

# III

---

## BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER THREE

FOLIOS 17A-38A

3:1

- A. He who takes the handful of meal offering [with the improper intention] to eat something [e.g., the handful, the frankincense] which is not usually eaten,
- B. to offer up something [e.g., the residue] which is not usually offered up,
- C. it is valid.
- D. R. Eliezer declares [the offering] invalid.
- E. [If one does so with the improper intention] to eat something which is usually eaten, to offer up something which is usually offered up,
- F. [in a volume] less than an olive's bulk — it is valid.
- G. [If he does so with the improper intention] to eat a half-olive's bulk and to offer up a half-olive's bulk —
- H. it is valid.
- I. For eating and offering up do not join together.

**I.1** A. *Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Eliezer? Scripture has said, 'And if any of the meat of the sacrifice of his peace offerings should be eaten, being eaten at all' (Lev. 7:18) [using the word for eating two times] — Scripture thus speaks of two forms of eating, one, the eating done by a person, the other, the eating done by the altar. This serves to tell you that, just as improper intentionality can take effect for eating done by a man, so improper intentionality can take effect concerning eating down by the altar. And just as improper intentionality concerning what is ordinarily eaten by a human being can take effect later on for what is ordinarily eaten by a human being, and improper intentionality concerning what is ordinarily eaten by the altar can take effect later on for what is ordinarily eaten by the altar, so improper intentionality concerning eating by a human being may take effect concerning what is eaten by the altar, and likewise, improper intentionality concerning eating by the altar may take effect concerning what is eaten by a human being. Why so? Because the All-Merciful has spoken of the burning on the altar with the word 'eating.'"*

- B. *And rabbis?*
- C. *The reason that the All-Merciful has spoken of the burning on the altar with the word “eating” is to indicate that [17B] there is no difference between expressing an improper intention vis à vis the altar when one uses the word “eating” and expressing such an intention using the word “burning up.” Or to indicate that, just as in the case of eating, the minimum volume that must be subjected to improper intentionality is an olive’s bulk, so, for the case of burning up, the minimum volume that must be subjected to improper intentionality is an olive’s bulk. But as to the matter of eating, it always must be in the ordinary way [that is, the handful on the altar, the residue for human consumption; any other intentionality is null].*
- D. *And R. Eliezer?*
- E. *If that were so, Scripture should have said either, “eating, eating,” or “may be eaten...may be eaten....” Why express matters as “should be eaten, being eaten at all”? It is to imply the two conclusions that have been set forth [the intention must pertain to a minimum volume of an olive’s bulk; the intention may be to burn on the altar what is eaten by a human being, or to eat what is usually burned on the altar; both are taken into account (Cashdan)].*
- I.2.** A. *Said R. Zira to R. Assi, “If that is the basis for the position of R. Eliezer, then the penalty of extirpation should also be imposed in such a case! And should you say that that is indeed the fact, you are the one who has said in the name of R. Yohanan, ‘R. Eliezer concedes that he is not liable to the penalty of extirpation.’”*
- B. *He said to him, “What we have here is a conflict of Tannaite formulations of the position of R. Eliezer. There are those who say that the invalidation of the offering is on the basis of the rule of the Torah, and there are those who said that it is invalid only by the authority of rabbis. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- C. **He who slaughters an animal offering intending to drink of its blood on the next day and to burn up his meat on the next day, to eat of its sacrificial parts on the next day — it is valid.**
- D. **R. Eliezer declares it invalid [since the intention is to eat what is not usually eaten].**
- E. **If he intended to leave over its blood for the next day,**
- F. **R. Judah declares it invalid.**
- G. **Said R. Eleazar, “Even in this case does R. Eliezer declare the offering in valid, but sages declare it valid” [cf. T. Zeb. 2:26].**
- H. *Now in accord with whose position is R. Judah’s ruling? [Cashdan: What is Judah’s view in the first case, in which the intention is to drink the blood on the next day?] Should we say that it is in line with the position of rabbis? But if rabbis declare valid an offering in which the officiating priest has expressed an improper intentionality using the language of eating [drinking and burning on the altar are included under ‘eating’ (Cashdan)], here, surely all the more so will they validate the offering! So he must rule in line with R. Eliezer. And R. Eleazar has said, Said R. Eleazar, “Even in this case does R. Eliezer declare the offering in valid, but sages declare it valid”! But is not R. Eleazar’s view the same as R.*

*Judah's? So it must be concluded that at issue between them is the matter of extirpation. The first Tannaite authority [Judah] takes the view that in the case of leaving some of the blood over for the next day, R. Eliezer declares the rite invalid only; in the other cases [drinking the blood on the next day, burning the meat on the next day], R. Eliezer imposes also the liability to extirpation. Then R. Eleazar comes along to indicate that in both of these cases, R. Eliezer holds that the offering is invalid alone, but extirpation does not apply.*

- I. *Not at all! All parties concur that the penalty of extirpation is not imposed. But what we have are three distinct positions. The initial Tannaite report maintains that only in the other cases do R. Eliezer and sages differ [Cashdan: Eliezer maintains that where there was an intention of burning on the next day what is usually eaten, the offering is rabbinically invalid as a preventative measure against the intentionality of burning on the next day what is usually burned, in which case the offering would be refused by the authority of the Torah, not of rabbis]. But in the case of leaving over, all parties concur that the offering is valid. [18A] R. Judah takes the view that only in the other cases is there a dispute, but as to leaving over, all parties concur that the offering is invalid. We declare the offering invalid when the improper intention concerned leaving part of the blood for the next day, only as a preventative measure against the leaving of all of the blood for the next day, for an intention to leave all the blood over for the next day even on the authority of the law of the Torah renders the offering invalid. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said to them R. Judah, "Do you not concede that if the priest actually left the blood or parts to be burned on the altar for the next day, the sacrifice is [retrospectively] invalid? Even if he gave thought to leaving these things over for the next day, it is equally invalid." Then R. Eleazar comes along to tell us that even in this case [of planning to leave over some of the blood for the next day], R. Eliezer declares the rite invalid, and sages valid.*
- J. *But does R. Judah take the position that if one expressed the intention to leave over some of the blood for the next day, all parties concur that the offering is invalid? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. Said Rabbi, "When I went to lay out the measures of my learning before R. Eleazar b. Shammua" — *and some say*, "...to lay out the measures of the learning of R. Eleazar b. Shammua" — "I found Joseph the Babylonian sitting before him, and he was most prized by him. And he said to him, 'My lord, "He who slaughters the animal offering intending to leave some of the blood for the next day," — what is the law?'
- L. "And he said to him, 'It is valid.'
- M. "The next morning he said to him, 'It is valid.'
- N. "At noon he said to him, 'It is valid.'
- O. "At dusk he said to him, 'It is valid, but R. Eliezer declares it invalid.'
- P. "Joseph the Babylonian's face glowed: 'It appears to me that until now our traditions on the matter have not been in line with one another until now.'
- Q. "He said to him, 'My lord, indeed so. For 'R. Judah repeated for me, "it is invalid," and I have made the rounds of all of his disciples, looking for another who confirmed the same view, and I found none. Now that you have repeated for me, "It is invalid," you have restored to me what I had lost.' And R. Eleazar b.

Shammua's eyes flowed with tears. He said, 'Fortunate are you, disciples of sages, that words of the Torah are so prized by you!' He recited in his regard this verse: 'O How I love your Torah, it is my meditation all day long' (Psa. 119:97). Lo, it is because R. Judah was the son of R. Ilai, and R. Ilai the disciple of R. Eliezer, that he repeated for him the formulations of R. Eliezer."

- R. *Now if you take the view that in the opinion of all authorities, it is invalid, then how could Joseph have said to him, you have restored to me what I had lost"? If he had told him only that there was a difference of opinion [what is the restoration that has taken place]? [Cashdan: it must therefore be said that Judah had also taught Joseph that there was a difference of opinion in the matter, contrary to the premise set out at the beginning.]*
- S. *What then? Did he teach him, "it is valid, but R. Eliezer declares it invalid"? If so, then why say, "Lo, it is because R. Judah was the son of R. Ilai, and R. Ilai the disciple of R. Eliezer, that he repeated for him the formulations of R. Eliezer"? [Cashdan: The intent is that Judah had taught his disciple Joseph that view only out of reverence for his teachers, but the law is not so; but as matters now stand, the teachings of Eleazar b. Shammua and Judah are identical.] So too we have learned that there is a dispute in the matter!*
- T. *In point of fact, [Judah] taught him that all parties concur that it is invalid. Then what did he mean when he said, "you have restored to me what I had lost"? Because he had brought to light the view, "it is invalid" [Cashdan: for until the final reply of Eleazar b. Shammua, there was not even the vaguest hint that any rabbi held the view that it is invalid, and this led Joseph to doubt the accuracy of his memory on Judah's teaching; Eleazar b. Shammua gave him reassurance.]*

### 3:2A-C

- A. [If] one (1) did not pour [oil over the fine flour], (2) did not mingle [the oil with unleavened cakes], (3) did not break up [the meal offering prepared in a baking pan], (4) did not salt it, (5) did not wave it [if such is required, as in the case of the meal offering of the omer and of the woman accused of adultery], (6) did not bring it near [M. 5:5-6] —
- B. or [if] he broke it up into big pieces or did not anoint it [with oil after baking (M. 6: 3)] —
- C. [the meal offerings so prepared] are valid.
- I.1 A. [If one (1) did not pour oil over the fine flour:] *What is the meaning of the language, did not pour oil? If we should say that he did not pour any oil at all, then Scripture has indicated that that is an indispensable part of the rite [so how could the offering be valid]? Rather, it was not a priest, but a non-priest, who did the pouring.*
- B. *If so, then when the passage says, did not mingle [the oil with unleavened cakes], what it should mean is that it was not a priest, but a non-priest, who did the mingling, with the implication that if there was no mingling whatsoever, then the meal offering is invalid. [18B] But have we not learned in the Mishnah: They said to him, "Are sixty tenths mixed together, and sixty-one not mixed together?" [M. Men. 12:4G]? And when we considered the matter, we said, what difference does it make if they cannot be mingled together? Have we not*

*learned in the Mishnah, [If] one ... did not mingle [the oil with unleavened cakes] [the meal offerings so prepared] are valid?*

- C. And said R. Zira, "In the case of whatever is suitable for mingling, mingling is not essential, and in the case of whatever is not suitable for mingling, mingling is indispensable." [Cashdan: in Zira's view the law before us is that mingling can be omitted so long as it is possible to do so if one wants, and the Mishnah's rule would mean that no oil at all was poured in].
- D. *What's going on here! Each rule stands on its own terms! The language **he did not pour in** means, the priest did not pour in the oil, but a non-priest did so; the language, **he did not mingle**, means, it was not mingled at all.*

## **II.1 A. ...or [if] he broke it up into big pieces:**

- B. *Now if he did not break it up into pieces at all, it is valid, if he broke it into big pieces, should there be any problem? [Of course it should be valid.]*
- C. *What is the meaning of **big pieces**? It is that there were many pieces [and the cakes had been broken into too many small pieces].*
- D. *If you prefer, I shall say, the fact is that the sense is big pieces. But still the matter had to be spelled out, for what might you otherwise have supposed? Where the pieces were not broken up at all, the offering is valid, since the offering still falls into the classification of cakes, while here, since they fall into the classification of neither cakes nor crumbs, we are informed that here too the offering is valid.*

## **II.2. A. May we say that when our Mishnah-paragraph says that a non-priest may not pour in the oil, it does not concur with the position of R. Simeon? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:**

- B. **R. Simeon says, "Any priest who does not confess [the validity of the sacrificial] service has no portion in the priesthood, as it is said, "He among the sons of Aaron who offers the blood of the peace offerings and the fat shall have the right thigh for a portion" (Lev. 7:33) if he confesses the validity of the rite, he has a share in the priesthood, and if he does not confess it, he has no share in the priesthood. I know only that they have no share in the priesthood. How do I know that the rule extends to the fifteen acts of service, including pouring the oil on the flour of the meal offering, mixing the oil with the flour, waving meal offerings, bringing them near, taking the handful of the meal offerings, burning them, pinching the necks of bird offerings, receiving the blood of sacrificial animals and sprinkling it on the altar and giving the wife accused of adultery the water to bring, breaking the heifer's neck, purifying the person with the skin ailment, raising hands in the priestly blessing both inside and outside of the Temple? Scripture adds, 'among the sons of Aaron,' meaning, all acts of service that have been entrusted to the sons of Aaron. The priest who does not confess these has no portion in the priesthood" [T. Dem. 2:7] [and here the pouring of the oil is a service done by priests, not by laymen, contrary to the Mishnah's rule (Cashdan).**
- C. *Said R. Nahman, "There really is no contradiction after all. The passage in the name of R. Simeon refers to the meal offering of a priest [which yielded no handful; the whole was burned on the altar], here we address the meal offering of*

*an Israelite. In the meal offering of an Israelite, from which the handful of meal must be taken, the task of the priesthood commences with taking out the handful; so we are informed that pouring in the oil and mingling may be validly done by non priests. In the case of the meal offering of a priest, where no handful is taken, the role of the priesthood commences at the outset.”*

- D. *Said to him Raba, “Now on the basis of what analogy do we derive the rule that pouring in oil applies also to the meal offering of a priest? The analogy is drawn from the meal offering of an Israelite [in which context alone Scripture imposes that requirement]. Then, just as there the pouring in may be done by a non priest, so here too it may be done by a non priest.”*
- E. *There are those who state matters as follows:*
- F. *Said R. Nahman, “There really is no contradiction after all. The rule here refers to the meal offering from which a handful is taken, there [Simeon] speaks of a meal offering from which no handful is taken [that is, the meal offering of a priest and those that accompany most offerings].”*
- G. *Said to him Raba, “Now on the basis of what analogy do we derive the rule that pouring in oil applies also to the meal offering from which a handful is not taken? The analogy is drawn from the meal offering from which a handful is taken. Then they must be comparable to those from which the handful is taken. Then, just as there the pouring in may be done by a non priest, so here too it may be done by a non priest.”*
- H. *In any event, then, it is best to conclude that our Mishnah does not accord with the position of R. Simeon.*
- I. *Then what is the basis for the position of rabbis?*
- J. *“And he shall pour oil upon it and put frankincense on it, and he shall bring it to Aaron’s sons the priests, and he shall take out of it his handful” (Lev. 2:1,2) — from the taking out of the handful and thereafter the religious duty is that of the priesthood. This then teaches that the pouring in of oil and the mingling are valid when done by non-priests.*
- K. *And R. Simeon?*
- L. *“Aaron’s sons [19A] the priests” — refers to what precedes as well as to what follows.*
- M. *But does R. Simeon really take the view that a verse of Scripture may be interpreted with reference to what precedes as much as to what follows? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- N. *“And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar” (Lev. 4:25) — “...shall take...” teaching that the receiving of the blood should be only with his right hand.*
- O. *“with his finger he shall take it,” teaching that the act of placing the blood should be performed only with the right hand.*
- P. *“and put it on the horns of the altar,” teaching that the act of placing the blood should be performed only with the right hand.*
- Q. *Said R. Simeon, “But is the word ‘hand’ used at all in connection with the act of receiving the blood? Rather, read as follows: ““with his finger and put” — indicating that the placing of the blood should be done only with the right hand.’*



Now since there is no reference to using ‘the hand’ in connection with receiving the blood, if the priest received the blood in his left hand, it is a valid offering.”

- R. *Said Abbaye, “At issue is whether a verse of Scripture is interpreted in context, in line with what precedes and what follows it” [Freedman: Simeon holds that a text can be interpreted only in line with what follows, hence “finger” refers to “and he shall but” but not to “and he shall receive,” which precedes, while rabbis hold that it goes with both.]*
- S. *But this is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon:*
- T. The “and” of “and he shall bring it” (Lev. 2: 2) serves to [Cashdan:] indicate conjunction with the preceding subject [Cashdan: and the former service, pouring in the oil, is determined by the later, taking of the handful, just as the latter is done by the priest alone, so the former is done only by the priest.]
- U. *Then does R. Simeon really take the position that the presence of an “and” serves to indicate conjunction with the preceding subject?*
- V. *Then how about the following:*
- W. “And he shall slaughter the bullock before the Lord, and Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall present the blood and sprinkle the blood” (Lev. 1: 5) — from the moment of receiving the blood and onward, the religious duty of doing the deeds belongs to the priesthood. This teaches that it is valid for the act of slaughter to be done by a non-priest.
- X. *Now if it were the case that R. Simeon really takes the position that the presence of an “and” serves to indicate conjunction with the preceding subject, then it also should be invalid for the act of slaughter to be done by a non-priest.*
- Y. *That case is exceptional, for Scripture has said, “and he shall lay his hand and he shall slaughter” (Lev. 1: 4) — just as the laying of hands is done by non-priests, so the slaughtering may be done by non-priests.*
- Z. Then it should also be the case that just as the laying of hands is done by the owner of the beast, so the slaughtering may be done by the owner of the beast.
- AA. *You may not take that position, for there is a contrary argument a fortiori: if the tossing of the blood, which is the principal component of the rite of atonement, does not require the participation of the owner, the act of slaughter, which is not the principal component of the act of slaughter, all the more so should not require the participation of the owner. And should you moreover claim that a rule may not derive by analogy from a case that is possible to a case that is possible, Scripture itself has revealed in connection with the Day of Atonement, “And he shall slaughter the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself” (Lev. 16:11), and singling out this case shows that slaughtering in general does not require the action of the owner in particular.*

**Any passage in which the words ‘Torah’ and ‘statute’ occur in regard to any rite, the meaning is only to signify that that matter is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite**

**II.3.** A. Said Rab, “Any passage in which the words ‘Torah’ and ‘statute’ occur in regard to any rite, the meaning is only to signify that that matter is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite.”

- B. *Now in the assumption that he meant to require both words, in line with the verse, "This is the statute of the law" (Num. 19: 2), [the question is raised:] lo, there is the case of the Nazirite, in which connection only "Torah" is written, and yet Rab said,<sup>m</sup> "Waving of the offering is indispensable in the case of the Nazirite."*
- C. *That case is exceptional, since it is written, "And so he must do" (Num. 6:21), it is as though it were written "statute."*
- D. *Lo, there is the matter of the thank offering, in which regard only "Torah" is written, and yet we have learned in the Mishnah: **the four [kinds of cakes used in connection with] the thank offering...impair the validity of one another [M. 3:6J].** [All are indispensable to the rite.]*
- E. *The case of the thank offering is exceptional, because it is linked to the Nazirite: "with the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving" (Lev. 7:13), and a master has said in this regard, "The term peace offerings encompasses also the peace offerings of the Nazirite."*
- F. *And lo, there is the case of the person afflicted with the skin ailment, in which instance only "Torah" is written, and yet we have learned in the Mishnah: **the four kinds used for the person afflicted with the skin ailment impair the validity of one another [M. 3:6L].***
- G. *That case is exceptional, since it is written, "This will be the law of the person afflicted with the skin ailment" (Lev. 14: 2) it is as though "statute" were written as well.*
- H. *And lo, there is the case of the Day of Atonement, in which case only the word "statute" is written, and yet we have learned in the Mishnah: **The two goats of Yom Kippur impair the validity of one another.***
- I. *It must follow that sufficient to bear that meaning is the appearance either of the word "Torah" or of the word "statute."*
- J. *But then there are all the other offerings, in which connection the word "Torah" is written, and yet the proper performance of the one is not indispensable to the acceptability of the others [Cashdan: one offering is valid even though the sacrificial portions of the guilt offering is not burned on the altar].*
- K. *If "Torah" is written, to reach this conclusion the word "statute" must also be conclusion, but if the word "statute" is written, to reach this conclusion it is not necessary that the word "Torah" be written.*
- L. *And lo, did not Rab explicitly say, "Any passage in which the words 'Torah' and 'statute'..."?*
- M. *This is the sense of what he said, "Even though the word 'Torah' occurs, only if the word 'statute' also appears is the rite indispensable, and otherwise it is not."*
- N. *Yet lo, there is the meal offering, in which the word "statute" occurs, and Rab has said, "In any passage in which the rite of the meal offering is repeated in some other verse [besides Lev. 2, 6:7-11], the purpose of doing so is only to indicate that the details are indispensable." So if Scripture*



went back over the matter, that is the case, but if not, it is not the rule [even though “statute” appears]!

- O. That case is different, since when the word “statute” appears, it is in connection with the act of eating.
- P. Then lo, there is the case of the show bread, in which the word “statute” is written with regard to eating, and yet we have learned in the Mishnah: **The two rows [of showbread] impair the validity of one another; the two dishes [of frankincense] impair the validity of one another. The rows [of showbread] and the dishes [of incense] impair the validity of one another [M. 3:6D-F].**
- Q. Then in any passage in which the word “statute” is used in the context of eating the offering, it relates to all the rites of the offering; but the case of the meal offering is exceptional, since it is written, “Of the bruised grain thereof and of the oil thereof” (Lev. 2:16), [19B] it is clear that solely the grain and oil are indispensable, but nothing else in context is indispensable.

**II.4.** A. Reverting to the body of the prior passage:

- B. Rab has said, “In any passage in which the rite of the meal offering is repeated in some other verse [besides Lev. 2, 6:7-11], the purpose of doing so is only to indicate that the details are indispensable.”
- C. And Samuel said, “The bruised grain and the oil are indispensable to one another, but no other detail of the rite is indispensable.”
  - D. *But then does Samuel take the position that even though the rite is repeated in some other verse, it is not indispensable?!*
  - E. *Rather, his position is this: wherever a rite is reviewed in some other verse, it certainly is indispensable. But here what is at issue is the interpretation of such phrases as “his handful” and “with his hand.” For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - F. “his handful” and “with his hand:” the meaning is that one may not use a measure in taking up the handful [but it must be done with his hand].
  - G. *Rab takes the view that that also has been set forth in another verse of Scripture: “And he presented the meal offering and filled his hand therefrom” (Lev. 9:17), and Samuel maintains that we do not derive a permanent rule of the cult from what is an enactment meant for a special occasion [the installation of Aaron as high priest].*
  - H. *Then does Samuel take the position that we do not derive a permanent rule of the cult from what is an enactment meant for a special occasion?*
  - I. *But have we not learned in the Mishnah: Utensils for liquids [blood, wine, oil, water] sanctify liquid; and measures for drystuffs [the tenth of the ephah and half issaron measures] sanctify that which is dry. Utensils for*

liquids do not sanctify that which is dry, and measures for drystuffs do not sanctify that which is liquid [M. Zeb. 9:7B-C]. And in that connection said Samuel, “That rule pertains only to measures, but as for sprinkling bowls, they sanctify dry things put into them, for it is written, ‘Both of them full of fine flour’ (Num. 7:13).”

J. *That case is exceptional, since the verse is repeated no fewer than twelve times in context.*

**II.5.** A. Said R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rab, “Lo, there is the matter of bringing near the meal offering to the altar, which is repeated in Scripture and yet is not indispensable to the rite” [Thus in our paragraph: **If one did not bring it near, the meal offerings so prepared are valid.**]

B. *Where is it repeated?* “And this is the law of the meal offering, the sons of Aaron shall bring it near before the Lord to the front of the altar” (Lev. 6: 7).

C. *But that verse simply indicates the place to which it is to be brought, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. “The sons of Aaron shall offer it [the meal offering] before the Lord” (Lev. 6: 7) [that is, at the altar] — Might one think that it is at the western side of the altar [facing the inner sanctum, hence “before the Lord” (Freedman)]?

E. Scripture states, “...in front of the altar” (Lev. 6: 7).

F. How so?

G. He would present it at the southwest corner of the altar, at the edge of the horn, and that suffices.

H. R. Eleazar says, “Might one think that he should present it at the west side of the horn or at the south side of the horn? [Not at all, for] in any case in which you find to verses of Scripture, one of which makes its own point but also supports the point of the other, the other of which makes its own point but denies the point of the other, you ignore the one that makes its own point but denies the point of the other and rely upon the one that makes its own point but also supports the point of the other. So if you maintain that ‘before the Lord’ means the rite must be done in the west, how can you sustain, ‘in front of the altar’? But if you say ‘in front of the altar’ means, in the south, then you support the view that ‘before the Lord’ means at the south.”

I. *And whence do you sustain this point?*

J. Said R. Ashi, “This Tannaite authority takes as his premise that the entire altar stood in the northern part of the courtyard” [Freedman: hence the south of the altar ended opposite the door leading to the

inner sanctum, and so that too would be called “before the Lord”].

- K. *Objected R. Huna to the stated proposition, “Now lo, there is the case of salting the meal offering, which is not repeated in Scripture, but it is indispensable to the rite. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- L. “‘It is a covenant of salt forever’ (Num. 18:19) — this indicates that there is **[20A]** a covenant in regard to salt [which must be included in every sacrifice],” the words of R. Judah.
- M. R. Simeon says, “Here we find ‘It is a covenant of salt forever’ (Num. 18:19), and elsewhere, ‘The covenant of an everlasting priesthood’ (Num. 25:13). Just as it is not possible for offerings to be without the priesthood, so it is not possible for offerings to be without salt.”
- N. *Said R. Joseph, “R. Kahana takes the view of our Tannaite authority, who has said, ‘If one did not salt it, the offering is valid.’”*
- O. *Said to him Abbaye, “If that is the case, then he did not pour oil ought to mean that he did not pour on any oil at all! But just as the meaning is, ‘if a priest did not pour on the oil but a non-priest did, ‘so here the meaning is, ‘if a priest did not put in salt but a non-priest did [it is valid].”*
- P. He said to him, “But then would it ever enter your mind that a non-priest would present an offering on the altar? [These are not possible as explanations, for the salt was put in at the altar, and a non-priest could never come that close.]
- Q. “*And if you prefer, I shall say, since in respect to salting, the word ‘covenant’ appears, it is as though it were repeated in a verse [and Rab would then regard salt as indispensable, just as do Judah and Simeon )Cashdan)].”*
- R. *But is there no verse that makes explicit reference to salting at all? Is it not written, “And every offering of your meal offering you shall season with salt [...with all your offerings you shall offer salt]” (Lev. 2:13)?*
- S. *That is required in accord with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- T. “And every offering of your meal offering you shall season with salt [...with all your offerings you shall offer salt]” (Lev. 2:13) —
- U. Had the verse stated, “every offering you shall season with salt,” I should have come to the conclusion that that requirement pertains also to wood and blood, since these fall into the category of offerings. The verse adds, “meal offering,” to indicate: just as the meal offering is exceptional in that there are other things that are required along with it

[e.g., wood for burning the handful (Cashdan)], so everything for which other things are required along with it require seasoning with salt.

- V. What about this proposition: “just as the meal offering is exceptional in that it serves to render other things permissible to the priesthood or the owner, so everything that it serves to render other things permissible to the priesthood or the owner requires seasoning with salt”? And that would then encompass the blood, since it serves to render other things permissible to the priesthood or the owner!
- W. Scripture states, “Neither shall you allow salt to be lacking from your meal offering” (Lev. 2:13) — and not from your blood!
- X. Might one then conclude that the entirety of the meal offering should require the addition of salt?
- Y. Scripture states, “...offering...,” meaning, it is the offering itself that requires salt, but the whole of the meal offering does not require salt.
- Z. I know only that that rule pertains to the handful of meal offering. How on the basis of Scripture do I know that the rule encompasses frankincense?
- AA. I encompass under the rule frankincense as well, for it is presented along with meal offering in a single utensil.
- BB. Then on what basis do I encompass under the law frankincense that is offered on its own, or frankincense that is offering in dishes, or frankincense that is offered with the priests’ meal offering or the meal offering of the anointed priest or the meal offering that accompanies the drink offerings, the sacrificial parts of the sin offerings, the sacrificial parts of the built offering, the sacrificial parts of most Holy Things, the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things, the sacrificial parts of a burnt offering, the sacrificial parts of the burnt offering of fowl? Scripture states, “every offering you shall season with salt.”

**II.7.** A. The master has said, “I know only that that rule pertains to the handful of meal offering. How on the basis of Scripture do I know that the rule encompasses frankincense? I encompass under the rule frankincense as well, for it is presented along with meal offering in a single utensil.”

B. But lo, you have just now stated, “Just as the meal offering is exceptional in that there are other things that are required along with it, so everything for

which other things are required along with it require seasoning with salt”!

- C. *This is the sense of that statement, as I might wish to make it: “‘offering’ forms an encompassing category, ‘meal offering’ a particularization of the foregoing, so we have here an encompassing category followed by a limiting and particularizing one. Consequently the scope of the encompassing category is limited to the traits of the limiting and particularizing one. Then the meal offering is subject to the rule, but nothing else is subject to the rule. Then the Scripture has gone and said, ‘with all your offerings,’ and that forms a second encompassing category, with the result that we have now two encompassing categories separated from one another by a particularizing category, in which case the encompassing categories take into account only items that bear the traits of the items that fall within the particularizing category. Just as the particularizing item is one that requires other things along with itself, so whatever else requires other things along with itself requires salting. And what are the other things that are required along with itself? It is the wood. In consequence, everything that requires wood must be seasoned with salt.”*
- D. *But might I say that subject to discussion is frankincense, with the consequence that I should introduce under the requirement of salt also an offering of blood, for libations are required along with it?*
- E. *The drink offerings accompany the burning of the sacrificial parts. How come? The reason is that eating and drinking go together [and the sprinkling of the blood is in fact not accompanied by libations].*
- F. *To the contrary! Atonement [by the blood] and drinking go together!*
- G. *Rather the operative consideration is that frankincense is presented with meal offerings in a single utensil, but drink offerings are not presented with the meal offerings in a single utensil. By contrast, wood, while indispensable for the meal offering, is indispensable for all other offerings [Cashdan: and therefore the relationship of the frankincense to the handful is a closer one than that of the drink offerings to the blood; the wood too is closely*

connected with the offering, since without it the offering is not possible].

- H. *But might I not say*, what is explicit in regard to the limiting exemplification is that other things are required to be presented along with it, and the offering serves to permit the appropriate components to the priests or owners, so anything with which other things have to be presented and which serves to permit the appropriate components to be utilized by the priests or owners are covered under the law. *And what that might be?* It is the frankincense that is presented in the dishes, *which serve to permit the priests to eat the bread, but nothing else falls into that category.*
- I. *Since the language*, “from your meal offering” *is required so as to exclude the blood, it follows that everything else is covered through its congruity with the meal offering in one aspect [or another].*

**II.8.** A. The master has said, “Scripture states, ‘Neither shall you allow salt to be lacking from your meal offering’ (Lev. 2:13) — and not from your blood.”

B. and might I say, “from your meal offering’ (Lev. 2:13) — and not from your sacrificial limbs [which in consequence are not supposed to be salted before they are put on the altar fires]?

C. *It stands to reason that limbs are to be encompassed under the law*, since, like the meal offering, other things are required to be presented with the limbs, they are burned by fire like the meal offering, they are offered on an altar outside the Temple court, like the meal offering they are subject to the law of left-overs, uncleanness, and sacrilege.

D. **[20B]** *To the contrary, it stands to reason that the blood should be encompassed under the law*, since, like the meal offering, the blood serves to permit components of the offering to the priests or the owners, and it is invalidated at sunset.

E. *The former are more numerous points of congruence.*

**II.9.** A. The master has said, “[Had the verse stated, ‘every offering you shall season with salt,’] I should have come to the conclusion that that requirement pertains also to wood and blood, since these fall into the category of offerings. [The verse adds, “meal offering,” to indicate: just as the meal offering is exceptional in that there are other things that are



- required along with it.\e.g., wood for burning the handful, so everything for which other things are required along with it require seasoning with salt].”
- B. *Whom have you heard take the position that wood is classified as an offering? It is Rabbi. But from Rabbi’s viewpoint, it really does require salting. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - C. “...offering...” (Lev. 2: 1) — this teachings that wood may be presented as a free will offering. And how much must the offering be? Two logs.
  - D. So too Scripture says, “And we cast lots for the offering of wood” (Neh. 10:35) —
  - E. Rabbi says, “Since the wood offering is classified as an ‘offering,’ it has to be salted and also brought near the altar [at the southwestern corner, like the meal offering (Cashdan)].”
  - F. And said Raba, “In the opinion of Rabbi, it is required also to take a handful out of the wood offering as well.”
  - G. And said R. Pappa, “In the opinion of Rabbi, an offering of wood requires another offering of wood as well [namely, wood from the Temple store is required to burn wood of a wood offering].”
  - H. *Then strike out the word “wood” from here:* [“I should have come to the conclusion that that requirement pertains also to wood and blood,” leaving only “I should have come to the conclusion that that requirement pertains also to blood”].
  - I. *Then what does the verse serve to exclude? It obviously cannot exclude blood, for that is covered by the expression, “and from your meal offering” [since we already have established that blood is excluded by another phrase of the same verse, so without wood, we are left with the result that blood is excluded by two distinct statements]!*
  - J. **[21A]** *Exclude wood but insert drink offerings in its stead, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - K. But the wine, blood, wood, and incense do not have to be salted.
  - L. *Who is the authority behind this ruling? If it is Rabbi, then the inclusion of wood [in a list of things that do not require salt] presents a problem, and if it is rabbis, then the inclusion of frankincense [in a list of things that do not require salt] presents a problem.*

- M. *It is the Tannaite figure represented in the following that has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- N. R. Ishmael, son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, says, “Just as it is explicit in the particularization of the rule [on the meal offering, Lev. 2:13] that it is something that is susceptible to uncleanness and is put on the altar fires, and is properly located on the outer altar, so therefore everything that is susceptible to uncleanness and is put on the altar fires, and is properly located on the outer altar [is encompassed under the same law, that salt must be added], hence eliminating frankincense, which is not offered on the outer altar.
- O. *Then the operative consideration [that blood does not require salting] is that Scripture has eliminated it from the rule. Then if it were not so, I might have come to the conclusion that salt requires salting. But surely by salting blood, it loses its character as blood!*
- P. For said Zeiri said R. Hanina, “Blood that has been boiled [and then eaten] does not involve the violation of the law against eating blood [since it is no longer classified as blood].”
- Q. And R. Judah, said Zeiri, “Salt that has been salted [and then eaten] does not involve the violation of the law against eating blood [since it is no longer classified as blood].”
- R. And R. Judah in his own name said, “Limbs that one roasted and then offered on the altar do not come within the category of ‘a sweet savor.’”
- S. *[In reply to O,] what might you otherwise have said? A bit of salt still should be put in, so as to carry out the religious duty? So we are told that it is entirely excluded from the law.*

**II.10.** A. *Reverting to the body of the prior passage:*

- B. For said Zeiri said R. Hanina, “Blood that has been boiled [and then eaten] does not involve the violation of the law against eating blood [since it is no longer classified as blood].”
- C. *In session, Raba stated this tradition. Abbayye raised the following objection: “[There is this rule, contradicting that statement:] If someone coagulated blood and ate it, or dissolved forbidden fat and gulped it down, he is liable.”*

- D. [He said to him, “]There is no contradiction, the one statement refers to coagulating the blood in fire, the other to coagulating the blood merely in the sun, If one does so in the fire, it will not [be classified as blood, and that is why there is no transgression involved in eating it (Cashdan)]. If it is coagulated merely in the sun, it will [remain in the classification of blood].
- E. [He said to him, “]Still, even though it was coagulated in the sun, should we not maintain that it does not revert to the status of blood? Did not R. Mani address the question of R. Yohanan: “As to blood that coagulated that one ate, what is the law?” And he replied to him, “Once it has lost its character as blood, it has lost that character permanently.”
- F. *The other remained silent.*
- G. He said to him, “But maybe the one case speaks of blood of sin offerings offered on the outer altar, the other, the blood of sin offerings offered on the inner altar.” [Blood of sin offerings on the inner altar may harden in the sun but is still fit for its purpose and is deemed blood, so blood of animals that are not holy that has hardened by the sun is classified as blood. Zeiri’s case involves blood sprinkled on the veil and the golden altar, and coagulated blood in that case is absolutely unfit for the purpose (Cashdan).]
- H. *He said to him, “That reminds me of something. For said Rabbah said R. Hisda, “In the case of eating congealed blood of a sin offering that was offered on the outer altar one is liable, for the All-Merciful has said, ‘And he shall take..and put it...’ (Lev. 4:30): and that refers to something that is suitable to be taken and put on the horn of the altar. But in the case of eating congealed blood of a sin offering that was offered on the inner altar one is not liable, for the All-Merciful has said, ‘And he shall dip...and sprinkle...’ (Lev. 4: 6), and this cannot be used for dipping and sprinkling.”*
- I. *And on his own account, Rabbah said, “Even in the case of blood that derived from sin offerings presented on the inner altar that had congealed and that someone had eaten, one is liable, since blood of the same sort is suitable for use in connection with sin offerings presented at the outer altar.”*

**II.11.** A. Said R. Giddal said R. Zeiri, “Blood, whether wet or dry, interposes [e.g., if one

immerses in an immersion pool, and prevents the proper contact between the body and the immersion pool].”

- B. *An objection was raised: **Blood, ink, honey, milk, mulberry juice, fig juice, sycamore juice, and carob juice, when dry, interpose, and when moist, do not interpose [T. Miq. 6:9D-F].***
- C. *There is no contradiction. The one case speaks of blood that was rancid, the other, not.*

### **III.1 A. [Supply:...did not salt it:]**

- B. “You shall salt” (Lev. 2:13) — *what purpose does this clause serve?*
- B. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “You shall salt” (Lev. 2:13) — might one suppose that the meaning is, “one should build it up [with salt]? Scripture says, “You shall salt” (Lev. 2:13).
- D. If “You shall salt” (Lev. 2:13), does that mean it may be done with salt water?
- E. Scripture says, “with salt.”

### **III.2. A. “Nor shall you allow salt to be lacking:”**

- B. [Since the word for “be lacking” uses the same consonants as those in the word Sabbath, the meaning is:] produce salt that has no Sabbath [but is produced winter and summer], and what is that? It is salt from Sodom.

### **III.3. A. How, then, on the basis of Scripture, do we know that if one could not get salt from Sodom, he may present salt of Istria [which is coarse and comes from rocks]?**

- B. Scripture says, “You shall offer,” meaning, any sort of salt;
- C. “You shall offer,” meaning, from any source.
- D. “You shall offer,” meaning, and even on the Sabbath.
- E. “You shall offer,” meaning, and even in uncleanness.

### **III.4. A. What is the sense of “you shall build up”?**

- B. *Said Rabbah bar Ulla, “This is the sense of the matter: ‘might you think that one should build it up as straw in clay?’”*
- C. *Said to him Abbaye, “If so, the form to yield such a possible interpretation should bear the letters to yield, ‘mix with straw.’”*
- D. *Rather, said to him Abbaye, “‘Might one think that one should pile up salt as in a building?’”*
- E. *Said to him Raba, “If so, the form to yield such a possible interpretation should bear the letters to yield, ‘building up row on row.’”*
- F. *Rather, said Raba, “‘Might one think that one should give it the taste of salt?’”*
- G. *What is the meaning of “give it the taste of salt?”*
- H. *Said R. Ashi, “‘Might one suppose that one should give it taste just enough as in the case of ‘understanding’ [which suffices in only small quantities]?’”*

### **III.5. A. Scripture in any event therefore says, “You shall salt.”**

- B. **How is this done?**
- C. **One brings a limb and puts salt on it and goes and turns it over and puts salt on it and then offers it up [T. Men. 6:4C-D].**
- D. Said Abbayye, “And so is done for cooking meat in the pot [salting the meat on both sides].”

**III.6.** A. [21B] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **The salt that is on the sacrificial limbs is subject to the laws of sacrilege. That which is on the ramp and altar is not available for benefit, but the laws of sacrilege do not apply [T. Men. 6:4A-B].**
- C. *And said R. Mattenah, “What is the verse of Scripture that is relevant? ‘And you shall present them before the Lord, and the priests shall cast salt upon them, and they shall offer them up for a burnt offering to the Lord’ (Eze. 43:24) [salt that is on the limb is part of the burnt offering (Cashdan)].”*

**III.7.** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah: [They ordained] concerning salt and wood, that priests should be able to make use of them” [M. Sheq. 7:1A].*

- B. Said Samuel, “That rule pertains only to using salt for their offerings, but not for eating the meat.”
- C. *Now on the premise that the meaning of “for their offerings” was, “for salting their offerings,” and “for eating,” “for eating Holy Things,” the question is raised: if salt is given to the priests to salt the hides of Holy Things, will we not give the priests salt for eating Holy Things as well? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: You turn out to say, “In three locations was salt placed, the salt chamber, the ramp, and at the head of the altar at the southwestern corner. And with the salt that was in the hewn-stone chamber they salted the hides; the salt that was on the ramp was used for salting the limbs; the salt that was at the head of the southwestern corner of the altar was used for salting the sacrificial parts of Most Holy Things and the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things, the handful, the frankincense, the meal offering of priests, the meal offering of the anointed priest, and the burnt offering of fowl” [T. Men. 6:1B, 6:2A-C].*
- D. *It must follow, what can be the meaning of “for their offerings”? For eating their offerings. And what can be the meaning of, “for eating”? “for eating unconsecrated food.”*
- E. *As to eating unconsecrated food, that is self-evident, for how does unconsecrated food end up in the Temple [where it may not be presented]?*
- F. *Even though a master has said, “‘And the remainder therefore shall Aaron and his sons eat, in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it” (Lev. 6: 9) —why does Scripture say this? It teaches that if there was only a small quantity of meal offering for eating, the priests may eat unconsecrated food and priestly rations [heave-offering] with it, so that it may yield a satisfying meal,” even so, salt that belongs to Most Holy Things is not given to them.*

**III.8.** A. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “That stands to reason. For if you think that the sense of ‘for their offering’ is for salting the offering that belongs to them, so that they are given that entitlement only because of the stipulation of the court, but if the court had not so stipulated, they would not be entitled to it, it may be argued to the contrary: if we provide*

*Israelites with salt for their offerings, should we not provide salt for the offerings of the priests? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ”*

- B. Might one suppose that he who says, “Lo, incumbent on me is a meal offering,” must present the salt as well out of his own property just as he must present the frankincense out of his own property? For that would stand to reason. we find a reference to bringing a meal offering and to bringing salt, to bringing a meal offering and to bringing frankincense. Just as the frankincense must derive from his own property [and not that of the Temple], so the salt must derive from his own property.]
- C. But you might consider taking this route: we find a reference to presenting a meal offering and to presenting salt. Just as in the case of presenting a meal offering, one presents wood, and as the wood derives from public property, so the salt derives from public property!
- D. Then let us find out which is the indicative analogy. We should draw an analogy for something that applies to all offerings from something that applies to all offerings, and let not frankincense contribute a governing analogy, since it does not pertain to all offerings.
- E. But you might consider taking this route: draw an analogy from something that is presented with meal offering in a single utensil to something else that is presented with it in a single utensil, but let not wood impose the governing analogy, which is not presented with it in a single utensil.
- F. To end all this, Scripture states, “It is a covenant of salt for ever” (Num. 18:19), and elsewhere [in regard to the shoe brad], “It is on behalf of the children of Israel, a covenant for ever” (Lev. 24: 8).
- G. Just as the funds to cover the latter derive from the public treasury, so the funds for the former derive from the public treasury.
- H. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, “This is what R. Shisha b. R. Idi said, ‘This entire matter is required only within the premise of the position of Ben Bukhri [Cashdan: that the priests did not contribute the shekel to the Temple funds and were not entitled to any of the Temple’s supplies, so the court had to stipulate that they could use the Temple’s supplies of wood and salt for their own offerings], for we have learned in the Mishnah: **Said R. Judah, “Testified Ben Bukhri in Yabneh: ‘Any priest who pays the sheqel does not sin.’ Said to him Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, ‘Not so. But any priest who does not pay the sheqel sins. But the priests expound this Scriptural verse for their own benefit: “And every meal offering of the priest shall be wholly burned, it shall not be eaten” (Lev. 6:23). Since the first sheaf of barley, the two loaves, and the show bread are ours, how [if we contribute] are they to be eaten?’” [M. Sheq. 1:4].”***
- I. *Now according to the argument of Ben Bukhri, if to begin with the priests are not liable to pay the shekel, if they do pay it, have they not committed a sin, bringing what is unconsecrated into the Temple?*



- J. *Well, what they do is contribute it to the community. You might have imagined maintaining that [22A] when the All-Merciful had given the right to use the Temple salt for their offerings, that was only to the Israelites, since they alone have a share in the money contributed to the chamber, but that right was not accorded to the priests, who have no share in the offerings that are collected in the chamber. Now we are informed that that is not the case.*

**III.9.** A. *Now as to wood, which the Tannaite authority finds obvious to belong to the community at large, how do we know that that is the fact? It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Might one suppose that he who says, “Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering,” must present wood out of his own property, just as he must present drink offerings out of his own property?
- C. “Scripture to the contrary states, ‘On the wood that is on the fire that is on the altar’ (Lev. 1:12) — just as the altar comes from public funds, so the wood and fire come from public funds,” the words of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon.
- D. R. Eleazar ben Shammua says, “Just as the altar has not been utilized by an ordinary person, so the fire and the wood must not be utilized by an ordinary person.”
- E. *What is at issue between the two formulations?*
- F. *At issue is whether it is required to use new wood.*

**III.10.** A. And is it forbidden to use old wood? But is it not written, “And Araunah said to David, let my lord the king take and offer what seems good to him; behold the oxen for the burnt offering and the threshing instruments and furniture of the oxen for wood” (2Sa. 24:22).” [Freedman, *Zebahim*: thus he took utensils that had already been used for a secular purpose and used them as fuel for the altar. So this is old wood.]

B. *This too was new wood.*

**III.11.** A. *What is the meaning of “furniture”?*

- B. Said Ulla, “A bed of turbel.”
- C. *So what’s “A bed of turbel”?*
- D. *Said R. Judah, [Freedman, Zebahim: ] “A goat with hooks, with which the threshers thresh.”*
- E. *Said R. Joseph, “What verse of Scripture shows it? ‘Behold I make*

you a new threshing sledge having sharp teeth; you shall thresh mountains' (Isa. 41:15)."

### 3:2D-H

- D. [If] its handful [of meal offering] was mixed with the handful of its fellow [meal offering] —
- E. (1) with the meal offering of priests, (2) with the meal offering of the anointed priest, (3) with the meal offerings brought with drink offerings [M. 6:2] —
- F. it is valid.
- G. R. Judah says, "In the case of [mixture with] the meal offering of the anointed priest [E2] or with the meal offering brought with drink offerings [E3], it is invalid.
- H. "For in the case of one, its mixture is thick [M. 3:3], and in the case of the others, its mixture is thin [M. 9:4], and each absorbs from the other [so E2 and E3 are dilute]." [One handful will have absorbed too much oil, the other has been diluted and now has too little oil.]

**I.1** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: Blood which was mixed with water, if it [the mixture] has the appearance of blood, is valid. [If] it was mixed in wine, they regard it as if it were water [and if the mixture is blood-color, it is valid]. [If] it [blood of Holy Things] was mixed with the blood of a beast or with the blood of fowl [which were unconsecrated], they regard it as if it were water. R. Judah says, "Blood [under any circumstances] does not annul blood" [M. Zeb. 8:6A-F].* [Cashdan: the blood of an offering, even though mixed in a larger quantity of unconsecrated blood, still retains its identity, so the mixture is valid for sprinkling. A mixture of like kinds is such that one component does not neutralize the other.]

B. Said R. Yohanan, "Both [the anonymous authority and R. Judah] derive support from the same verse of Scripture for their positions, namely, 'And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat' (Lev. 16:18) [the blood of the one being mixed with the blood of the other] — it is well established that the blood of the bullock is more abundant than the blood of the goat [Cashdan: nonetheless the goat's blood, which is less than that of the bullock, is not nullified but is treated by Scripture as distinct]. *Rabbis take the view that [22B]* on the basis of this verse of Scripture, it is clear that when things that are offered up are mixed together, one component of the mixture does not neutralize the other [Cashdan: but if a consecrated animal's blood was mixed with that of an unconsecrated animal's blood, or water with wine, one would neutralize the other, according to the quantities of each]. R. Judah maintains on this basis that, when like kinds are mixed, one component does not neutralize the other."

**I.2.** A. "*Rabbis take the view that* on the basis of this verse of Scripture, it is clear that when things that are offered up are mixed together, one component of the mixture does not neutralize the other:"

B. *But perhaps the operative consideration that one does not neutralize the other is that it is a mixture of like kinds [as Judah has maintained]?*

- C. *If the intent had been to tell us that the operative consideration is the mixture of things of like kind and not to tell us that the issue is what is offered up, it would be as you maintain. But since the case in hand as a matter of fact involves a mixture of things that are offered up, the obvious consideration is that it is a mixture of things that are offered up.*
- D. *Then perhaps we should concur if limited by the proof at hand that only where there is a mixture of things that are alike and that are offered up, one element cannot neutralize the other.*
- E. *That's a problem.*

**I.3.** A. "R. Judah maintains on this basis that, when like kinds are mixed, one component does not neutralize the other:"

- B. *But perhaps the operative consideration that it is because both of them are things that are offered up [as sages have maintained]?*
- C. *If the intent had been to tell us that the operative consideration is the mixture of things that are unlike but that are offered up, it would be as you maintain. But since it is, furthermore, also a mixture of one kind of liquid and another kind of liquid, it is clear that the operative consideration is that it is a mixture of like things.*
- D. *Then perhaps we should concur if limited by the proof at hand that only where there is a mixture of things that are alike and that are offered up, one element cannot neutralize the other.*
- E. *That's a problem.*

**I.4.** A. ***We have learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, "In the case of [mixture with] the meal offering of the anointed priest or with the meal offering brought with drink offerings, it is invalid. For in the case of one, its mixture is thick, and in the case of the others, its mixture is thin, and each absorbs from the other:"***

- B. *But if one absorbs from the other, what difference does that make? What we have here, after all, are the mixture of two things of like kind! [Cashdan: the handful here is made up of oil and water, mixed with one of the meal offerings, which has oil. The oil in the handful is disregarded, so that the flour of the handful will neutralize the oil of the other meal offering that it has absorbed, and the result is that the handful has too much oil and is invalid].*
- C. **[23A]** Said Raba, "R. Judah takes the view that wherever an element is mixed both with a like kind and also with another kind, you treat the like kind as though it were not there, and then the other kind, if larger in volume in the mixture, will neutralize the first kind"

**I.5.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. if the priest poured oil on the handful of meal offering that was taken from a sinner's meal offering —
- C. R. Yohanan says, "It is invalid."
- D. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "He himself to begin with wipes up with it the remains of the log of oil and then offers it up." [Cashdan: it is proper to scrape up with the handful of the sinner's meal offering any oil that may be found remaining in the log

measure that had been used for some other offering, so if he actually poured some oil on the handful, it certainly is valid.]

- E. But is it not written, “He shall not put oil on it, nor shall he put any frankincense on it” (Lev. 5:11)?
- F. The point of that verse is that one should not assign a quantity of oil for such a meal offering as one does for other such offerings [Cashdan: before the taking of the handful].
- G. *R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Dry meal offering that was mingled with one that was mixed with oil may be offered.*
- H. “R. Judah says, ‘It may not be offered.’
- I. *“Is not what is at issue the case of the handful of meal offering of a sinner [that normally does not contain oil] mixed up with the handful of the meal offering given as a gesture of free will [that does contain oil]?” [Cashdan: the one who permits making the offering does so because he holds that things offered up when mixed together do not neutralize each other, so that each is one considered as though it were by itself; where oil was poured on to a dry meal offering, they would declare it invalid, vs. the view of Simeon b. Laqish].*
- J. *No, we deal with the meal offering that accompanies bullocks and rams that is mixed with the meal offering that accompanies a lamb [the former using less oil, two logs to a tenth of an ephah of flour, the latter using more oil, three logs of oil to a tenth of ephah of flour].*
- K. *But that has been set forth explicitly: if the meal offering presented with a bullock or ram was mixed with the meal offering presented with a lamb, or a dry one was mixed with one mingled with oil, it may be offered up. R. Judah says, “It may not be offered up.” [Cashdan: dry in the second clause is then different from that in the first.]*
- L. *The one clause merely serves to illustrate the other.*

- I.6.** A. *Raba raised the question: “As to a handful of meal offering the oil of which was squeezed out onto the wood [leaving too little oil in the meal offering], what is the law? What is attached to an offering is classified as the offering [since the wood with the oil on it will later on be joined to the handful and burned together on the altar, it is as though the oil were still in the handful, so that the oil is not lacking (Cashdan)], or is it not classified as the offering?”*
- B. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “Is this not the same issue as that addressed by R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish? For it has been stated:*
  - C. *“He who offers up a limb of less a volume than an olive’s bulk [of meat] —*
  - D. *“R. Yohanan said, ‘He is liable [for making an offering outside of the Temple].’*
  - E. *“R. Simeon b. Laqish said, ‘He is exempt from liability.’*
  - F. *“R. Yohanan said, ‘He is liable:’ what is attached to what is taken up to the altar is equivalent to what is taken up in its own right.*
  - G. *“R. Simeon b. Laqish said, ‘He is exempt from liability:’ what is attached to what is taken up to the altar is not equivalent to what is taken up in its own right.”*
  - H. *Nonetheless, the question raised just now may just as well be addressed to both R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish.*

- I. *The question may be addressed to R. Yohanan: R. Yohanan took his position in that other case only with regard to a bone, since that is of the same species as the meat, but here, in which case the wood is not the same species as the meal offering, he might have said that that is not the case.*
- J. *And perhaps R. Simeon b. Laqish took the position that he did only with regard to the bone, since it can be distinguished from the rest, and if it is separated, there is no requirement to put it back, but not in respect to the oil, for that cannot be distinguished and removed from the mixture.*
- K. *Or perhaps these points of distinction do not register.*
- L. *The question stands.*

### 3:3A-I

- A. **Two meal offerings from neither one of which the handful had been taken and which [having fallen into a single utensil] were mixed up together —**
- B. **if one can take the handful from this one by itself and from that one by itself,**
- C. **[both] are valid.**
- D. **And if not, they are invalid.**
- E. **The handful [taken from a meal offering] which was mixed up with a meal offering from which the handful had not been taken —**
- F. **he should not offer it [the mixture] up.**
- G. **And if he offered it up, this one from which the handful had been taken goes to the credit of its owner. And this one from which the handful had not been taken does not go to the credit of its owner.**
- H. **[If] its handful was mixed up with its residue, or with the residue of its fellow, he should not offer it up.**
- I. **But if he offered it up, it goes to the credit of the owner.**

- I.1** A. Said R. Hisda, “Carrion is neutralized in a larger quantity of properly slaughtered meat, for it is not possible for properly slaughtered meat to become carrion, but properly slaughtered meat is not neutralized in carrion meat, since carrion meat can become properly slaughtered meat, since, when it has putrefied [and is no longer edible], the uncleanness attaching to it is removed.”
- B. And R. Hanina said, “Whatever can become like the other is not neutralized, but whatever cannot become like the other is neutralized.” [Cashdan: it is the substance that is going to be neutralized that is taken into account, that is, the substance that forms the smaller part of the mixture; if it can become like what constitutes the greater part of the mixture, the mixture is then a mixture of like kinds and neutralization does not take place.]
- C. *In accord with the position of which party do [Hisda or Hanina] differ? If it is in accord with rabbis, lo, they have said, “It is things that are offered up that do not neutralize one another, but like kinds that are mixed together do neutralize one another.” Nor can it be in accord with the principle of R. Judah, for lo, [23B] R. Judah takes the view that the issue is appearance [Cashdan: it is then immaterial whether the carrion meat can become like slaughtered meat or vice versa, for even if the mixture is of like kinds, neutralization takes effect], and by that criterion, one way or the other we have a mixture of like kinds.*

- D. *Rather, it is in accord with R. Hiyya. For R. Hiyya repeated as a Tannaite tradition: Carrion and properly slaughtered meat are neutralized by one another [when mixed together].*
- E. *And whose view does R. Hiyya accept? In accord with the position of which party do [Hisda or Hanina] differ? If it is in accord with rabbis, lo, they have said, "It is things that are offered up that do not neutralize one another, but like kinds that are mixed together do neutralize one another." Nor can it be in accord with the principle of R. Judah, for so far as R. Judah is concerned, in any mixture of like kinds there is no neutralization.*
- F. *In point of fact, he follows the view of R. Judah, and when R. Judah takes the view that in any mixture of like kinds there is no neutralization, that is the case where it is possible for one kind to become like the other, but here, where it is not possible for one kind to become like the other, neutralization does take effect.*
- G. *Then at issue here is this point: R. Hisda maintains that we take account of the character of that which neutralizes [meaning, what forms the larger volume of the mixture,] and R. Hanina maintains we take account of the character of what is neutralized [meaning, the smaller part of the mixture]. [Cashdan: if this substance can become like the substance that is in the minority, the mixture is deemed to be one of like kinds, and neutralization will not take place].*
- H. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **Two meal offerings from neither one of which the handful had been taken and which [having fallen into a single utensil] were mixed up together — if one can take the handful from this one by itself and from that one by itself, [both] are valid. And if not, they are invalid.** Now in this case, once the priest takes up the handful from one of the meal offerings, the rest is classified as residue, but the residue does not neutralize the other meal offering, the one from which the handful has not yet been taken. [Cashdan: it is certain that neutralization does not take place, for otherwise it would not be permitted subsequently to take the handful from the second meal offering.]*
- I. *Now whose view is represented here? It cannot be that of rabbis, for lo, they maintain that it is things that are offered up that are not annulled when mingled with one another, in consequence of which where there is a mixture of things of the same kind, neutralization does take place. So it obviously represents the position of R. Judah. And that poses no problem to him who holds that the operative criterion is what is to be neutralized; here what is to be neutralized [the other meal offering, from which no handful has been taken] can become like what does the neutralization, for when the handful will have been removed from the other meal offering, the net effect will be to leave a residue, like that of the first meal offering. But within the premise of him who holds that the operative criterion is the status of that which is neutralized, one must raise this question: can the residue ever become like that from which the handful has not yet been taken? [Certainly not. So we have a mixture of unlike kinds, neutralization should take effect, so it should not be allowed to take the handful from the second meal offering (Cashdan).]*
- J. *Then shall we say that the passage is not in accord with R. Hiyya as set forth by R. Hisda?*



- K. *In point of fact it is in line with what R. Zira said, for said R. Zira, “‘Burning’ is stated with reference to the handful (Lev. 2: 2) and the same with reference to the residue (Lev. 2:10). Just as with regard to the handful, concerning which ‘burning’ is stated, one handful cannot neutralize the other [which even Judah concedes], so in the case of the remainder, where the same word occurs, the residue cannot neutralize the handful.” [Cashdan: the effect of Zira’s teaching is that the law of neutralization does not apply to any mixture of remainders and handfuls in any circumstances.]*
- L. *Come and hear: **The handful [taken from a meal offering] which was mixed up with a meal offering from which the handful had not been taken — he should not offer it [the mixture] up. And if he offered it up, this one from which the handful had been taken goes to the credit of its owner. And this one from which the handful had not been taken does not go to the credit of its owner.** It follows that the meal offering from which the handful has not been taken does not neutralize the handful. And in accord with whom does this rule take its position? It cannot be that of rabbis, for lo, they maintain that it is things that are offered up that are not annulled when mingled with one another, in consequence of which where there is a mixture of things of the same kind, neutralization does take place. So it obviously represents the position of R. Judah. And that poses no problem to him who holds that the operative criterion is what effects neutralization [the greater part of the mixture], for here what effects neutralization can become like that which is neutralized, since every particle in the batch is suitable to be taken up in the handful [Cashdan: consequently, the mixture is deemed to be one of like kinds and neutralization does not take place]. But in accord with the position of him who holds that what is to be neutralized [the other meal offering, from which no handful has been taken] forms the paramount criterion, one must raise this question: can the residue ever become like the meal offering from which the handful has not yet been taken? Then shall we say that the passage is not in accord with R. Hiyya as set forth by R. Hisda?*
- M. *In point of fact it is in line with what R. Zira said, [as above: for said R. Zira, “‘Burning’ is stated with reference to the handful (Lev. 2: 2) and the same with reference to the residue (Lev. 2:10). Just as with regard to the handful, concerning which ‘burning’ is stated, one handful cannot neutralize the other [which even Judah concedes], so in the case of the remainder, where the same word occurs, the residue cannot neutralize the handful.”]*
- N. *Come and hear: **[If] its handful was mixed up with its residue, or with the residue of its fellow, he should not offer it up. But if he offered it up, it goes to the credit of the owner.** Now here is a case in which what effects neutralization [the greater part of the mixture] cannot become like that which is subjected to neutralization, nor can what is subjected to neutralization become like what effects neutralization [so neutralization should take effect (Cashdan)]. And yet the residue does not neutralize the handful here? Whose view then is represented? It cannot be that of rabbis, [supply, as above:] for lo, they maintain that it is things that are offered up that are not annulled when mingled with one another, in consequence of which where there is a mixture of things of the same*

kind, neutralization does take place. So it obviously represents the position of R. Judah. And that poses no problem to him who holds that the operative criterion is what effects neutralization [the greater part of the mixture], for here what effects neutralization can become like that which is neutralized, since every particle in the batch is suitable to be taken up in the handful [Cashdan: consequently, the mixture is deemed to be one of like kinds and neutralization does not take place]. But in accord with the position of him who holds that what is to be neutralized [the other meal offering, from which no handful has been taken] forms the paramount criterion, one must raise this question: can the residue ever become like the meal offering from which the handful has not yet been taken? Then shall we say that the passage is not in accord with R. Hiyya as set forth by R. Hisda?

- O. *In point of fact it is in line with what R. Zira said, [as above: for said R. Zira, “‘Burning’ is stated with reference to the handful (Lev. 2: 2) and the same with reference to the residue (Lev. 2:10). Just as with regard to the handful, concerning which ‘burning’ is stated, one handful cannot neutralize the other [which even Judah concedes], so in the case of the remainder, where the same word occurs, the residue cannot neutralize the handful.”*
- P. *Come and take note: if one seasoned unleavened dough with cumin or sesame seed or any other kind of spice, the unleavened dough is suitable [for use for Passover in keeping the religious requirement of eating unleavened bread]. For the dough remains in the category of unleavened bread, though it is now in the class of seasoned unleavened bread. Now on the premise that the spices are more in volume than the unleavened dough, then, from the viewpoint of him who maintains that what is to be neutralized forms the paramount criterion, there is no problem, for what is to be neutralized here [the dough] can become like what effects neutralization, for when it becomes mouldy, it can serve as a spice [and is no longer unleavened bread (Cashdan)]. But from the perspective of him who maintains that the operative criterion is what effects neutralization [the greater part of the mixture], can spice ever become like the unleavened dough? [No, and therefore the mixture is one of unlike things and neutralization should take place, in which case it is no longer unleavened dough at all].*
- Q. *In this matter with what case do we deal? It is one in which the spices are not abundant, and the unleavened dough forms the greater part, on which account it is not neutralized. That conclusion is sustained by the wording of the passage, which states, “For the dough remains in the category of unleavened bread, though it is now in the class of seasoned unleavened bread.”*
- R. *That is decisive.*

**I.2.** A. *When R. Kahana went up to the Land of Israel, he found the sons of R. Hiyya in session, stating, “A tenth of an ephah of flour designated for use for a meal offering which one divided [24A] and left in two halves in the mixing utensil, which a person who has completed his rite of purification but awaits sunset to complete the rite of purification touched one of the two parts, what is the law? When we have learned the rule in the Mishnah, **A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering [M. Hag. 3:2C-D]**, that rule pertains in particular to a case in*

*which the components that are contained in the common utensil touch one another. But in a case in which they are not touching one another, that is not the case? Or perhaps there is no differentiating the one from the other case?"*

- B. *He said to them, "Have we learned in the Mishnah-passage the language, 'a utensil forms into one entity'? What we have learned is **a utensil unites, meaning, in every case.**"*
- C. *"If someone [divided a tenth into two parts and then] put another half tenth between them, what is the law?" [Does uncleanness affecting it affect the other halves or not?]*
- D. *He said to them, "What requires the utensil is united by the utensil, what does not require the utensil is not united by the utensil" [Cashdan: the extra half-tenth has no need of this utensil and could not be used together with the other halves that are in it, so the other halves are not affected with uncleanness].*
- E. *"If, [without touching the utensil or the contents], a person who has completed his rite of purification but awaits sunset to complete the rite of purification stuck his finger between them?"*
- F. *He said to them, "You have nothing that imparts uncleanness through the medium of its contained air space except for clay utensils alone."*
- G. *Then he, for his part, went and raised this question of them: "What is the law as to taking a handful from one half of the meal in the utensil in behalf of the other [when each half is separate from the other]? [Cashdan: when taking the handful, does one have to take some from each half, or may it be taken entirely from one half in regard to what is in the entire utensil?] *Is the union based on the law of the Torah or merely on the decree of rabbis [and in the latter case, one would have to take a bit of meal of both components of the whole]?"**
- H. *They said to him, "We have heard no answer for this question, but we have heard an answer to a parallel question, **for we have learned in the Mishnah: Two meal offerings from neither one of which the handful had been taken and which [having fallen into a single utensil] were mixed up together — if one can take the handful from this one by itself and from that one by itself, [both] are valid. And if not, they are invalid.** Now, it follows, if he can take the handful, they are valid. And why should that be the case? The rest that is mixed in the utensil is not touching the handful that is taken!" [The remainder of one meal offering is entirely separate from the handful of that same meal offering, nevertheless, the offering is valid, because all parts are united by the utensil, thus the principle of union derives from the Torah (Cashdan)].*
- I. *Said Raba, "But perhaps the lumps are separated like the teeth of a comb [joined at the bottom, separate at the top]." [Cashdan: in our Mishnah the two meal offerings were lying side by side and separated only at the ends where the handfuls might be taken. But if the two halves were entirely distinct, the question stands.]*
- J. *So what's the upshot?*
- K. *Said Raba, "Come and take note, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: "And he shall take up therefrom" (Lev. 6: 8) — from what is joined together. So one may not present a tenth ephah of flour divided in two utensils and take up the*

handful from one of them.’ Lo, in the case at hand the flour in a single utensil comparable to that in two, the handful may be taken.”

- L. *Said to him Abbaye, “But perhaps the two utensils of the ruling refer to a qapiza-measure set into a qab-measure [Cashdan: the latter was constructed with the former fixed in its hole, so the two really form one utensil, with two distinct receptacles; when both are filled to the brim with flour of meal offering, the components of the two receptacles do not touch, since the sides of the inner one separate the contents of the one from the other; and even if the flour was heaped up to over the sides of the inner one, so that there is contact, still it is invalid, for the contact between the contents is not made in the utensil but outside of it]. And even so on top the contents are combined, the sides of the qapiza-measure forming a partition below, one may not present the meal offering therein. And by ‘one utensil that is like two’ may be a hen trough, in which the contents, though separated by a partition, still are in contact. In this case, where they are not in contact, however, you will have yet to address your question.”*

**I.3.** A. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: “If two half tenths are joined by a utensil, and another half tenth, outside the two, is joined by liquid [e.g., a pipe or conduct running from the utensil to the place where, outside the utensil, another half tenth lay], what is the law? [Cashdan: the question is whether or not the uncleanness can be passed on to the half tenth that is lying outside in the following stages: first the uncleanness is passed on by reason of the uniting force of the utensil to the other half tenth that is with it in the utensil, then the latter passes on the uncleanness to what is lying outside by reason of the connection effected by water]. When we have learned in the Mishnah, **A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering [M. Hag. 3:2C-D]**, does that rule pertain in particular to what is inside the utensil but not to what is outside of it, or perhaps, once there is a connection effected, there is connection?*

- B. *“And if you take the position that once there is a connection effected, there is connection, what is the law where there is a connection effected through water [with one of the halves inside the utensil], a combination effected through a utensil [between the two halves that are inside it], and then came the touch from the outside of one who has completed his rites of purification and awaits sunset for the completion of the process that will leave him wholly clean? When we have learned in the Mishnah, **A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering [M. Hag. 3:2C-D]**, does that rule pertain in particular to a case in which the unclean sources comes into contact with what is inside but not where it comes into contact with what was outside, or perhaps there is no difference?”*

C. *The questions stand.*

**I.4.** A. *Raba raised the following question: “A tenth of an ephah of flour designated for use for a meal offering which one divided and one half of which became unclean, and which one afterwards put into a bowl, and then a person who has completed his rite of purification but awaits sunset to complete the rite of purification touched the part that was already unclean, what is the law? Do we rule that the unclean part is simply stuffed with uncleanness [once it is unclean, it cannot become more*

unclean than it is, and the other half tenth with it in the utensil remains clean], or is that not the case?”

- B. *Said to him Abbaye, “But do we ever invoke the conception that something is simply stuffed with uncleanness [once it is unclean]? Have we not learned in the Mishnah, A sheet which was unclean [24B] with pressure uncleanness [by reason of a person afflicted with flux uncleanness, described at Lev. 15, who has sat or stood on the sheet] which one made into a curtain is clean from midras uncleanness [since it is no longer used for sitting or lying], but it now is susceptible to the uncleanness imparted by contact with the former pressure uncleanness. Said R. Yosé, “And with what pressure-uncleanness has this [sheet] now come into contact? But only if a person afflicted with the flux-uncleanness [of Lev. 15] has touched it is it unclean, on account of contact with the Zab” [M. Kel. 27:10]. In any event, the passage is explicit that “if a Zab has touched it it is unclean, on account of contact with the Zab,” even at the end. But why should that be the case? Why not invoke the conception, the unclean part is simply stuffed with uncleanness [once it is unclean, it cannot become more unclean than it is, and the other half tenth with it in the utensil remains clean]?”*
- C. *He said to him, “How in the world do you know that the premise is that the contact with the person afflicted with flux uncleanness came only at the end of the process? Perhaps that contact was prior to the imposition of the uncleanness conveyed not through touch but through the pressure of lying or sitting, so we have a case in which a more weighty uncleanness has been imposed upon a less weighty uncleanness? [All parties concur that we then do not invoke the conception, the unclean part is simply stuffed with uncleanness [once it is unclean, it cannot become more unclean than it is, and the other half tenth with it in the utensil remains clean]. But here, in which both forms of uncleanness are of a light order, that would not be the case.”*
- D. *[He said to him,] “But then attend to the following clause: R. Yosé concedes that if two sheets are lying, folding one on top of the other, and one afflicted with flux uncleanness sat on them, the upper one has become unclean with flux uncleanness, the lower is unclean with both flux uncleanness and also the uncleanness that comes from contact with flux uncleanness. But why should that be the case? Why not invoke the conception, the unclean part is simply stuffed with uncleanness [once it is unclean, it cannot become more unclean than it is, and the other half tenth with it in the utensil remains clean]?”*
- E. *“Here, the uncleanness comes about simultaneously, while in our case the episodes of uncleanness are successive.”*

**I.5.** A. Said Raba, “A tenth ephah of fine flour [destined for a meal offering] that one divided, and one half of which was lost, and one designated another in its stead, and then the first half was found, so that lo, all three of them are in the mixing utensil — if the half tenth that had gotten lost became unclean, it is joined with the first half tenth but not with the substituted half tenth. If the substituted half tenth became unclean, it is joined with the first half tenth but not with the half tenth that had gotten lost. If the first half tenth became unclean, it can be united with either of the others.” [Cashdan: the first half tenth was intended to be taken in the first

place together with what was lost, then with what was substituted for the lost one, so that a relation was set up between the first half tenth and each of the others; so all can then become unclean.]

- B. Abbaye said, "Even if any one of the half tenths was made unclean, it joins with either of the others. *What is the operative consideration? All of them belong to the same little house*" [having been intended to be used for one and the same meal offering (Cashdan)].
- C. Said Raba, "And so with regard to the matter of taking up the handful: if a handful was taken from the half tenth that was lost, then its residue and the first half tenth may be eaten, but not the substituted half tenth; if it was taken from the substituted half tenth, what was left of it and the first half tenth may be eaten, but not the half tenth that was lost; if it was taken from the first half tenth, then what was left may be eaten, but the others may not be eaten." [Cashdan: the first half tenth was intended to go with each of the other half tenths, and since the handful can serve only in respect to a tenth, there is one half tenth that has not been rendered permissible by the handful, but we do not know which one, so neither may be eaten.]
- D. Abbaye said, "Even if the handful was taken from any of the half tenths, the other two may not be eaten. *What is the operative consideration? All of them belong to the same little house*" [having been intended to be used for one and the same meal offering (Cashdan)].
- E. *Objected R. Pappa, "Now you maintain that the residue of it may be eaten. But one third of the handful was never offered!"* [Cashdan: presumably when the handful was taken and offered, it was intended to serve everything that was in the utensil, so that a third of the handful should not have been offered, representing as it did the superfluous half tenth. Consequently the handful must be regarded as having been incomplete, so that what was left of it cannot be eaten.]
- F. *Objected R. Isaac b. R. Mesharshayya, "But the handful itself — how can it be offered! For is it not the fact that a third of it has never been consecrated?"*
- G. *R. Ashi said, "The taking of the handful is governed by the intentionality of the officiating priest, and when the priest takes the handful, he does so only in regard to a tenth"* [and he disregards the third half tenth when he takes the handful, so the residue of the half tenth from which the handful was taken may be eaten, while the other two may not, for we do not know which was the half tenth to which the priest paid no attention (Cashdan)].

### 3:3J-L

- J. [25A] [If] the handful was made unclean and one [nonetheless] offered it up, the priest's frontlet effects acceptance.
- K. [If] it went forth [beyond the veils] and one offered it up, the priest's frontlet does not effect acceptance.
- L. For the priest's frontlet effects acceptance for that which is unclean, but it does not effect acceptance for that which goes forth beyond the veils [M. Zeb. 8:12].

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



- B. “And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things” (Exo. 28:38) [the high priest’s head plate atones for faults in connection with the offering] — and what is the iniquity for which the head plate atones? If you should say that it is for the sin of making the offering refuse, lo, it is stated to the contrary, “It shall not be accepted” Lev. 19: 7). If you say, it is the sin of leaving the meat over beyond the proper time, lo, it is stated, “Neither shall it be imputed to him” (Lev. 7:18). Lo, it can bear the iniquity only for the sin of uncleanness, for that is remitted from the prevailing prohibition when it comes to the offering of the community.
- C. *To this formulation objected R. Zira, “But might I not say that it is the sin of taking the offering outside beyond the vails, for that sin was remitted from the prevailing prohibition at the time that the high places were permitted?”*
- D. *Said to him Abbaye, “Said Scripture, ‘That they may be accepted before the Lord’ (Exo. 28:38), meaning, an iniquity that is committed before the Lord [in the Temple] is remitted by the plate, and not the sin of taking the offering outside of the Temple.”*
- E. *To this formulation objected R. Ilai, “But might I say that what is remitted is the sin of making the offering with the left hand, for that sin is remitted in the rite of the Day of Atonement?”*
- F. *Said to him Abbaye, “Said Scripture, ‘sin...,’ meaning, it is a sin that has taken place that is remitted, but that excludes what is done on the Day of Atonement it is entirely correct to carry out an act of service with the left hand.”*
- G. *R. Ashi said, “‘...the sin involving Holy Things,’ but not the sin of those that sanctify [and set forth] the offering [e.g., the left-handed priest].”*
- H. *Said R. Sima b. R. Idi to R. Ashi, and some say, R. Sima b. R. Ashi to R. Ashi, “But might I not say that what is involved is the sin of a blemished offering’s being made, for that is remitted when it comes to fowl? For a master has said, ‘The condition of not being blemished and of being of male gender are required only in the case of sacrifices made of beasts, but not of sacrifices made of birds.’”*
- I. *He said to him, “Concerning your point Scripture has said, ‘It shall not be accepted’ (Lev. 22:23), and ‘it shall not be acceptable for you’ (Lev. 22:20) [under no circumstances are blemished animals accepted].”*

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

- B. If the blood of an offering was made unclean and inadvertently was sprinkled, it is acceptable; if this was done deliberately, it is not accepted. That rule pertains only to an individual’s offering, but in the case of an offering in behalf of the entire community, the offering is acceptable whether made inadvertently or deliberately. In the case of an offering presented by a gentile, whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, **[25B]** the offering is not acceptable.
- C. *And in contradiction, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* For what does the high priest’s head plate atone? For blood, meat, and forbidden fat, that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, whether in the case of an offering in behalf of an individual or an offering in behalf of the community.”
- D. *Said R. Joseph, “There is no contradiction, the one represents the view of R. Yose, the other of rabbis, , as has been taught on Tannaite authority: **They do***

**not separate heave offering from that [produce] which is unclean for that which is clean. And if he separated heave offering [in that manner] — [if he did it] unintentionally, that which he has separated is [valid] heave offering; [but if he did it] intentionally, he has not done anything [M. Ter. 2:2A-D].** And R. Yosé says, “Whether it was done inadvertently or deliberately, the produce designated as heave offering indeed is heave offering.” [Cashdan: the statement then that even if part of the offering was deliberately made unclean, the plate atones, represents the view of Yosé.]

- E. *Well, I can grant you that R. Yosé takes the position that there is no penalty, but have you heard him state in so many words that the plate atones for uncleanness of portions of the offering that are eaten by the priests or owner [as distinct from the portions of the offering that are sacrificed? All concur on the ones that are burned on the altar, but what about the edible parts?] To the contrary, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, “The priestly frontlet atones for portions of the offering that may be eaten.” R. Yosé says, “The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten.”*
- F. *Reverse the attributions in this way: R. Eliezer says, “The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten.” R. Yosé says, “The priestly frontlet atones for portions of the offering that may be eaten.”*
- G. *To that proposition objected R. Sheshet, “But can you really reverse matters in such a way? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *“‘Might one suppose that if the meat was made unclean before the tossing of the blood, people should be liable on that account on grounds of uncleanness? Scripture states, “Every one that is clean shall eat the meat; but the soul that eats of the meat of the sacrifice of peace offerings that pertain to the Lord, while still unclean, shall be cut off from his people” (Lev. 7:19-20).*
- I. *“‘That food that is permitted to clean people brings about culpability on the count of uncleanness, but an unclean person who eats of what has not been rendered permitted to clean persons is not liable on the count of uncleanness. But perhaps that is not the case, but rather, if the unclean person eats what may now be eaten by people who are clean, he is liable on account of uncleanness, but if an unclean person who eats what may not now be eaten by clean persons [Cashdan: even though it had once been rendered permitted to them, e.g., when the meat was permitted after sprinkling the blood but then became unfit by being left overnight or being taken out of the Temple court], he is not liable on the consideration of uncleanness.*
- J. *“‘But perhaps that is not the case, but rather, the meaning is, if an unclean person eats what may now be eaten by people who are clean, he is liable on account of uncleanness, but if he eats what may not now be eaten by clean people, is not not liable on account of uncleanness, in which case I would exclude those parts of the offering that were left overnight or taken out of the Temple court, since they may not now be eaten by those who are clean?*
- K. *“‘Scripture says, “that pertain to the Lord,” which is inclusive.*
- L. *“‘So might I then encompass meat that was refuse and meat that was left over? (But is that not the same thing as meat that was left overnight? Rather:) so might I include meat that was refuse, treating it as meat that was left over? Scripture says,*

“of the sacrifice of peace offerings” — which is exclusive. So what makes you include the one and exclude the other?

- M. “Here we have a verse that uses an inclusive and also an exclusive phrase. So I encompass those that were once permitted [left overnight, taken outside of the sanctuary after sprinkling, both of them rendered permitted through the sprinkling], but I exclude those that were never permitted.
- N. “And if you raise the question, then why is an unclean person liable on ground of uncleanness for eating, after sprinkling of the blood, meat that had become unclean before the sprinkling, I will answer, it is because the plate atones for it.’
- O. “Now one is liable only for that which became unclean, but not for that which was taken out, and from whom have you heard the message that where the offering was taken out of the temple court, the sprinkling is null? It is R. Eliezer, and yet we have the rule that the plate atones for the uncleanness of the edible parts.” [Cashdan: but if we reverse the authorities, Eliezer holds the opposite view].
- P. *Said R. Hisda, “That really is no problem. The one position sets forth the position of R. Eliezer, the other, that of Rabbis.”*
- Q. *Now I grant you that you may well have heard the view in R. Eliezer’s name that the frontlet effects atonement for the edible parts of the sacrifice, but have you heard him say that we do not impose any sanction at all [so that atonement is attained even if the unclean blood was deliberately sprinkled?]*
- R. *Yes indeed, for, just as we took for granted that R. Yosé took that position [on the basis of what he said in regard to heave offering], so we may assume that is R. Eliezer’s position as well. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- S. R. Eliezer says, “Whether one designated unclean produce as heave offering for clean produce inadvertently or deliberately, the portion designated as heave offering is indeed classified as such.”
- T. *Well, I can grant that R. Eliezer took that position [that a deliberate act still produces valid results] in regard to heave offering, which is a less weighty matter, but have you heard him take the same position in the context of Holy Things, which are a more weighty matter?*
- U. *Well, if not him, then whom?*
- V. Rabina said, “As to the uncleanness affecting it, whether it was made unclean inadvertently or deliberately, the offering is acceptable; but as to sprinkling the bloods, if the blood was sprinkled inadvertently, it is acceptable, but if this was done deliberately, it is not.” [Cashdan: Rabina explains away the contradiction between the two statements. The first formulation, which says with regard to the private offering, if inadvertently, it is acceptable, if deliberately, not,’ deals with sprinkling unclean blood; the second, which says that the plate atones for blood that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately deals with the uncleanness; the sprinkling would be acceptable only if done inadvertently.]
- W. And R. Shila said, “As to tossing the blood, whether this is done inadvertently or deliberately, the offering is acceptable; but as to uncleanness, if it was made unclean inadvertently, it is acceptable, but if deliberately, it is not.”
- Y. *And how does R. Shila explain the formulation, “which became unclean, whether inadvertently or deliberately”?*

- Z. It means, it was inadvertently rendered unclean, but the blood was tossed whether inadvertently or deliberately.
- AA. **[26A]** *Come and take note:* blood that had become unclean, which one tossed — if this was done inadvertently, it has been accepted, but if it was done deliberately, it was not accepted. [Cashan: this obviously means that if the unclean blood was sprinkled deliberately, it is not acceptable, vs. Shila's view.]
- BB. *This is the sense of that formulation:* in the case of blood that became unclean, if it was tossed, whether this was done inadvertently or deliberately, if it was made unclean inadvertently, the offering is accepted; if it was made unclean deliberately, the offering is not accepted.

### 3:4A-B

- A. **[If before the handful was offered up] its residue was made unclean, [if] its residue was burned, [if] its residue was lost,**
- B. **in accord with the reasoning of R. Eliezer, it is valid, and in accord with the reasoning of R. Joshua, it is invalid.**
- I.1 A. Said Rab, "But that is the case only if all of the residue was made unclean. [Cashdan: only then does Joshua maintain that one may not burn the handful.] But the handful, the residue of which was made unclean only in part, is not covered by the law."
- B. *On the premise that the statement just now made refers only to the residue's being made unclean, but not to its being lost or burned, then what can be the supposition of this statement? If Rab's maintains that the residue is a matter of substance, then even if it is lost or burned, the same rule should also pertain. If he maintains that the residue is not a matter of substance, but we deal with a case in which it became unclean, then the reason that the handful may be burned is that the frontlet propitiates in any event, then, if so, even if the whole of the residue were affected, the same rule should apply!*
- C. *In point of fact, he takes the view that the residue is a matter of substance, and in his view, the same rule that applies if it is made unclean applies if it is lost or burned. The reason, then, that matters are formulated as , "made unclean," is simply that he has made reference only to the first item mentioned in context. And so it has been stated in a Tannaite formulation: "R. Joshua says, 'All the sacrifices that are mentioned in the Torah of which there remained an olive's bulk of meat and an olive's bulk of fat — the priest sprinkles the blood on its account. If there remained only a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, he does not toss the blood on its account. And in the case of a burnt offering, even if there is a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, one tosses the blood on its account, because in any event all of it is suitable for burning. And in the case of a meal offering, if there did not remain of the sacrifice a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, even if the whole meal offering in its entirety remains available, one does not sprinkle the blood on its account. As to the Passover, if there is an olive's bulk for each and every participant, one tosses the blood, and if not, one does not toss the blood' [T. Zeb. 4:3A-F]."*

**I.2.** A. *What in the world is the meal offering doing here?*

- B. Said R. Pappa, “It is the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings. It might have entered your mind to suppose that since it is presented along with an animal offering, it is comparable to the body of the animal offering itself. So we are informed that that is not the case [but that it follows its own rule].”

**I.3.** A. *What is the source of this rule [that the blood may be sprinkled even though only an olive’s bulk of fat remained]?*

- B. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Ishmael, and some assigned it in the name of R. Joshua b. Hanania, “Said Scripture, ‘And he shall burn the fat for a sweet savor to the Lord’ (Lev. 17: 6) — that refers to sprinkling the blood on account of the fat, even if there is no valid meat.” [Cashdan: “And the priest shall sprinkle the blood...and burn the fat...,” which clearly shows that the sprinkling is performed on account of the fat.]
- C. *So we have found the evidence that shows the rule for the fat. As to the rule covering the caul of the liver and the two kidneys?*
- D. *It is in line with that which has been repeated as a Tannaite rule:*
- E. **And in the case of a meal offering, if there did not remain of the sacrifice a half olive’s bulk of meat or a half olive’s bulk of fat, even if the whole meal offering in its entirety remains available, one does not sprinkle the blood on its account.**
- F. *It is on account of the meal offering that, under such conditions, one does not toss the blood. Lo, in regard to the the rule covering the caul of the liver and the two kidneys?*
- G. Said R. Yohanan in his own name said, “[Said Scripture, ‘And he shall burn the fat] for a sweet savor to the Lord’ (Lev. 17: 6) — that applies to any portion of the beast that produces a sweet savor to the Lord.”
- H. *And it was necessary for Scripture to set forth the rule covering the fat and also to set forth the rule covering the sweet savor. For if Scripture had noted the rule covering only the fat, I might have concluded that in the case of the fat the rule pertains, but in the case of the caul of the liver and the two kidneys it does not. So Scripture wrote, “for a sweet savor,” to encompass them as well. And if Scripture had written only “for a sweet savor,” I might have supposed that that is the case even with the meal offering. So Scripture also included the explicit reference to the fat [to exclude the grain offering].*

### 3:4C-E

- C. **[If the meal offering] was not in a utensil of service, it is invalid.**
- D. **R. Simeon declares valid.**
- E. **[If] one offered up its handful two times [that is, by halves], it is valid.**

**I.1** A. Said R. Judah b. R. Hiyya, “What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon? Scripture has said, ‘It is most holy, as the sin offering and as the guilt offering’ (Lev. 6:10) — if the priest comes to perform the service with his hand, he does it with his right hand, as he would for the sin offering; if he comes to perform the act of service with a utensil, he does so with the left hand, as with a guilt offering.”

- C. And R. Yannai said, "Once he has taken a handful from the utensil of service, he may offer it up and burn it even in his girdle, even in a potsherd."
- D. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "All with regard to the handful that it must be sanctified [in a utensil of service]." [Cashdan: all that Simeon permits is to take out the handful after it has been sanctified in a utensil of service and to offer it with the hand upon the altar.]
- E. *An objection was raised: The offering up of the fat, limbs, or wood, which one presented whether by hand or by a utensil, whether by the right hand or by the left hand, is valid. The handful of meal offering, incense, and frankincense, that one offered up, whether by hand or in a utensil, whether by the right hand or the left, is valid [T. Zeb. 1:12A].*
- F. *That refutes the proposed proposition of R. Judah b. R. Hiyya [since if it stands for Simeon, as is presently presupposed, it approves practices that he rejects].*
- G. *R. Judah b. R. Hiyya may reply to you, "The formulation concerns distinct cases, thus: if it is done by hand, it must be with the right hand. If it is done by a utensil, then that may be with either the right hand or the left."*
- H. *Come and take note: If one took up the handful not with a utensil of service, or if he consecrated the handful not using a utensil of service, or offered it up or burned it up not with a utensil of service, it is invalid. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon declare it valid only if it was put into a utensil [but not a utensil of service, contrary to Nahman's claim]."*
- I. *Say: from the point at which it has been put into a utensil and thereafter. [Cashdan: after the handful had been sanctified in a utensil of service, the services that follow do not require a utensil.]*
- J. *Come and take note: But sages say, "Taking the handful must be done with a utensil of service. How so? He takes the handful of meal offering from a utensil of service. He sanctifies it in a utensil of service. He offers it up and burns it up in a utensil of service." R. Simeon says, "If he has simply taken out the handful from a utensil of service, he may offer it up and burn it not using a utensil of service, and that is enough" [against Nahman's position].*
- K. *Say: Once he has taken the handful and sanctified it with a utensil of service, he may then offer it up and burn it, and that suffices.*
- L. *Come and take note: If one has taken the handful with his right hand and put it into his left hand, he should go and put it back in his right hand. "If it was in his left hand [26B] and he gave thought to it to offer it up, whether outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place, it is not subject to the consideration of refuse. If it was in his right hand and he gave thought to it to offer it up outside of its proper place, it is invalid, but extirpation then does not apply to it. If it was in his right hand and he gave thought to it, to offer it up outside of its proper time, it is refuse, and they are liable to extirpation on its account. If he took the handful with a consecrated utensil and put it into an unconsecrated utensil, let him put it back into a consecrated utensil, and it is valid. if it was in an unconsecrated utensil and he gave thought to it to offer it up whether outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place, the consideration of refuse does not apply to it. If it was in a consecrated utensil and he gave thought to it to offer it up outside*



of its proper place, it is invalid, and extirpation does not apply to it. If he gave thought to it to offer it up outside of its proper time] it is refuse, and they are liable on its account to extirpation,” the words of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon.

M. And sages say, “If a valid person took the handful and gave it to an invalid person, his act of handing it over has rendered it invalid. If he took the handful in a consecrated utensil and put it into an unconsecrated utensil, his act of putting it into the unconsecrated utensil has invalidated it.] If one took the handful in his right hand and put it into his left hand, his act of putting it into his left hand has invalidated it. [But he who takes the handful from an unconsecrated utensil and puts it into a consecrated utensil, if before he put in its oil and frankincense, he gave thought to it to offer it up, whether outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place, it is invalid, and extirpation does not apply to it. If after he put in its oil and frankincense he gave thought to it to offer it up outside of its proper place, it is invalid, and extirpation does not apply to it. If he gave thought to offer it up outside of its proper time, it is refuse, and they are liable on its account to extirpation]” [T. Men. 5:13-15].

N. *What is the operative consideration [behind sages’ view that If a valid person took the handful and gave it to an invalid person, his act of handing it over has rendered it invalid? It is because sanctification in a utensil is required, and once one has put it into his left hand, it is comparable to blood that was poured directly from the neck of the beast onto the pavement and then been gathered up, which is invalid. Then it must further follow that, in the view of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, putting the material into the utensil of service is not required, and that would surely refute the position of R. Nahman and sustain that of R. Judah b. R. Hiyya. [Cashdan: he must transfer it back again to the right hand, and that accords with Judah’s view that the hand that is used must be the right hand.]*

O. *Is this also going to refute the position of R. Yannai?*

P. *R. Yannai may reply to you, “I formulate my position in accord with the Tannaite authority who repeated the rule concerning the burning of the fats, in which the terms are not to be taken as separate cases.” [Cashdan: accordingly it is permitted to offer the handful in the left hand.]*

**II.1 A. [If] one offered up its handful two times [that is, by halves], it is valid.**

B. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “**Halves**, but not halves of halves.”

C. And R. Yohanan said, “**Halves**, and even halves of halves.”

D. *What is at issue between them?*

E. *Said R. Zira, “What is at issue between them are the questions of whether or not the handful that is burned may be less than two olive’s bulks in volume, and whether burning of a volume of less than an olive’s bulk falls into the classification of an offering at all.*

F. “R. Joshua b. Levi takes the view that the handful that is burned may not be less than two olive’s bulks in volume, and burning of a volume of less than an olive’s bulk does not fall into the classification of an offering at all.



- G. “R. Yohanan maintains that the handful that is burned may be less than two olive’s bulks in volume, burning of a volume of less than an olive’s bulk falls into the classification of an offering.”

**II.2.** A. *It has been stated:* As to him who offers up the handful of the meal-offering, at what point does that act render the residue of the meal-offering permitted for eating [by the priests]?

B. R. Hanina said, “When the fire covers [all of] it.”

C. R. Yohanan said, “When the fire catches over the greater part of it.”

D. *Said R. Judah to Rabbah b. R. Isaac, “I shall explain to you the operative consideration behind the position of R. Yohanan:* Scripture has said, ‘And lo, the smoke of the land went up as the smoke of a furnace’ (Gen. 19:28), and a furnace does not smoke until the fire has burned up the larger part.”

**II.3.** A. *Said Rabin bar R. Ada to Raba, “Your disciples say, ‘said R. Amram, “It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. ““I only know that what is ordinarily offered by night, for example, limbs and the fat parts of the offering, may be offered up and burned after sunset and permitted to continue burning through the night. How do I know that things that are ordinarily offered by day, for instance, the handful, frankincense, incense offering, meal offering of the priests, anointed high priest’s meal offering, and the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings, also may be offered up and burned after sunset?”

C. ““But have you not said, ‘things that are ordinarily offered by day’?!”

D. ““Rather: ‘things that are offered at sunset.’”

E. ““How do I know that these also may be permitted to continue burning through the night? Scripture states, ‘This is the law of the burnt offering’ (Lev. 6: 2). [Cashdan: one law applies to everything that are put on the altar.] That serves as an inclusive formulation.” *Now if it is offered up only at sunset, it is not at all possible that the fire will have burned the greater part of it by sunset.*” [Cashdan: If the handful was not offered before sunset, it is invalid; it may be placed on the altar just before sunset, as soon as the fire has taken hold it is deemed offered, contrary to Yohanan’s position.]

F. There is really no problem, for the latter rule refers to the handful’s being taken up, and with that action, the remainder becomes permissible. [Cashdan: it is true that as soon as the fire has taken hold, it is deemed to have been offered, but only in the sense that it has been taken up and accepted by the altar; but it will render eating the residue permitted only when the fire has burned the greater part of it.]

G. *R. Eleazar repeats the language as, “after sunset,” and interprets the passage to speak of a case in which the pieces have burst off the altar [and they may be put back through the night; but the handful had been placed on the altar before sunset].*

H. *So too, when R. Dimi came, he said R. Yannai [said], “The passage deals with what has burst off the altar.”*

I. *But how would it be possible for R. Yannai to have made such a statement, for has not R. Yannai said, “Any part of the incense that burst off the altar, even a whole grain, is not to be restored”?*

J. *Furthermore, R. Hanina bar Minyomi of the household of R. Eliezer b. Jacob repeated as a Tannaite formulation: “‘And he shall take up the ashes to which the fire has reduced the burnt offering on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 3) means, what was reduced as a burnt offering you put back on the altar, but you do not put back what was consumed as incense.”*

K. *Drop the word incense [from Amram’s formulation of matters].*

**II.4.** A. *Said R. Assi, “When R. Eleazar was setting forth the laws of meal offerings, he asked this question: ‘The handful which one put on the altar and upon which one then put the wood pile — what is the law? Is this a manner of burning or is it not a manner of burning?’*

B. *The question stands.*

**II.5.** A. *Hezekiah raised this question: “The limbs which one put on the altar and upon which one then put the wood pile — what is the law? [Is this a manner of burning or is it not a manner of burning?] ‘Upon the wood’ is what Scripture has said (Lev. 1: 8), and that is meant literally? Or perhaps, since another verse states, ‘whereto the fire has consumed the burnt offering on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 3), he may do it either way?”*

B. *The question stands.*

**II.6.** A. *R. Isaac Nappaha raised the question: “What is the law concerning limbs that one set by the side of the wood pile?”*

B. *To be sure, in the opinion of him who says that they must actually be on top of the wood, that is no problem, [27A], for here it is written, “upon the wood.” Where the question concerns us, it is within the position of whim who holds that “upon” may bear the sense of “near.”*

C. *What is the rule then? Does “upon” mean “near,” or perhaps since “upon the wood” and “upon the altar” (Lev. 1:80 are juxtaposed, they are treated as comparable, so that just as “upon” means literally in the one, so it means literally in the other instance?*

D. *The question stands.*

### 3:5

A. **(1) The handful [of meal offering]:**

B. **[the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it [= M. 1:2].**

C. **(2) The tenth [of the ephah]:**

D. **[the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it.**

E. **(3) Wine:**

F. **[the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it [Num. 15:5; 7:10].**

G. **(4) Oil:**

H. **[the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it.**

**I. (1) Flour and oil impair the validity of one another. [If one is invalidated, the other is as well.]**

**J. (2) The handful of meal offering and frankincense impair the validity of one another.**

**I.1 A. The handful [of meal offering]: [the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it:**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, “his handful” twice [at Lev. 2: 2 and 5:12].*

**II.1 A. The tenth [of the ephah]: [the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it.**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, “of the fine flour thereof” (Lev. 2: 2) — if any part is missing, it is invalid.*

**III.1 A. Wine: [the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it [Num. 15: 5; 7:10].**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, “thus” (Num. 15:11) [that is, exactly in this way].*

**IV.1 A. Oil: [the absence of] the smaller part of it impairs the validity of the greater part of it.**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, [in regard to the oil of the drink offering], “Thus.”*

D. *And, with regard to the oil of the free will offering, “And of the oil thereof” (Lev. 2: 2), meaning, any part that lacks invalidates the whole.*

**V.1 A. Flour and oil impair the validity of one another:**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, “Of the fine flour thereof and of the oil thereof” (Lev. 16: 5) and “of the bruised grain thereof and of the oil thereof” (Lev. 23:17).*

**VI.1 A. The handful of meal offering and frankincense impair the validity of one another:**

B. *What is the scriptural basis?*

C. *Because it is written, “with all the frankincense thereof” (Lev. 2: 2) and “all the frankincense that is upon the offering” (Lev. 6: 8).*

### 3:6

**A. (3) The two goats of Yom Kippur impair the validity of one another.**

**B. (4) The two lambs of Aseret [Pentecost/Shabuot] impair the validity of one another.**

**C. (5) The two loaves of bread impair the validity of one another**

**D. (6) The two rows [of showbread] impair the validity of one another.**

**E. (7) The two dishes [of frankincense] impair the validity of one another.**

**F. (8) The rows [of showbread] and the dishes [of incense] impair the validity of one another.**

- G. (1) The two kinds [of cakes] which pertain to [the offering of] the Nazirite,
- H. (2) the three [kinds used for] the red cow,
- I. (3) the four [kinds used in connection with] the thank offering,
- J. (4) the four [kinds] which are in the lulab [Lev. 23:40],
- K. (5) the four kinds used for the person afflicted with the skin ailment
- L. impair the validity of one another.
- M. The seven sprinklings of blood of the red cow impair the validity of one another.
- N. (1) The seven sprinklings of blood between the bars [on the Day of Atonement] , and (2) those which are on the veil [of the Holy of Holies], and (3) those which are on the golden altar impair the validity of one another [M. Zeb. 5:1].

**I.1 A. The two goats of Yom Kippur impair the validity of one another:**

- B. The term “statute” appears in this regard [Lev. 16:34].

**II.1 A. The two lambs of Aseret [Pentecost/Shabuot] impair the validity of one another.**

- B. The term “shall be,” appears in this regard [Lev. 23:17].

**III.1 A. The two loaves of bread impair the validity of one another**

- B. The term “shall be,” appears in this regard [Lev. 23:17].

**IV.1 A. The two rows [of showbread] impair the validity of one another.**

- B. The term “statute” appears in this regard [Lev. 16:34].

**V.1 A. The two dishes [of frankincense] impair the validity of one another.**

- B. The term “statute” appears in this regard [Lev. 24:9].

**VI.1 A. The rows [of showbread] and the dishes [of incense] impair the validity of one another.**

- B. The term “statute” appears in this regard.

**VII.1 A. The two kinds [of cakes] which pertain to [the offering of] the Nazirite,**

- B. The term “so he must do” appears in this regard [Num. 6:21].

**VIII.1 A. the three [kinds used for] the red cow,**

- B. The term “statute,” appears in this regard [Num. 19:2].

**IX.1 A. the four [kinds used in connection with] the thank offering,**

- B. The thank offering is set forth along with the offering of the Nazirite, “With the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving” (Lev. 7:13), and a master has said, ““of his peace offerings’ encompasses the peace offering of the Nazirite.”

**X.1 A. the four kinds used for the person afflicted with the skin ailment impair the validity of one another.**

- B. It is stated, “This shall be the law of the leper” (Lev. 14: 2).

**XI.1 A. the four [kinds] which are in the lulab [Lev. 23:40],**

- B. It is written, “You shall take” (Lev. 23:40) — one act of taking of them all.
- C. Said R. Hanan bar Raba, “This [rule that all kinds must be in hand] has been stated only in a case in which one did not have all of them, but if he had them all, then

one does not invalidate the other [if they are not bound together in a single handful].”

- D. *To that proposition an objection was raised:* Among the four species that are joined in the *lulab*, two produce fruit, and two do not produce fruit. Those that produce fruit are to be joined to those that do not, and those that do not are to be joined to those that do. And one does not carry out the pertinent obligation concerning them unless all of them form a single bundle. And so it is in regard to Israel’s pleasing God, that too takes place only when all of them form a single community, in line with this verse: “He who builds his chambers in heaven and has founded his community upon earth” (Amo. 9: 6).
- E. *What we have here is a conflict of Tannaite formulations, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. **The lulab, whether bound with others or not —**
- G. **R. Judah says, “If it is bound up, it is valid, and if it is not bound up, it is not valid” [T. Suk. 2:10A-B].**
- H. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Judah?*
- I. *By means of a verbal correspondence he draws an analogy because the word “taking” occurs both in the present context and in the setting of the bunch of hyssop [used in the purification rites of the person afflicted with the skin ailment, Lev. 14:4]. Just as in that context, what is required is that a bundle be made, so here too, what is required is that a bundle be made.*
- J. *And rabbis?*
- K. *They draw no such analogy established by the common appearance of the same word, “taking.”*
- L. *In accord with which of the two positions is the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. The proper performance of the religious duty in regard to the *lulab* is to bind the species together, but if one has not done so, it is valid.
- N. *In accord with which party is that statement? Now this cannot be in accord with R. Judah, for if one has not bound the species together, why should the arrangement be valid?*
- O. *And it can hardly accord with rabbis [vis à vis Judah], for why should it be an element of the religious duty [to do so at all, if they say one need not do so]?*
- P. Indeed, the statement accords with rabbis, and what is the sense of “religious duty”? It is on the count of, “This is my God and I will glorify him” (Exo. 15: 2), which means one should be glorified before him through carrying out religious duties [in an especially felicitous manner, but if one does not do things exactly in that way, the action remains valid].

**XII.1 A. The seven sprinklings of blood of the red cow impair the validity of one another.**

- B. The term “statute,” appears in this regard [Num. 19: 2].

**XIII.1 A. The seven sprinklings of blood between the bars [on the Day of Atonement], and (2) those which are on the veil [of the Holy of Holies], and**

**(3) those which are on the golden altar impair the validity of one another [M. Zeb. 5:1].**

- B. In respect to the sprinklings on the day of atonement, it is because the term “statute,” appears in this regard [Lev. 16:34].
- C. *As for the bullock offered on account of the error of the anointed high priest and the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error and the he goats on account of the sin of idolatry, it is because of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. [With reference to the sin offering presented in behalf of the entire community, which is offered on the inner altar,] “Then shall he do with the bullock as he did with the bullock of the sin offering, so shall he do with this” (Lev. 4:20) — how come Scripture duplicates the statement of the law of sprinkling? **[27B]** It is to teach that if the priest omitted one of the applications of the blood on the horn of the altar, he has done nothing at all. [The sacrifice is null.] [I know that this applies only to the seven applications of blood [before the veil of the ark], which are in fact indispensable in all instances. How do I know that the same indispensability pertains to the four applications of the blood? It is from the wording, “so shall he do with this” (Lev. 4:20). “With the bullock” refers to the bullock that is offered on the Day of Atonement. “as he did with the bullock” refers to the bullock of the anointed priest. “of the sin offering” refers to the goats that are brought as a sin offering on account of an inadvertent act of idolatry. Details are omitted elsewhere, because the rule given here pertains to them. Might one think that I should extend the same rule even to the goats that are presented on the Festivals and to the goats that are presented on the New Moon? Scripture states to the contrary, “...with this.” Then how come you extend the rule to the items listed earlier but exclude from the rule the items just now enumerated? After Scripture has extended the rule and also limited the application of the rule, I extend the rule to these, which achieve atonement for a known violation of a religious duty, and I exclude the others, which do not make atonement for the known violation of a religious duty for the goats on the Festival and New Moon atone for inadvertent uncleanness caused to the Temple, of which people may not have been informed at all. “And the priest shall make atonement [and it shall be forgiven to them]” (Num. 15:28) — even though he did not lay hands on the bullock. “and it shall be forgiven to them” (Num. 15:28) — even though he had not poured out the residue [of the blood on the outer altar]. Now how come you treat the offering as invalid in the case of [omission of] sprinkling [the blood], but treat the offering as valid in the case of omission of laying on of hands and pouring out of the residue of the blood? So you may state matters: I invalidate the offering in a case of sprinklings of blood, since in other matters these are indispensable to the rite, but I validate the offering in the case of the omission of the laying on of hands and the pouring out of the residue of the blood, for these actions are not treated elsewhere as indispensable to the proper conduct of any rite.]

**XIII.2. A. [The seven sprinklings of blood of the red cow impair the validity of one another:]**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*



- C. **The seven acts of sprinkling the blood of the Red Cow that one carried out not for the purpose for which the act was originally designated or not properly aimed are in valid. As to acts of sprinkling the blood that must be performed inside the Temple, by contrast, or acts of sprinkling the liquids for the purification rite of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, if they were made for some purpose other than that for which they were originally designated, they are invalid, but if they were not directed in the right place, they still are valid [T. Zeb. 1:9F, H].**
- C. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “In respect to the sprinkling of the blood of the Red Cow, if they were made for some purpose other than that for which they were originally designated, they are invalid, but if they were not directed in the right place, they still are valid”?*
- D. *Said ‘R. Hisda, “There is no contradiction between these two formulations, since one represents the position of R. Judah, the other of rabbis. [The basis for this view will emerge at Y, only after a full analysis of] what has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- E. **He who had completed his rites of purification, inclusive of sunset, but had not yet completed his atonement by bringing the requisite offerings who entered the Temple court inadvertently is liable to a sin offering; if he did so deliberately, he is subject to the penalty of extirpation; and it is not necessary to say that the same rule applies to one who has immersed but who has not yet awaited sunset; and as to all other unclean persons, as well as clean persons who entered the area within the boundary and went into the Temple proper, they are liable to a flogging of forty stripes. If they went inside the veil or toward the front of the mercy seat, they are subject to the penalty of death at the hands of heaven.**
- F. **R. Judah says, “If such a person entered anywhere within the area went into the Temple proper or the veil, they are liable to a flogging of forty stripes. If such a one went toward the front of the mercy seat, he is subject to the penalty of death at the hands of heaven” [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:10].**
- G. *What is at issue between these two positions?*
- H. *It concerns the following verse, “And the Lord said to Moses, Speak to Aaron your brother, that he not come at just any time to the holy place within the veil, toward the front of the mercy seat that is upon the ark, so that he not die” (Lev. 16: 2). Rabbis take the view that the prohibition against entering the holy place is the negative one established by the language, “that he not come,” and the one against entering within the veil or towards the front of the mercy seat is on the count of “that he not die.” R. Judah takes the view that the prohibition against entering the holy place or the area within the veil is on the count of, “that he not come,” and the one against entering the area towards the front of the mercy seat is on the count of, “that he not die.”*
- I. *And how to account for the reading propounded by rabbis?*
- J. *If it should enter your mind that matters are as R. Judah has said, then the All-Merciful should have written, “into the holy place” and “towards the front of the mercy seat,” but there would have been no need to add, “within the veil.” I should then have taken the view that since entry into the holy place imposes liability to a*



*flogging, is there any question that entering the area within the veil should do so? So why then did the All-Merciful have to add the detail, “within the veil”? It is to yield the inference that the penalty of death applies.*

K. *And R. Judah?*

L. *If the All-Merciful had written, “into the holy place” but not “within the veil,” what might I have supposed? I might have imagined that “into the holy place” refers only to the area “within the veil,” with the result that if such a person entered the Temple, he would not even violate a prohibition.*

M. *And rabbis?*

N. *You can never have maintained such a view, for the whole of the Temple is classified as “the holy place,” in line with this verse: “And the veil shall divide for you between the holy place and the most holy” (Exo. 26:33).*

O. *And how come R. Judah goes his own way?*

P. *If matters were as rabbis lay them out, then the All-Merciful should have said only, “into the holy place within the veil,” but not “towards the mercy seat,” and I would have reasoned in this way: if for going into the space within the veil the death penalty is incurred, how much the more so for entering towards the front of the mercy seat! So how come the All-Merciful said also, “towards the front of the mercy seat”? It is to provide the inference that it is only for entering the area towards the front of the mercy seat that the death penalty is incurred, but for entering the area within the veil, one violates only a negative commandment.*

Q. *And rabbis?*

R. *True enough, it really is not required. The only reason that the All-Merciful has stated, “towards the front of the mercy seat” is to exclude entering by the side [from any sort of prohibition]. [Cashdan: any entry into the Holy of Holies not made in the ordinary way through the door on the east with the face looking westward would be exempt from penalty].*

S. *That is in accord with what is taught on Tannaite authority by the household of R. Eliezer b. Jacob:*

T. *“Towards the front of the mercy seat on the east” (Lev. 16:14) — this provides the generative analogy for the fact that, in any passage in which it is stated, “front,” the meaning is, “the east side.”*

U. *And R. Judah?*

V. *For that purpose, Scripture can just as well have said, “the front,” so why add, “towards”? It is to teach that “towards” is meant in an exact and literal way.*

W. *And rabbis?*

X. *“...towards” is not meant in an exact and literal way.*

Y. *[Reverting to Hisda’s explanation of the conflict noted earlier,] and from R. Judah’s position, which is that “towards” is meant in an exact and literal way, he furthermore would take the view that “and he shall sprinkle towards the front” likewise is meant in an exact and literal way. Rabbis for their part will maintain that, just as in the case at hand, “...towards” is not meant in an exact and literal way, so in the other case, it is not interpreted in an exact and literal way.*

- AA. *To this exposition objected R. Joseph, "From the viewpoint of R. Judah, who holds that 'towards' is meant in an exact and literal way, the word 'upon' also is meant in an exact and literal way. Then in the second sanctuary, in which there were no ark or mercy seat, no sprinklings should have been made on the Day of Atonement!"*
- BB. Said Rabbah bar Ulla, "Said Scripture, 'And he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary,' Lev. 16:33), meaning, for the place that is made holy for the holy sanctuary [the place sanctified for the ark, even though it was not present]."
- CC. *[As against Hisda,] Raba said, "Both conflicting statements represent the position of rabbis, but there is no contradiction. [28A] In the one case, the priest stood facing the west with his back to the east and there he sprinkled [Cashdan: the right position for sprinkling the blood of the Red Cow, and valid even though the sprinkling was not quite in the direction of the Holy of Holies], and in the other, he faced south with his back to the north and did the sprinkling from there [Cashdan: in which case both the position of the priest who sprinkled the blood and the direction in which the blood was sprinkled were wrong, therefore the sprinkling was invalid]."*

**XIII.3.** A. *The master has said: As to acts of sprinkling the blood that must be performed inside the Temple, by contrast, or acts of sprinkling the liquids for the purification rite of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, if they were made for some purpose other than that for which they were originally designated, they are invalid, but if they were not directed in the right place, they still are valid [T. Zeb. 1:9F, H]. But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: "In respect to the sprinkling of the blood of the Red Cow, if they were made for some purpose other than that for which they were originally designated, they are invalid, but if they were not directed in the right place, they still are valid"?*

- B. *Said R. Joseph, "There really is no contradiction between the two cited formulations. The one represents the position of R. Eliezer, the other of rabbis. The former is that of R. Eliezer, for he draws an analogy between the guilt offering and the sin offering and also between the log of the person healed of the skin ailment and the guilt offering. Rabbis do not draw such analogies."*
- C. *But from the perspective of R. Eliezer, is it valid to draw an analogy from a law that itself has been derived by an analogy?*
- D. *Rather, said Raba, "Both formulations represent the position of rabbis, one concerning the validity of the offering, the other, the acceptance of the offering [Cashdan: in fulfillment of the obligation of the owner]."*

### 3:7

- A. **(1) The seven branches of the candlestick [Exo. 25:31-32] impair the validity of one another.**

- B. And its seven lamps impair the validity of one another.
- C. (2) The two portions [of Scripture] in the mezuzah [Deu. 6: 4-9, 11, 13-21] impair the validity of one another,
- D. and even [the shape of] one letter impairs their validity.
- E. (3) The four portions [of Scripture] which are in prayerbox [tefillin] [Deu. 6: 4A, 11:13-21, Exo. 13: 1-10, 11-16] impair the validity of one another,
- F. and even [the shape of] one letter impairs their validity.
- G. The four fringes impair the validity of one another,
- H. for the four of them constitute a single commandment.
- I. R. Ishmael says, "The four of them constitute four distinct commandments [so they do not impair the validity of one another]."
- I.1 A. [The seven branches of the candlestick [Exo. 25:31-32] impair the validity of one another.] *how come?*
- B. In their regard, "shall be" is stated [Exo. 25:36: "their knops and their branches shall be of one piece with it].

### **Topical Appendix on the Lampstand and Candlestick**

- I.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. A lampstand is suitable only when made from a gold bar. If one made it from filings, it is invalid. If one made it from other kinds of metal, it is valid. You turn out to rule, what is valid in the case of a lampstand is invalid in the case of a trumpet. What is valid in the case of a trumpet is invalid in the case of a lampstand [T. Hul. 1:19A-C].
- C. *What then differentiates making it from filings, in which case it is invalid? It is because it is written, "beaten work" and "shall be" (Exo. 25:31).*
- D. *But in reference to other metals, it also should be invalid, since Scripture says "of gold" and "will be"!*
- E. Said Scripture, "shall the candlestick be made," and that encompasses other metals besides gold.
- F. *So why not say that it encompasses also filings?*
- G. *Don't let it enter your mind! For with reference to beaten gold, the expression, "shall be" is used.*
- H. *But does not the clause, "shall the candlestick be made" refer to "beaten work"?*
- I. *The reason that Scripture says, "of beaten work" two times [at Exo. 25:31, 36, Num. 8: 4] is to show that meeting that condition is indispensable.*
- J. *So "gold" is written twice [at Exo. 25:31, 36, Num. 8: 4], and should that not indicate that the use of gold likewise is indispensable?*
- K. *What good does that do? True enough, if you maintain that if it is made of filings, it is unfit, but of other forms of metal is fit, that is in line with the use of "gold" twice and "of beaten work" twice, serving as the foundation for an exposition [given presently]. But if you maintain that if it is made of filings, it is fit, but if it is made out of other forms of metal, it is unfit, then what exposition is to be served on account of the use of "gold" twice and "of beaten work" twice?*

**I.3.** A. *What is the exposition to which reference has just been made?*

B. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. *“Of a talent of pure gold it shall be made, with all those utensils” (Exo. 25:39) —*

D. *if it derives from gold, it must be a talent, if it does not derive from gold, it does not have to be a talent.*

E. *“Cups, knops and flowers:” if the lampstand is made of gold there have to be cups, knops, and flowers, but if it is not made of gold, it does not have to have cups, knops, and flowers.*

F. *Might I then further say, if it is made of gold, there also have to be branches, but if it is not made of gold, there do not have to be branches?*

G. *[In the latter case] that object would be classified as a lamp, [not a branched candlestick].*

H. *“And this was the work of the candlestick, beaten work of gold” (Num. 10: 2):*

I. *If it is made of gold, it must be beaten work, and if it is not made of gold, it does not have to be beaten work.*

J. *And what purpose is served by “beaten work” in the latter verse?*

K. *It serves to exclude from the present requirement the trumpets, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

L. **A trumpet is valid only when made from a silver bar. If one made it from filings, it is valid. If one made it from other kinds of metal, it is invalid. You turn out to rule: what is valid in the case of a lampstand is invalid in the case of a trumpet, what is valid in the case of a trumpet is invalid in the case of a lampstand [T. Hul. 1:19A-C].**

M. *What then differentiates making it from other metals, in which case it is invalid? It is because it is written, “beaten work” and “shall be” (Exo. 25:31).*

N. *It is because it is written, “silver” (Num. 10: 2) and also “shall be.”*

O. *So why not say that it encompasses also filings [so that if made of filings, they should be invalid], since it is written, “beaten work” and “shall be”?*

P. *Scripture stated in the context of the lampstand, “It was beaten work,” meaning, “it” was beaten work, not trumpets.*

**I.4.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. All utensils **[28B]** that Moses made were valid both for him and for generations to come, but the trumpets that he made were valid for him but invalid for coming generations.

C. *What is the reason that that exception was made of the trumpets? If we should propose that Scripture says, “Make for you” (Num. 10: 2), meaning, for you but not for the coming generations,” then how about the following verse: “And make for yourself an ark of wood” (Deu. 10: 1). Does this too mean, for you but not for coming generations? But in point of fact, just as in the latter verse, the use of “for yourself” means, in one view, belonging to you, or, in another opinion, “I*

would prefer that it derive from your property and not from theirs,” *then here, it means the same thing.*

- D. *Here is the difference: “for yourself” is stated twice, “Make for yourself” and “they shall be for you” (Num. 10: 2).*

**I.5.** A. *R. Pappa b. R. Hanina recited as a Tannaite formulation in the presence of R. Joseph: “The candlestick derived from a single mass of gold; if it was made of silver, it is valid; if of tin, lead, or a tin alloy —*

B. *“Rabbi declares it unfit.*

C. *“And R. Yosé b. R. Judah declares it fit.*

D. *“If it was made of wood, bone, or glass, all parties concur that it is unfit.”*

E. *He said to him, “What’s your view of the reason for the disagreement?”*

F. *He said to him, “Both authorities interpret by appeal to the principle of an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing. But one authority holds that just as the particularization makes it explicit that it must be of metal, so any made of any kind metal is valid. The other of the two authorities maintains that just as the particularization makes it explicit that it must derive from a weighty metal, so anything that derives from a weighty metal is valid [Lead, tin, and wood do not qualify.]”*

G. *He said to him, “Strike out yours and affirm mine, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

H. *“As to a utensil of service which one made of wood —*

I. *“Rabbi declares it unfit.*

J. *“And R. Yosé b. R. Judah declares it fit.*

K. *Now what is the reason for the disagreement? Rabbi applies the exegetical principle of “generalization followed by specification” [in which the generalization includes only the elements expressed in the specific example, thus permitting only a very narrow reading of the proposed analogy.] R. Yosé b. R. Judah applies the exegetical principle of “extension and limitation” [in which the generalization is treated as encompassing, and a single item is excluded therefrom, thus permitting a much broader reading of the analogy].*

L. *“Rabbi applies the exegetical principle of ‘generalization followed by specification.’ [Citing the verse, ‘And you shall make a candlestick of pure gold, of beaten work shall the candlestick be made’ (Exo. 25:31),] ‘And you shall make a candlestick...’ [represents] a generalization, ‘of pure gold’ [constitutes] a specification [limiting the foregoing], ‘of beaten work shall the candlestick be made’ [then supplies] a further generalization. [Accordingly, we have in hand] a generalization, a specification [which limits the foregoing], and a further generalization. You may then draw an analogy only in accord with the limitations of the specification. Just as, in the specification, it is explicitly stated that the candlestick must be made of metal, so any [utensil of the cult] must be made of metal. [That is why Rabbi declares invalid utensils of cultic service that are made out of wood.]*

M. *“R. Yosé b. R. Judah, [by contrast,] applies the exegetical principle of ‘extension and limitation.’ ‘And you shall make a candlestick...’ represents an extension [or, an encompassing statement], ‘... of pure gold,’ constitutes*

a limitation on the foregoing. Then the framer of the passage went and made yet another extension by the encompassing statement, “of beaten work shall the candlestick be made.” [Accordingly, we have in hand] an extension, a limitation, and a further extension. The second extension then encompasses everything. And what is subject to the encompassing statement? It serves to encompass [all sorts of objects, of whatever substance. Any sort of substance, including wood, may be used to manufacture utensils for the Temple. What then is the force of the limitation [‘of pure gold’]? It has the force of excluding the use of earthenware.”

- N. *[He said to him,] “To the contrary, strike out yours and affirm mine.”*
- O. *[He said to him,] “Don’t even imagine such a thing, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- P. *“If there is no gold, one presents silver, copper, iron, tin, or lead.*
- Q. *“R. Yosé b. R. Judah validates even one of wood.*
- R. *“And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- S. *“A person may not a house in the model of the Temple, or a porch in the model of the Temple porch, or a courtyard in the middle of the Temple courtyard, or a table in the model of the Temple’s table, or a candelabrum in the model of the Temple candelabrum. But he may make one that has five, six, or eight branches, but he may not make one with seven, even though it is of metals other than the ones used in the Temple.*
- T. *“R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, ‘Even one of wood he may not make, because that is how the Hasmonaeans made it.’*
- U. *“Said the rabbis to him, “Is there any proof from that precedent? It was made of metal staves plated with tin. When they got rich, they made one of silver. When they got still richer, they made one of gold.””*

**I.6.** A. *Said Samuel in the name of an elder, “The height of the candlestick was eighteen handbreadths,*

- B. *“three for the base and its flower on top of it, two handbreadths unadorned, one handbreadth for the cup, knop, and flower, two handbreadths unadorned, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, one handbreadth unadorned, one handbreath for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, then one handbreadth plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, then two handbreadths unadorned; that left three handbreadths in which were three cups, a knop, and a flower.*
- C. *“What were the cups like? They were like cups from Alexandria [Cashdan: wide at the top and tapered down towards the base]. What were the knops like? They were like apples from Crete. What were the flowers like? They were like the blossoms around the capitals of columns. It turns out that there were twenty-two cups, eleven knops, and nine flowers.*



- D. “Omission of any one of the required cups invalidates the others, omission of any one of the required knobs invalidates the others, and omission of any one of the flowers invalidates the others.
- E. “Omission of one kind of the cups, knobs, and flowers invalidates the others.”
- F. *Now it is clear that it is on the basis of the following verses of Scripture that there were twenty-two cups: “And in the candlestick were four cups” (Exo. 25:34), “Three cups like among blossoms in one branch, a knob, and a flower” (Exo. 25:33), so that its own were four [at the central side (Cashdan)], [29A] and the eighteen at the six branches add up to twenty-two. It is equally beyond doubt that there were eleven knobs, for “the knobs thereof” speaks of two, and six of the six branches and the knob [Cashdan: from which the first pair of branches rose] and the knob [from which the second came] and the knob [from which the third rose] all together make eleven. But how do we know that there were nine flowers? There were two of its own, six of the six branches, and these add up only to eight!*
- G. Said R. Shalman, “It is written, ‘To the base thereof, and to the flowers thereof, it was beaten work’ (Num. 8: 4).” [This involves an extra flower.]
- H. Said Rab, “The height of the candlestick was nine handbreadths.”
- I. *An objection was raised by R. Shimi bar Hiyya to Rab, “A stone was before the candlestick, and on it were three steps, on which the priest stands and fixes up the lamps [M. Tamid 3:9G].” [Cashdan: if the height of the candlestick were only nine handbreadths, then surely the priest had no need of stone or steps to reach it.]*
- J. *He said to him, “Are you really Shimi [who I knew to be intelligent]? My sense was, only from the point at which the branches rise and upwards [so it was eighteen handbreadths in height, as Samuel said].”*
- I.7.** A. “And the flowers and lamps and tongs of gold, of finished gold” (2Ch. 4:21) —
- B. *What is the meaning of “finished gold”?*
- C. Said R. Ammi, “The meaning is that in making these, they finished up all of the gold of Solomon.”
- D. For said R. Judah said Rab, “Solomon made ten candlesticks, and for each one he used up a thousand talents of gold, each was cast in a furnace a thousand times so it was reduced to a single talent.”
- E. *Is that so? But surely it is written, “And all of King Solomon’s drinking utensils were of gold, and all the utensils of the house of the forest of Lebanon [the Temple] were of pure gold, none were of silver, it was valued as nought in the time of Solomon” (1Ki. 10:21) [so he had all the gold he wanted]!*
- F. *What we said concerned only the fine gold.*
- G. *But what it lose so much in the refining price? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “There was the incident in which the candlestick used in the Temple turned out to be larger by a Gordian golden denar than the one made



by Moses. So it was cast into the furnace eighty times to work it down to a talent.”

- I. *Since it had long stood in that condition, it remained pretty much what it was.* [Cashdan: it was well refined in Solomon’s days, so when it was cast eighty times into the furnace, it would not have lost so much].

**I.8.** A. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “*What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: ‘upon the pure candlestick’ (Lev. 24: 4)? [The meaning is,] the instructions on how to make it came down from the pure place.*”

- B. What about the following: “upon the pure table” (Lev. 24: 6) — does this too mean that the instructions on how to make it came down from the pure place? But the sense of “pure” is that it can become unclean, *so pure in the former case also means that it can become unclean.*

- C. *With regard to the table, there is no problem, because that is in line with what R. Simeon b. Laqish expounded. For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the phrase, ‘upon the pure table’ (Lev. 24: 6)? It is that it can become unclean. And yet, it is an article made of wood, and the fact is that an object made of wood that is made to set at rest cannot receive uncleanness. So the usage bears the lesson that they would lift it up and show the pilgrims the show bread that was on it, saying, ‘Behold God’s love for you!’ [The table could be moved and therefore was subject to uncleanness, so ‘pure’ used in connection with the table bears the sense of, ‘free from the uncleanness that can be contracted.’]”*

D. *What is the meaning of “Behold God’s love for you”?*

E. *It is in accord with what R. Joshua b. Levi said, for said R. Joshua b. Levi, “The great miracle that took place with the show bread was that when it was removed it was as fresh as when it was set on the table, in line with this verse: ‘to put hot bread in the day that it was taken away’ (1Sa. 21: 7).”*

- F. *But here, with regard to the candlestick, if one says that the meaning is “pure” is that it is pure of the uncleanness that it can receive, that meaning is hardly informative, since, after all, it is a metal utensil, and metal utensils, all know, are susceptible to uncleanness. So it can only mean that the instructions on how to make it came down from the pure place.*

**I.9.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “An ark made of fire, a table made of fire, and a candlestick made of fire came down from heaven; Moses saw them and copied the pattern: ‘And see that you make them after their pattern, which is being shown you in the mountain’ (Exo. 25:40).”

- C. *So how about the following: “And you shall rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof that has been shown you in the mountain?” (Exo. 26:30)?*

- D. *Here we find “according to the fashion thereof,” there, “after their pattern.”*

**I.10.** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Gabriel girded himself with a sort of belt [to keep his clothing out of his way when he did the work], and he showed Moses how to make the candlestick: ‘and his this was the work of the candlestick’ (Num. 8: 4).”

- I.11.** A. *The Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael:* “Three matters gave Moses difficulties until the Holy One, blessed be he, showed him with his finger [how to make them]: the candlestick, [how to identify] the new moon, and the difference between clean and unclean creeping things.
- B. “the candlestick: ‘and this was the work of the candlestick’ (Num. 8: 4).
- C. “[how to identify] the new moon: ‘This month shall be to you the beginning of months’ (Exo. 12: 2).
- D. “and the difference between clean and unclean creeping thing: ‘And these are those that are unclean’ (Lev. 11:29).”
- E. Others say, “Also the rules for slaughter: ‘now this is that which you shall offer upon the altar’ (Exo. 29:38).”

**II.1** A. **The two portions [of Scripture] in the mezuzah [Deu. 6:4-9, 11, 13-21] impair the validity of one another, and even [improper the shape of] one letter impairs their validity:**

- B. *That’s obvious!*
- C. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “No, it was required to deal only with the matter of the tittle of the letter Y [which had to be fully imprinted].”*
- D. *That’s also obvious!*
- E. *Rather, it is in accord with this other statement that said R. Judah said Rab. For said R. Judah said Rab, “Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a space of parchment has been invalidly incised.”*

**II.2.** A. *Said Asian bar Nidbakh in the name of R. Judah, “If the inner leg of the letter H had a hole in it, it remains valid; if the right leg had a hole in it, it is invalid.”*

- B. *Said R. Zira, “To me this was explained by R. Huna” —*
- C. *Said R. Jacob, “To me this was explained by R. Huna: if the inner leg of the H had a hole it is still valid, if the right leg had a hole and there still was left the size of a small letter [Cashdan: the upper part of the leg was still joined to the roof of the letter so that it can be read as an H although reduced in size] it is still valid; otherwise it is not.”*

**II.3.** A. *Agra, the father in law of R. Abba, [29B] found that the right leg of the letter H in the word, “the people,” had been severed by a hole.*

- B. *He came to R. Abba, who ruled that if there still was the size of a small letter left, it is valid, and otherwise, it is not valid.”*

**II.4.** A. *R. Ammi bar Tamri, who is the same as R. Ammi bar Diqui, found that the leg of the letter V in the word “and he killed” [Exo. 13:15, a verse in one of the prayerbox [tefillin] had been severed by a hole.*

- B. *He came to R. Zira who said to him, “Go get a youngster who is not too smart and not too dumb. If he can read the word as ‘and he killed’ it is valid, otherwise, the word is ‘he will be killed’ and the parchment is invalid.”*

**Topical Appendix: The Shapes of Letters of the Torah; How the Letters Are Written for Use in the Torah**

- II.5.** A. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “At the time that Moses went up on high, he found the Holy One in session, affixing crowns to the letters [of the words of the Torah]. He*

said to him, 'Lord of the universe, who is stopping you [from regarding the document as perfect without these additional crowns on the letters]?'

- B. "He said to him, 'There is a man who is going to arrive at the end of many generations, and Aqiba b. Joseph is his name, who is going to interpret on the basis of each point of the crowns heaps and heaps of laws.'
- C. "He said to him, 'Lord of the Universe, show him to me.'
- D. "He said to him, 'Turn around.'
- E. "He went and took a seat at the end of eight rows, but he could not grasp what the people were saying. He felt faint. But when the discourse reached a certain matter, and the disciples said, 'My lord, how do you know this?' and he answered, 'It is a law given to Moses from Sinai,' he regained his composure.
- F. "He went and came before the Holy One. He said before him, 'Lord of the Universe, How come you have someone like that and yet you give the Torah through me?'
- G. "He said to him, 'Silence! That is how the thought came to me.'
- H. "He said to him, 'Lord of the Universe, you have shown me his Torah, now show me his reward.'
- I. "He said to him, 'Turn around.'
- J. "He turned around and saw his flesh being weighed out at the butcher-stalls in the market.
- K. "He said to him, 'Lord of the Universe, 'Such is Torah, such is the reward?'
- L. "He said to him, 'Silence! That is how the thought came to me.'"

**II.6.** A. Said Raba, "There are seven letters that require the use of three strokes in the writing of them:

- B. "Shin, ayin, tet, nun, zayin, gimmel, and saddi."

**II.7.** A. *Said R. Ashi, "I have noticed that the most meticulous scribes add a vertical stroke to the roof of the het and suspend the inner leg of the letter H. They add a vertical stroke to the roof of the letter H, with the sense, 'he lives in the heights of the world.'*

- B. *"They suspend the inner leg of the letter H, for the reason that will now be specified."*

C. *R. Judah Nesiah asked R. Ammi, "What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, "Trust in the Lord for ever, for in Yah, the Lord, is an everlasting rock' (Isa. 26: 4)?"*

- D. He said to him, "Whoever places his trust in the Holy One, blessed be he, lo, he has a refuge in this world and in the world to come."

E. *He said to him, "No, this is what was difficult for me: How come the verse says, 'in Yah,' but not 'Yah'?"*

- F. *It is in accord with R. Judah bar Ilai's exposition: "This refers to the two worlds that the Holy One, blessed be he, one using the H of the divine name, the other the Y of the divine name. But I don't know whether the world to come was with the Y and this world with the H, or the this world with the Y and the world to come with the H.*

- G. “But when Scripture says, ‘These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created,’ do not read the word as though it were written, ‘when they were created,’ but rather, ‘with an H they were created,’ on the basis of which I draw the conclusion that this world was made with the H of the divine name, and the world to come with the Y.
- H. “And why was this world made with an H? It is because it resembles an area closed on three sides and open on the fourth, meaning, whoever wants to go astray may as well go astray.”
- I. *And how come the left leg of the H is suspended*
- J. *It is to say, whoever wants to come back can come back*
- K. *And why not come in the way he went out?*
- L. *The occasion would not arise.*
- M. *And that is in accord with what R. Simeon b. Laqish said, for said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘As to the scorners, he scorns them, but as to the humble he gives grace’ (Pro. 3:34)? If someone comes wanting to be purified, he is helped to do so; if he comes wanting to be made unclean, they open the way for him.”*
- N. *And how come the H has a crown?*
- O. Said the Holy One, blessed be he, “If he comes back, I shall set a crown on him.”
- P. [Continuing H:] “And how come the world to come was made with a Y? It is because the righteous there are few in number [Cashdan: the letter Y is the smallest in the alphabet and its head droops down].
- Q. “And why is the Y’s head drooping?
- R. “Because the righteous in the world hang their heads low, since the good deeds done by the one are not like those of the next” [so that each is ashamed before the other (Cashdan)].

**II.8.** A. *Said R. Joseph, “These two rulings that Rab stated with regard to scrolls of the Torah are refuted in each case by a Tannaite formulation.*

B. *“Here is the first: said Rab, ‘A scroll of the Torah that has two errors on each column may be corrected, but if there are three, it must be hidden away.’*

C. *“Here is the refutation on Tannaite authority: If there are three, it may be corrected, if there are four, it must be hidden away.”*

**II.9.** A. *A Tannaite rule: if there is a single column that is whole and without error, it affords protection for the entirety of the Torah scroll.*

B. *Said R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta in the name of Rab, “But that is the case only if most of the scroll is properly written.”*

C. *Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “If in a column there are three errors, what is the rule?”*

D. *He said to him, “Since it can be corrected, it is as though they were already corrected.”*

**II.10.** A. *[The rule that a scroll with four mistakes in each column must be put away] pertains, however, if letters are missing, but if there are too many letters, we do not take account of the matter.*

- B. *And if letters are missing, why is that not the case?*
- C. *Said R. Kahana, "Because it would look speckled"* [Cashdan: inserting missing letters above the liens would make the whole look irregular].

**II.11.** A. *Agra, father in law of R. Abba, had too many letters in his scroll. He brought it before R. Abba.*

- B. *He, who said to him, "[The rule that a scroll with four mistakes in each column must be put away] pertains, however, if letters are missing, [30A] but if there are too many letters, we do not take account of the matter."*

**II.12.** A. [Reverting to 8.C:] *"Here is the second, for said Rab, 'He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point may finish off even in the middle of a column.'*

- B. *"Here is the refutation: He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point should not finish off in the middle of a columns one might with other pentateuchs, but he should gradually diminish each line as he goes along until he gets to the bottom of a column."*
- C. *Rab's statement made reference to other pentateuchs.*
- D. *But lo, he explicitly referred to a scroll of the Torah!*
- E. *His reference was "pentateuchs within a scroll of the Torah."*
- F. *Is that so! But has not R. Joshua bar Abba said Rab Giddel said Rab said, "...before the right of all Israel' (Deu. 34: 5) are written in the middle of the column."*

- G. *The meaning is, in the middle of the line [but not at the end of the column].*

**II.13.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. *Rabbis say, "One may finish even in the middle of the line."*
- C. *R. Ashi said, "In the middle of a line in particular."*
- D. *And the decided law is, "In the middle of a line in particular."*

**II.14.** A. *Said R. Joshua bar Abba said R. Giddel said Rab, "The last eight verses of the Torah must be read in the public lection in the synagogue by one person alone."*

- B. *In accord with what authority is this ruling? It cannot be that of R. Simeon, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *"So Moses the servant of the Lord died there' (Deu. 34: 5) — is it possible that Moses was alive and wrote, 'So Moses the servant of the Lord died there'? But to this point in the Torah, Moses did the writing, and from that point to the end, Joshua b. Nun did the writing," the words of R. Judah.*
- D. *Others say it was said by R. Nehemiah.*
- E. *Said to him R. Simeon, "Is it possible that the scroll of the Torah was lacking a single letter? Is it not written, 'Take this scroll of the Torah and put it' (Deu. 31:26)? But up to this point the Holy One, blessed be he, did the speaking, and saying the matter aloud, Moses did the writing. But from this point to the end, the Holy One blessed be he did the speaking, and Moses did the writing, in tears. That is in line with this verse, 'Then Baruch answered them, he pronounced all these words to me with his own mouth, and I wrote them down with ink in the*

book' (Jer. 36:18). [Cashdan: Jeremiah did not repeat the words because of the grief they caused him.]”

- F. *Accordingly, must we not say the statement above cannot accord with R. Simeon?*
- G. *You may even maintain that it represents the view of R. Simeon, but since the phrase at hand is exceptional in one aspect, it is exceptional in another as well.*

**II.15.** A. And said R. Joshua bar Abba said R. Giddal said Rab, “He who buys a scroll of the Torah in the market is like one who has merely grabbed a religious duty by buying it in the market.

- B. “But he who writes one out for himself is regarded by Scripture as though he had personally received it at Mount Sinai.”
- C. Said R. Sheshet, “But if someone corrected even a single letter in it, Scripture regards it as though he had written the whole of the scroll.”

**II.16.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A person should make use of parchment-sheets of from three to eight columns, less or more than that he should not use.
- C. He should not put in too many columns, since it would look like a mere letter, nor should he put in too few columns, for the eyes would wander. The width of the column should be sufficient for the word “according to your families” to be written three times [that is, thirty letters in breadth].
- D. If a sheet nine columns wide should come into one’s possession, he should not divide it into three on the one side and six on the other, but four on the one side and five on the other.
- E. When is this the case? At the beginning or middle of the scroll, but at the end of a scroll, even a single verse or column [Cashdan: make take up the whole sheet].
- F. *A single verse do you say!? Rather, say, a single verse in a single column.*
- G. The width of the margin below shall be a handbreadth, the margin above should be three fingerbreadths, and between one column and the next the space should be two fingerbreadths.
- H. In Pentateuchs, the margin below should be three fingerbreadths, two above, a thumb breadth between one column and the next.
- I. Between one line and the next must be the space of a line, between one word and the next the width of a letter, between each letter a hairbreadth.
- J. One should not reduce the size of the script on account of the margin above or below or on account of the requisite space between one line and the next or between one section and the next.
- K. If near the end of a line one has to write a word containing five letters, he must not write two letters inside the column and three outside, but **[30B]** three in and two outside. [Cashdan: if there is sufficient space for three letters he may write the word allowing two letters to encroach upon the margin, but if there is not sufficient space for three letters he must write the whole word in the next line].
- L. If near the end of a line one has to write a word containing two letters, he must not write it between the columns but must write the word at the beginning of the following line.



- M. “He who errs and omits the Name of God [and wrote the next word] should erase what he has written and insert it above the line, and write the Name on the spot that has been erased,” the words of R. Judah.
- N. R. Yosé says, “He may even insert the Name above the line.”
- O. R. Isaac says, “He may even wipe away the word that was written and write the Name instead.”
- P. R. Simeon Shezuri says, “He may write the whole name above the line but not part of the name.”
- Q. R. Simeon b. Eleazar in the name of R. Meir says,<sup>m</sup> “He may not write the Name either on an erased spot nor on a word that has been wiped away, nor may he insert it above the line. What does he have to do? He has to remove the whole sheet and hide it away.”

**II.17.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. R. Hananel said Rab said, “The decided law is that one may write the Name above the line.”
- C. Rabbah bar bar Hana said R. Isaac b. Samuel said, “The decided law is that one erases the word that was written and write the Name instead.”
- D. *Why should R. Hananel say that the decided law follows this authority, and Rabbah bar bar Hana say that the decided law follows that authority?*
- E. Because people confuse the names and rulings, if they are not spelled out explicitly.

**II.18.** A. Said Rabin bar Hinena said Ulla said R. Hanina, “The decided law is in accord with Simeon Shezuri, and not only so, but in every passage in which R. Simeon Shezuri has given a teaching, the decided law is in accord with him.”

- B. *In what context was this statement made? Should you say that it is in the context of the statement just now cited, “R. Simeon Shezuri says, ‘He may write the whole name above the line but not part of the name,’” since it has been stated, and in that regard it has been stated, “R. Hananel said Rab said, ‘The decided law is that one may write the Name above the line,’ and Rabbah bar bar Hana said R. Isaac b. Samuel said, ‘The decided law is that one erases the word that was written and write the Name instead,’” if it were in this connection that R. Hanina’s ruling was stated, he ought to have stated his opinion along with the others.*
- C. *Rather, it was in the following setting: **He who slaughters a beast and found in it an eight-months’ birth, living or dead, or a dead nine-months’ birth, tears it out and removes its blood. “[If] he found a live nine-months’ birth, it requires slaughtering. And it is liable to the rule concerning it and its young [Lev. 22:28, which are not to be slaughtered on the same day],” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “The slaughtering of its mother renders it clean.” R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Even if [it grew to the] age of eight years and ploughs a field—the slaughtering of its mother renders it clean.” [If] one cut [into a beast] and found in it a living nine-months’ birth, it requires slaughtering, because its mother has not been slaughtered. [M. Hul. 4:5A-H].***



- D. *Lo, since in that regard it has been stated, “Zeiri said R. Hanina said, ‘The decided law accords with R. Simeon Shezuri,’” if it were the case, then he should have made the same statement there. [Cashdan: if Hanina’s ruling was stated in this connection, then Rabin b. Hinena should also have stated his tradition of the law alongside Zeiri.]*
- E. *Rather it was in the following context: At first they ruled, “He who goes out in chains and said, ‘Write a writ of divorce for my wife,’ — lo, these should write and deliver it to her.” They reverted to rule, “Also: He who is taking leave by sea or going forth in a caravan [may give the same valid instructions]. R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Also: he who is dying” [M. [Git. 6:5J-L](#)].*
- D. *Or it may have been in the following: [Regarding] heave offering of the tithe from demai produce which returned to its place [which fell back into the now-tithed demai produce from which it was originally separated, thus rendering the entire mixture prohibited to a non-priest — R. Simeon of Shezuri says, “Even on a weekday he inquires of him [the vendor] and eats at his word” [M. [Demai 4:1A-M](#)].*
- E. *But lo, it has been stated in this regard: said R. Yohanan, “The decided law accords with the position of R. Simeon Shezuri in the case of the dying man and in the case of heave offering of the tithe from demai produce which returned to its place [which fell back into the now-tithed demai produce from which it was originally separated,” if it were so, he should have made the statement there.*
- F. *Rather, the correct context is the following: R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Egyptian beans that one originally sowed for the sake of their seed and part of them had taken root before the New Year, part afterward, one may not designate heave offering and tithes from one part in behalf of the other, for one may not designated heave offering and tithes from new produce in behalf of the old or from old in behalf of the new. What should one do? He should collect the whole crop into a single heap and then designate the heave offering and tithes from it, so that the new produce in the heave offering or tithe will be deemed to be taken in respect to the new produce left in the heap, and the old for the old” [T. [Shebiit 2:13](#)] [M. [Sheb. 2:8A](#): are treated in the same way [as the types of produce mentioned at M. [Shebiit 2:7A](#), and so are subject to the rule of M. [2:7C-G](#)].”*
- G. *But lo, it has been stated in this regard: said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Yohanan, “The decided law accords with R. Simeon Shezuri,” if it were so, he should have made the statement there.*
- H. *Rather, said R. Pappa, “The correct context concerned the chest.”*
- I. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “It concerned the wine.”*
- J. *R. Pappa said, [\[31A\]](#) “The correct context concerned the chest, as we have learned in the Mishnah:” The chest — The House of Shammai say, “[R] is measured from the inside [to determine its volume.” And the House of Hillel say, “It is measured from the outside.” These and those agree that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rims*

is not measured. R. Yosé says, “They agree that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rims is measured. But [the space] between them is not measured.” R. Simeon Shezuri says, “If the legs are a handbreadth high, [that space which is] between them is not measured, and if not, [that space which is] between them is measured [M. Kel. 18:1A-F].”

- K. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “It concerned the wine, as we have learned in the Mishnah:” R. Meir says, “Oil is in the first remove of uncleanness under all circumstances.” And sages say, “Also honey.” R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Also: wine” [M. Tohorot 3:2A-C].*
- L. *Does it then follow that the initial authority excludes wine from the rule?*
- M. *Repeat the rule as: “Only: wine.”*

**II.19.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **Said R. Simeon Shezuri, “There was a case in which untithed produce became mixed with my produce that had already been tithed, so I came and asked R. Tarfon, who instructed me, ‘Go and buy produce from the market and separate tithes from it, newly produced produce for the other’ [T. Dem. 5:22L-N].**
- C. *[Tarfon] took as his premise that the majority of common folk tithe their produce, so that here he was in the status of taking tithe from what is exempt from tithe by the law of the Torah in behalf of what also is exempt by the same law.*
- D. *But why did he not instruct him, “Go, buy produce from a gentile”?*
- E. *He held as his premise that there is no valid right of ownership to real estate in the Land of Israel assigned to a gentile, such as entirely to remove from the produce of that land the obligation to tithe [and since there was an obligation to tithe the produce] he would consequently be in the status of taking tithe from what is exempt from tithe by the law of the Torah in behalf of what also is exempt by the same law. Therefore it would be a case of designating tithe from what is liable to tithing in behalf of what is exempt from tithing.*

**II.20.** A. *There are those who say that he said to him, “Go and buy produce from a gentile, and separate tithes from it, newly produced produce for the other.”*

- B. *He held as his premise that there is an entirely valid right of ownership to real estate in the Land of Israel assigned to a gentile, such as entirely to remove from the produce of that land the obligation to tithe [and since there was no obligation to tithe the produce] he would consequently be in the status of taking tithe from what is exempt from tithe by the law of the Torah in behalf of what also is exempt by the same law. Therefore it would be a case of designating tithe from what is exempt from tithing in behalf of what is exempt from tithing.*
- C. *But why not say to him, “Go, buy it from the market?”*

D. *[Tarfon] took as his premise that the majority of common folk do not tithe their produce.*

**II.21.** A. R. Yemar bar Shelamayya sent word to R. Pappa, “Does the statement, ‘Said Rabin bar Hinena said Ulla said R. Hanina, “The decided law is in accord with Simeon Shezuri, and not only so, but in every passage in which R. Simeon Shezuri has given a teaching, the decided law is in accord with him,”’ apply also to the **case in which untithed produce became mixed with produce that had already been tithed?**”

B. *He replied to him, “Yes.”*

C. *Said R. Ashi, “Said to me Mar Zutra that R. Hanina of Sura found a difficulty in the question. It is obvious, [31B] for did he say, ‘Wherever in the Mishnah he has stated...’? What it says is, ‘in every passage in which R. Simeon Shezuri has given a teaching.’”*

**II.22.** A. Said R. Zeiri said R. Hananel said Rab, “If a tear in a scroll of the Torah extended into two lines, it may be sewn together, but if into three lines, it may not be sewn together” [Cashdan: but the whole sheet of parchment must be removed].

B. *Said Rabbah the Younger to R. Ashi, “This is what R. Jeremiah of Difti said in the name of Raba: ‘As to that which we have said, “but if into three lines, it may not be sewn together,” that rule applies only to old scrolls, but as to new ones, it would not matter [how far the tear went; the parchment may be sewn together]. And when it says, “old,” that is not actually old, and when it says “new,” it is not actually new, but the former means one that was prepared with gall nut juice, the latter, not.’”*

C. *And that is the case only with sinews, but not with thread.*

**II.23.** A. R. Judah bar Abba raised the question, “As to a tear that ran between the columns, or between one line and another, *what is the law?* [May the tear be sewn up in these cases?]”

B. *The question stands.*

**II.24.** A. Said R. Zeiri said R. Hananel said Rab, “A doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah [mezuzah] that was written in lines of two words each is valid.”

B. *The question was asked: if the lines contained in succession two words, three, then one, what is the rule?*

C. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “All the more so is it valid, for he has arranged the words as in a poem [song].”*

D. *An objection was raised: “If he wrote it out like a poem, or if he wrote out a poem like it, it is invalid”!*

E. *When that law was set forth as a Tannaite statement, it was stated in connection with a scroll of the Torah.*

**II.25.** A. *So too it has been stated:*

B. *Said Rabbah bar Hanah said R. Yohanan,*

- C. and some say, said R. Aha bar bar Hanah said R. Yohanan, “A doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah [mezuzah] that was written in lines of two words each is valid,
- D. “so long as it is not in the form of a tent or tail-like” [Cashdan: the words in the consecutive lines must not increase in a regular order, like a tent, narrow above and wide below; nor decrease in a regular order, like a tail].

**II.26.** A. Said R. Hisda, “‘above the earth’ [Deu. 11:21, the final words in the parchment in the doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah] must be on the last line [by themselves].”

B. Others say, “At the end of the line: ‘as the heaven is high above the other’ (Psa. 103:11).” [Cashdan: the penultimate line in the mezuzah ends with ‘the heaven’ so that if ‘above the earth’ were written at the end of the last line, it would be seen that ‘the heaven’ is directly above ‘the earth’ in conformity with the expression in Psalms.]

C. *And there are those who say, “At the beginning, as the heaven is far from the earth.”*

**II.27.** A. Said R. Helbo, “I saw R. Huna rolling up the doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah beginning at ‘one’ and ending at ‘hear.’ He also left the space between the sections closed [beginning the second passage on the same line as the ending of the first].”

B. *An objection was raised:* said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “R. Meir would write it on a parchment of inferior quality, in the form of a column, [32A] leaving a space above and a space below and leaving the space open between the sections. [He did not leave the space between the sections closed.] I said to him, ‘My lord, why?’ He said to me, ‘Since these passages are not contiguous in the Torah itself.’” And said R. Hananel said Rab, “The decided law accords with the statement of R. Simeon b. Eleazar.” *Now does this not refer to the law governing leaving space between the sections open?*

C. *No, it refers to leaving a space above and below.*

D. And how much space above and below?

E. *Said R. Menassia b. R. Jacob, and some say, said R. Samuel bar Jacob, “The space taken up by the clasps of the scribes” [Cashdan].*

**II.28.** A. Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “And don’t you take the view that Rab’s statement pertained to leaving a space above and below? But Rab affirms the principle that we rely on common practice, and common practice nowadays is to leave the space between the sections closed!”

B. “For said Rabbah said R. Kahana said Rab, ‘Should Elijah come and announce, “People carry out with a covered shoe the rite of removing the shoe of the deceased childless brother to end the levirate connection,” people would obey him. But if he announced, “People do not carry out with a sandal the rite of removing the shoe of the deceased childless brother to end the levirate connection,” people would not obey him, for the people now commonly practice the rite with a sandal.’

C. “And R. Joseph said R. Kahana said Rab said, ‘Should Elijah come and announce, “People do not carry out with a sandal the rite of removing the shoe of the deceased childless brother to end the levirate connection,” people would obey him.

But if he announced, “People do not carry out with a sandal the rite of removing the shoe of the deceased childless brother to end the levirate connection,” people would not obey him, for the people now commonly practice the rite with a sandal.’

- D. *[Abbayye continues,] “And we said in that connection, ‘what is at issue between these two formulations? At issue is the use of a sandal to begin with.’ [Cashdan: according to Rabbah’s version it is not right nowadays to use a covered shoe to begin with, if a sandal is in hand; Joseph has the covered shoe used even though a sandal is available.]*
- E. *Does it not follow that the statement of the law that Rab made pertains to leaving space [but as to the general practice, closing the space, Rab follows common practice].*
- F. *Indeed it does.*

**II.29.** A. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “The religious duty properly performed is to leave the space between the sections closed, *but if it was left open, it is valid. For what is the meaning of R. Simeon b. Eleazar’s saying, ‘open’? It means, ‘even open.’*”

- B. *May we then say that the following supports his view:*
- C. Along these same lines, a scroll of the Torah that was worn out, or prayerbox [tefillin] that were worn out — people may not make of them door-post markers containing verses of the Torah, for things are not brought down from a more weighty leave of sanctification to a less weighty level of sanctification.
- D. *It then follows that, if it were permitted to bring things down from a more weighty leave of sanctification to a less weighty level of sanctification, it would be allowed make of a scroll of the Torah that was worn out, or prayerbox [tefillin] that were worn out door-post markers containing verses of the Torah. But how is that possible? In the one case the portions are closed, in the other, they are open!*
- E. *Perhaps it would have been permitted to do so only to complete the door-post markers containing verses of the Torah.*
- F. *Then if it were permitted to bring things down from a more weighty leave of sanctification to a less weighty level of sanctification, it would be allowed make of a scroll of the Torah that was worn out, or prayerbox [tefillin] that were worn out door-post markers containing verses of the Torah. the door-post markers containing verses of the Torah? But lo, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: The law revealed to Moses from God at Sinai is this: scriptural portions in the prayerbox [tefillin] must be written on parchment of high quality, those for the door-post markers may be written on parchment of lower quality. The former is the side of the hide next to the meat of the animal, the latter, the side of the hide next to the hair.*
- G. That is merely a description of the best possible way to carry out the religious duty [but it is not indispensable].
- H. *But lo, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: if one changed the correct procedure in either case, it is invalid?*
- I. *Both cases speak only of the prayerbox [tefillin], but in the one case, he wrote the portions on the side of the hide nearest to the hair, in the other, [32B] he wrote it on the side nearest to the meat of the beast.*

- J. *If you prefer, I shall say, the statement, if one changed the correct procedure in either case, it is invalid, frames a conflict of Tannaite statements. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If one changed the correct procedure in either case, it is invalid. R. Ahai declares it valid, in the name of R. Ahai b. R. Hanina, and some say, in the name of R. Jacob b. R. Hanina.*
- K. *Then if it were permitted to bring things down from a more weighty leave of sanctification to a less weighty level of sanctification, it would be allowed make of a scroll of the Torah that was worn out, or prayerbox [tefillin] that were worn out door-post markers containing verses of the Torah. the door-post markers containing verses of the Torah? But lo, it must be written on ruled lines [but the scriptural parts of the prayerbox [tefillin] are not, so they cannot serve for the doorpost marker]! For said R. Minyumi bar Hilqiah said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, "Any doorpost market that is not written on lined parchment is invalid." And R. Minyamin bar Hilqiah in his own name said, "The requirement that a lined parchment be used in the doorpost market is a law revealed to Moses from Sinai."*
- L. *It is a conflict of Tannaite statements. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Jeremiah says in the name of Our Rabbi, "Prayerbox [tefillin] and doorpost markers may be written not from a master copy but from memory, and they do not require the use of lined parchment."*
- M. *And the decided law is that prayerbox [tefillin] do not require the use of a lined parchment, and the doorpost marker does require the use of a lined parchment, and both this and that may be written not from a master copy but from memory. How come? Because these are things that people know by heart perfectly well.*

**II.30.** A. *Said R. Helbo, "I saw R. Huna, planning to take a seat on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah law, invert a utensil on the ground, put the scroll on it, and then take a seat on the couch. He took the position that it is forbidden to sit on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah is lying. And he differs from Rabbah bar bar Hannah."*

- B. *For said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "It is permitted to sit on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah is lying."*
- C. *"And should someone murmur to you [to contradict you], 'There is the case in which R. Eleazar who was sitting on his bed and remembered that a scroll of the Torah was lying on it, so he slipped off and took a seat on the ground, so it appeared as though he had been bitten by a snake,' [you may reply to him,] 'In that case, the scroll of the Torah in fact was lying on the ground.'"*

**II.31.** A. *Said R. Judah said Samuel, "If one wrote the doorpost marker in the form of a letter, it is invalid."*

- B. *How come?*
- C. *We appeal to the analogy formed by verbal connection through the use of the word "writing" both here and also in connection with the scroll of the Torah [at Deu. 6: 9, Exo. 17:14, respectively].*

**II.32.** A. *And said R. Judah said Samuel, "If one hung the doorpost marker on a stick [and attached the stick to the doorpost], it is invalid."*

- B. *How come?*
- C. *We require that it be "upon your gates" (Deu. 6: 9).*



- D. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. If one hung it on a stick or attached it to the wall behind the door, it brings danger, and no religious duty is accomplished.
- F. Members of the household of King Munbaz would do it that way when they stayed at an inn as a memorial of the doorpost market.

**II.33.** A. And said R. Judah said Samuel, "The religious duty is to locate it within the contained space of the door [on the side where the door shuts, within the framework of the doorpost (Cashdan)]."

- B. *That's obvious, for the All-Merciful has said, "upon your gates" (Deu. 6: 9).*
- C. *It might have entered your mind that, since said Raba, "The religious duty is to place it [33A] in the handbreadth nearest to the street," the further it is from the house, the better. So we are informed to the contrary.*

**II.34.** A. And said R. Judah said Samuel, "If one wrote it in two columns, it is invalid."

- B. *An objection was raised: If one wrote it in two columns and put it on two doorposts, it is invalid. Lo, if it was placed on a single one, it is valid.*
- C. The sense is, "such that it could be placed on two doorposts."

**II.35.** A. And said R. Judah said Samuel, "In regard to the doorpost market, be guided by the hinge."

- B. What is the "hinge"?
- C. *Said R. Ada, "The sockets [Cashdan: for the pin of the hinge]."*
- D. *How so?*
- E. For instance, if there is a door between two rooms, one for men, one for women [Cashdan: the mezuzah must be affixed to the right doorpost as one enters the house; in this case, where one door communicates between two rooms, while each room has its own door leading to the street, it is difficult to establish which room leads into the other, and on which doorpost of this door the mezuzah is to be fixed. The answer is, that side of the door where the sockets for the doorpin are placed is considered to be the inside. Accordingly, the mezuzah must be affixed to the right doorpost as one enters the house on the inside of which the sockets are found.]

**II.36.** A. *The exilarch built a house and said to R. Nahman, "Put up the doorpost market for me."*

- B. *Said R. Nahman, "First put the doorposts in place."*

**II.37.** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, "If one affixed it like a bolt [horizontally], it is invalid.

- B. *Is that so? Now lo, when R. Isaac bar Joseph came, he said, "All of the doorpost markets in the household of Rabbi were affixed in the manner of a bolt, and the one on the door through which Rabbi would enter the study hall had no doorpost market at all"!*
- C. *No contradiction! In the one case, it was attached horizontally, in the other, it was bent at a right angle.*
- D. *Is that so [that the one on the door through which Rabbi would enter the study hall had no doorpost market at all]? Now lo the door through which R. Huna would enter the study hall did have a doorpost marker.*

- E. *But that was the door that was used more often than the others, and said R. Judah said Rab, "The rule of the doorpost market is that one has to place it on the door that is most commonly used."*

**II.38.** A. Said R. Zira said R. Mattena said Samuel, "The religious duty of the door marker is to place it at the start of the upper third of the doorpost."

- B. And R. Huna said, "One raises it above the ground by a handbreadth and removes it from the lintel by a handbreadth, but otherwise the entire area of the doorpost is suitable for affixing the door marker."

- C. *An objection was raised:* "One raises it above the ground by a handbreadth and removes it from the lintel by a handbreadth, but otherwise the entire area of the doorpost is suitable for affixing the door marker," the words of R. Judah.

- D. R. Yosé says, "'And you shall bind them' (Deu. 6: 8), 'and you shall write them' (Deu. 6: 9) — just as the thing that is bound has to be high up [namely, the prayerbox [tefillin], so the thing that is written must be placed high up."

- E. *Now, from the perspective of R. Huna, there is no problem, since he has made his ruling in accord with the position of R. Judah. But as for Samuel, in accord with whose position has he made his ruling? It can be neither in accord with R. Judah nor in accord with R. Yosé.*

- F. *Said R. Huna b. R. Nathan, "In point of fact, his position accords with that of R. Yosé. [33B] And what is the meaning of, to place it at the start of the upper third of the doorpost? It is that one should not put it lower than a third of the doorpost away from the lintel."*

**II.39.** A. Said Raba, "The religious duty is to place it in the handbreadth nearest to the street."

- B. *What is the operative consideration here?*

- C. Rabbis say, "So that one will meet a religious duty as soon as one returns home."

- D. R. Hanina of Sura says, "So that it will afford protection to the whole of the house."

**II.40.** A. Said R. Hanina, "Come and take note that the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not the same as the trait of a mortal. The mortal trait is that the king is seated on the throne inside, and the people guard him outside.

- B. "But the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not the same. His servants take up their seats inside, and he guards them from the outside, as it is said, 'The Lord your keeper, the Lord is the shade on your right hand' (Psa. 121: 5)."

**II.41.** A. R. Joseph b. Raba in the name of Raba expounded, "If one set the doorpost market within the doorpost to the depth of a handbreadth, it is invalid."

- B. *May we say that the following supports that view:*

- C. if one put it in the post of the door or added another frame, and it was a depth of a handbreadth, another doorpost marker is necessary, but if the depth is less, no other one is required.

- D. *When that Tannaite formulation was set forth, it concerned a door behind a door.*

- E. *Lo, that matter has been dealt with explicitly:* if there was a door behind a door to a depth of a handbreadth, another doorpost marker is necessary, but if the depth is less, no other one is required.

F. *The purpose was to spell out, "how so?" [That is, to provide an example.]*

**II.42.** A. *A Tannaite formulation: if one set up a doorframe of hollow reeds, he may cut away a length of reed and put the mezuzah in the hole."*

B. Said R. Aha bar Raba, "That rule applies only in a case in which one set up the doorframe and only then cut away the hole and left the market therein. But if to begin with one cut the hole and put the market therein and only then set up the reed as a door post, it is invalid. Scripture is clear: 'you will make,' but not use what is ready-made."

**II.43.** A. *And said Raba, "Doors that are faulty are exempt from the requirement of having a doorpost marker."*

B. *What is the definition of doors that are faulty?*

C. *There was a disagreement on that matter between R. Rihumi and Abba Yosé.*

D. *One said, "The ones that have no lintel."*

E. *The other said, "The ones that have no side posts."*

**II.44.** A. Said Rabbah bar Shila said R. Hisda, "A hall closed on three sides and open on the fourth is exempt from the requirement of a doorpost marker, because it does not have doorposts."

B. *Then if it has doorposts, it would require one. But is it not the fact that the posts are made only to help hold up the ceiling!*

C. *This is the sense of the statement at hand: A hall closed on three sides and open on the fourth, even though it has door posts, is exempt from the requirement of a doorpost marker, because the doorposts are made only to support the ceiling."*

D. *Said Abbaye, "I myself have seen that while the halls in the master's house have posts, they have no doorpost markers. That is clearly because he holds that the posts are serving only as supports for the ceiling."*

E. *An objection was raised: A lodge, a room with three walls and open at the fourth side, and a balcony, all require a doorpost marker.*

F. *At issue here is a room with three walls and open at the fourth side of a school house.*

G. *But a room with three walls and open at the fourth side of a school house is a perfectly proper room!*

H. *At issue is a Roman a room with three walls and open at the fourth side.*

**II.45.** A. Said Rabbah said R. Judah, "An entrance lodge has to have two door post markers."

B. *What is the meaning of an entrance lodge?*

C. Said R. Pappa the elder in the name of Rab, "It is a gate house with one door opening onto to a courtyard, the other on to dwelling houses."

**II.46.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *A gatehouse that leads into a garden and thence to an out house*

C. *R. Yosé says, "It is classified as an outhouse."*

D. *And sages say, "It is classified as the gatehouse [and requires a doorpost marker]."*

- E. *Both Rab and Samuel say, "If the door opens from the garden to the house, all parties concur that it is liable. How come? It obviously forms the entry into the house. Where there is a difference, it concerns a door that opens from the house into the garden. One master holds that the outhouse is principal, the other, the garden is principal. [Thus sages treat it as exempt.]"*
- F. *Both Rabbah and R. Joseph say, "If the door opens from the house into the garden, all parties concur that it is exempt. How come? It obviously forms the entry into the garden. Where there is a difference, it concerns a door that opens from the garden into the house. One master holds that it serves for going into the house, the other, that it is there wholly for the sake of the garden, [34A] and that is the intention in making it."*
- G. *Abbaye and Raba acted in accord with Rabbah and R. Joseph, and R. Ashi acted in accord with Rab and Samuel, imposing the more strict view.*
- H. *The decided law is in accord with Rab and Samuel, imposing the more strict view.*

**II.47.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. *A staircase open from a downstairs room to the upper chamber [with a door closing the foot of the stairs] —*
- C. *Said R. Huna, "If it has only a single door, it has to have a single doorpost market, but if it has two doors [bottom and top floors], it has to have two of them."*
- D. *Said R. Pappa, "That statement of R. Huna's leads to the inference a room that has four doors has to have four doorpost markers."*
- E. *So what else is new?*
- F. *It is necessary to make that observation to make the point that even though only one of the doors is ordinarily used, all four of them have to be marked.*

**II.48.** A. *Said Amemar, "A door in the corner has to have a doorpost marker."*

- B. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, "But lo, it has no posts!"*
- C. *He said to him, "[The extremities of the two walls to which the door is attached (Cashdan)] form the doorposts."*

**II.49.** A. *R. Pappa came to the house of Mar Samuel and saw a door that had only one door post on the left side, to which a doorpost marker was affixed. He said to him, "In accord with what authority is the arrangement made? It is in accord with R. Meir. Now I should readily concede that R. Meir held that a doorpost marker was required at the right side, but has he said that it is required at the left side?"*

- B. *What is the source of the ruling? It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *"Upon the doorposts of your house" (Deu. 6: 9) — on the right side as you enter the house.*
- D. *You say that it is to be at the right side. But perhaps it is only at the left side?*
- E. *Scripture states, "[Upon the doorposts of] your house" (Deu. 6: 9).*
- F. *So how does the cited clause yield the besought proposition?*
- G. *Said Rabbah, "'As you enter' bears the sense of the right side, for when someone walks into a house, it is with the right foot first."*
- H. *R. Samuel bar Aha before R. Pappa in the name of Raba bar Ulla said, "It is from the following: 'And Jehoiada the priest took a chest and bored a hole in the*

lid of it and put it beside the altar on the right side as one comes into the house of the Lord, and the priests that kept the threshold put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord' (2Ki. 10:12)."

**II.50.** A. *And how in fact do we know R. Meir's position? It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A house that has only one doorpost is liable to the placement of a doorpost marker —
- C. R. Meir declares liable.
- D. And sages exempt.
- E. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of sages?*
- F. *Scripture refers to "doorposts."*
- G. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Meir?*
- H. *It is in line with the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. "'...doorposts...' — I infer that the smallest number of doorposts, in the plural, can be only two. Then when Scripture refers to 'doorposts' in the second reference to the same matter [at Deu. 11:20], for which there is no obvious necessity, what we come up with is an augmentative clause following another augmentative clause, and where there is an augmentative clause following another augmentative clause, the sole upshot is to impose a limitation. [Cashdan: for here each expression by itself indicates plurality, and since it is repeated, Scripture thereby intimates that the condition of plurality is no longer essential.] Accordingly, Scripture has imposed a limitation on the requirement of the doorpost marker," the words of R. Ishmael.
- J. R. Aqiba says, "That is hardly required, for it is written, 'upon the lintel and the two sideposts' (Exo. 12:23) — there is hardly need for Scripture to refer to 'two....' So why does Scripture refer to 'two...'? This serves as the generative analogy for every passage in which reference is made to doorposts. It bears the meaning that only one is subject to discussion, unless Scripture explicitly says, 'two.'"

**II.51.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "And you shall write them" (Deu. 6: 9) —
- C. is it possible to suppose that one should write the scriptural portions that go into the doormarkers on the stones of the house?
- D. Here we find a reference to "writing," and elsewhere we find a usage of the word "writing." Just as elsewhere, the writing is to be on a scroll, so here too it is to be on a scroll.
- E. Maybe you should take this route:
- F. Here we find a reference to "writing," and elsewhere we find a usage of the word "writing." Just as elsewhere, the writing is to be on stones, so here too it is to be on stones.

- G. Now let us see which is the correct base-analogy? We should derive the meaning of “writing” from a reference to “writing” that pertains to all generations to come for the sense of a reference to “writing” that pertains to all generations to come, and we should not derive the meaning of “writing” from a reference to “writing” that does not pertain to all generations to come for the sense of a reference to “writing” that pertains to all generations to come.
- H. And the scroll must be written with ink: “Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words to me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book” (Jer. 36:18).

**II.52.** A. Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, “Scripture has said, ‘upon the doorposts,’ *and you maintain that we derive the sense of the word ‘writing’ here from the meaning of the word ‘writing’ there [that it should be on a scroll]?*”

- B. “Scripture has said, ‘and you shall write them,’ meaning, writing that is flawless, and then, put it ‘on your doorposts.’ Now since Scripture has said, ‘and you shall write them’ [with the sense: on a scroll], *what need do I have to go looking for verbal analogies such as have been proposed? Were it not for the availability of the verbal analogy, I might have suppose that one may write it on a stone and then set up the stone on the threshold as the doorpost. So we are informed that that is not the case.*”

**III.1** A. **The four portions [of Scripture] which are in prayerbox [tefillin] [Deu. 6: 4A, 11:13-21, Exo. 13: 1-10, 11-16] impair the validity of one another, and even [the shape of] one letter impairs their validity.**

- B. *That’s self-evident! What else is new!*
- C. Said R. Judah said Rab, “The law was required, specifically, to deal with the case of the tittle of the letter Y.”
- D. *So What else is new!*
- E. *Rather, it is in accord with this other statement that said R. Judah said Rab. For said R. Judah said Rab, “Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a space of parchment has been invalidly incised.”*

### **Topical Appendix: The Tefillin Rules and Regulations in General**

**III.2.** A. **[34B]** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “The word for frontlets [referring to phylacteries] occurs three times, two times lacking the indication of the plural, one time including that full spelling [at Deu. 6: 8, 9:18, and Exo. 13:16]. that indicates there are four [sections of Scripture to be inserted into the phylacteries],” the words of R. Ishmael [and that explains why all four are required].
- C. R. Aqiba says, “It is not necessary [to resort to such a proof], for the letters for the first half of the word, in the Katpi language [Coptic] , stand for two, and the letters for the second half of the word, in Afriki, stand for the word two.”

**III.3.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Might one suppose that one should write them on four pieces of hide, then put them into four compartments made out of four pieces of hide?



- C. Scripture says, And for a memorial between your eyes” (Exo. 13: 9) — “I have spoken to you concerning a single memorial, not two or three memorials.”
- D. How is this done?
- E. One writes them out on four pieces of hide and puts them into four compartments that are made out of a single piece of hide. But if one wrote them out on a single hide and put them into four parchments, he has carried out his obligation.

**III.4.** A. “And there has to be a blank space between each portion of Scripture,” the words of Rabbi.

- B. And sages say, “It is not required.”
- C. But they concur that between each one and the next there has to be a line or thread, and if the divisions between the compartments are not readily discerned [from the outside], they are null.

**III.5.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. How does one write out the *prayerbox*?
- C. “The prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the hand, one writes out on a single hide, but if he wrote it out on four pieces of hide and then put it into a single box, he has carried out his obligation. But they have to be bound together, in line with the verse, ‘and it shall be for a sign for you on your hand’ (Exo. 13: 9), and just as from the outside it appears as a single sign, so from the inside it must be one sign,” the words of R. Judah.
- D. R. Yosé says, “It is not required to do it that way.”
- E. Said R. Yosé, “R. Judah b. Rabbi conceded to me that if someone does not have a prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the hand, but possesses two prayer-parchments [*tefillah* ] to be placed upon the head, he may cover up one of them with a hide and put it on his arm.”
- F. “Concede”? *This is the very point of their dispute!*
- G. Said Raba, “From the statement that R. Yosé has made, it is clear that R. Judah retracted his view.”
- H. *But can that be true? And lo, R. Hananiah sent word in the name of R. Yohanan, “As to the prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the hand, it may be made into the prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the head, but as to the prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the head, it may not be made into the prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the hand, because what is at a weightier level of sanctification may not be brought down to a lighter level of sanctification.”*
- I. *That is no problem, one ruling speaks of an old one [one for the head that had been worn on the head, and it may not then be reduced to the lower level of the one used on the arm], the other to a new one.*
- J. *But in the opinion of him who takes the view that merely designating something for a given purpose is substantial, the solution is to say that the owner had made a stipulation concerning it to begin with.*

**III.6.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. What is the order of verses of Scripture in the prayer-parchment [*tefillah* ] that is to be placed upon the head?

- C. “Sanctify to me’ (Exo. 13: 1-10), “and it shall be when the Lord shall bring you” (Exo. 13:11-16), on the right side; “Hear O Israel” (Deu. 6: 4-9) and “And it shall come to pass if you hearken diligently” (Deu. 11:13-21) are on the left side.
- D. *And lo, has the opposite not been taught on Tannaite authority?*
- E. *Said Abbaye, “There is no contradiction. The one speaks of the right hand of the one who reads them [the one who faces the person wearing the prayer-parchment], the other, the perspective of the one who wears them, at his right, thus the reader reads them according to their logical order [as they are located in the torah].*

**III.7.** A. Said R. Hananel said Rab, “If one reversed the order of the scriptural lections, the prayer-parchments [tefillin] are invalid.”

- B. *Said Abbaye, “That rule pertains [35A] only to a case in which he put a portion that should be inside outside, or one that should be outside inside. But if he put what should be inside on the inside, or what should be on the outside outside, there is no objection.”*
- C. *Said to him Raba, “How come putting the portion that should go inside outside, or the portion that should go outside inside, it is invalid? Is the reason not that what should look out onto the open does not do so, while what should not look out onto the open does so? So too, putting an outside portion outside, or an inside portion inside, should be invalid as well, since what should look out onto the open on the right looks out on the left, and what should look out onto the open side on the left looks out on the right! So we had better conclude that no such distinction is to be drawn [so any change in the correct order leaves the prayer-parchment invalid].”*

**III.8.** A. And said R. Hananel said Rab, “The fact that there is an underside of the prayer-parchment is a law given to Moses at Sinai.”

**III.9.** A. Abbaye said, “The duct that is provided to the prayer parchment is a law given to Moses at Sinai.”

**III.10.** A. Abbaye also said, “The fact that the letter shin must be embossed on the right and left side of the prayer parchment for the head is a law given to Moses at Sinai.”

B. The division between the compartments has to reach as far as the stitches.

C. *R. Dimi of Nehardea said, “It is not necessary; the pen [used when writing the portions] would discern flaws.”*

**III.11.** A. Abbaye also said, “The parchment for use for the scriptural portions for the prayer-parchments must be examined for flaws, for we require the writing to be perfect, and if there are flaws, it would not be that way.”

B. *R. Dimi of Nehardea said, “It is not necessary; the pen [used when writing the portions] would discern flaws.”*

**III.12.** A. Said R. Isaac, “The fact that the straps of the prayer--parchments must be black is a law given to Moses at Sinai.”

B. *An objection was raised: prayer-parchments are to be tied only with straps of the same material as that of which they are made, whether these are green, black, or white. Red should not be used because it is disgusting [the color of blood] and*

because of another consideration [namely, the man who wears them can have had sexual relations with his wife during her menstrual period].

- C. Said R. Judah, "There is the case of a disciple of R. Aqiba who tied on his prayer-parchments with straps of blue wool, and R. Aqiba said nothing to him about it. It is hardly possible that that righteous man would see his disciple doing such a thing and not stop him!"
- D. He said to him, "Well, he really did not see him, since if he had seen him do so, he would have stopped him."
- E. There was the case of Hyrqanos, son of R. Eliezer b. Hyrqanos, who tied on his prayer-parchments with straps of purple wool, and R. Eliezer said nothing to him about it. It is hardly possible that that righteous man would see his son doing such a thing and not stop him!"
- F. They said to him, "Well, he really did not see him, since if he had seen him do so, he would have stopped him."
- G. *Now, the Tannaite statement has set forth in any event, whether these are green, black, or white, [and that contradicts Isaac]!*
- H. *There is no contradiction: the one speaks of the outside of the strap, the other of the inside [and it is the outside of which Isaac spoke; that has to be black].*
- I. *But if the color is the inside of the strap, then what's the point of the claim, because it is disgusting [the color of blood] and because of another consideration [namely, the man who wears them can have had sexual relations with his wife during her menstrual period]?*
- J. *Sometimes it gets twisted.*

### **III.13.** A. *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. The fact that the boxes containing the prayer-parchments have to be square is a law revealed to Moses at Sinai.
- C. Said R. Pappa, "[Cashdan:] this refers to the stitching and the diagonal." [Cashdan: the stitching of the underside of the box must be done so that the box remains a perfect square; the stitches should not be pulled too much for fear that the leather will become creased and lose its correct shape; it must be an exact square so that the diagonal should be one and two-fifths times the length of the side.]
- D. *May we say that the following sustains his view, as we have learned: He who makes his prayer-parchment box round has made a dangerous thing, in which no religious duty inheres.*
- E. *Said R. Pappa, "The cited Tannaite formulation deals with a case in which he has made the box round like a nut."*

### **III.14.** A. Said R. Huna, "As to the boxes containing the prayer parchments, so long as the [external] sides of the box are whole, they are valid."

- B. R. Hisda said, "If two of them were split, they are valid, but if three, they are not."
- C. Said Raba, "As to your statement, 'If two of them were split, they are valid, but if three, they are not,' that statement applies only in a case in which the tears are not facing one another, but if they are facing one another, the object is invalid. *And*

*even if they were facing one another, the object still is invalid if the box was new, but if it was old, that would not matter."*

- D. *Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, "What is the definition of new and what is the definition of old?"*
- E. *He said to him, "So long as when one stretches the leather it snaps back, it is old; otherwise it is new. [35B] Or else, if when you hold the strap, the box hangs on it [without the strap's snapping] it is new, otherwise it is old."*

**III.15.** A. *Abbaye was once in session before R. Joseph when the strap of his prayer-parchment box broke. He said to him, "What is the law on tying it together?"*

- B. *He said to him, "It is written, 'you shall bind them' (Deu. 6: 8), meaning, it just be an unflawed knot."*
- C. *Said R. Aha b. R. Joseph to R. Ashi, "What is the law on sewing it together?"*
- D. *He said to him, "Go out and see how people behave in this regard."*

**III.16.** A. *Said R. Pappa, "Straps [that hang down from the prayer-parchment box of the head] that have been cut short are acceptable."*

- B. *But that is not so, for the sons of R. Hiyya said, "Straps [that hang down from the prayer-parchment box of the head] that are blue are acceptable, hyssop twigs that are cut short are valid." That is because in both instances these form accessories of what is needed to carry out a religious duty. But here, these are accessories of holy things, so the same rule would not apply.*

**III.17.** A. *It follows that a fixed length for the strap has been set forth, so what is the minimum length?*

- B. *Said Rammi bar Hama said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "To the middle finger."*
- C. *R. Kahana showed the middle finger bent, R. Ashi showed the middle finger extended [Roman style].*

**III.18.** A. *Rabbah would tie the knot at the back of the head and let the straps fall straight down over his shoulders [following Cashdan verbatim].*

- B. *R. Aha bar Jacob would Rabbah would tie the knot and plait the straps.*
- C. *Mar b. Rabina would do it the way we do [Cashdan: let the straps hang down over his shoulders in front].*

**III.19.** A. *Said R. Judah b. R. Samuel bar Shilat in the name of Rab, "The way in which the knot of the straps of the boxes containing prayer parchments is tied is a law revealed to Moses from Sinai."*

- B. *Said R. Nahman, "The beautiful side of the straps must be on the outside."*

**III.20.** A. *R. Ashi was in session before Mar Zutra. The strap of his prayer-parchment box got twisted. He said to him, "Does the master not take the position that the beautiful side of the straps must be on the outside?"*

- B. *He said to him, "It never entered my mind."*

**III.21.** A. *"And all the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon you, and they shall fear you" (Deu. 28:10) —*

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- C. R. Eliezer the Elder says, "This refers to the boxes of the prayer-parchment that is worn on the head."

**III.22.** A. "And I will take away my hand and you shall see my back" (Exo. 33:23)

- B. Said R. Hana bar Bizna said R. Simeon the Pious, "This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be he, showed Moses [how to tie] the knot of the the boxes of the prayer-parchment."

**III.23.** A. Said R. Judah, "The knot of the the boxes of the prayer-parchment has to be placed up high, so that Israel will be up high, and not below;

- B. "and it should be facing the front, so that Israel will be in front and not behind."

**III.24.** A. Said R. Samuel b. Bidri said Rab, or some say, said R. Aha Arika said R. Huna, or some say, said R. Menashayya said Samuel, "When putting on the prayer-parchment boxes, at what point does one say a blessing over them? It is at the moment at which one puts them on."

- B. *But can this be so?* And lo, said R. Judah said Samuel, "In the case of carrying out all religious duties, one says a blessing prior [to doing] them and then goes on to carry them out"!

- C. *Both Abbaye and Raba said,* "It is from the time that they have been put on up to the time that they have been tied." [Cashdan: as long as they have not been tied, the religious duty has not yet been performed.]

**III.25.** A. [36A] Said R. Hisda, "If one interrupted with talk between putting on one box containing prayer-parchment and the next, he has to go back and say the blessing."

- B. *So if he talked he has to, but if he did not, he does not have to?* And lo, R. Hiyya b. R. Huna in the name of R. Yohanan sent word, "On putting on the prayer-parchment box for the arm, one says, 'Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us to put on boxes containing prayer-parchments.' On putting on the prayer-parchment box for the head, one says, 'Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us concerning the religious duty of prayer-parchments'"!

- C. *Both Abbaye and Raba said,* "If one did not interrupt by talking, he has to recite only a single blessing, but if he did, he has to recite the two specified blessings."

**III.26.** A. If one interrupted with talk between putting on one box containing prayer-parchment and the next, that represents a transgression on his hands, and on account of such a transgression, one would have to go home from the battle front [in line with Deu. 20: 8].

**III.27.** A. *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. When he puts it on, he puts on the one for the hand and then he puts on the one for the head,

- C. and when he takes it off, he takes off the one for the head and afterward he takes off the one for the hand.

- D. *Now there is no problem in understanding why,* when he puts it on, he puts on the one for the hand and then he puts on the one for the head, for it is written, "And you shall bind them for a sign on your hand" (Deu. 6: 8) and then, "And they shall be for frontlets between your eyes" (Deu. 6: 8). *But how on the basis of Scripture*

*do we know that when he takes it off, he takes off the one for the head and afterward he takes off the one for the hand?*

- E. *Said Rabbah, “R. Huna explained it to me: ‘Said Scripture, ‘And they shall be for frontlets between your eyes,’ meaning, so long as they are ‘between your eyes’ both of the boxes shall be in place [so the one on the head is taken off first].”*

**III.28.** *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. When putting on the prayer-parchment boxes, at what point does one say a blessing over them? It is at the moment at which one puts them on.
- C. How so?
- D. If one got up early to go out on a journey and is afraid lest the boxes be lost, he puts them on, and when the time comes to utilize them in prayer, he should touch them and then recite the blessing over them.
- E. How long does one keep them on?
- F. To sunset.
- G. R. Jacob says, “Until the last pedestrian has left the market [after dark].”
- H. Sages say, “Until sleep.”
- I. But sages concede to R. Jacob that if one has taken them off to go to the privy or to go into a bath house and the sun meanwhile set, he does not go and put them back on again.
- J. Said R. Nahman, “The decided law accords with the position of R. Jacob.”
- K. *R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna would wear them when saying the evening prayer.*
- L. *There are those who say, “The law does not accord with the position of R. Jacob.”*
- M. **[36B]** *But lo, is it not the fact that R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna would wear them when saying the evening prayer?*
- N. *In that regard they differ.*

**III.29.** *A. But did Rabbah b. R. Huna make any such statement? And did not Rabbah bar R. Huna say, “If it is a matter of doubt whether or not darkness has fallen, one should not take them off [if one is then wearing them] or put them back on [if one has stopped wearing them]”? It then follows that if the darkness had certainly fallen, one does remove them!*

- B. *It was with regard to the eve of the Sabbath that that statement was made.*
- C. *Then on what premise does he take that position? If he takes the view that the night is also a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments, then the Sabbath also should be a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments, and if he takes the view that the night is not a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments, then the Sabbath also should not be a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments! For the same passage of Scripture that eliminates the Sabbath as a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments also eliminates the night as a time for wearing the boxes containing prayer-parchments. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *“and you shall observe this ordinance in its season from day to day’ (Exo. 13:10) —*



- E. “‘day’ — but not night.
- F. “‘from day’ — but not every day, eliminating the Sabbath and festivals,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- G. R. Aqiba says, “The ordinance is addressed only to the Passover alone.” [The meaning of “day to day” is in fact, year to year.]
- H. *The rule derives from the same text from which R. Aqiba derives it, as it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. R. Aqiba says, “Might one suppose that a man should put on the boxes containing prayer-parchments on Sabbaths and festival days? Scripture to the contrary says, ‘And it shall be for a sign on your hands and for frontlets between your eyes’ (Exo. 13:16) — it is when such a sign is required, then excluding Sabbaths and festival days which themselves constitute such a sign.”

**III.30.** A. Said R. Eleazar, “Whoever puts on the boxes containing prayer-parchments after sundown violates an affirmative commandment.”

- B. R. Yohanan said, “He violates a negative one.”
- C. *May we then say that at issue between them is what was said by R. Abin in the name of R. Ilaa? For said R. Abin said R. Ilaa, “In any passage in which the words occur, ‘observe lest,’ or ‘do not,’ the sense is a negative commandment.” One authority concurs with what R. Abin said, and the other does not concur in what R. Abin said.*
- D. *Not at all, for all parties concur in the view of R. Abin in the name of R. Ilaa. But here what is at issue is the following:*
- E. *One party maintains that the language of “observe” used in the context of a negative commandment has the power of a negative commandment, and the same language used in the context of an affirmative commandment has the power of an affirmative commandment. And the other party takes the view that the language of “observe” even when used in the context of an affirmative action also has the force of a negative commandment.*

**III.31.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “If the purpose [of taking off or of putting on the boxes containing prayer-parchments] is to take good care of them, it is permitted [to do the one or the other].”

- B. *And said Rabina, “I was in session before R. Ashi, and it got dark, and he removed his prayer-parchment boxes, so I said to him, ‘Does the master do so in order to protect them,’ and he said to me, ‘Yes. But I noticed that his purpose was not to protect them. He took the opinion that that was the law in theory, but it was not a law that is set forth as practical instruction [but he ignored it, and took them off ad lib.]”*

**III.32.** A. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “A man is obligation to touch the boxes containing prayer parchments every hour.

- B. “This derives from an argument a fortiori from the rule governing the frontlet of the priest [to which the boxes are comparable] (Exo. 28:38). If of the frontlet of the priest, which contains the name of God only one time, the Torah says, ‘And it shall always be on his forehead,’ meaning, in the forefront of his thoughts so that

he must not be diverted from it, how much the more so does that rule pertain to the boxes, which contain the name of God a great many times!”

**III.33.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Your hand” (Exo. 13: 9) — this refers to the left hand.
- C. You say that this refers to the left hand. But perhaps it refers only to the right?
- D. Scripture says, “Yes, my hand has laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand has spread out the heavens” (Isa. 48:13), and further, “Her hand he has put to the tent pin and her right hand to the workmen’s hammer” (Jud. 5: 6), and “Why do you withdraw your hand, even your right hand” Draw it out of your bosom and consume them”: (Psa. 74:11).
- E. **[37A]** R. Yosé the Netmaker says, “We find that the right hand also may be referred to simply as ‘hand,’ in line with the following: ‘And when Joseph saw that his father was laying his hand, the right one’ (Gen. 48:17).”
  - F. *And the other?*
  - G. *It may be called “the hand, the right one,” but never “the hand.”*
- H. R. Nathan says, “Such proof is hardly required, since it is written, ‘And you shall bind them’ (Deu. 6: 8), ‘and you shall write them’ (Deu. 6: 9). Just as the writing is to be on the right, so the binding is to be on the right, and since the binding is to be with the right hand, the place where the box is laid has to be the left hand.”
- I. *And on what basis does R. Yosé the Netmaker derive the rule that the place where the box is laid has to be the left hand?*
- J. *He derives it from the same proofs that serve R. Nathan.*
- K. R. Ashi said, “He derives it from ‘your hand,’ since the word is written with the letter H at the end, pointing to the weaker hand” [following Cashdan].
- L. *Said R. Abba to R. Ashi, “And might I say it means the stronger hand?”*
- M. *He said to him, “Is it written with a het ?”*
  - N. *This is in accord with the following conflict of Tannaite formulations:*
  - O. “Your hand” written with the he points to the left hand.
  - P. Others say, ““Your hand” serves to encompass the stump of the arm.”
  - Q. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - R. If a person has no arm, he is exempt from putting on the boxes containing prayer parchments.
  - S. Others say, ““Your hand” serves to encompass the stump of the arm.”

**III.34.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A left handed person puts on his boxes containing prayer parchments on his right hand, for in his case that functions as the left.
- C. *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: He puts it on his left hand, that is, the left hand of the commonality of people?*
- D. *Said Abbaye, “The latter Tannaite formulation concerns one who is ambidextrous.”*

**III.35.** A. A member of the household of Manasseh [said], ““On your hand’ refers to the biceps muscle; ‘between your eyes’ speaks of the skull.”

- B. *Where is that?*

- C. *Members of the household of R. Yannai say, "It is the place where the skull of a baby is yet tender."*

**III.36.** A. *Pelimo asked Rabbi, "One who has two heads — on which one does he put the box containing the prayer-parchments?"*

- B. *He said to him, "Either go into exile or accept ostracism!"*

- C. *In the interim someone came in and said to him, "An infant has been born to me that has two heads, so how much do I have to pay to the priest for the redemption of the firstborn son?"*

- D. *An old man came forward and stated as a Tannaite rule, "He is obligated to give him ten selas [instead of the usual five, which would cover one]."*

- E. *Is that so? And has not Rami bar Hama taught as a Tannaite statement, "Since it is said, 'The firstborn of man you shall surely redeem' (Num. 18:15), might I conclude that that would cover even a first born that was afflicted with a fatal organic disease [Cashdan] within thirty days of birth? Scripture states, [37B] 'Howbeit' (Num. 18:15), thus imposing a limitation on the matter."*

- F. *The case is exceptional, since the All-Merciful has declared the law to be by the criterion 'per head' [which does not pertain to the question raised by Pelimo].*

**III.37.** A. *The master has said, "'On your hand' refers to the biceps muscle; 'between your eyes' speaks of the skull."*

- B. *What is the scriptural source for this rule?*

- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- D. *"Upon your hand" — this refers to the biceps muscle.*

- E. *You say that this refers to the biceps muscle. But perhaps it means literally upon your hand?*

- F. *The Torah has said to put on the box containing prayer parchments on the hand, and the Torah has said to put on the box containing prayer parchments on the head. Just as in the latter case it is on the highest point that is on the head, so here it is on the highest point that is on the hand.*

- G. *R. Eliezer says, "Such a proof is hardly required. Lo, Scripture states, 'And it shall be for a sign for you on your hand,' meaning, for you, not for others [and hence should be concealed]."*

- H. *R. Isaac says, "That is hardly necessary. Lo, Scripture says, 'You shall lay upon these words of mine in your heart...and you shall bind them' (Deu. 11:18) — the location must be in a place corresponding to the heart."*

**III.38.** A. *R. Hiyya and R. Aha b. R. Ivia would locate it precisely at the point corresponding to the heart.*

- B. *R. Ashi was in session before Amemar. He had a sore on his arm, so the box containing the prayer parchments was exposed [his coat having been cut away (Cashdan)]. He said to him, "Does the master not accept the formulation, "'And it shall be for a sign for you on your hand,' meaning, for you, not for others [and hence should be concealed]?"*

- C. *He said to him, "That has been stated only so as to indicate the place: where it is a sign to you alone [on the upper part of the arm, but it does not have to be covered all the time (Cashdan)]."*

**III.39.** A. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that it must be high up on the head?*

- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *"Between your eyes" — this refers to the spot high up on the head.*
- D. *You say that this refers to the spot high up on the head, but perhaps it refers only to the spot "between your eyes" literally?*
- E. *Here it is said, "Between your eyes," and elsewhere, "Nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead" (Deu. 14: 1). Just as the latter refers to the highest point on the head, the place on which one would make such a cutting, so the present reference is to the highest point on the head, where a bald spot can be made.*
- F. *R. Judah says, "Such a proof is hardly necessary. The Torah has said to put on the box containing prayer parchments on the hand, and the Torah has said to put on the box containing prayer parchments on the head. Just as in the former case it is on a spot that can contract uncleanness on the basis of only a single symptom of the skin ailment [such a symptom anywhere covered by hair is unclean when a yellow hair appears], so in the former case it must be set in a spot that can contract uncleanness on the basis of only a single symptom of the skin ailment.*
- G. *"That would then exclude the place between the eyes where skin and hair are located [in which instance two, not a single, symptoms are required if the spot is to be deemed afflicted with the skin ailment, either ] a white hair or a yellow hair."*

**IV.1** A. **The four fringes impair the validity of one another, for the four of them constitute a single commandment. R. Ishmael says, "The four of them constitute four distinct commandments [so they do not impair the validity of one another]:"**

- B. *What is at stake between the two positions?*
- C. *R. Joseph said, "At issue is a linen garment that has woollen show-fringes."*
- D. *Rabbah bar Abina said, "At issue is a garment with five corners."*
- E. *Rabina said, "They differ in regard to what R. Huna said. For R. Huna said, 'He who goes forth on the Sabbath in a garment that is not distinguished as the law requires [by proper show-fringes] is liable to bring a sin offering' [by reason of inadvertently carrying from one domain to the other]."* [Cashdan: if the garment had only three fringes, according to the initial authority the religious requirement has not been carried out, so because of Huna's statement, the fringes are regarded as unnecessary; according to Ishmael, the precept has been performed, so Huna's ruling would not apply.]

**IV.2.** A. *Said R. Shisha b. R. Idi, "Someone who cut off a corner of his garment has done nothing, for he has made it into a five cornered garment [and it has to have show fringes anyhow]."*

**IV.3.** A. *Said R. Mesharshayya, "Someone who cut off a corner of his garment has done nothing. What is the reason? It is as though he has simply spread it out [and it still has to have show fringes]."*

- B. *“[So] we have learned in the Mishnah: All tied-up goatskins are clean, except for those of the Arabs [M. Kel. 26:4J].*
- IV.4.** A. *Said R. Dimi of Nehardea, “If someone sewed together the folded corners of his garment, he has done nothing. If it is the fact that he does not need them, he should just cut them off and discard them.”*
- V.1** A. **R. Ishmael says, “The four of them constitute four distinct commandments [so they do not impair the validity of one another]:”**
- B. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The decided law is in accord with R. Ishmael.”
- C. *But the decided law is not in accord with his opinion.*
- V.2.** A. *Rabina was going along behind Mar b. R. Ashi on one of the Sabbaths prior to the Festival, when the corner of the master’s garment with its show-fringes tore off. Rabina did not tell him about it. When he got home and Rabina said that it had torn away there in the street, he said to him, “If you had told me about it then, I would forthwith have taken it off.”*
- B. *But has not a master said, “Great is the dignity that is owing to a human being, since it overrides a negative commandment of the Torah” [and it would have been improper to remove the garment in the street, so he was permitted to continue to wear it, even on the Sabbath, though it was not a valid garment and he therefore violating the law against carrying what was not validly worn].*
- C. *Rab b. Sheba interpreted the statement before R. Kahana, [38A] “It refers to a prohibition, “You shall not turn aside” (Deu. 17:11) [Cashdan: the rabbinic prohibition may be set aside on account of the dignity owing to a person, but not a rule deriving from the Torah].*
- D. *And some say, Rabina told him there and then on the street, and Mar said to him, “Do you imagine that I am going to take it off right here? Has not a master said, ‘Great is the dignity that is owing to a human being, since it overrides a negative commandment of the Torah,’ [and it would have been improper to remove the garment in the street, so he was permitted to continue to wear it, even on the Sabbath, though it was not a valid garment and he therefore violating the law against carrying what was not validly worn]. For lo, Rab b. Sheba interpreted the statement before R. Kahana, ‘It refers to a prohibition, “You shall not turn aside” (Deu. 17:11).”*
- E. *“Here we deal only with the area that is neither public nor private domain, where it is merely by decree of rabbis that it is prohibited to carry something.”*