I.1** A. **[The meal offering of the offering of the first sheaf of barley:] what is the operative consideration?**
- B. *Since it derives from the produce of the new growing season, and from barley, a tenth of really fine flour could be derived only by sifting three seahs of the grain.*
- II.1** A. **The two loaves of bread [come from] two tenths taken from three seahs [Lev. 23:17]: what is the operative consideration?**
- B. *Since it derives from wheat, even though it derives from the produce of the new growing season, a tenth of really fine flour could be derived by sifting only two seahs of the grain.*
- III.1** A. **The showbread comes from twenty-four tenths taken from twenty-four seahs [Lev. 24: 5 twenty-four loaves, each of two tenths]: what is the operative consideration?**
- B. *Since it derives from wheat, and from the produce of the past growing season, a tenth of really fine flour could be derived by sifting even a single seah of the grain.*

**III.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. In the case of all meal offerings, if the number of tenth-measures of flour used was too big or too small, the offering is invalid. If the number of seahs of grain was too big or too small, the offering is valid [cf. T. **Men. 8:15**].

7:7

- A. The [meal offering of the] offering of the first sheaf of barley was sifted through thirteen sieves [each finer than the former].  
B. And the two loaves [Lev. 23:17] [were sifted through] twelve sieves.  
C. And the showbread [was sifted through] eleven sieves,  
D. R. Simeon says, “There is no prescribed limit to the matter [of C].  
E. “But flour that was sifted as much as necessary did one bring,  
F. “as it is said, And [in the case of showbread] you will take fine flour and bake it (Lev. 24: 5) — that it should be sifted as much as necessary.”

**I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. One made use of a thin and a thick sieve, a thin one so that it will hold the fine flour, and a thick one so that it will hold the refuse.  
C. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “The thirteen sieves were located one on top of the other. The lowest of all of them was so made as to hold the fine flour” [T. **Men. 8:14J-K**].

**II.1** A. R. Simeon says, “There is no prescribed limit to the matter [of C]. But flour that was sifted as much as necessary did one bring, as it is said, ‘And [in the case of showbread] you will take fine flour and bake it’ (Lev. 24: 5) — that it should be sifted as much as necessary.”

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*  
C. “And you shall take fine flour and bake it into twelve loaves of it; two tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. And you shall set them in two rows, six in a row, upon the table of pure gold. And you shall put pure frankincense with each row, that it may go with the bread as a memorial portion to be offered by fire to the Lord. Every Sabbath day Aaron shall set it in order before the Lord continually on behalf of the people of Israel as a covenant for ever. And it shall be for Aaron and his sons, and they shall eat it in a holy place, since it is for him a most holy portion out of the offerings by fire to the Lord, a perpetual due” (Lev. 24: 5-9):  
D. “fine flour and bake it:”  
E. How do we know that one may also take wheat [for baking the twelve loaves of bread under discussion here]?  
F. Scripture says, “You shall take fine flour.”  
G. Might one suppose that other meal offerings also may derive from wheat [not barley, the usual grain for that purpose]?  
H. Scripture says, “it.”  
I. This derives from wheat, but other meal offerings do not derive from wheat [Sifra CCXLI:1.1].  
J. That is on account of the excessive expense.

- K. *What is the meaning of,* That is on account of the excessive expense?
- L. Said R. Eleazar, "The Torah took into consideration the Israelites' capital [here: their cattle]. *And where is this shown?* 'And you shall give the congregation and their cattle something to drink' (Num. 20: 8)."