

XII

BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER TWELVE

FOLIOS 100B-104B

12:1

- A. Meal offerings and drink offerings which were made unclean
- B. before one has sanctified them in a [consecrated] utensil
- C. are subject to redemption [for money, which is deemed consecrated in their stead].
- D. [If they are made unclean] after one has sanctified them in a [consecrated] utensil,
- E. they are not subject to redemption.
- F. Fowl and wood and frankincense and a utensil of service are not subject to redemption [at all],
- G. for [the rule (Lev. 27:11-13) that permits redemption of a blemished offering] is stated only [in connection with offerings of] cattle.

I.1 A. [Meal offerings and drink offerings which were made unclean before one has sanctified them in a [consecrated] utensil are subject to redemption:] Said Samuel, “Even though [meal offerings and drink offerings] are clean, they may be redeemed.

- B. *“What is the operative consideration? So long as they have not been sanctified in a Temple utensil of service, the sanctification that affects them is merely that covering their value, and sanctification only as to value is subject to redemption. And as to the reference to their having been made unclean, made in the Mishnah, that is misleading, since, in point of fact, the rule is the same even though they were not unclean. But because the Tannaite framer had in mind to state, [If they are made unclean] after one has sanctified them in a [consecrated] utensil, they are not subject to redemption, he stated also, so that even though they were unclean, they still may not be redeemed, he stated in the first clause as well, which were made unclean.”*

II.1 A. [If they are made unclean] after one has sanctified them in a [consecrated] utensil, they are not subject to redemption:

- B. *But that’s obvious. They are, after all, sanctified as to their physical body, not merely as to their value!*

- C. *It was necessary to make that point nonetheless, for you might otherwise have supposed that since a blemished Holy Thing is called unclean, then what is unclean may then be classified as blemished, and just as what has been blemished may be redeemed in money even though it is sanctified as to its physical body, not merely as to its value, so this too is subject to redemption. Thus we are informed that the All-Merciful has not classified what is unclean as blemished in that sense [having been sanctified in a utensil of service]. [101A] The reason is that in no case do we find that what has been sanctified in a utensil of service may be redeemed.*

II.2. A. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that what is blemished is classified as unclean?*

- B. *It is in accord with that which we have learned on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **“And if it be any unclean beast, of which they may not bring an offering [then the man shall bring the animal before the priest, and the priest shall value it as either good or bad; as you the priest value it, so shall it be; but if he wishes to redeem it, he shall add a fifth to the valuation]” (Lev. 27:11) —**
- D. **it is concerning blemished beasts that are to be redeemed that Scripture speaks [in the term ‘unclean’].**
- E. **You say that it is concerning blemished beasts that are to be redeemed that Scripture speaks. But perhaps it speaks only of actually unclean beasts.**
- F. **When Scripture says, “And if it is an unclean animal, then he shall buy it back at your valuation” (Lev. 27:27), lo, Scripture covers the case of the dedication of [the value of] an unclean animal [for the upkeep of the Temple house, and as we see, that also requires valuation in the redemption process]. So how shall I interpret, “And if it be any unclean beast, of which they may not bring an offering [then the man shall bring the animal before the priest, and the priest shall value it as either good or bad; as you the priest value it, so shall it be; but if he wishes to redeem it, he shall add a fifth to the valuation]” (Lev. 27:11)? It is concerning blemished beasts, indicating that they are to be redeemed.**
- G. **Might one suppose that they are to be redeemed because of a transient blemish?**
- H. **Scripture is explicit, “...of which they may not bring an offering,” thus referring to one that is not offered at all, therefore excluding this one, which may not be offered today but which can be offered tomorrow. [And if you prefer, I shall explain, [a transient blemish does suffice, so] what value is there in the specification “Lame and blind”? That means that the blemishes must be permanent ones] [Sifra CCLXXII:I.1].**
- I. *Objected R. Huna bar Manoah, “ Fowl and wood and frankincense and a utensil of service are not subject to redemption [at all], for [the rule (Lev. 27:11-13) which permits redemption of a blemished offering] is stated only [in connection with offerings of] cattle. Now there is no problem with respect to fowl, for they are sanctified as to their physical body, and Scripture speaks only of cattle. But wood and frankincense and a utensil of service ought to be subject to redemption! But is the operative consideration not be that*

animals that are without blemish and clean may not be redeemed, while these, even though unclean, are classified as clean. For wood and frankincense are not classified as foodstuffs by reason of their own traits, but are so classified only because of the esteem in which they are held by reason of being Holy Things. So long as wood has not been cut up into chips for use on the altar, have not been made susceptible to uncleanness; frankincense, so long as it has not been sanctified in a utensil of service, also has not been made susceptible to uncleanness; utensils of ministry can be made clean by immersion in an immersion pool, so are not classified as unclean.”

- J. *Not at all. In point of fact I may say to you that the other things, even when clean, may be redeemed, but even when unclean, these may not be redeemed because they are hard to come by.*
- K. *Well, there is no problem in that explanation so far as it extends to frankincense and utensils of service, because these really are hard to come by, but wood is pretty broadly available!*
- L. *No, wood also falls into the class of what is hard to come by, for a master has said, **And any piece of wood in which a worm is found is invalid for use on the altar [M. Mid. 2:5J].** Therefore wood too is hard to come by.*

II.3. A. Said R. Pappa, “If Samuel had heard that which has been taught on Tannaite authority, he would have retracted the statement that he made: **He who sanctifies an unblemished animal for the upkeep of the Temple house — they redeem it only for the purpose of the altar alone [T. Tem. 1:13C-D]**, since what is suitable for the altar can never be released from the altar. [In light of this statement, how can he hold that even though meal offerings and drink offerings are clean, they may be redeemed?]

- B. *But that is not true. He did hear of that statement, but he did not retract his judgment. For did you not explain earlier that the operative consideration is that, since they are scarce, they may not be redeemed? Here too, since disqualifying blemishes in the case of cattle are commonplace, even skin over the eye disqualifying, animals free from blemish and fit for the altar are very scarce indeed.*

II.4. A. R. Kahana said, “If meal offerings and drink offerings became unclean, they may be redeemed. If they are clean, they may not be redeemed [but must be used on the altar].”

- B. So did R. Oshaia say, “If meal offerings and drink offerings became unclean, they may be redeemed. If they are clean, they may not be redeemed [but must be used on the altar].”
- C. *There are those who state:* “said R. Oshaia, ‘Even if they are clean, they may be redeemed.’”
- D. R. Eleazar says, “All of them if unclean may be redeemed, if clean, may not be redeemed, except for the tenth ephah of the meal offering of the poor sinner. For lo, the Torah has said, ‘...from his sin’ in the one case, and, in the other, ‘for his sin.’” [Cashdan: [At Lev. 5: 6, 10, 13 we find the stated language. For the sins of Lev. 5:1-4 the rich man brings animals, a poor man, birds, and a very poor one, a meal offering. In regard to the first two, Scripture says, ‘...make atonement from

his sin,' in the third, '....make atonement for his sin.' The upshot is that if a poor person designated funds for the meal offering and then got rich, he has to add to the money for his sin and present what is required of a rich man. If he brought a tenth ephah of flour for the meal offering, he has to redeem it and add funds to buy a bird or animal offering. The meal offering therefore is redeemed, even though it is clean (Cashdan).]

- II.5.** A. Said R. Oshaia, "I have heard that in the opinion of R. Simeon, if a meal offering was turned into refuse [by reason of the officiating priest's improper intention to eat the residue of the meal outside of the proper place or time], it does not fall into the classification of food such as to be subject to the laws of food uncleanness. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **"The fruit of fruit trees in the first three years after planting, mixed seeds in a vineyard, [101B] an ox that is to be put to death by stoning, a heifer that has had its neck broken, the birds of the leper's offering, the firstborn of an ass, and a mixture in which meat and milk have been boiled together — all of them are in the class of food so far as the rules of uncleanness are concerned [even though they may not be used for any sort of benefit, they still contract and convey uncleanness as food].**
- C. **"R. Simeon says, 'None of them receives uncleanness as food. [What cannot be eaten also is not deemed food so far as cultic uncleanness is concerned.]** [So it follows that if a meal offering was turned into refuse [by reason of the officiating priest's improper intention to eat the residue of the meal outside of the proper place or time], it does not fall into the classification of food such as to be subject to the laws of food uncleanness] **[Thus in any event after the breaking of the neck [of an ass that is a firstborn which has not been redeemed with a lamb], it is forbidden to derive benefit from it.]**
- D. **"But R. Simeon concedes in respect to the mixture of meat and milk that it does receive uncleanness as soon, since at one point it was suitable to be subject to such uncleanness [before the cooking took place]" [T. Uqs. 3:12A-H].**
- E. *And R. Assi said R. Yohanan said, "What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon? It is written, 'All food therein which may be eaten' (Lev. 11:34) — food you can give to gentiles to eat is classified as food, but food you cannot give to gentiles to eat is not classified as food."*
- F. Now with reference to a meal offering was turned into refuse [by reason of the officiating priest's improper intention to eat the residue of the meal outside of the proper place or time], it is food that you cannot give to gentiles to eat, [so it does not fall into the classification of food such as to be subject to the laws of food uncleanness].
- G. *If so, meat that has fallen into milk should be classified as able to convey food uncleanness, for it is food that you can give to outsiders to eat. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, "Meat cooked in milk may not be eaten, but one may derive benefit from it [e.g., by selling it to gentiles to eat], as it is said, 'For you are a holy people to the Lord your God' (Deu. 14:21), [which is followed by the prohibition of cooking a kid in its mother's milk, bearing the sense that you may not eat it but you may give it to*

others to eat]. And further, ‘And you shall be holy to me’ (Exo. 22:30) [in regard to terefah-meat].” Just as in that latter case, the food may not be eaten but one may derive benefit from it, so here too, the food may not be eaten but one may derive benefit from it.”

- H. *What we have here is a case of giving more than a single reason, specifically, for one thing, it is food that one may give to outsiders to eat, and, in addition, for the Israelite there was a time in which it was suitable for eating [and both considerations are in play].*
- I. *An objection was raised: R. Simeon says, “There is that which is left over of the sacrifice that receives uncleanness as food, and there is that which is left over of the sacrifice that does not receive uncleanness as food. How so? If the meat of the offering was left overnight before sprinkling the blood, that which is left over that does not receive uncleanness as food. If the meat of the offering was left overnight after sprinkling the blood, that is left over that does receive uncleanness as food. As to flesh of the sacrifice that has been rendered refuse because the officiating priest has formed the improper intention of eating his share at an improper time, in the case of Most Holy Things or Lesser Holy Things, it does not receive uncleanness as food. The afternoon offering that has been made refuse nonetheless does receive uncleanness as food” [T. Uqs. 3:12E-H]. [Vs. Oshaia: if a meal offering was turned into refuse [by reason of the officiating priest’s improper intention to eat the residue of the meal outside of the proper place or time], it does not fall into the classification of food such as to be subject to the laws of food uncleanness.]*
- J. *[Oshaia may solve this problem by pointing out:] that forms no contradiction. In the one case at some moment the flour of the meal offering was permitted for food [that is, before it was consecrated for the meal offering], in the other [the case of Oshaia] there was never a moment at which the substance was permitted as food.*

II.6. A. *And what sort of case would be one in which there was not a single moment when the substance was not permitted?*

- B. *A case in which the grain was sanctified for a meal offering while it was still attached to the ground [so it was then insusceptible and never became susceptible by reason of the sanctification].*
- C. *But the owner can have redeemed it [at which point the grain would be available for food]!*
- D. *That would pose no problem to the version of R. Oshaia’s statement that presents his position as follows: “If meal offerings and drink offerings became unclean, they may be redeemed. If they are clean, they may not be redeemed [but must be used on the altar].” But in regard to the version of his opinion, “Even if they are clean, they may be redeemed,” the grain most certainly can be redeemed!*
- E. *Here, in any event the grain has not been redeemed.*
- F. *But if someone wanted, he could redeem it, and we have heard from R. Simeon the opinion that whatever is available for redemption is classified as though it were already redeemed. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- G. **R. Simeon says, “A red cow imparts uncleanness as food because at some one moment at the very least it was fit for food [before it was designated for its present purpose]” [T. Par. 7:9A].** And in this connection stated R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Simeon would say that a red cow may be redeemed even though it has already been put on the wood pile where it is to be burned!”
- H. *But what sort of comparison is that! True enough, a red cow can be redeemed, for if the officiating authorities found a better one than that, it is a religious duty to redeem that one [and buy another]. But as to the meal offerings, what sort of religious duty is conceivable in such a case, such that one must redeem what has been consecrated for a meal offering at all!*
- II.7.** A. *And lo, in the matter of meat that is kept overnight before the sprinkling of the blood, in which case it is a religious duty to sprinkle the blood, and if one wants to, he could have sprinkled the blood. And yet the statement is explicit that it does not fall under the law of food uncleanness!*
- B. *Here, with what sort of case do we deal? It was a case in which there was not sufficient time by day to sprinkle the blood.*
- C. *But then if there were sufficient time by day to sprinkle the blood, what would have been the law? Obviously, the meat would fall under the law of food uncleanness. Then, instead of stating the rule, **If the meat of the offering was left overnight after sprinkling the blood, that is left over that does receive uncleanness as food**, the Tannaite authority should have made the distinction in his presentation of the case in this way: Under what circumstances? In a case in which there was not sufficient time by day to sprinkle the blood. But if there were sufficient time by day to sprinkle the blood, then it does convey the uncleanness pertaining to foods.*
- D. *Well, in point of fact, that is precisely what the framer of the passage meant to tell us, namely: if it was left over night before the blood was ready for sprinkling, it conveys uncleanness under the law of food uncleanness [since there was sufficient time left to sprinkle the blood, the blood is regarded as sprinkled, and the meat is permitted to the priests and is subject to food uncleanness (Cashdan)].*
- E. *But in the case of an offering, whether of Most Holy Things or Lesser Holy Things, that had been turned into refuse, there is a religious duty to sprinkle the blood in the right way [that is, without invalidating intentionality], [102A] and if one wanted to do so, one could have sprinkled it correctly. And still, the passage says, **As to flesh of the sacrifice that has been rendered refuse because the officiating priest has formed the improper intention of eating his share at an improper time, in the case of Most Holy Things or Lesser Holy Things, it does not receive uncleanness as food.** And yet the improper intentionality that has led to classifying the offering as refuse took place during the sprinkling of the blood [and before the sprinkling, the offering was valid, and the blood was ready to be sprinkled properly, so the meat should be subject to food uncleanness; but that is not stated, so we have to conclude*

that whatever is appropriately ready for sprinkled is not considered as already sprinkled (Cashdan)].

- F. *No, the invalidating intentionality leading to the classification of the offering as refuse took place during the act of slaughtering.*
- G. *Then if the improper intentionality that has led to classifying the offering as refuse took place during the sprinkling of the blood, what is the rule?*
- H. *Here too, it would impart uncleanness as food.*
- I. *Then instead of formulating the matter as, **The afternoon offering that has been made refuse nonetheless does receive uncleanness as food**, the author of the passage should use this language: Under what circumstances? In a case in which the invalidating intentionality leading to the classification as refuse took place during the act of slaughter. But if refuse came about during the act of sprinkling the blood, it does impart uncleanness as food.*
- J. *Well, in point of fact it was necessary for him to make explicit reference to the issue of turning the meal offering into refuse, for even though one has expressed the invalidating intentionality leading to the status of refuse at the point of taking up the handful of meal offering, and the point at which the handful is taken out of the meal offering corresponds to the point at which the beast is slaughtered in an animal offering, still, the meal offering would be subject to the laws of food uncleanness, since at some moment, to begin with, it was permitted for eating [before the meal was consecrated].*

II.8. A. Said R. Ashi, “I repeated this tradition before R. Nahman, who said to me, ‘You may even say that the language, ‘if it remained overnight before the sprinkling’ is meant in its commonplace sense. And you may even say, the intentionality leading to the classification as refuse was expressed prior to the sprinkling. Still, there would be no problem [in regard to what Simeon has said about the red cow, ‘whatever is subject to redemption is deemed as to have been redeemed, while he does not invoke the same notion to food uncleanness, whatever is going to be sprinkled is as though it were sprinkled,]’ for while we accept the principle, ‘if he wanted to redeem it he could have done so [for this can be done by a mere statement, and therefore even though not redeemed, it is classified as already redeemed], we do not accept the principle, ‘if he wanted to sprinkle the blood, he could have sprinkled the blood’ [Cashdan: for so long as the act of sprinkling has not been performed, the fact that it can be sprinkled does not mean it is classified as though it were already sprinkled].”

- B. *An objection was raised on the strength of the following: A general principle did R. Joshua state: “Whatever has had a moment of availability to [for use by] the priests—the laws of sacrilege do not apply thereto. And [whatever] has not [yet] had a moment of availability to the priests — the laws of sacrilege do apply thereto.” What is that which has had a moment of availability to the priests? That which [after the proper tossing of the blood] has been left*

overnight, and that which has been made unclean, and that which has gone forth [beyond the veils]. And what is that which has not [yet] had a moment of availability to the priests? That which has been slaughtered [with improper intention to eat that which is usually eaten or to offer up that which is usually offered up] outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place, and that, the blood of which invalid men have received or tossed [M. [Meilah 1:1G-O](#)]. Now, in any event, the Tannaite formulation at the outset states, **That which [after the proper tossing of the blood] has been left overnight, and that which has been made unclean, and that which has gone forth [beyond the veils].** Does this not, then, mean, that it actually was left overnight? And yet it is classified as having had a moment of permissibility to the priests, because, if one had wanted to toss the blood, it is deemed as though it had been tossed, and that is why it is not subject any longer to the law of sacrilege!

- C. *Not at all! The sense is that, it was ready to become disqualified if taken out or made unclean. But if it had actually been taken out or made unclean, what would have been the rule? Here too, the laws of sacrilege would have applied.*
- D. *Well, then, instead of formulating matters in this language, **Whatever has had a moment of availability to [for use by] the priests...And [whatever] has not [yet] had a moment of availability to the priests...,** the Tannaite formulation should have been: Whatever has been rendered permissible to the priests is not subject to the law of sacrilege, and whatever has not been rendered permissible to the priests is subject to the law of sacrilege.*
- E. *Rather, said R. Ashi, “Do you really propose that there is a contradiction between the rule on sacrilege and the rule on uncleanness? The law of sacrilege is invoked by reason of sanctification, and here there is no issue of sanctification once the holiness has departed [the blood having been made ready to be sprinkled, for then the holiness of the meat is gone, for whatever is ready to be sprinkled is as though it were sprinkled (Cashdan)]. So how can it revert? But with regard to food uncleanness, the law of food uncleanness applies to what is a edible, and not to what is not edible; where the blood has been sprinkled, the meat of the offering has been made edible and so is subject to the law of food uncleanness, while where the blood has not been sprinkled, the meat of the offering has not become edible and so does not convey food uncleanness.”*
- F. *An objection was raised: **He who brings a suspensive guilt offering, and is informed that he did not commit a sin — if this was before it was slaughtered, “it [the animal] goes forth and pastures among the flock,”** the words of R. Meir. And sages say, [\[102B\]](#) “It is set out to pasture until it is blemished, then it is sold, and its proceeds fall [to the Temple treasury] as a freewill offering.” R. Eliezer says, “It is offered up. For if it does not come on account of this sin, lo, it comes on account of some other sin.”. If after it was slaughtered, he is [so]*

informed, the blood is to be poured out. And the meat goes forth to the place of burning. [If the man is informed after] the blood is [properly] tossed, the meat is to be eaten. R. Yosé says, “Even if [he is informed while] the blood is in the cup, it is to be tossed, and the meat is to be eaten” [M. Ker. 6:1]. And in this connection said Raba, “R. Yosé has made his statement in accord with the theory of R. Simeon, who has said, ‘Whatever is ready to be tossed is classified as though it were already tossed.’” [Cashdan: we thus see that by this principle as soon as the blood was ready for sprinkling, the meat of the offering is deemed to be a foodstuff so that it may be eaten by the priests. This is contrary to Ashi’s statement.]

- G. *But is this the operative consideration behind R. Yosé’s position? Not at all, for in the west in the name of R. Yosé bar Hanina, they say, “R. Yosé’s operative consideration is that utensils of service sanctify what is invalid so that, even to begin with, the contents may be offered up.”*

II.9. A. *Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana, “Since R. Simeon has said, ‘Whatever is ready to be tossed is classified as though it had already been tossed,’ then whatever is ready to be burned should also be classified as already burned. Then how come the left over offering and the red cow can impart the uncleanness pertaining to foods? All they are [being ready to be burned and so being classified as burned up] is mere dirt!”*

- B. *He said to him, “It is the special value attached to Holy Things that renders them suitable for eating for the present context.”*

- C. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “Granted that that special value attached to Holy Things renders them invalid as to its own self, does it have the effect of making it unclean in such a concrete way that it can impart uncleanness in the first and second removes to food that it may touch [which food that transmits food uncleanness can do]? If that were the case, then you should be able to solve the conundrum presented by R. Simeon b. Laqish: if the dry part of a meal offering becomes unclean, does it transmit uncleanness to the first and second removes?”*

- D. *What he asked had to do with whether the law of the Torah yields that conclusion, but we are here addressing uncleanness imposed merely by decree of rabbis.”*

12:2

- A. **He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring a meal offering prepared] in a baking pan,” but brought one prepared in a frying pan,**
- B. **[or he who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering prepared] in a frying pan,” but brought one prepared in a baking pan [M. 5:8] —**
- C. **what he has brought, he has brought [as a separate freewill offering].**
- D. **But his obligation [for the original pledge] he has not carried out.**
- E. **[He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to offer] this [fine flour as a meal offering prepared] in a baking pan,” but brought one prepared in a frying pan,**
- F. **[or he who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring this fine flour as a meal offering prepared] in a frying pan,” [but brought one prepared] in a baking pan-**

- G. lo, this is invalid.
- H. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths [of an ephah of fine flour prepared] in a single utensil,” but brought [it] in two utensils,
- I. [or, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths of an ephah of fine flour prepared] in two utensils,” but he brought [it] in one utensil —
- J. what he has brought, he has brought.
- K. But his obligation he has not carried out.
- L. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to offer] these in one utensil,” but brought [them] in two utensils,
- M. [or he who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to offer these] in two utensils,” but he brought [them] in one utensil —
- N. lo, these are invalid.
- O. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths [of an ephah of fine flour] in a single utensil,” but brought them in two utensils,
- P. [if] they said to him, “In a single utensil did you vow [to bring the offering],”
- Q. but he [then] offered them in a single utensil,
- R. they are valid.
- S. But [if he offered them] in two utensils, they are invalid [for they cannot now be deemed a separate freewill offering].
- T. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths [ephahs of fine flour] in two utensils,” but brought them in one utensil,
- U. [if] they said to him, “In two utensils did you vow [to bring them] ,”
- V. [but] he [then] offered them in two utensils,
- W. they are valid.
- X. [If] he gave them in a single utensil, they are deemed to be equivalent to two meal offerings which were confused [M. 3:3].

- I.1 A. *All of the specified cases had to be spelled out. For if the Tannaite framer of the passage had catalogued only the first cases, [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring a meal offering prepared] in a baking pan,” but brought one prepared in a frying pan, [or he who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering prepared] in a frying pan,” but brought one prepared in a baking pan [M. 5:8] — what he has brought, he has brought [as a separate freewill offering], we should have supposed that the operative consideration was that he had promised a meal offering prepared on a griddle and brought one prepared in a pan.*
- B. *But in the other cases, [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths [of an ephah of fine flour prepared] in a single utensil,” but brought [it] in two utensils, or, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring two tenths of an ephah of fine flour prepared in two utensils,” but he brought it in one utensil], where both meal offerings were prepared on a griddle or both were prepared in a pan, we should have said that he has even carried out the obligation of his vow. So the other cases are required.*
- C. *And if he had stated only those other cases, we should have said that the operative consideration was that he had divided up the meal offering, but in the*

former ones, where he had not done so, we should have said that that is not the case. So all the cases were necessary.

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

B. **what he has brought, he has brought. But his obligation he has not carried out.**

C. R. Simeon says, "He has even carried out his obligation."

II.1 A. [He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to offer] this [fine flour as a meal offering prepared] in a baking pan," but brought one prepared in a frying pan, [or he who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring this fine flour as a meal offering prepared] in a frying pan," [but brought one prepared] in a baking pan — lo, this is invalid:

B. *But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. The utensils of service have not sanctified [the meal offerings that were put into them, so why not just transfer what was put into a pan into the griddle, rather than declaring the contents invalid]!

D. Said Abbaye, "'The utensils of service have not sanctified [the meal offerings that were put into them,' so far as offering them on the altar, but they have sanctified them in such wise that they can before invalid]" [Cashdan: if taken out of the utensils assigned to them.]

II.2. A. Said Abbaye, [103A] "The cited rule applies only in a case in which he defined when he took the vow what kind of utensil he would use. But if this was done at the time of designated the flour [and at that moment mentioned the utensil in which the flour would be prepared, and it is different from the one that he had said he would use when he took the vow, it is valid], for Scripture says, 'according as you have vowed' (Deu. 23:24), and not 'according as you have designated.'"

B. *This has been stated also:*

C. Said R. Aha bar Hanina said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "'The cited rule applies only in a case in which he defined when he took the vow what kind of utensil he would use. But if this was done at the time of designated the flour [and at that moment mentioned the utensil in which the flour would be prepared, and it is different from the one that he had said he would use when he took the vow, it is valid], for Scripture says, 'according as you have vowed' (Deu. 23:24), and not 'according as you have designated.'"

12:3

A. [He who says,] "Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a meal offering made of barley," [in any case] must bring one made of wheat. [Free will meal offerings have to be made of wheat.]

B. [He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made] of meal," must bring one made of fine flour.

C. [He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering] without wine and frankincense," must bring one with oil and frankincense.

D. [He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of] a half-tenth," must bring one made of a whole tenth.

- E. [He who says, “Lo , I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of a tenth and a half-tenth,” brings one made of two [whole] tenths [of an ephah of fine flour].
- F. R. Simeon declares free [of the obligation to bring a meal offering in any of the foregoing cases],
- G. for [in so specifying,] he has not volunteered [a freewill meal offering] in the way in which people volunteer [to make a freewill meal offering].
- I.1 A. *Why should this be the case, for we have a vow and grounds for remitting it right along side [Cashdan: for by the additional words, “of barley,” he obviously meant to annul his expressed vow, since everyone knows that only wheat may be offered as a meal offering and not barley]!*
- B. *Said Hezekiah, “Lo, who is the authority behind this ruling? It is the House of Shammai, who take the position that we are guided by the words that are initially stated. For we have learned in the Mishnah: [He who says,] ‘Lo, I am a Nazir as to dried figs and pressed figs’ — the House of Shammai say, ‘He is a Nazir.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘He is not a Nazir’ [M. Naz. 2:1A-C].”*
- D. *R. Yohanan said, “You may even take the position that the ruling before us accords with the House of Hillel. We assume that the man said, ‘If I had known that one cannot take a vow in this way, I should never have taken a vow in this way but in the right way.’”*
- E. *Said Hezekiah, “They stated that rule only in a case in which he said, ‘a meal offering of barley.’ But if he had said, ‘a meal offering of lentils,’ that is not the case.”*
- F. *But in accord with whose position did Hezekiah make his ruling? It obviously is within the framework of the House of Shammai. But the position of the House of Shammai is based on the principle, we are guided by the words that are initially stated. So what difference does it make to me whether he said barley or lentils?!”*
- G. *He retracted [and therefore concurs with Yohanan.]*
- H. *So why did he retract?*
- I. *Said Raba, “Because he found our Mishnah difficult, specifically, ‘why state “a meal offering of barley” and not “a meal offering of lentils”?’ It is because of the error. In regard to not using barley, one can make a mistake, but no one can make a mistake in respect to lentils!”*
- J. *And R. Yohanan said, “Even if the statement was, ‘...of lentils....’”*
- K. *But in accord with whose position did Hezekiah make his ruling? It obviously is within the framework of the House of Hillel. But the position of the House of Hillel is based on the error that the man has made. So someone may not know that barley cannot be used, but no one is going to err in regard to lentils!*
- L. *He replied to Hezekiah within the premise of Hezekiah’s own statement: “Why did you retract? It was because the Mishnah does not specify, ‘of lentils.’ But perhaps that was so self-evident as not to require specification! So in fact it is not only where he said ‘of lentils,’ in which case the sole intent can be only that he proposes to revoke his vow, in which case we maintain that one is guided by what the man initially said,*

but even in a case in which he said 'of barley,' where he can have made such an error, we still take the position that we are guided by the first things that the man has said."

- M. **[103B]** *Said Zeiri, "The rule applies only in a case in which the man specified, 'a meal offering,' but if he did not specify 'a meal offering,' that is not the rule [but the man is exempt from any obligation whatsoever]."*
- I.2.** A. *In session R. Nahman stated this tradition. Objected Raba to R. Nahman, "[He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made] of meal," must bring one made of fine flour. But here is a case in which he did not make the matter of the meal offering explicit at all!]"*
- B. *No, he said meal offering.*
- C. **[He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering] without wine and frankincense," must bring one with oil and frankincense. But here is a case in which he did not make the matter of the meal offering explicit at all!]"**
- D. *No, he said meal offering.*
- E. **[He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of] a half-tenth," must bring one made of a whole tenth. But here is a case in which he did not make the matter of the meal offering explicit at all!]"**
- F. *No, he said meal offering.*
- G. *If so, look at what follows: He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of a tenth and a half-tenth," brings one made of two [whole] tenths [of an ephah of fine flour].*
- H. *But as soon as he said "a meal offering of a tenth," he was forthwith subjected to the obligation to bring a tenth, and when he added "and a half," that is null!*
- I. *What really is required here is a case in which he said, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of half a tenth and a tenth," in which instance, as soon as he said "meal offering," he forthwith was obligated to bring a tent, and when he added, "half a tenth," that is null, and when he said "a tenth," he had to bring another tenth.*
- J. *If so, what are we to make of the concluding statement, namely, R. Simeon declares free [of the obligation to bring a meal offering in any of the foregoing cases], for [in so specifying,] he has not volunteered [a freewill meal offering] in the way in which people volunteer [to make a freewill meal offering]?*
- K. *Said Raba, "R. Simeon adopts the theory of R. Yosé, who holds that someone is likewise guided in interpreting the statement by the last words that are said and not only the first ones."*

12:4A-I

- A. **A man volunteers to make a freewill offering of a meal offering consisting of sixty tenths and brings it in a single utensil.**
- B. **If he said, "Lo, I pledge myself [to bring a meal offering] of sixty-one [tenths of an ephah]," he brings sixty in a single utensil, and one in a single utensil.**
- C. **For so does the community bring on the first festival day of the Festival [Sukkot] which coincides with the Sabbath sixty-one [tenths].**

- D. It is enough for the individual to fall short of the community by one [tenth].
- E. Said R. Simeon, "And are not these for bullocks, and these for rams, and they are not mixed up with one another [for the quantity of oil for the tenths is not uniform]?"
- F. "But [the reason is that] up to sixty tenths [of an ephah] can be mixed together [= Eliezer b. Jacob, M. 9:3]."
- G. They said to him, "Are sixty mixed together, and sixty-one not mixed together?"
- H. He said to them, "So it is in all measures [prescribed by] sages:
- I. "In forty seahs [of water] one immerses. In forty seahs of water less a single qartob, one cannot immerse."

- I.1 A. This question was raised before R. Judah bar Ilai: How do we know that **If he said, "Lo, I pledge myself [to bring a meal offering] of sixty-one [tenths of an ephah]," he brings sixty in a single utensil, and one in a single utensil?"**
- B. R. Judah bar Ilai, the principal speaker on all occasions, commenced discourse by stating, "**For so does the community bring on the first festival day of the Festival [Sukkot] which coincides with the Sabbath sixty-one [tenths]. It is enough for the individual to fall short of the community by one [tenth].**"
- C. Said to him R. Simeon, "**And are not these for bullocks, and these for rams, and they are not mixed up with one another [for the quantity of oil for the tenths is not uniform]?** In the case of some the mixture is thick, with some, thin; some are mixed in the morning, some at night [not all the sixty one tenths were offered at on time, some being included in the tenth offered with the daily whole offering of the morning, some in the evening (Cashdan)]. So they may not be mixed one with the other."
- D. Said to him R. Judah, "Then how do you explain it?"
- E. He said to him, "It is written, 'And every meal offering mixed with oil or dry' (Lev. 7:10) — the Torah has thereby stated, 'Present a meal offering the whole of which can be mixed in one utensil.'"
- F. He said to him, "Then can sixty be mixed together in one utensil, but not sixty one?"
- G. He said to him, "Every measurement prescribed by the sages is the same one: one may immerse in forty seahs of water, but in forty seahs of water less one qartob, one may not immerse. The volume of an egg of food has the capacity to impart the uncleanness of foods, but the volume of an egg less a sesame seed does not impart the uncleanness of food. A piece of cloth three by three handbreadths by three handbreadths contracts uncleanness by reason of the sitting or lying of a person afflicted with the flux [of Lev. 15], but a piece of cloth three by three handbreadths less a single three does not contract that pressure uncleanness."
- I.2. A. *So even though* So they may not be mixed one with the other, *what difference does it make? Have we not learned in the Mishnah: [If] one did not mingle [the oil with unleavened cakes], [the meal offerings so prepared] are valid [M. Men. 3:2A, C]?*

- B. Said R. Zira, “In the case of any mixture that is suitable for mixing, the mixing is not indispensable to the proper performance of the rite, but in the case of any mixture that is not suitable for mixing, the mixing is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite.”
- I.3.** A. Said R. Bibi said R. Joshua b. Levi, “There was the case involving a certain mule belonging to the household of Rabbi that died, and sages measured the blood that flowed out of it [to find out whether it was a quarter-log in volume, which, when congealed, is equal to an olive’s bulk and imparts uncleanness as does the carcass itself].”
- B. Objected R. Isaac bar Bisna, “**R. Joshua and R. Joshua b. Beterah testified concerning blood deriving from carrion, that it is clean [M. Ed. 8:1A]. And said R. Joshua b. Batera, ‘There was a case in which wild asses were speared in the royal square for food for the lions, and the pilgrims who came up for the Festival had to walk up to their knees in the blood, and nobody said anything about it’ [T. Ed. 3:2B].**”
- C. *[Bibi] shut up.*
- D. *Said to him R. Zeriqa, “How come the master did not reply to him at all?”*
- E. He said to him, “How can I reply? Lo, R. Hanina has said, “And your life shall hang in doubt before you” (Deu. 28:66) refers to one who buys grain annually [having no land of his own]; “and you shall fear night and day” refers to one who buys grain weekly; “and shall have no assurance of your life” is one who has to buy from the bread store for his daily needs.” **[104A]** And I am one who has to go to the bread store every day.”
- F. *So what’s the upshot?*
- G. *Said R. Joseph, “R. Judah was the teacher in the household of the patriarch and he gave that decision as he had heard it. For we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, “Six opinions of the House of Shammai’s more lenient, and the House of Hillel’s more stringent, rulings.” The blood of carrion — The House of Shammai declare it clean. And the House of Hillel declare it unclean [M. Ed. 5:1A-D].”*
- H. Said R. Yosé b. R. Judah, “Even when the House of Hillel declared it unclean, they declared unclean only in the volume of a quarter-log of blood, since it can congeal and so constitute an olive’s bulk.”
- J. They do not volunteer as a freewill offering a single log [of wine], two, or five. But they volunteer as a freewill offering three, four, or six, and any number more than six.

12:4J

Free-standing exercise, utilizing the statement of the Mishnah for an independent purpose

I.1 A. *The question was raised:* Is there a fixed volume required for drink offerings [is what one presents in volume divisible], or is there no fixed volume for drink offerings? [Cashdan: 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?]

B. *What would be an illustrative case?*

C. *For instance, if someone presented five logs of wine. If you say that there is no fixed volume for drink offerings, one can draw off and present four logs, for that is the right volume for a ram, and the rest would serve as a free will offering. But if you say that there is a fixed volume for drink offerings [so that the offering is indivisible], then these five logs may not be offered unless the requisite volume is made up [in this case, another log of wine to make up six as is required for a bullock]. So what is the rule?*

D. Said Abbaye, **“There were six shofar-shaped chests for free will offerings [M. Sheq. 6:5]. And we said in that context, ‘for what’? And the answer: ‘for the surplus of funds set aside for a sin offering, the surplus of funds set aside for a guilt offering, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a Nazirite, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, the surplus of funds set aside for bird offerings, and the surplus of funds set aside for the meal offering of a poor sinner.’ Now if it were the fact [that the wine of the drink offerings was not indivisible, so that the quantity for a ram, four logs, could be drawn off and offered and the remaining log made a free will offering (Cashdan)], another shofar-chest should be set up to take over the surplus of funds set aside for drink offerings.”**

E. *[The six surpluses that have been catalogued] serves for free will offerings of the community [and the surplus money cannot be used for the original purpose (Cashdan)], while the surplus of drink offerings is common, and the surplus of drink offerings of one person can be mingled with that of another and be offered. [Cashdan: for drink offerings were offered at all times, even without an animal sacrifice, and the surplus of several offerings of wine therefore could be combined and offered; there was no need for a special chest in which to collect the surplus of each type of drink offering.]*

F. Said Raba, **“Come and take note: ‘All who are native shall do these things’ (Num. 15:13): this teaches that one may voluntarily present drink offerings [without associated animal offerings]. And how much must such an offering be? Three logs. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if one wanted to bring more, he may do so? Scripture says, ‘shall be’ (Num. 28:14). Might one suppose one may present less? Scripture says, ‘after this manner’ [cf. Sifré to Numbers CVII:XII.3]. Now what is the meaning of ‘bring more’? If I should propose it means presenting four or six logs of wine, then why should three logs of wine be acceptable? That is because it is the volume suitable for a lamb. Then four or six are suitable for a ram or bullock respectively [and no verse is needed to prove these quantities are acceptable]. So it must refer to presenting five logs, and that proves that the wine for drink offerings is not indivisible.”**

G. *That indeed proves the point.*

H. Said R. Ashi, **“But have we not learned in our Mishnah: They do not volunteer as a freewill offering a single log [of wine], two, or five. But they volunteer as a freewill offering three, four, or six, and any number more**

than six! *Now five is treated as equivalent to two. Just as two serve for no drink offerings, so five cannot be allowed!*"

I. *But why do you see things in such a way, when one may just as well maintain that each follows its own rule?* [Cashdan: two logs cannot be offered under any circumstances, but five may be offered as suggested, four for the drink offering of a ram, one for a free will offering.]

J. *Said Abbaye, "If you find grounds to maintain that drink offerings are not indivisible, then it is not indivisible [Cashdan: therefore any quantity above two logs may be offered]. But if you find grounds to maintain that drink offerings are indivisible, then I find no problems with any number of logs up to ten [Cashdan: the offerings of one, two, or five may not be presented, but any quantity up to and including ten are acceptable]. But about eleven [104B] I do not know. What is to be said? Someone intended to offer the drink offerings of two bullocks [twelve logs], and therefore these may not be presented until the requisite volume has been made up? Or perhaps he intended to present the drink offerings of two rams and one lamb? Do we say he proposed to present the drink offerings corresponding to two quantities of one kind and one of the other or not?"* [Cashdan: for the quantity is odd and unusual.]

K. *The question stands.*

12:5

- A. **"They volunteer wine [alone, unaccompanied by any animal offering] as a freewill offering, but they do not volunteer oil as a freewill offering," the words of R. Aqiba.**
- B. **R. Tarfon says, "They volunteer [also] oil as a freewill offering."**
- C. **Said R. Tarfon, "Just as we find in the case of wine that it is brought in fulfillment of an obligation, and it [also] is brought as a freewill offering, so in the case of oil, it is brought in fulfillment of an obligation, and it [also] is brought as a freewill offering."**
- D. **Said to him R. Aqiba, "No. If you have so stated the rule in connection with wine, it is because it is offered in fulfillment of one's obligation entirely by itself.**
- E. **"But will you say so in connection with oil, which is not offered in fulfillment of one's obligation entirely by itself?"**
- F. **Two people do not volunteer as a freewill offering a single tenth.**
- G. **But they volunteer as a single freewill offering a burnt offering and peace offerings,**
- H. **and in the case of fowl, even a single bird.**
- I.1 A. **Said Raba, "On the basis of both authorities we may derive the conclusion that a person may voluntarily present a meal offering with drink offerings [but without a sacrifice] every day."**
- B. *That is obvious!*
- C. *Not at all. What might I have thought? That in respect to the free will offering of meal, the All-Merciful has listed only five kinds of meal offerings and no more. So we are informed that that is the case only where the particular classification of*

meal offering has not been articulated. [Cashdan: where someone pledged a meal offering without saying what kind, he has to bring one of the five kinds described in the Torah]. *But where someone has articulated the kind he wishes [and it is a meal offering associated with drink offerings], that is valid and may be presented.*

II.1 A. Two people do not volunteer as a freewill offering a single tenth. But they volunteer as a single freewill offering a burnt offering or peace offerings, or, in the case of fowl, even a single bird:

- B. *What is the operative consideration? Is it because it is written, ‘brings’ (Lev. 2: 1) [in the singular]? In respect to the burnt offering, the singular, “brings” occurs (at Lev. 1: 3). And if you say that the reason is that in connection with the burnt offering, the plural you is used, “your burnt offerings” (Num. 29:39), well, with respect to meal offerings, we find the plural you, “and your meal offerings” (Num. 29:39).*
- C. *The scriptural basis for the distinction made in the Mishnah’s rule is that in connection with the meal offering, the word “person” [soul] is used (Lev. 2: 1). [That must mean, one but not two, in line with the rule of the Mishnah.]*
- D. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. Rabbi says, “‘Whoever he be of the house of Israel who brings his offerings, whether it be any of their vows or any of their freewill offerings, which they bring to the Lord’ (Lev. 22:18) — every sort of offering may be presented by a partnership. Scripture has excepted only the meal offering, in the context of which the language, ‘soul’ is used.”

II.2. A. Said R. Isaac, “How come the meal offering was singled out through the use, in that context, of the word ‘soul’?

- B. “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Who is the one who usually brings only a meal offering? It is a poor person. Then I credit him as though he had offered his soul before me.’”

II.3. A. Said R. Isaac, “How come the meal offering was singled out through the provision of five kinds of meal offerings prepared with oil are explicitly set forth in that regard? It may be compared to the case of a mortal king, for whom his ally prepared a feast. Since the king knew that the ally was a poor man, he said, ‘Prepare the meal for me in five types of dishes, so that I can enjoy the pleasure that you mean to provide.’”