

# V

---

## BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER FIVE

FOLIOS 52B-63B

5:1

- A. All meal offerings are brought unleavened [Lev. 2: 4-5, 6:7-9],
- B. except for the leavened cakes of thank offerings [M. 7:1] and the two loaves of bread [of Pentecost], which are brought as leavened bread [Lev. 7:13, 23:17].
- C. R. Meir says, “The leaven is set aside for them from their own [contents], and it leavens them.”
- D. R. Judah says, “Also: that is not of the best way [Cashdan: for the yeast is too fresh and not sufficiently potent to leaven the rest of the meal offering properly].
- E. “But one brings the leaven and puts it into the measure and [then] fills the measure [with meal].”
- F. They said to him, “Also: it would be either too little or too much.”
- I.1 A. R. Perida asked R. Ammi, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that **all meal offerings are brought unleavened?**”
- B. “How on the basis of Scripture?! It is as it is expressly stated in writing in regard to those offerings to which the rule applies, and where it is not expressly stated in writing, there is the encompassing statement, [53A] ‘This is the law of the meal offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord in front of the altar...and that which is left therefore shall Aaron and his sons eat; it shall be eaten as unleavened bread’ (Lev. 6: 7, 9) [so what more can you want!].”
- C. [Perida] said to him, “As to the proper fulfillment of the religious duty I had no question at all. [Obviously, the meal offerings are not to be leavened.] What I wanted to know was whether or not the detail that the meal offerings are not to be leavened is indispensable to the proper fulfillment of the rite [so that if the offering was leavened, it is invalidated].”

- D. *He said to him, "The fact that the detail of leaven is absolutely indispensable to the proper fulfillment of the rite also is specified in writing: 'It shall not be baked leaven' (Lev. 6:10) — only unleavened."*
- E. *Objected R. Hisda, " But might I not say, 'It shall not be baked [wholly] leaven[ed]' — but only in the condition of dough in an early stage of fermentation?"*
- F. *"In an early stage of fermentation" as defined by whom? If it is as defined by R. Meir [the stage at which the surface of the dough has become pale] then from the perspective of R. Judah it is not leavened at all. If it is as defined by R. Judah [at the stage when the surface of the dough has become wrinkled] then it is absolutely leavened so far as R. Meir is concerned. Furthermore, if it is as defined by R. Meir and in line with R. Meir's position, it is absolutely leavened, for on account of eating it on Passover one would be flogged!*
- G. *The sense is, "in an early stage of fermentation" as defined by R. Judah and in accord with the ruling of R. Judah [and no penalty is incurred, so the meal offering may be in that condition and not necessarily absolutely unleavened, and that forms the basis of Perida's question (Cashdan)].*
- H. *Objected R. Nahman bar Isaac, " But might I not say, 'It shall not be baked [wholly] leaven[ed]' — but only soaked in hot water?" [The meal offering may be leavened if it is not baked but only boiled in water (Cashdan).]*
- I. *What would be the sense of soaked in hot water? Just scalded there in? But as a matter of fact, if a meal offering is to be offered soaked, that is specifically stated in Scripture [the high priest's meal offering is described by Scripture as soaked], and the meal offering that is the commonplace one is not described as having to be soaked!*
- J. *But might I not say that where Scripture is explicit that the meal offering is to be soaked, it is a religious duty to do so. But where there is no explicit requirement by Scripture to soak the meal offering, if one wants to soak the meal offering, he may do so, and if he wants to present it as unleavened bread, he may do so?*
- K. *Objected Rabina, " But might I not say, 'It shall not be baked [wholly] leaven[ed]' serves to prohibit an individual from doing so in general, but the meal offering itself is not invalidated?"*
- L. *So how do we know the rule? It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. *"Unleavened:"*
- N. *Might one suppose that that is merely a description of the ideal way in which to carry out the religious duty [but not an indispensable condition]?*
- O. *Scripture says, "...will be...", meaning, Scripture has imposed that condition as an obligatory requirement.*
- I.2.** A. *R. Perida asked R. Ammi, "How do we know that all meal offerings, having been kneaded in lukewarm water, are to be carefully watched so that they do not become leavened?"*
- B. *"Let us derive the rule from the analogy of Passover: 'And you shall carefully watch the unleavened bread' (Exo. 12:17)."*

- C. *He said to him, "In the same passage it is written, 'it shall be unleavened' (Exo. 12:17), meaning, 'carefully watch it.' But have you not identified this clause to prove that the detail is indispensable?"*
- D. *"If so, Scripture should have said, 'it is to be unleavened.' Why does it say, 'it shall be'? That yields two rules."*
- I.3.** A. *Said rabbis to R. Perida, "R. Ezra the great-grandson of R. Eutolus, himself a tenth generation descendant of R. Eleazar b. Azariah, who is a tenth generation descendant of Ezra, is standing at the door."*
- B. *He said, "What's all this nonsense? If he is well informed [a son of the Torah], well and good; if he is well informed and offspring of well informed ancestors, still better. But if he is descendent of well informed authorities but himself is not well informed, then let a fire eat him up!"*
- C. *They said to him, "Well, he is well informed."*
- D. *He said to them, "Let him in."*
- E. *He saw that he was muddle-headed. He commenced by citing the verse, "'I said to the Lord, you are my Lord, my gratefulness is not with you' (Psa. 16: 2). Said the community of Israel before the Holy One, blessed be he, 'Lord of the world, show me how grateful you are for having made you known in the world!'*
- F. *"He said to her, "'my gratefulness is not with you.'" I am grateful only to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who are the first ones to make me known to the world: "with the saints that are in the earth, they are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight" (Psa. 16: 3)"*
- G. *When [Ezra] heard "mighty," he commenced by saying, "Let the Almighty come and exact vengeance for the mighty from the mighty through the mighty!"*
- H. *"Let the Almighty come:' this is the Holy One, blessed be he, of whom it is written, 'The Lord on high is mighty' (Psa. 93: 4).*
- I. *"and exact vengeance for the mighty:' this refers to Israel, in line with what is said: 'they are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight.'*
- J. *"from the mighty:' this refers to the Egyptians: 'the might sank like lead in the water' (Exo. 15:10).*
- K. *"through the mighty:' this refers to water: 'above the voices of many waters, mighty waters, breakers of the sea' (Psa. 93: 4).*
- L. *"Let the beloved, son of the beloved, come and build the beloved, for the Beloved, in the portion of the beloved, so that the beloved may come and gain atonement therein.*
- M. *"Let the beloved:' this refers to King Solomon: 'And he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah [beloved of the Lord] for the sake of the Lord' (2Sa. 12:25).*
- N. **[53B]** *"son of the beloved, come:' this refers to the son of Abraham: 'what has my beloved to do in my house' (Jer. 11:15).*
- O. *"and build the beloved:' this refers to the sanctuary: "How beautiful are your tabernacles' (Psa. 84: 2).*
- P. *"for the Beloved:' this refers to the Holy One, blessed be he: 'Let me sing of my beloved' (Isa. 5: 1).*

- Q. “‘in the portion of the beloved:’ this refers to Benjamin: ‘Of Benjamin he said, The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety by him’ (Deu. 33:12).
- R. “‘so that the beloved may come and gain atonement therein:’ this refers to Israel: ‘I have given the dearly beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies’ (Jer. 12: 7).
- S. “Let the good come and receive the good from the Good for the good.
- T. “‘Let the good come:’ this refers to Moses: ‘And she saw that he was good’ (Exo. 2: 2).
- U. “‘and receive the good:’ this refers to the Torah: ‘For I give you good doctrine’ (Pro. 4: 2).
- V. “‘from the Good:’ this refers to the Holy One, blessed be he: ‘The Lord is good to all’ (Psa. 145: 9).
- W. “‘for the good:’ this refers to Israel: ‘Do good, O Lord, to the good’ (Psa. 125: 4).
- X. “Let this come and receive this from This for this people.
- Y. “‘Let this come:’ this refers to Moses: ‘For as for this Moses, the man’ (Exo. 32: 1).
- Z. “‘and receive this:’ this refers to the Torah: ‘And this is the Torah that Moses set’ (Deu. 4:44).
- AA. “‘from This:’ this refers to the Holy One, blessed be he: ‘This is my God and I will glorify him’ (Exo. 15: 2).
- BB. “‘for this people:’ this refers to Israel: ‘This people, which you have gotten’ (Exo. 15:16).”

**I.4.** A. Said R. Isaac, “When the house of the sanctuary was destroyed, the Holy One, blessed be he, found Abraham, our father standing in the house of the sanctuary.

- B. “He said to him, “‘What has my beloved to do in my house?’” (Jer. 11:15).
- C. “He said to him, ‘I have come with a complaint concerning my children.’
- D. “He said to him, ‘They sinned against me and I sent them into exile: [“who executes so many vile designs” (Jer. 11:15)].’
- E. “He said to him, ‘But perhaps they sinned in error?’
- F. “He said to him, “‘She has wrought lewdness” (Jer. 11:15).
- G. “He said to him, ‘Maybe only a few sinned?’
- H. “He said to him, ‘The majority were wicked: “so *many* of whom execute vile designs.”’
- I. “He said to him, ‘You owed it to remember the covenant of circumcision!’
- J. “He said to him, ‘Even that they nullified:’ “The sacral flesh will pass away from you” (Jer. 11:15).’
- K. “He said to him, ‘Maybe if you waited for them, they would have repented?’
- L. “He said to him, “‘for you exult while performing your evil deeds.”’
- M. “He put his hands on his head and wept, saying, ‘Then perhaps, God forbid! there is no hope for them?’

N. “An echo came forth: ‘The Lord has called your name a leafy olive tree, fair with goodly fruit’ (Jer. 11:16) — just as the olive tree produces its best only at the very end, so Israel will flourish only at the end of time.”

**I.5.** A. “Because of the noise of the great tumult he has kindled fire upon it and its branches are broken” (Jer. 11:16):

B. Said R. Hinnena bar Pappa, “At the noise of the words of the spies, the Israelites’ branches were broken.”

C. For said R. Hinnena bar Pappa, “A formidable statement the spies made when they said, ‘For they are stronger than we’ (Num. 13:31). Rad the letters that yield ‘than we’ not in that way but rather as though they said, ‘than he,’ so as to say, ‘even the Householder cannot remove his furniture from there!’”

D. *Objected R. Hiyya bar Hinnena, “Why does the verse read, ‘because of the noise of the great tumult’? Rather, it should read, ‘because of the noise of the formidable word.’ Rather, read it along these lines:*

E. “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, to Abraham, ‘Your voice have I heard, and I have had compassion for them. I originally planned that they be subjugated by four kingdoms, with each one of them lasting for the span of time that the four kingdoms did last. *Now each shall last only for the span of time allotted to it.*’

F. *There are those who say, “I said they would be subjected to four kingdoms in succession, but not it will be a concurrent sentence.”*

**I.6.** A. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Why is Israel compared to an olive tree? It is to tell you, just as the leaves of an olive do not fall off either in the dry season or in the rainy season, so Israel will not be null either in this world or in the world to come.”

B. And said R. Yohanan, “Why is Israel compared to an olive tree? It is to tell you, just as the olives yield their oil only after crushing, so Israel returns to the good only through suffering.”

**II.1** A. **R. Meir says, “The leaven is set aside for them from their own [contents], and it leavens them.” R. Judah says, “Also: that is not of the best way. But one brings the leaven and puts it into the measure and [then] fills the measure [with meal].” They said to him, “Also: it would be either too little or too much:”**

B. *What is the meaning of the phrase, it would be either too little or too much?*

C. Said R. Hisda, “[If the yeast used was thick [hard and compressed], there would be more than the usual quantity of flour in this meal offering, and if the yeast was thin, [taking up much space in the utensil,] there would be less than the usual quantity of flour [so in either case the meal offering would be invalid.]”

D. *Still, in the end, only a tenth of flour is measured!* [Cashdan: when the measure is filled up with flour, there is already yeast in the utensil, so it is immaterial how much is taken up by the yeast, so long as the measure is full].

E. *Both Rabbah and R. Joseph said, “We take the measure in accord with the volume that was originally there [when it was flour].”* [Cashdan: in measure we have regard to the amount of flour used in the yeast; from this standpoint there

would be either too much or too little flour according to the consistency of the leaven.]

- F. *But why not take a little flour from it and leaven it outside and then put it back and knead it with the rest of the flour?*
- G. *It is a precautionary decree against the possibility that one may produce the leaven from some other source [not from the meal offering itself].*

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

- B. The meal offering [that is leavened, the two loaves of Pentecost, the ten of thank offerings] may not be leavened **[54A]** with apples.
- C. In the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel they said, “They do leaven it with apples.”
- D. *R. Kahana repeated this statement in the name of R. Hanina b. Teradion.*
- E. *In accord with what authority is the following statement, which we have learned in the Mishnah: [As regards] an apple [in the status of heave offering] which one chopped up and placed in dough, and [as a result the dough] was leavened — lo, this [the dough] is forbidden [for consumption by a non-priest] [M. Ter. 10:3A-C]?*
- F. *In accord with whom? One may well say that it is in accord with the position of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel and not in accord with the contrary view of rabbis [who maintain that apples do not serve as a leavening agent].*
- G. *You may maintain that it is in accord even with rabbis in the present context. For granting that apples do not wholly leaven properly, but it does serve as an inferior leaven.*

- II.3.** A. Said R. Ila, “You have nothing from which it is more difficult to take out the handful than the meal offering presented by a poor sinner.” [Cashdan: since it was without oil, one takes a handful of dry flour and then smooths away the flour bursting between the fingers, and it takes skill to prevent the flour from slipping out of the hand.]
- B. R. Isaac bar Abdimi said, “As to the meal offering of the poor sinner, one mixes it with water and it remains entirely valid.”
  - C. *May we say that this is what is at issue between the two: one authority takes the view that we take the measure in accord with the volume that is presently there. The other maintains that we do take the measure in accord with the volume that was originally there [when it was flour].*
  - D. *Not at all! All parties concur that we take the measure in accord with the volume that is presently there. But this is what is at issue between them:*
  - E. *One authority maintains, “What is the meaning of ‘dry’ [the condition of the sinner’s meal offering]? It is dry in the sense that there is no oil.”*
  - F. *The other authority holds, “What is the meaning of ‘dry’ [the condition of the sinner’s meal offering]? It is dry in the sense that there is nothing else at all [inclusive of water].”*

**II.4.** A. *There, in the Mishnah, we have learned: Calf meat which is swollen, and old meat which is shrunken, are measured as they are [M. Uqs. 2:8G-I].*

- B. *Rab, R. Hiyya, and R. Yohanan say, “They are measured as they are.”*



- C. *Samuel, R. Simeon b. Rabbi and R. Simeon b. Laqish say, "They are measured according to their initial condition."*
- D. *An objection was raised: A piece of calve's meat that was not at the prescribed measure [to be subject to uncleanness, which is, the bulk of an egg], and that swelled so that it is now of the prescribed volume — up to now it was not susceptible to uncleanness, but from this point forward, it is susceptible to uncleanness. [This contradicts Samuel, R. Simeon b. Rabbi and R. Simeon b. Laqish.]*
- E. *That is only on the authority of rabbis.*
- F. *If so, then note what follows: And so with regard to the meat of an offering that was refuse or left-over. [A piece of meat that was refuse or left over but was less than an olive's bulk swelled to requisite size, one ate it, and if we take as our criterion the present size, then one is subject to the sanction of extirpation (Cashdan).] Now if you maintain that that rule is on the authority of the Torah, then we can understand the considerations of refuse and uncleanness. But if you maintain that the rule is only on the authority of rabbis, then on the authority of rabbis do we invoke the considerations of refuse and remnant?*
- G. *Say: And so with regard to the meat of an offering that was refuse or left-over in connection with the consideration of uncleanness. For it might have entered your mind that since the consideration of uncleanness so far as it affects what is refuse or left-over is only by reason of the authority of rabbis, rabbis would not have applied this rule to what is in any event only a consideration by authority of rabbis. So we are informed that that is not the fact.*
- H. *Come and take note: the meat of an old animal that had been of requisite size but that had shrivelled so that it is now less than the requisite size, up to now would have been subject to uncleanness, but from now on is insusceptible to uncleanness. [This contradicts Samuel, R. Simeon b. Rabbi and R. Simeon b. Laqish.]*
- I. *Said Rabbah, "In any case in which something was of the requisite volume but now is not of the requisite volume, it is not of the requisite volume [and not unclean]. But if at first it was not of the requisite volume and now it is of the requisite volume, that is the case only by reason of the authority of rabbis. [54B] Where there is a dispute it concerns a case in which the thing was at first of the requisite volume, but then shrivelled up, and then swelled up. One party maintains that there can be a final nullification of a prohibition, and the other party maintains that there cannot be a final nullification of a prohibition." [Cashdan: Rab, R. Hiyya, and R. Yohanan hold that the prohibition is suspended only for the interim but is not finally nullified.]*
- J. *And is there any authority at all who takes the view that in matters of prohibition, a prohibition can be permanently nullified? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **An egg's bulk of foodstuffs which one left in the sun and which shrank, and so (1) an olive's bulk of corpse matter, (2) an olive's bulk of carrion and (3) a lentil's bulk of a creeping thing,***

4) an olive's bulk of refuse, (5) an olive's bulk of remnant, and (6) an olive's bulk of prohibited fat — lo, they are clean. And they are not liable on their account because of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness. [If] one left them in the rain and they expanded, they are unclean, and they are liable on their account [for transgression of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness [M. **Toh. 3:4**]? Does this not decisively refute the view of him who maintains that in matters of prohibition, a prohibition can be permanently nullified?

K. *Sure does!*

L. *Come and take note: One may separate by number tithe from fresh figs in behalf of pressed figs [T. **Ter. 4:1H**]. Now if you take the view, "They are measured as they are," that poses no problems. [Cashdan: the pressed figs are considered in the condition in which they were before, namely, fresh, and ten fresh figs can serve for tithe, whether we reckon the tithe by number of volume.] But if you maintain, "They are measured according to their initial condition," then you have a case in which too much is given as tithe [Cashdan: for reckoning by volume ten fresh figs would take up as much as a fifth of the volume of ninety pressed figs]. And yet it has been taught on Tannaite authority: he who gave too much tithe — while the produce is properly tithed, the tithe is ruined [since part of what is included within the tithe is in fact not tithe at all] [T. **Dem. 8:13A-B**].*

M. *So what is to be said? That they are measured according to their initial condition? Then go on to the next clause of the same passage: And one may give pressed figs by measure as tithe in behalf of fresh figs [so a qab of pressed figs may serve as tithe for nine qabs of fresh figs]. Now if you take the view, "They are measured as they are," that poses no problems. But if you maintain, "They are measured according to their initial condition," then you have a case in which too much is given as tithe.*

N. *Here what we are dealing with is the great heave-offering [the initial designation of a portion of the produce, that is handed over to the priest]. And the initial version of the rule deals with someone who gives in a generous spirit, and the second clause likewise deals with someone who gives in a generous spirit [so the issue of giving too much is null].*

O. *If so, then I shall cite the concluding portion of the same passage: Said R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé, "Father would take ten pressed figs from the cake and designate them as serving for ninety fresh figs in the basket." Now if we really are dealing with the great heave offering, then what is the number ten doing here? [It is irrelevant, since 'ten' pertains only to the tithe, not to heave offering.] But what we are dealing with here is the heave offering of the tithe, and it represents the position of Abba Eleazar b. Gomel. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

P. *Abba Eleazar b. Gomel says, "And this heave-offering of yours shall be reckoned to you as though it were the grain of the threshing floor" (Num. 18:27) — Scripture speaks of two classifications of heave-offering, the one is the great heave-offering, the other, the heave offering that is*



separated from the tithe. Just as the great heave offering may be designated by the priest by mere estimation, without measuring the exact quantity, and by merely making a mental decision, so heave offering of the tithe is designated by a mere estimation without an exact measurement, **[55A]** and by a mental action. And just as great heave offering is to be given liberally, so heave offering of the tithe is to be given liberally. [We moreover find that tithe is called by Scripture heave-offering, since it is written, ‘But the tithes of the children of Israel which they offer as a heave offering to the Lord I have given to the Levites to inherit’ (Num. 18:24). And, furthermore, the tithing of animals is treated as comparable to the tithing of grain. So just as the tithe of grain is designated through a mere act of estimation, without an exact measurement of the quantity, and by a mere mental action, so the herd is tithed by a mere estimation and by a mere mental action.]”

- Q. *But there is a problem right there: Said R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé, “Father would take ten pressed figs from the cake and designate them as serving for ninety fresh figs in the basket.” Now if you take the view, “They are measured according to their initial condition,” that poses no problems. But if you maintain, “They are measured as they are,” then you have a case in which too little is given as tithe [Cashdan: for when reckoning by weight the quantity set aside would be much less than a tenth of the weight of the whole]!*
- R. *When R. Dimi came, he said R. Eleazar [said], “The case of dried figs is exceptional, for they can be boiled and made to revert to their initial condition.”*

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

- B. One may designate as heave offering fresh figs for pressed figs in a locale in which it is customary to press figs, but one may not designate as heave offering pressed figs for fresh figs even in a place in which it is customary to press figs.”

**II.6.** A. A master has said: “One may designate as heave offering fresh figs for pressed figs in a locale in which it is customary to press figs:”

- B. If it is a place in which it is customary, then it may be done, but if it is not a place in which it is customary, then it may not be done.
- C. *Now how can we imagine such a situation? If it is a situation in which there is priest, then why is this not allowed even if it is not customary to do so? Have we not learned in the Mishnah: **Wherever there is a priest [to receive the heave offering at once], [the householder] separates heave offering from the choicest [produce]. [Wherever there is not a priest to receive the heave offering immediately, he separates heave offering from that which keeps. R. Judah says, “He always should***

separate heave offering from the choicest produce]" [M. **Ter. 2:4**]. *Is it not then self-evident that there is no priest available?*

- D. *Then what about the concluding clause: but one may not designate as heave offering pressed figs for fresh figs even in a place in which it is customary to press figs? But if there is no priest present, then why may this not be done? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **Wherever there is not a priest to receive the heave offering immediately, he separates heave offering from that which keeps. R. Judah says, "He always should separate heave offering from the choicest produce"** [M. **Ter. 2:4**]? So it is obvious that we deal with a case in which a priest is present.*
- E. *Shall we then say that the first clause deals with a case in which there is no priest while the second with one in which there is a priest?*
- F. *Sure, why not! The first clause deals with a case in which there is no priest while the second with one in which there is a priest.*
- G. *Said R. Pappa, "What is to be inferred from this discussion is that we make the effort to interpret a Tannaite paragraph by appeal to two distinct sets of facts, rather than to interpret any internal disharmony by appeal to the claim that we have two distinct authorities before us."*

## 5:2

- A. All those meal offerings [that must be unleavened] are kneaded in lukewarm water.
  - B. And one watches them, that they not leaven.
  - C. And if the residue became leavened, one transgresses a negative commandment.
  - D. As it is said [in proof of B], "No meal offering which you shall offer to the Lord shall be made with leaven" (Lev. 2:11).
  - E. And they are liable [on account of leavening] in connection with
  - F. (1) kneading it,
  - G. (2) rolling it,
  - H. and (3) baking it.
- I.1** A. [And if the residue became leavened, one transgresses a negative commandment:] *what is the scriptural basis for this rule [that the residue must not be leavened]?*
- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "Said Scripture, 'It shall not be baked leavened: their portion' (Lev. 6:10), meaning, "even the portion [of the priests, the residue] must not be baked leavened.'"

- C. *But does that clause serve the proposed purpose? Is it not required for the purpose of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. Why does Scripture say, "It shall not [55B] be baked leavened: their portion" (Lev. 6:10)? Is it not said in any event, "It shall not be made leavened" (Lev. 2:11)?
- E. Since it is said, "It shall not be made leavened" (Lev. 2:11), one might suppose that one might be liable on only a single count for all of the acts that are entailed in violating the law. But Scripture states, "It shall not be baked leavened: their portion" (Lev. 6:10). Since the act of baking was covered by the encompassing statement on the matter, why has it been singled out? It is to form an analogy to it: just as baking is distinguished as a distinct action and on that account people bear liability for that action on its own, so I introduce also the acts of kneading and rolling out the dough and every other individual action involved with it.
- F. That serves to encompass also the work of smoothing the dough, which is a distinct action and on that account people bear liability for that action on its own.
- G. *The portion of the verse from which we derive our rule is, "their portion."*
- H. *Might I then say that the whole of the verse is meant to serve only that one purpose [to indicate that the residue may not be leavened. How do we know that the meal offering as a whole, before taking out the handful, may not be leavened (Cashdan)?]*
- I. *If so, Scripture ought to have written, "their person shall not be baked leavened." Why does Scripture say, "It shall not be baked leavened: their portion" (Lev. 6:10)? That bears inferences concerning two rules.*
- J. *But might I say that for the baking, which the All-Merciful has specified in particular, one is liable on a single count. But as to the other matters, one is liable on a single count for the rest of them put together?*
- K. The reason is that we deal here with a matter that was covered by an encompassing generalization and has been singled out from among the items covered by that generalization. That serves to teach a lesson. It is not concerning itself that it serves to teach a lesson, but rather, to teach a lesson concerning the encompassing generalization in its entirety.
- L. But might I say, "it shall not be made leavened" is an encompassing generalization, and "it shall not be baked leavened" forms a particularization of the foregoing. So we have an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing. Covered by the encompassing generalization is only that which is contained within the particularization. *So for baking one is liable, but not for anything else.*
- M. Said R. Aptoriki, "The reason that that is not the case is that we have an encompassing generalization followed only at a distance by a particularization thereof. And in any case in which there is encompassing generalization followed only at a distance by a particularization thereof, we do not draw the consequences that would ordinarily derive from an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing."
- N. *Objected R. Ada bar Ahbah, and some say, Kadi, "Do you maintain that in any case in which there is encompassing generalization followed only at a distance by a*

particularization thereof, we do not draw the consequences that would ordinarily derive from an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing? *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- O. ““And he shall slaughter it in the place where they slaughter the burnt offering before the Lord; it is a sin offering” (Lev. 4:24):
- P. “Where is the burnt offering slaughtered? It is on the north side of the altar. So this too is slaughtered on the north side of the altar.
- Q. Now is it from this verse that the rule is to be derived? Is it not in point of fact stated, “In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed” (Lev. 6:18) [referring to all sin offerings]? So why is this [sin offering presented by a ruler] singled out? It is to establish the place in which it is to be killed, so to prove that if one did not slaughter it in the north, it is invalid [and that repetition teaches the rule just now stated, yielding the fact that the keeping these rules is indispensable to the valid performance of the rite].
- R. You maintain that that is the reason that the matter has been singled out. But perhaps it is not the case, but rather to indicate that this offering alone [the ruler’s sin offering] is the only one that requires the north, but no other sin offering has to be killed at the north side of the altar? Therefore Scripture states, “And he shall kill the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering,” so stating an encompassing rule in regard to all sin offerings: all have to be slaughtered in the north.
- S. *The operative consideration, then, is that the All-Merciful has also written, “And he shall slaughter the sin offering.” So if that were not the case, I might have maintained that this offering alone [the ruler’s sin offering] is the only one that requires the north, but no other sin offering has to be killed at the north side of the altar. And what would the reason be? Is it not because what we have is an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization thereof, and even though these stand at a distance from one another, we nonetheless do draw the consequences that would ordinarily derive from an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing?*
- T. *Objected R. Ashi, “But is this really a case of an encompassing generalization followed by a particularization of the foregoing? What it is is the opposite: a particularization followed by an encompassing generalization! In that case, the encompassing principle adds to what is contained within the particularization, encompassing in this instance every other sin offering! But the Tannaite framer’s of the passage raises a question from the use of the word ‘it’ (Lev. 4:29). [Cashdan: Lev. 4:29 was necessary to extend the rule generally so as to include all sin offerings.] This is the sense of his statement:*
- U. ““Or perhaps that is not the case, but perhaps the sense is that while this sin offering in particular must be slaughtered on the north side of the altar, no other sin offering has to be slaughtered there, since the All-Merciful has said, “it.”””

**I.2.** A. And how to begin with do we know that the laying on of hands is required?

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

C. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- D. “‘And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat’ (Lev. 4:24) [the goat brought by the ruler] — this encompasses the goat brought by Nahshon under the rule of the laying on of hands,” the words of R. Judah.
- E. R. Simeon says, **[56A]** “It serves to encompass under the rule of laying on of hands the goats brought on account of inadvertent idolatry.”
- F. *To this proposition Rabina objected, “That conclusion serves full well for R. Judah, but from R. Simeon’s perspective, what is there to be said?”* [Freedman, Zebahim: he does not include it in respect of laying hands, so a text is not required to show that the north does not apply to it].
- G. *Said Mar Zutra b. R. Mari to Rabina, “And does that conclusion serve so well for R. Judah anyhow? Where it is included under the law, it is included under the law, where not, not [so no verse of Scripture is required]. And should you say that if Scripture had not included the matter, we should have reached the same conclusion by argument for analogy, then if that is the case, we can infer by analogy also the rule on laying on of hands. So you must answer that a temporary sacrifice [done once, as with Nahshon’s] cannot derive its law by inference from a permanent one, and so here too, a sacrifice brought only on a special occasion cannot find its rule by analogy to the rule governing a sacrifice that is permanent. [There is no reason to suppose that the sin offering of Nahshon, which was for an occasion, had to be done at the north, and therefore why is a text needed to exclude it? So we do not know the answer to our question, As to the verse, “And he shall kill it for a sin offering in the place where they kill the burnt offering” (Lev. 4:33), what is the purpose of the word “it”?]”*
- H. “Rather: ‘it’ is slaughtered in the north, but the one who does the slaughtering does not have to stand in the north.”
- I. *But the law on the slaughterer derives from what R. Ahia said. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. R. Ahia says, “‘And he shall kill it on the side of the altar at the north:’ why is this stated? It is because we find that the priest who receives the blood must stand in the north and also must receive the blood in the north. If he stood in the south and received the blood in the north, the offering is invalid. So you might have thought that the same rule governs slaughtering the animal. Scripture says, ‘And he shall kill it,’ meaning, ‘it’ must be in the north, while the one who does the act of slaughter need not be in the north.”
- K. “...it” must be killed in the north, but a bird does not have to be killed in the north [when the neck of the bird is wrung to kill it as a sacrifice]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. Might one suppose that killing a bird offering must be done in the north?
- M. *That conclusion, after all, stands to reason, for if killing a lamb, which does not have to be done by a priest, must be done in the north, killing a bird, which does have to be done by a priest, surely should be done in the north!*
- N. Accordingly, it is necessary to specify “it,” to bear the meaning, “it” must be killed in the north, but a bird does not have to be killed in the north.
- O. No, what is particular to the lamb is that Scripture has required the use of a utensil in killing it [while no knife is required for a bird]!

- P. Rather, “it” must be killed in the north, but a Passover offering does not have to be slaughtered in the north. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “Might one suppose that slaughtering the Passover offering must take place in the north? For it stands to reason. If Scripture required that the burnt offering be slaughtered at the north, though it did not specify a fixed time for slaughtering the burnt offering, surely the Passover offering, for which Scripture did prescribe a fixed time for slaughter, surely should have to be slaughtered in the north.
- R. “Accordingly, it is necessary to specify ‘it,’ to bear the meaning, ‘it’ must be killed in the north, but a Passover offering does not have to be killed in the north.”
- S. Not at all. The distinctive trait of the burnt offering is that it is wholly burned up.
- T. Then derive the matter from the sin offering [which is not wholly burnt up but yields meat to the priest].
- U. What is distinctive about the sin offering is that it achieves atonement for those who are liable to the penalty of extirpation.
- V. Then derive the matter from the guilt offering.
- W. What is distinctive about the guilt offering is that it falls into the classification of Most Holy Things, and, as a matter of fact, you cannot derive the rule from the cases of the burnt offering, guilt offering or sin offerings, for all of them are in the classification of Most Holy Things.
- X. *So, in the end, it must be as we originally said:*
- Y. “it” is slaughtered in the north, but the one who does the slaughtering does not have to stand in the north.”
- Z. *And as to the question that you raised based on what R. Ahia said* [R. Ahia says, “‘And he shall kill it on the side of the altar at the north:’ why is this stated? It is because we find that the priest who receives the blood must stand in the north and also must receive the blood in the north. If he stood in the south and received the blood in the north, the offering is invalid. So you might have thought that the same rule governs slaughtering the animal. Scripture says, ‘And he shall kill it,’ meaning, ‘it’ must be in the north, while the one who does the act of slaughter need not be in the north.”] — *the answer is, the sense is not to exclude the slaughterer from the requirement that the rite be done in the north, but rather, “While the one who does the slaughtering need not be in the north, the one who receives the blood must be in the north.”*
- AA. *The receiver? But surely that is deduced from the language, “and he shall take,” meaning, “let him take himself to the north”!*
- BB. The authority at hand does not accept the sense, “and he shall take,” meaning, “let him take himself to the north.”

## **II.1 A. And they are liable [on account of leavening] in connection with (1) kneading it, (2) rolling it, and (3) baking it:**

- B. Said R. Pappa, “If one baked the meal offering leavened, he is liable to a flogging on two counts, once for shaping it while it is leavened, once for baking it while it was leavened.”
- C. *But have you not said earlier,* “Just as baking is distinguished as a distinct action and on that account people bear liability for that action on its own, so I introduce



also the acts of kneading and rolling out the dough and every other individual action involved with it”?

- D. *That is no problem. In the one case he shaped it and baked it, in the other case someone else shaped it and he baked it [the other person being liable for shaping, he for baking, two counts].*

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

- B. **A firstling which suffered from congestion of blood [M. Bekh. 5:2D] —**
- C. **“They do not draw blood from it in a place on which one makes a blemish.**
- D. **“But they draw blood from it in a place on which one does not make a blemish,” the words of R. Meir.**
- E. **And sages say, “Also: They draw blood from it in a place on which one makes a blemish, on condition that it may not be slaughtered on account of that blemish, but on account of some other blemish.”**
- F. **R. Simeon says, [56B] “Also: It is slaughtered on account of that blemish.”**
- G. **R. Judah says, “Even if it is on the point of death, they do not draw blood from it.”**
- H. Said R. Hiyya b. Abba said R. Yohanan, “All concur that one who adds leavening after another has leavened dough is liable for having violated the prohibition concerning preparing unleavened meal offering, for it is written, ‘It shall not be baked with leaven.’ ‘No meal offering...shall be made with leaven’ (Lev. 6:10, 2:11).
- I. “All further concur in the case of one who mutilates a beast that has already been mutilated that he is liable, for Scripture states, ‘that which has its stones bruised or crushed or torn or cut off you shall not offer to the Lord’ (Lev. 22:24). If one is guilty for cutting off the testicles, how much the more so for merely tearing them! So the point of the verse is to indicate that one who tears after another person has cut the testicles is liable.
- J. “The dispute concerns only one who blemishes an already-blemished animal.
- K. “*R. Meir takes the view*, “‘There shall be no blemish therein’” (Lev. 22:21) [even a blemished animal may not be further blemished], *and sages hold to the theory*, ‘It shall be perfect to be accepted’ (Lev. 22:21) [one should not blemish an unblemished animal, but an already blemished one is not at issue].”
- L. *And how does R. Meir interpret the language*, “‘It shall be perfect to be accepted’”?
- M. *He requires that language to exclude from the altar a beast that to begin with is blemished.*
- N. *A beast that to begin with is blemished obviously is excluded from the altar — it is no more than a palm-tree!*
- O. *Rather, it is to exclude Holy Things that have been rendered unfit for the altar after they were redeemed. You might have thought that, since it is forbidden to shear or work them, they also may not be blemished. Scripture so informs us that that is not the case.*
- P. *And how do rabbis deal with the verse*, “‘There shall be no blemish therein’”?
- Q. *That forbids even indirectly causing a blemish.*

- R. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- S. “There shall be no blemish therein” —
- T. Thus I am informed only that one must not cause a blemish by what one does oneself. How do I know that one may not bring a case of pressed figs or dough and put it on the ear of the beast, so that a dog will come and chew on it [and cause a blemish]?
- U. Scripture says, “There shall be no blemish....” Not only “no blemish” but “there shall be no blemish” at all.

- II.3.** A. Said R. Ammi, “If one put leavening on dough of meal offering and then went his way and took his seat, and, on its own, the meal offering leavened, he is liable on that account, just as he would be for performing an act of forbidden labor on the Sabbath [even though the result of the action took place on its own account].”
- B. *But under such circumstances would one be liable?* And has not Rabbah bar bar Hannah said [57A] R. Yohanan said, “If one put meat on coals on the Sabbath and turned the meat over, he is liable; if he did not turn the meat over, he is exempt?”
  - C. *Said Raba, “What is the meaning of ‘liable’? It is, ‘also liable, as in the act of roasting on the Sabbath.’”*

**II.4.** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan said, “If one put meat on coals on the Sabbath and turned the meat over, he is liable; if he did not turn the meat over, he is exempt.”
- C. *How are we to imagine such a case? If we maintain that if the man did not turn the meat over, it would then not cook, then it is obvious that he is exempt. So it must be that if he did not turn over the meat, it would nonetheless cook. In that case, why should he not be liable [even if he did not turn it over]?*
- D. *The rule is required to cover a case in which, if he did not turn over the meat, it would have cooked on only one side but not the other, like that which was eaten by Ben Derusai [who ate his food only lightly cooked], but if the man had turned it over, the meat would have been roasted on both sides, like that which was eaten by Ben Derusai. Then we are informed that whatever is done on one side alone like that which was eaten by Ben Derusai is regarded as null [since that is simply not regarded as cooked food by the normal standard].*

**II.5.** A. Said Raba, “But if the meat were amply roasted at a single spot to the extent of a dried fig, one would be liable [even if the meat were not turned over].”

- B. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “If in a single spot that is so, but if it were in two or three spots is it not so? But have we not learned in the Mishnah: **He who ...bores a hole — in any measure at all is liable** [M. Shab. 12:1C]? Now how are we to imagine the case? If we say that it is in a single spot, if the hole is any small size at all, then what good is it [that one should be liable for having performed constructive work]? So is it not in two or three places, in which case they may be of some value if joined together?”*
- C. *No, I means a hole in one place, for it can be useful as a keyhole.*
- D. *There are those who state the matter in the following version:*

- E. Said Raba, "But if the meat were amply roasted even in two or three places to the extent of a dried fig, [one would be liable even if the meat were not turned over]."
- F. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, "So we too have learned in the Mishnah: **He who ...bores a hole — in any measure at all is liable [M. Shab. 12:1C]? Now how are we to imagine the case? If we say that it is in a single spot, if the hole is any small size at all, then what good is it [that one should be liable for having performed constructive work]? So is it not in two or three places, in which case they may be of some value if joined together?"***

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

- B. If Scripture had said, "Which you shall bring to the Lord shall not be made leavened" (Lev. 2:11) alone, I might have supposed that only the handful is not to be made leavened. How do I know that the prohibition of leavening applies to the whole of the meal offering?
- C. Scripture adds, "meal offering."
- D. How do I know that the same law applies to all other meal offerings?
- E. Scripture says, "Every meal offering."
- F. "Which you shall bring to the Lord" means, what is valid, not what is not valid,
- G. on which basis they said, "He who leavens a valid meal offering is liable, but he who leavens an invalid one is not."

**II.7.** A. R. Pappa raised this question: "If someone leavened a meal offering and then it was taken out of the sanctuary and afterward he again leavened it, what is the law? *Shall I say that, since the meal offering was taken outside, it has been invalidated, so that when it is brought back and leavened, one is not liable on that account on the grounds of putting in leavening after leavening has already been put in? Or perhaps, since it was leavened, it has been invalidated, so taking it outside has no affect upon it, and when it is brought back and leavened once again, one is liable on that account on the grounds of leavening once again what has already been leavened?"*

- B. *The question stands.*

**II.8.** A. R. Mari raised this question: "If one leavened the handful on top of the altar, what is the law? '...which you shall bring' is what the All-Merciful has said, and lo, this has already been brought up to the altar? Or perhaps what is lacking burning is in the status of not having been brought up to the altar, so it is as though the act of bringing the offering has not been completed?"

- B. *The question stands.*

**II.9.** A. Now that [at 6.D-E] the encompassing prohibition has been derived from 'Every meal offering,' what purpose is served by the clause, "which you shall bring"?

- B. *It is required in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "'Which you shall bring to the Lord shall not be made leavened' (Lev. 2:11) encompasses under the law prohibiting leavening the meal offering that is brought with drink offerings," the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- D. R. Aqiba says, "It serves to encompass under the law prohibiting leavening the show bread."

- II.10.** A. But as to the meal offering that is brought with drink offerings, it is prepared with fruit juice, [57B] and in any event fruit juice does not cause leavening!
- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Yosé the Galilean maintained that the meal offering that accompanied drink offerings was mixed with water and would be valid on such a basis.” [Therefore it can be leavened, so the rule is required to say that it should not be.]
- II.11.** A. Now the flour for the show bread was put into a measuring utensil for dry materials, *and we have a tradition that* R. Aqiba said, “What is put into a measuring utensil for dry materials has not been sanctified” [Cashdan: so it cannot be subject to the prohibition of leavening, since it is not sanctified as a meal offering until it is set on the table, for even the kneading need not have been in a utensil of service].
- B. *Rabin sent word in the name of R. Yohanan, “That is the correct representation of the teaching of the Mishnah, but the names of the cited authorities are to be reversed:*
- C. ““Which you shall bring to the Lord shall not be made leavened” (Lev. 2:11) encompasses under the law prohibiting leavening the show bread,’ the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- D. “R. Aqiba says, ‘It serves to encompass under the law prohibiting leavening the meal offering that is brought with drink offerings.’”
- II.12.** A. *R. Yohanan is consistent with views expressed in other connections, for* said R. Yohanan, “R. Yosé the Galilean and one of the disciples, R. Ishmael, namely, R. Josiah, say precisely the same thing. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. ““And had anointed them and sanctified them: [namely, utensils of service used for liquids]’ (Num. 7: 1):
- C. “R. Josiah says, ‘A measuring cup used for liquids was anointed both inside and outside, but a measuring cup for dry stuffs was anointed on the inside, but not on the outside.’
- D. “R. Jonathan says, ‘A measuring cup used for liquids was anointed on the inside and not on the outside, but a measuring cup for dry stuffs was anointed not at all. You may know that that is the case, for lo, they also are not capable of imparting the status of sanctification to what is put into them, in line with this verse: “You shall bring out of your dwellings two loaves for waving, baked of two tenths of an ephah; they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven, for firstfruits to the Lord” (Lev. 23:17). When are they sanctified to the Lord? Only after having been baked [but not when the flour has been put into the utensil of service].”
- E. *What is at stake in this dispute?*
- F. *It is the meaning of the word “them.”*
- G. *R. Josiah takes the view that “them” excludes the outside of the dry measure, and R. Jonathan takes the view that the dry measure was not sanctified at all, so there was no need for a verse to exclude it from the stated rule; and “them” excludes only the outside of the liquid measure.*
- H. *And why did [Yohanan] not say [instead of “R. Yosé the Galilean and one of the disciples, R. Ishmael, namely, R. Josiah, say precisely the same*

thing], “R. Aqiba and one of the disciples, R. Ishmael, namely, R. Jonathan, say precisely the same thing”?

- I. *It is because they are not of one mind concerning liquid measures. [Aqiba wants liquid measures anointed inside and out, to sanctify whatever is put inside and what is put outside (Cashdan).]*

**II.13.** A. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, “And lo, there was a bowl used for kneading the show bread, and that was a measuring utensil for liquids!”*

- B. *He said to him, “We deal with a case in which the kneading was done on a slab.”*

- C. *“If that is the case, then, when R. Jonathan said to him, ‘You may know that that is the case, for lo, they also are not capable of imparting the status of sanctification to what is put into them,’ he ought to have replied that it might have been measured out in a tenth measure that had not been sanctified!”* [Cashdan: just as the kneading was not done in the usual utensil of service, one can just as well say that the flour was measured out in an unconsecrated measuring cup, and on that account the loaves were sanctified only when they were baked and not before.]

- D. *“How can you draw such a comparison! With regard to not using the bowl, since the All-Merciful never wrote that the act had to be done in a bowl for kneading, if it was done on a slab, that hardly makes any difference; but in the matter of the tenth measure, the all-Merciful said explicitly that a tenth measure has to be made, with which the flour was to be measured, so would someone not make use of the sanctified tenth measure and make use of an unsanctified one? [Surely not!]*”

**II.14.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **How on the basis of Scripture do we know that one who offers a piece of the meat of a sin offering, a piece of the meat of a guilt offering, a piece of the meat of Most Holy Things, a piece of the meat of Lesser Holy Things, a piece of the residue of the barley-wave-offering, a piece of the residue of the Two Loaves and the show bread and of meal offerings, or of leaven or of honey, transgresses a negative commandment? Scripture states, “For you shall burn no leaven nor any honey as an offering by fire to the Lord” (Lev. 2:11) [T. Mak. 5:3B-F]. The meaning is that any offering, if only a portion of it is offered on the fire, is subject to the prohibition, “For you shall burn....”**

- C. *But are the two loaves of bread and the show bread burned up on the altar? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “The two loaves and show bread are excluded, because no part of them is offered on the fire”?*

- D. *Said R. Sheshet, “The meaning is, no part of them is actually offered on the fire [Cashdan: nonetheless, since the offering consisted of loaves and lambs or show bread and frankincense, it is also true to say that part of the offering is put upon the fire].”*

**II.15.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Anyone who offers up any one of the afore-listed items on the ramp [cf. T. **Mak. 5:3A**: **all the same are the altar and the ramp for this purpose**] —
- C. R. Yohanan said, “He is liable.”
- D. R. Eleazar said, “He is exempt from liability.”
- E. R. Yohanan said, “He is liable.” *for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. “...the altar...” (Lev. 2:12) — I know that the rule pertains only to what is offered on the altar. How on the basis of Scripture do I know that what is offered on the ramp falls under the law?
- G. Scripture states, “But they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar” (Lev. 2:12).
- H. R. Eleazar said, “He is exempt from liability:” *What is the scriptural basis for his position?*
- I. Scripture said, “Leaven and honey...as an offering of first fruits you may bring them unto the Lord” (Lev. 2:12) — *only with respect to “them” does Scripture bear the inference that the ramp is regarded as equivalent to the altar, but that is not the case with other things at all.*
- J. **[58A]** *And as to R. Yohanan, how does he deal with this word “them”?*
- K. *He requires it in line with that which has been taught on the basis of Tannaite authority:*
- L. Might one suppose that an individual may voluntarily present a free will offering of incense along these same lines [as did the heads of the tribes when they dedicated the altar]? I cite this scripture: “That which has emerged from your lips shall you observe and do” (Deu. 23:24). Scripture therefore says, “You shall not offer exotic incense on it” (Exo. 30: 9). Only the community may make such a presentation, but not an individual.
- M. Might one suppose that an individual may not present it, since he may not present such a thing as an obligatory offering, but the community may present incense as a freewill offering, since the community does present incense as an obligatory offering?
- N. Scripture states, “them:” only these are to be offered, the two loaves, which are made with leaven, and the offering of first fruits, which includes honey.

**II.16.** A. And is it the fact that the two loaves may not be presented as a freewill offering? *Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Since “any leaven” is said why is it necessary to use the word “any” with reference to honey? And since “any honey” is mentioned, why was it necessary to use the word “any” with regard to leaven?
- C. It is because a rule pertains to leaven that does not pertain to honey, and a rule pertains to honey that does not pertain to leaven, specifically:
- D. The general prohibition of leaven is remitted when it comes to the sanctuary, but the general prohibition of honey is never remitted, even with regard to the sanctuary.
- E. The general prohibition of honey is remitted when it comes to the residue of the meal offerings, but the general prohibition of leaven is not remitted when it comes to the residue of meal offerings.



- F. Thus, because a rule pertains to leaven that does not pertain to honey, and a rule pertains to honey that does not pertain to leaven, it was necessary for Scripture to use the word “any” in regard to leaven, and it was necessary for Scripture to use the word “any” in regard to honey.
- G. *And what is the case in which the prevailing prohibition of leaven is suspended with regard to the sanctuary? Is it not the two loaves of bread, in that they may be offered as a free will offering?*
- H. Said R. Amram, “No, the reference is to what is offered with them” [Cashdan: the two lambs that were offered as an obligation with the two loaves may also be offered as a freewill offering upon the altar].
- I. *If that is so, then the same applies to firstfruits, for we have learned in the Mishnah: The pigeons that [were] on top of the baskets were [sacrificed as] burnt offerings, but [the pigeons] which are in their hands are given [as a gift] to the priests [M. Bik. 3:5A-B]!*
- J. *These served only as a decoration for the first fruits [but were not presented as obligatory along with the first fruits.]*

**II.17.** A. Rammi bar Hamma raised this question to R. Hisda: “He who offers up upon the altar a piece of the meat of a sin offering made of a bird — what is the law? Does the rule of Scripture speak only of an offering, a portion of which has been offered on the fire, *and no portion of this has been offered on the fire? Or does it speak of everything that is classified as an offering, and this is classified as an offering?*”

B. He said to him, “It speaks of everything that is classified as an offering, and *this is classified as an offering.*”

**II.18.** A. *There is a conflict of Tannaite formulations along these same lines:*

- B. R. Eliezer says, “The rule of Scripture speak only of an offering, a portion of which has been offered on the fire.”
- C. R. Aqiba says, “It speaks of everything that is classified as an offering.”
- D. *What is at stake between them?*
- E. Said R. Hisda, “At issue between them is a piece of the meat of a sin offering made of a bird.”
- F. Rab said, “At issue between them is the log of oil of a person afflicted with the skin ailment [Lev. 14:12, 1:14, not burned upon the altar but classified as an offering].”
- G. For Levi stated as a Tannaite rule, “every offering of theirs’ (Num. 18: 9) encompasses also the log of oil of the leper.”

**II.19.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Leaven you shall not burn” (Lev. 2:11) — I know only that the rule that the meal offering must not be leavened if it is burned upon the altar only for the whole of it.
- C. How do I know that the same rule applies to part of it? Scripture says, “any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).

- D. And how do I know that the same rule applies to the mixture of it? Scripture states, “for any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).
- E. *What is the sense of this statement?*
- F. *Said Abbaye, “This is the sense of the statement: “Leaven you shall not burn” (Lev. 2:11) — I know only that the rule that the meal offering must not be leavened if it is burned upon the altar only for an olive’s bulk of it.*
- G. “How do I know that the same rule applies to a half olive’s bulk of it? Scripture says, “any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).
- H. “And how do I know that the same rule applies to the mixture of it? [Cashdan: if the handful consisted of what was partly leavened and partly unleavened and the one was not to be distinguished from the other]? Scripture states, “for any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).”
- I. *Raba said, “This is the sense of the statement: “Leaven you shall not burn” (Lev. 2:11) — I know only that the rule that the meal offering must not be leavened if it is burned upon the altar only for a handful of it.*
- J. “How do I know that the same rule applies to a half a handful of it? Scripture says, “any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).
- K. “And how do I know that the same rule applies to the mixture of it? [Cashdan: if the handful consisted of what was partly leavened and partly unleavened and the one was not to be distinguished from the other]? Scripture states, “for any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).”
- L. *What is at issue between these two readings of the matter?*
- M. *Abbaye takes the view that a handful may be validly taken even if it is not in volume so much as two olive’s bulks, [58B] and the act of burning less than an olive’s bulk is effective.*
- N. *And Raba holds that a handful may not be validly taken if it is not in volume so much as two olive’s bulks, and the act of burning less than an olive’s bulk is null.*

## **II.20.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. He who offers up leaven or honey on the altar —
- C. said Raba, “He is flogged on the count of the leaven and also on the count of the honey and also on the count of the mixture of what contains leaven and what does not contain leaven and also on the count of a mixture of what contains honey and what does not contain honey.”
- D. Abbaye said, “He is not flogged for violating a negative commandment that encompasses a number of distinct prohibitions” [Cashdan: he is not flogged for offering the mixture].
- E. *There are those who state matters in this way: he nonetheless is flogged on one count.*
- F. *And there are those who say: he is not flogged on any count at all, for the negative commandment that he has violated is not concrete in the way in which the negative commandment not to muzzle an ox in its threshing is concrete [Deu. 25: 1ff.].*

- A. [59A] There are [meal offerings which] require oil and frankincense, oil but not frankincense, frankincense but not oil, neither oil nor frankincense.
- B. And these are they that require oil and frankincense:
- C. (1) the meal offering of fine flour [Lev. 2: 1, 6:8],
- D. and (2) the meal offering prepared in the baking pan [Lev. 2: 5],
- E. and (3) the meal offering prepared in the frying pan [Lev. 2: 7],
- F. and (4) the meal offering of the cakes,
- G. and (5) of the wafers [Lev. 2: 4],
- H. (6) the meal offering of the priests,
- I. and (7) the meal offering of the anointed priest [Lev. 6:20ff.],
- J. (8) the meal offering of gentiles,
- K. and (9) the meal offering of women,
- L. and (10) the meal offering of the omer (Lev. 2:14-15, 23:9-14).
- M. The meal offering which is brought with drink offerings requires oil but does not require frankincense [Num. 15: 4ff.].
- N. The showbread requires frankincense but does not require oil [Lev. 24: 7].
- O. The two loaves, the meal offering of a sinner, and the meal offering of the woman accused of adultery [require] neither oil nor frankincense [Lev. 5:11, Num. 5:15].

**I.1** A. *Said R. Pappa, "All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes."* [Cashdan: the first four meal offerings listed above must be baked into ten cakes, so that even the fourth kind of meal offering, the one baked in an oven, for which an alternative is allowed, must be either ten cakes or ten wafers, but not five and five.]

- B. *That judgment then excludes the position of R. Simeon, who has said, "Half may be in cakes, half in wafers."*
- C. *So he teaches us that that is not so.*

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

- B. "[You shall add oil to it] and lay frankincense on it; [it is a meal offering:]"
- C. oil goes on it, but not on the show bread.
- D. For one might have maintained the following: Is the opposite to that proposition not a matter of logic?
- E. The meal offering that is contributed along with drink offerings, which does not require frankincense, does require oil. Show bread, which requires frankincense, surely should require oil.
- F. Scripture says, "You shall add oil to it" but not onto the show bread.
- G. "You shall lay frankincense on it" (Lev. 2:15)
- H. on it you put frankincense, but not on the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings.
- I. And is the opposite to that proposition not a matter of logic?

- J. If show bread, which does not require oil, requires frank incense, the meal offerings that accompany drink offerings, which do require oil, surely should require frankincense!
  - K. Scripture says, “[You shall add oil to it] and lay frankincense on it; [it is a meal offering:]”
  - L. but not on the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings.
  - M. “it is a meal offering.”
  - N. this serves to encompass under the rule of adding frankincense the meal offering brought on the eighth day of the consecration of the priest [Lev. 9: 4].
  - O. “it.”
  - P. this serves to exclude the two loaves, which do not require either oil or frankincense. [And is that proposition not a matter of logic: if I exclude them from the requirement of adding oil, which applies to the meal offering brought with drink offerings [Num. 15: 4], should I not exclude them from the requirement of adding frankincense, which does not apply to the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings? Indeed, if I have excluded them from the requirement of frankincense, which applies to the show bread [Lev. 24: 7], should I not exclude them from the requirement of having oil applied, which does not pertain to the show bread? That indeed is the claim of logic: if I exclude them from the requirement of adding oil, which does not apply to the show bread, should I exclude them from the requirement of having frankincense added, which does apply to the show bread? Indeed, if I have excluded them from the requirement of frankincense, which does not apply to the meal offerings that accompany drink offerings, I should not exclude them from the requirement of adding oil, which does apply to the meal offerings that accompany drink offerings. [The utter confusion yields the necessity of appealing solely to Scripture:] “it.” this serves to exclude the two loaves, which do not require either oil or frankincense]
- I.3.** A. A master has said, “[You shall add oil to it] and lay frankincense on it; [it is a meal offering:] oil goes on it, but not on the show bread.”
- B. Might I not say, “oil goes on it, but not on the meal offering presented by the priests”?
  - C. *It is more sensible to extend the law to the meal offering of the priests, since* [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is subject to these rules:] it is a tenth of an ephah of fine flour it must be done in a utensil of service; it is prepared outside; it is unfit when it rots; it has to be brought near to the altar; and it has to be burned on the fire of the altar.
  - D. *To the contrary, the show bread ought to be encompassed under this requirement, because, after all,* [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is subject to these rules:] it is obligatory, it may be offered when unclean, it is eaten, it is subject to the law of refuse, and it is offered on the Sabbath.
  - E. *The former is the more reasonable, since there it is written, “Any one”* (Lev. 2: 1) [Cashdan: an individual; since in connection with the meal offering of fine flour, where oil and frankincense are expressly required, Scripture uses the term “any one,” it is inferred that every individual meal offering requires oil and frank incense; hence the priests’ meal offering is included.]

- I.4.** A. A master has said, “Scripture says, “[You shall add oil to it] and lay frankincense on it; [it is a meal offering:] but not on the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings.”
- B. *But might I not say, ““[You shall add oil to it] and lay frankincense on it; [it is a meal offering:] but not on the meal offering of the priests”?*
- C. *It is more sensible to extend the law to the meal offering of the priests, since [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is subject to these rules:] it is a tenth of an ephah of fine flour; it must be mixed with a log of oil; it has to be brought near to the altar; and it is offered entirely by itself.*
- D. *To the contrary, the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings ought to be encompassed under this requirement, because, after all, [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is subject to these rules:] it is obligatory for the community; it may be offered when unclean, and it is offered on the Sabbath.*
- E. *The former is the more reasonable, since there it is written, “Any one” (Lev. 2: 1) [Cashdan: an individual; since in connection with the meal offering of fine flour, where oil and frankincense are expressly required, Scripture uses the term “any one,” it is inferred that every individual meal offering requires oil and frankincense; hence the priests’ meal offering is included.]*

- I.5.** A. “it is a meal offering” — this serves to encompass under the rule of adding frankincense the meal offering brought on the eighth day of the consecration of the priest [Lev. 9: 4].
- B. *Might I say that the intent is to exclude it?*
- C. *How on the world can you think so? If you say that “it” serves to encompass, it is well, but if you say that the intent is to exclude, then the expression is redundant, for we do not infer a rule that is occasional from the rule that is perpetual.*

- I.6.** A. “it” — this serves to exclude the two loaves, which do not require either oil or frankincense:
- B. But might I say that it is meant to exclude from the law the meal offering of priests?
- C. *It is more sensible to extend the law to the meal offering of the priests, since [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is subject to these rules:] it is a tenth of an ephah of fine flour; it requires the use of a utensil of service; it must be unleavened; it is offered on its own; it has to be brought near to the altar; and it is offered entirely by itself.*
- D. *To the contrary, [59B] the two loaves of bread ought to be encompassed under this requirement, because, after all, [like the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, they are subject to these rules:] they are obligatory for the community; it may be offered when unclean, they are subject to the law of refuse, they may be eaten, and they are offered on the Sabbath.*
- E. *The former is the more reasonable, since there it is written, “Any one” (Lev. 2: 1).*

## 5:4

- A. And one is liable [for putting on a meal offering which does not require oil and frankincense] on account of the oil by itself and on account of the frankincense by itself.**

- B. [If] one put oil on it, he has invalidated it.
- C. [If he put] frankincense on it, he should gather it up [and remove it].
- D. [If] he put oil on its residue, he does not violate a negative commandment.
- E. [If] he put a utensil above a utensil [one containing oil or frankincense, the other containing the meal offering], he has not rendered it invalid.

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

- B. “he shall not add oil to it:”
- C. And if he did so, he has invalidated the offering.
- D. “or lay frankincense on it:”
- E. Might one suppose that if he did so, he has invalidated it?
- F. Scripture says, “...for it is a sin offering.” [Cashdan: It is a valid sin offering even though it has had frankincense put upon it.]
- G. Or since it says, “...for it is a sin offering,” might one suppose that if one did put oil on it, it remains a valid offering?
- H. Scripture says, “...it is....”
- I. Then how come you validate the offering despite putting on frankincense and invalidate in the case of adding oil?
- J. I invalidate it in the case of putting on oil, for it is not possible to pick it out again,
- K. and I invalidate the offering if one has put on frankincense, because one can go and pick it out again.

**I.2.** A. *Raba b. R. Huna addressed this question to R. Yohanan: “If one put upon it fine frankincense, what is the rule? Since the operative consideration is that it is possible to pick it out of the mixture, and here it is not possible to do so, it is invalid? Or perhaps it is because the mixture will not swallow up the frankincense and this one also will not be swallowed up, it remains valid?”*

- B. *Come and take note: [If he put] frankincense on it, he should gather it up [and remove it].*
- C. *But perhaps the sense of the matter is, “There is this, but yet another consideration,” namely, for one thing, the mixture will not swallow up the frankincense, and, furthermore, he should pick the frankincense out of the mixture. [Cashdan: one reason is valid without the other, so that even though it cannot be picked off again, it is still valid, since it is not absorbed in the flour.]*
- D. *Come and take note: “I declare it valid if frankincense was put on, since it can be picked off.”*
- E. *But perhaps here again, the sense of the matter is, “There is this, but yet another consideration.”*
- F. *So what’s the upshot?*
- G. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, *“It has been taught on Tannaite authority: the meal offering of a sinner and the meal offering brought on account of a husband’s jealousy, upon which one put frankincense — one picks off the frankincense and the offering is valid. But if prior to picking off the frankincense, one gave thought and expressed the intention to the offering, whether concerning eating the residue outside of the proper time or whether doing so outside of the proper place, while the offering is therefore invalidated, the penalty of extirpation does not apply*



[since the offering was not then valid anyhow]; and if this was after one had picked off the frankincense that one expressed the invalidating intention concerning it to eat it outside of the proper place, it is invalid, and extirpation does not apply; if it was concerning doing so outside of the proper time, then it is refuse, and liability to extirpation is incurred on account of it.” [So the operative consideration is picking out the frankincense, and to answer the question, if one cannot pick out the fine frankincense, then the offering is invalid.]

- H. [Following Cashdan’s text:] But it should be deemed rejected! [Cashdan: why is it taught in our Mishnah and in the passage just quoted that the frankincense may be picked off from the meal offering? Surely once the meal offering has had frankincense put upon it, it became invalid and so absolutely rejected as a meal offering. How then can it become valid after it has once been made invalid?]
- I. *Said Abbaye, “Scripture still classifies it as ‘a sin offering’ (Lev. 5:11).”* [Cashdan: it is still valid as a sin offering even after it has had frankincense upon it.]
- J. *Raba said, ‘Lo, who is the authority behind this rule? It is Hanan the Egyptian, who does not accept the rule that if blood is once rejected, it is permanently rejected. For so it has been taught on Tannaite authority.’”*
- K. Hanan the Egyptian says, “Even if the blood is in the cup, without casting lots he brings its fellow and mixes it with it.” [Freedman, *Zebahim*: two he goats were taken on the day of Atonement, one sacrificed as a sin offering, the other sent away into the wilderness, and the lot decided which was which. Blood of the former was received in a cup and sprinkled on the altar. If the scape goat died before the blood of the other was sprinkled, Hanan rules that we do not say the blood is rejected so two other goats must be brought; only one more is brought and paired up with the one already slaughtered.]
- L. *R.Ashi said, “In any case in which one has the power to correct the situation, we do not say that rejection has taken place [e.g., as in this case by transferring the blood].”*
- M. *R. Adda said, “Reason supports the view of R. Ashi. For whom do you know who has accepted the principle of rejection? It is R. Judah. For we have learned in the Mishnah: [The two goats of the Day of Atonement — the religious requirement concerning them is that the two of them be equivalent in appearance, height, and value, and that they be purchased simultaneously. But even though they are not equivalent [in these regards], they are valid. [If] one purchased one this day and the other the next, they are valid. If one of them died, if before the casting of the lots it died, let the priest purchase a mate for the survivor. But if after the casting of the lots it died, let one get another mate and cast lots for them as at the outset. And he says, “If the one belonging to the Lord died, then this one upon which the lot, ‘For the Lord’ has come up is to stand in its stead. And if the one which was for Azazel has died, this one upon which the lot, ‘For Azazel,’ has come up will stand in its stead.” And the second one is to be put out to pasture until it is blemished, and then it is sold, and the money received for it is to fall to a freewill offering. For a sin offering of the community is not left to die. R. Judah says, “It is left to die.”] And further did R. Judah say, “[If] its blood is*

**poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die. [If] the one which is to be sent forth died, let its [the other's] blood be poured out" [M. Yoma 6:1].** *Now we have in hand the knowledge concerning his view that in any case in which one has the power to correct the situation, we do not say that rejection has taken place. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, 'The priest would fill one cup with mingled blood and sprinkle it once against the base of the altar [for if the blood of one of them was mixed in, this will turn out to validate it' [T. Pes. 4:12D-E] [This proves that in any case in which one has the power to correct the situation, we do not say that rejection has taken place]."*

**I.3.** A. Said R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan, "If one put any small quantity of oil on an olive's bulk of meal offering, one has invalidated it.

B. *"What is the operative consideration? 'He shall not put' (Lev. 5:11) means, any quantity at all, however little; 'upon it' means, at least the minimum quantity, an olive's bulk."*

**I.4.** A. And further said R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan, "If one put an olive's bulk of frankincense on any small volume of meal offering, he has invalidated it.

B. *"What is the operative consideration? 'He shall not put' (Lev. 5:11) means, there must be a quantity that qualifies as an amount worth putting on it; so what you then have in 'upon it' [60A] is one augmentative clause following another augmentative clause, and the sole result of one augmentative clause following another augmentative clause is to impose a limitation."*

**I.5.** A. Said R. Isaac bar Joseph, "Asked R. Yohanan, 'If one put any small quantity of oil on an olive's bulk of meal offering, what is the law? Do we require that the putting on of oil be of the same volume as the placing of frankincense [an olive's bulk at a minimum] or is that not the case?'"

B. *The question stands.*

**II.1** A. **If he put oil on its residue, he does not violate a negative commandment. If he put a utensil above a utensil, one containing oil or frankincense, the other containing the meal offering, he has not rendered it invalid:**

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

C. *"He shall not put on it oil and he shall not give...."*

D. *might one suppose that Scripture speaks of two priests' doing so?*

E. *Scripture says, "upon it," meaning that the verse refers to the meal offering and not to the priest.*

F. **Might I suppose that one should not put a utensil above a utensil [one containing oil or frankincense, the other containing the meal offering], he has rendered it invalid?**

B. *Scripture states, "upon it," meaning, upon the actual meal offering.*

## 5:5

**A. There are those [offerings] which require bringing near but do not require waving, waving but not bringing near, waving and bringing near, neither waving nor bringing near.**

- B. These [are offerings] which require waving but do not require bringing near:
- C. (1) the meal offering of fine flour,
- D. and (2) the meal offering prepared in the baking pan,
- E. and (3) the meal offering prepared in the frying pan [Lev. 2: 8],
- F. and (4) the meal offering of cakes,
- G. and (5) the meal offering of wafers,
- H. and (6) the meal offering of priests,
- I. and (7) the meal offering of an anointed priest,
- J. and (8) the meal offering of gentiles,
- K. and (9) the meal offering of women,
- L. and (10) the meal offering of a sinner.
- M. R. Simeon says, "To the meal offering of priests, the meal offering of an anointed priest, bringing near does not apply, because the taking of a handful does not apply to them.
- N. "And whatever is not subject to the taking of a handful is not subject to the act of bringing near."

**I.1** A. *Said R. Pappa, "All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes." [Cashdan: the first four meal offerings listed above must be baked into ten cakes, so that even the fourth kind of meal offering, the one baked in an oven, for which an alternative is allowed, must be either ten cakes or ten wafers, but not five and five.]*

- B. *What does that platitudinous statement serve to tell us?*
- C. *That judgment then excludes the position of R. Simeon, who has said, "Half may be in cakes, half in wafers." So he teaches us that that is not so.*

**I.2.** A. *What is the source in Scripture of this statement [that meal offerings that are listed have to be brought near the altar]?*

- B. *It is as our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **If Scripture had said, "When you present to the Lord [omitting: a meal offering] that is made in any of these ways, it shall be brought to the priest who shall take it up to the altar,"**
- D. **I might have said, "What requires bringing near is only the handful alone. How do I know that I should encompass under the rule of bringing near the meal offering?**
- E. **Scripture says explicitly, "meal offering."**
- F. **How do I know that I should encompass all meal offerings?**
- G. **Scripture says, using the accusative particle, "the meal offering."**
- H. **How do I know that the law encompasses the meal offering of a poor sinner?**
- I. **Scripture says, using the accusative particle, "the meal offering."**
- J. **I might propose that what requires bringing near is solely the meal offering brought as a free will offering.**
- K. **But is this not a matter of logic?**
- L. **Bringing a meal offering as a free will offering and [60B] bringing a meal offering as a matter of obligation form a single classification. Just as a meal**

offering presented as a free will offering requires bringing near, so the same rule applies to a meal offering of a sinner [brought as a matter of obligation], which should likewise require bringing near.

- M. No, if you have stated that rule governing bringing near in the case of a free will offering, on which oil and frankincense have to be added. will you say the same of the meal offering of a sinner [Lev. 5:11], which does not require oil and frankincense?
- N. The meal offering brought by a wife accused of adultery will prove to the contrary, for it does not require oil and frankincense, but it does require bringing near [as is stated explicitly at Num. 5:15].
- O. No, if you have applied the requirement of bringing near to the meal offering brought by a wife accused of adultery, which also requires waving, will you say the same of the meal offering of a sinner, which does not have to be waved?
- P. Lo, you must therefore reason by appeal to a polythetic analogy [in which not all traits pertain to all components of the category, but some traits apply to them all in common]:
- Q. the meal offering brought as a free will offering, which requires oil and frankincense, does not in all respects conform to the traits of the meal offering of a wife accused of adultery, which does not require oil and frankincense, and the meal offering of the wife accused of adultery, which requires waving, does not in all respects conform to the traits of a meal offering brought as a free will offering, which does not require waving.
- R. But what they have in common is that they are alike in requiring the taking up of a handful and they are also alike in that they require bringing near.
- S. I shall then introduce into the same classification the meal offering of a sinner, which is equivalent to them as to the matter of the taking up of a handful, and also should be equivalent to them as to the requirement of being drawn near.
- T. But might one not argue that the trait that all have in common is that all of them may be brought equally by a rich and a poor person and require drawing near, which then excludes from the common classification the meal offering of a sinner, which does not conform to the rule that it may be brought equally by a rich and a poor person, [but may be brought only by a poor person,] and such an offering also should not require being brought near!
- U. [The fact that the polythetic classification yields indeterminate results means failure once more, and, accordingly,] Scripture states, “meal offering,”
- V. with this meaning: all the same are the meal offering brought as a free will offering and the meal offering of a sinner, both this and that require being brought near.
- W. R. Simeon says, “[When you present to the Lord a meal offering that is made in any of these ways,] *it shall be brought* [to the priest who shall take it up to the altar]’ — that statement serves to encompass under the rule of waving also the sheaf of first grain,

- X. “for it is said, ‘When you come into the land which I give you and reap its harvest, *you shall bring* the sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest to the priest, [and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, that you may find acceptance]’ (Lev. 23:10).
- Y. “‘...who shall take it up to the altar’ serves to encompass the meal offering of the wife accused of adultery, that that too requires being brought near: ‘who shall take it up to the altar’ [parallel to Num. 5:25].
- Z. R. Simeon says, “‘When you present to the Lord a meal offering that is made in any of these ways, *it shall be brought* [to the priest who shall take it up to the altar] — that statement serves to encompass under the rule of waving also the sheaf of first grain, for it is said, ‘When you come into the land which I give you and reap its harvest, *you shall bring* the sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest to the priest, [and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, that you may find acceptance]’ (Lev. 23:10) ‘...who shall take it up to the altar’ serves to encompass the meal offering of the wife accused of adultery, that that too requires being brought near: ‘who shall take it up to the altar’ (parallel to Num. 5:25)]:”
- AA. is that proposition not a matter of logic?
- BB. if the meal offering brought by a sinner, which does not require waving, does require drawing near, the meal offering of a wife accused of adultery, which does require waving, surely should require drawing near.
- CC. No, if you have invoked that rule in the case of the sinner’s meal offering, which derives from wheat, will you invoke the same rule in the case of the meal offering of an accused wife, which does not derive from wheat [but from barley, and therefore falls into a different genus]?
- DD. The meal offering of the sheaf of first grain will prove the contrary, for it too does not derive from wheat [but rather from barley] and yet it does require being brought near!
- EE. No, if you have invoked that rule in the case of the meal offering of the sheaf of first grain, which requires also oil and frank incense, will you place into that same category and subject to that same rule the meal offering of an accused wife, which does not require oil and frank incense?
- FF. Lo, you must therefore reason by appeal to a polythetic analogy [in which not all traits pertain to all components of the category, but some traits apply to them all in common]:
- GG. The sinner’s meal offering, which derives from wheat, is not in all respects equivalent to the meal offering of the sheaf of first grain, which after all does not derive from wheat, nor is the meal offering of the sheaf of first grain, which requires oil and frank incense, equivalent in all respects to the meal offering of the sinner, which does not require oil and frankincense. But the common trait that pertains to them both is that they both require the taking up of a handful, and, furthermore, they both require being brought near.
- HH. So I shall invoke the case of the meal offering of an accused wife, which is equivalent to them in that the taking up of a handful is required. It should also be equivalent to them in being brought near.

- II. Or perhaps what they have in common is that they are not valid if they derive from coarse meal and they require drawing near. Then that would exclude the meal offering of the accused wife, which indeed is valid when it derives from coarse meal, and which, therefore, should not require drawing near.
- JJ. [Accordingly, Scripture is required to settle the matter, which it does when it states, ] “..who shall take it up to the altar,”
- KK. which then serves to encompass the meal offering of the wife accused of adultery, and indicates that that too requires being brought near.
- LL. R. Judah says, “‘When you present [to the Lord a meal offering that is made in any of these ways, it shall be brought to the priest who shall take it up to the altar]:’
- MM. “That phrase serves to encompass also the meal offering of an accused wife, indicating that it too requires being brought near, as it is said, ‘And he will present her offering in her behalf’ (Num. 5:15).”
- NN. But does the rule governing the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley not require the support of a verse of Scripture?
- OO. How come?
- PP. It derives from logic:
- QQ. If the meal offering of a sinner, which does not have to be waved, has to be brought near, the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, which does have to be waved, surely should have to be brought near!
- RR. But the distinguishing trait of the meal offering of the sinner is that it is presented of wheat [while the other is of barley]!
- SS. The meal offering of the wife accused of adultery will prove to the contrary, since it too is made up of barley.
- TT. What is the distinguishing trait of the meal offering presented by the wife accused of adultery? It is that it is presented to clarifying whether or not a sin has been committed, so as to discover the matter of guilt!
- UU. The meal offering of the sinner will prove to the contrary.
- VV. So matters go around in circles, and the indicative trait of the one is not the same as the indicative trait of the other, and the indicative trait of the other is not the same as the indicative trait of the one. But the quality that is shared among them all is that all are equivalent in the matter of having the handful taken up, and they are equivalent in the matter of being brought near, on which account I introduce the case of the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley, which is equivalent to them as to the taking of a handful, and which also should be equivalent to them as to the act of drawing near!
- WW. *Now what weakness can be found in this argument?*
- XX. R. Simeon raises this question: “The distinguishing shared trait among them is that they are commonly offered [which is not so of the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley].”
- YY. But R. Judah?



- ZZ. To the contrary, the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley is the more reliable, for the others may just never come up!
- AAA. But perhaps when Scripture says, “When you present...,” the implication is only to mean that an individual is permitted to present as a free will offering a variety of meal offering other than those that are listed in the present context?
- BBB. And that is a matter of logic:
- CCC. The community at large presents a meal offering deriving from wheat and brought as a matter of obligation, and the individual may present a meal offering deriving from wheat and brought as a free will offering.
- DDD. If the community, which presents a meal offering deriving from wheat and brought as a matter of obligation, also may present a meal offering deriving from barley and brought as a matter of obligation, so the individual, who may bring a meal offering deriving from wheat and brought as a matter of a free will offering, also may present as a free will offering a meal offering deriving from barley.
- EEE. [That incorrect conclusion is forestalled by Scripture, when it says,] “[When you present to the Lord a meal offering that is made in any of] these [ways, it shall be brought [to the priest who shall take it up to the altar],”
- FFF. you have the possibility of bringing only these.
- GGG. Or perhaps the sense of “these” is only as follows:
- HHH. “One who says, ‘Lo, incumbent on me is a meal offering’ must bring all five types”?
- III. Scripture says, “*of* these ways,”
- JJJ. so that if one wants, he brings only one of the types, and if he wants, he brings all five types. [If someone made explicit which one he has in mind, he brings that one, but if he does not remember what he did specify the type of meal offering, then he may bring all five types.]
- KKK. R. Simeon says, “[When you present to the Lord a meal offering [that is made in any of these ways,] *it shall be brought* to the priest who shall take it up to the altar’ — that statement serves to encompass all meal-offerings under the rule of bringing near.”
- LLL. Might one suppose that that requirement pertains to the two loaves of bread and the show bread?
- MMM. Scripture says, “[When you present to the Lord a meal offering that is made] in any of these ways” [which then excludes the specified bread].
- NNN. Why then have you encompassed under the rule of being brought near all manner of meal offerings but then excluded from the rule the two loaves and the show bread?
- OOO. After Scripture has used inclusionary language, it has further used exclusionary language.
- PPP. What distinguishes these meal offerings is that part of any one of them is tossed onto the altar fires, then excluding the two loaves of bread and the show bread, which yield nothing at all to the altar fires [but which the priests consume entirely on their own].

- QQQ.** But then the meal offering that accompanies the drink offerings [specified at Num. 15: 1ff.], which is wholly tossed onto the altar fires, also should require bringing near!
- RRR.** Scripture states, “[And it shall be brought [to the priest] who shall take it up to the altar.”
- SSS.** Why then have you encompassed all varieties of meal offerings but excluded the meal offerings that accompany drink offerings?
- TTT.** [61A] After Scripture has used inclusionary language, it has further used exclusionary language.
- UUU.** What distinguishes these meal offerings is that they come in their own account, which then excludes meal offerings that accompany drink offerings, for these do not come in their own account at all.
- VVV.** But is it not the fact that the meal offering of priests and the meal offering of a priest that is anointed come on their own account. Is it possible that they too require being brought near?
- WWW.** Scripture says, “who shall take it up to the altar.”
- XXX.** *That is required on its own account, to indicate that the meal offerings listed here have to be brought near?*
- YYY.** If that were the case, Scripture can as well have worded itself, “And he shall bring near,” but why, “and he shall bring it near”?
- ZZZ.** Why then have you encompassed all meal offerings and at the same time excluded the meal offering of priests and the meal offering of the anointed priest?
- AAAA.** After Scripture has used inclusionary language, it has further used exclusionary language.
- BBBB.** What distinguishes these meal offerings is that part of them is tossed on the altar fires, and, further, they come on their own account, and they yield a residue for the priests.
- CCCC.** That then excludes the two loaves and the show bread, none of which is put on the fire, and it further excludes the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings, which does not come on its own account, and, finally, it excludes the meal offering of priests and the meal offering of the high priest, none of which yields a residue for the priests to eat.
- DDDD.** “[The priest] shall remove [the token portion from the meal offering]:”
- EEEE.** Might one suppose that this is done with a utensil?
- FFFF.** Scripture says, “With its handful” (Lev. 6: 8).
- GGGG.** Just as the removing described there is not with a handful [and not a utensil,] so the same procedure applies here [Sifra XXII:I.1-XXIII:IV.1].

**5:6-7**

**5:6**

- A.** These [are offerings which] require waving and do not require bringing near:
- B.** (1) the log of oil of the person healed of the skin ailment;
- C.** (2) his guilt offering [Lev. 14:12]’

- D. and (3) first fruits — this is in accord with the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [M. Bik. 2:4, 3:6];
- E. and (4) the sacrificial parts of the peace offerings of an individual;
- F. and (5) their breast and thigh [Lev. 10:15] —
- G. both those of Israelite men and women but not those of others —
- H. and the (6) two loaves of bread, and the two lambs of Pentecost [Aseret/Shabuot];
- I. How does one carry out the rite?
- J. One puts the two loaves of bread on top of the two lambs and places his two hands below and swings them forward and backward and upward and downward,
- K. as it is written, “Which is waved and which is raised up” [Exo. 29:27].
- L. The waving was at the east [of the altar], and the bringing near of the west [at the southwestern corner].
- M. And the wavings come before the bringings near.
- N. The meal offering of the omer [on the sixteenth of Nisan, Lev. 23:11], and the meal offering of the woman accused of adultery [Num. 5:25] require [both] waving and bringing near.
- O. The showbread and the meal offering brought with drink offerings [require] neither waving nor bringing near.

### 5:7

- A. R. Simeon says, “Three kinds [of offering] require three rites, two [apply] to each of them, but [all] three apply to none of them.
- B. “And these are they:
- C. “The sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual, and the sacrifices of peace offerings of the community, and the guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment.
- D. “The sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual [M. 5:6G4-5] require (1) laying on of hands while the animal is yet alive [Lev. 3: 2], and (2) waving of the slaughtered animals, but (3) waving does not apply to them while they are alive [Lev. 10:15].
- E. “The sacrifices of peace offerings of the community [the lambs of Pentecost/Shabuot, M. 5:611 require (1) waving while they are alive and (2) when they are slaughtered, but (3) the laying on of hands does not apply to them [Lev. 23:20].
- F. “The guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment requires (1) laying on of hands and (2) waving while it is alive [Lev. 14:12-13], but (3) waving does not apply to it when it has been slaughtered.”

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

- B. “And the priest will take one of the male lambs and offer it up as a guilt-offering” (Lev. 14:12) —
- C. This teaches that they [the beast and the log of oil] require waving all at once.

- D. And how do we know that, if he waved this one by itself and the other one by itself, he has fulfilled the obligation?
- E. Scripture says, “and he shall offer it for a guilt offering and the log of oil and shall wave” — in reference to the guilt-offering.
- F. Might one think that he should wave and go back and wave again?
- G. Scripture says, “And he will wave... a waving” — a waving, and not wavings.
- H. “Before the Lord” (Lev. 14:12) — in the east [Sifra CLII:I.5]

- I.2.** A. But lo, it has been said, “‘Before the Lord’ — might one suppose that means on the west side”?
- B. One should say, that was stated only of the meal offering, for it is classified as a sin offering, and a sin offering is supposed to be placed at the base of the altar [with the residue of the blood]. But at the southeast corner there was no base.
  - C. *But here we certainly can speak of the east side as “before the Lord.”*

**II.1 A. and first fruits — this is in accord with the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob:**

- B. *Where is the passage in which R. Eliezer b. Jacob figures?*
- C. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. “‘And the priest shall take the basket out of your hand’ (Deu. 26: 4) teaches that the basket of first fruits has to be waved,” the words of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.
- F. *What is the scriptural basis for the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob?*
- G. There is an analogy drawn between the use of the word “hand” here and the use of the same word in connection with peace-offerings.
- H. Here it is written, “And the priest shall take the basket out of your hand” (Deu. 6 26: 4), and there [with reference to the peace-offering] it is written, “His own hands shall bring the offering to the Lord” (Lev. 7:30).
- I. **[61B]** Just as in the present case it is the priest who does the work, so there it is the priest who does it.
- J. Just as in that other passage, it is the owner who participates, so here too the owner participates.
- K. How is this possible [for both to be involved]? The priest puts his hand underneath the hand of the owner and waves [the basket of first fruits, just as he would do in the case of the animal brought as a sacrifice in the category of peace-offerings].

**II.2.** A. *And why should the passage not further read, “In accord with the position of R. Judah”?*

- B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. R. Judah says, “‘And you shall set [the basket of first fruits] down’ (Deu. 26:10).
- D. “This refers to waving the basket.
- E. “You say it refers to waving the basket, but perhaps the sense is that it is literally set down.
- F. “Since further on, it says, ‘And set it down’ (Deu. 26: 4), that takes care of that action.

G. “To what, then, does the cited verse, ‘And you shall set ... down ...’ refer? It can only refer to waving.”

H. Said Raba, “Since the verse of Scripture to which R. Eliezer b. Jacob referred appears earlier in the chapter, the Mishnah’s framer cited only his position [that is, Deu. 26: 4 rather than Deu. 26:10].”

I. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “It is because his mastery of the law was formidable.”*

**III.1** A. and (4) the sacrificial parts of the peace offerings of an individual, and (5) their breast and thigh [Lev. 10:15] — both those of Israelite men and women but not those of others:

B. *What is the sense of this statement?*

C. *Said R. Judah, “This is the sense of this statement: both those of Israelite men and women but not those of others* — these offerings have to be waved; but the waving itself must be done by an Israelite, and not by women.

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

B. [“Say to the people of Israel:”]

C. The children of Israel present a wave offering, and idolators do not present a wave offering

D. .[Since “children” uses the Hebrew for “sons,” we conclude that] the sons of Israel wave offerings, and women do not wave offerings.

E. Said R. Yosé, “Since we find that Scripture has not made a distinction between the offerings brought by idolators and the offerings brought by women as to the laying on of hands, we should not make a distinction between the offerings brought by idolators and the offerings brought by women as to presenting a wave offering. [Neither should do either. Then why resort to Scripture at all in this instance?”]

F. But what difference does this argument make to me? For Scripture has made no distinction between the offerings brought by idolators and the offerings brought by women as to the laying on of hands, for the laying on of hands is done only by the owner of the beast [in which case the consideration of ownership is paramount].

G. But should we not make a distinction between between the offerings brought by idolators and the offerings brought by women as to presenting a wave offering, for the waving is done by a priest? [So the analogy falls away, since there is reason for comparability at one point, but not at the other.]

H. On that account it was necessary for Scripture to say, “Say to the people of Israel:”

I. The sons of Israel wave offerings, and the daughters of Israel do not wave offerings [Sifra XCIV:I.2].

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

B. “The children of Israel:”

C. I know only that the waving is done by sons of Israel. How do I know that the law encompasses proselytes and freed slaves?

D. Scripture says, “who offers the sacrifice.”

- E. But perhaps the sense of “who offers the sacrifice” is to refer only to the priest who presents the offering?
- F. When Scripture says, “he shall bring with his own hands,” Scripture encompasses the hands of the owner.
- G. How so?
- H. The priest puts his hand under the hand of the owner” [Sifra XCIV:L3].

**III.4.** A. How is it done?

- B. The sacrificial parts were put on the palm of the hand, with the breast and thigh above them, and in a case in which the cakes are to be waved, they always are put on top.
- C. *When is that?*
- D. Said R. Pappa, “In the case of the consecration of the priest.”

- III.5.** A. *What is the scriptural basis for that fact? Should we say that it is in line with the verse, “The thigh that is waved and the breast that is waved they shall put upon the fat of the burnt offering to wave it for a wave offering” (Lev. 10:15), it is also written, “He shall bring the fat upon the breast” (Lev. 7:30)?*
- B. *Said Abbayye, “The latter speaks of the way in which the priest brings them from the slaughter house and turns them over to the priest who is going to wave them” [Cashdan: so that now in the hands of the priest who is waving them, the breast and thigh are above the fat].*
  - C. *But is it not written, “And they put the fat upon the breasts” (Pro. 9:20)?*
  - D. *That speaks of handing the things over to the priest who is going to burn them.*
  - E. *By the way, we may infer from these verses that we require the participation of three verses, along the lines of the verse, “In the multitude of people is the glory of the king” (Pro. 14:28).*

**IV.1** A. and the (6) two loaves of bread, and the two lambs of Pentecost:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the first fruits as a wave offering before the Lord [with the two lambs]:”
- D. Might one suppose that [he should put the lambs upon the bread, so that] the bread was placed below?
- E. Scripture says, “with the two lambs.”
- F. If it is “with the two lambs,” then might one think that the bread was on top of the lambs?
- G. Scripture says, “with the bread of the first fruits.”
- H. The matter is still puzzling, for I do not then know whether the bread is put upon the lambs or the lambs upon the bread?
- I. Just as we find in all circumstances, the bread is on top, here too, the bread should be on top.
  - J. *Where do we find matters so?*
  - K. Said R. Pappa, “At the consecration of the priests.”
- L. R. Yosé b. Meshulam says, “The lambs are to be on top of the bread. And how do I interpret “with the two lambs’?”

- M. “to exclude the seven [lambs, indicating that the bread does not have to be waved with the seven lambs, to which reference is made earlier: ‘And you shall present with the bread seven lambs a year old without blemish.’”
- N. Hanina b. Akhinai says, “One puts the two loaves of bread between the thighs of the lambs and waves them all, and he then turns out to fulfill these two verses of Scripture: ‘bread with the lambs,’ ‘lambs with the bread.’”
- O. Said Rabbi, “Before a mortal king one would not do such a thing. Before the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be he, will people do such a thing?”
- P. “Rather, one puts one beside the other and waves them” Sifra CCXXXIII:1.10].

**IV.2.** A. *But lo, we require some way of carrying out the requirement that it be “upon”?*

- B. *Said R. Hisda to R. Hamnuna, and some say, R. Hamnuna to R. Hisda, “Rabbi is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, in which he holds that ‘upon’ means ‘near to,’ in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *““And you shall put pure frankincense on each row” —*
- D. *“Rabbi says, “upon” here means “near to.”*
- E. *““You say it means “near to,” but perhaps it means literally, “upon”? Since Scripture says, “And you shall put a veil on the ark” (Exo. 40: 3) [and that was not actually upon but only near the ark, in front of it,] you must conclude that “on” means “near to.”””*

**V.1** A. **One puts the two loaves of bread on top of the two lambs and places his two hands below and swings them forward and backward and upward and downward:**

- B. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “One swings **forward and backward**, to Him who owns all four winds, **upward and downward**, to Him who owns heaven and earth.”
- C. *In the West the matter was repeated in this way:*
- D. Said R. Hama bar Uqba said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “One swings **forward and backward** to hold back destructive winds, **upward and downward** to hold back destructive dews.”
- E. Said R. Yosé bar Abin, “That is to say that doing even trivial parts of a religious duty serves to hold back punishment.
- F. “For lo, the act of waving is nothing more than a trivial aspect of the religious duty, and yet it holds back destructive winds and dew.”
  - G. And Rabbah said, “And so is the case with the *lulab*.”
  - H. *R. Aha bar Jacob would wave the lulab and say, “This is an arrow in the eyes of satan.”*
  - I. *But this is not a good thing, because it may lead [satan] to be provoked against him [who does it].*

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

- B. “The offerings of peace offerings presented in behalf of the community have to be waved after they are slaughtered, and they are waved as is,” the words of Rabbi.



- C. And sages say, “That is the case only with the breast and thigh.”
- D. *What is at stake between them?*
- E. *Said R. Hisda to R., Hamnuna, and some say, R. Hamnuna to R. Hisda, “At issue is the principle: ‘Derive the rule from it and again from it,’ as against, “Derive the rule from it but then establish it in its own place.’ [Cashdan: Whenever a subject is inferred from another by means of analogy or by an argument based on common indicative traits, to what extent is the inference carried? The first formulation, Derive the rule from it and again from it, holds that the two subjects must in the end be brought to absolute agreement on every point. The second formulation, Derive the rule from it but then establish it in its own place, maintains that the inference is to be made with regard to one point only, and as for the rest, each subject is regulated by the rules governing its other aspects.]*
- F. *“Rabbis take the view, ‘Derive the rule from it but then establish it in its own place.’ just as the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of an individual have to be waved once the animal is slaughtered, so the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community have to be waved once the beast is slaughtered; ‘but then establish it in its own place,’ means, just as in that case [in the matter of the individual’s peace offering] the waving involves the breast and thigh, so here too it involves the breast and thigh.*
- G. *“Rabbi maintains, ‘Derive the rule from it and again from it:’ just as the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of an individual have to be waved once the animal is slaughtered, so the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community have to be waved once the beast is slaughtered; but also ‘...and again from it:’ while in that case [involving the peace offering of an individual] the waving is of the breast and thigh alone, here it is waving of them as they are. That is, just as they are when they are alive.”*
- H. **[62B]** *R. Pappa said, “All parties agree, ‘Derive the rule from it and again from it.’ But this is the basis for the position of Rabbi, namely, [the peace offering of the community] must be in accord with the rule prevailing for the peace offering of the individual. Just as in that case, whatever is given as a gift to the priest must be waved, so in this case, whatever is given as a gift to the priest must be waved.” [Cashdan: the whole beast is a gift to the priest, but in the case of the peace offering of an individual, only the breast and thigh are gifts to the priests.]*
- I. *Rabina said, “All parties concur, ‘Derive the rule from it but then establish it in its own place:’ but this is the operative consideration for the position of rabbis:*
- J. *“It is written, ‘their peace offerings,’ which is inclusive.” [Lev. 7:34 speaks of the peace offering of an individual, but it is in the plural, so that even another classification of peace offering, namely, that of the community, yields for waving only the breast and thigh (Cashdan)].*

**VI.1 A. R. Simeon says, “Three kinds [of offering] require three rites, two [apply] to each of them, but [all] three apply to none of them. And these are they:**

The sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual, and the sacrifices of peace offerings of the community, and the guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment. The sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual [M. 5:6G4-5] require (1) laying on of hands while the animal is yet alive [Lev. 3:2], and (2) waving of the slaughtered animals, but (3) waving does not apply to them while they are alive [Lev. 10:15]. The sacrifices of peace offerings of the community [the lambs of Shabuot, M. 5:61 require (1) waving while they are alive and (2) when they are slaughtered, but (3) the laying on of hands does not apply to them [Lev. 23:20]. The guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment requires (1) laying on of hands and (2) waving while it is alive [Lev. 14:12-13], but (3) waving does not apply to it when it has been slaughtered:”

- B. But may not not be argued *a fortiori* that the peace offering of the individual while yet alive should be waved:
- C. If the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community, which do not require the laying on of hands while yet alive, do require waving while yet alive, the peace offering of the individual, which requires the laying on of hands while it is yet alive, surely should require waving while it is yet alive!
- D. *The All-merciful excluded the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community by using the word “them,” thus excluding the peace offering of the individual.*
- E. And should not the peace offerings of the community require laying on of hands by an argument *a fortiori*:
- F. if the sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual, which do not require waving while alive, do require the laying on of hands, the sacrifices of peace offerings of the community, which do require waving while yet alive, surely should require the laying on of hands!
- G. Said Rabina, “We have learned that there are two layings on of hands that are done in connection with offerings of the community” [the bullock offered when the whole community has sinned in error, and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement].
- H. And the guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment should require waving after it has been slaughtered by reason of an argument *a fortiori*:
- I. if the sacrifices of peace offerings of the individual, which do not have to be waved when they are alive, have to be waved once they have been slaughtered, the guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment, which does have to be waved when it is alive, surely should have to be waved when it has been slaughtered!
- J. The All-Merciful has imposed an exclusionary usage when it says, “it” (Lev. 23:20), in the context of the peace offering presented in behalf of the individual, thus eliminating from the rule the guilt offering presented by the person healed of the skin ailment.

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

- B. Five people who presented a single offering — one waves the beast in behalf of all of them.
- C. In the case of a woman, the priest waves her offering in her behalf.

- D. And so too, he who sends his offerings from overseas — the priest waves them in his behalf.

## 5:8

- A. [63A] He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to a meal offering baked in a baking pan,” should not bring one prepared in a frying pan.
- B. [If he says, “Lo, I pledge myself to] a meal offering prepared in a frying pan,” he should not bring one prepared in a baking pan,
- C. And what is the difference between a baking pan and a frying pan?
- D. But: “The frying pan has a cover, and the baking pan has no cover,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- E. R. Hananiah b. Gamaliel says, “A frying pan is deep, and what is cooked in it is spongy, and a baking pan is flat, and what is cooked in it is hard.”

- I.1** A. [“The frying pan has a cover, and the baking pan has no cover,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean:] *What is a verse of Scripture that can serve for the position of R. Yosé?*
- B. *Might I say that the sense of the word for frying pan is supplied by the word, using the same letters, that yields “stirrings of the heart,” in line with the verse that contains the same word, “My heart is stirred by a goodly matter” (Psa. 45: 2)? And the sense of the word for baking pan derives from the letters, in that word, that can yield, “pratings of the mouth” [Cashdan: sinful talk, spoken openly, without concealment, and here the offering is prepared in an open utensil, without a cover], as people remark, “He is just babbling”?*
- C. *But one might just as well say the contrary: the latter bears its name because it is offered for what is hidden in the heart: “Wherefore did you flee in secret” (Gen. 31:27), and the former because it is offered for the whispering of the lips, in line with the saying, “His lips were whispering”!*
- D. *So I suppose it is just another tradition.*

**II.1** A. R. Hananiah b. Gamaliel says, “A frying pan is deep, and what is cooked in it is spongy, and a baking pan is flat, and what is cooked in it is hard:”

- B. The pan is deep: “And all that is prepared in the pan” (Lev. 7: 9); the griddle is flat: “and on the griddle” (Lev. 7: 9).

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

- B. The House of Shammai say, “He who says, ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is a baking pan’ — the vow must stand until Elijah comes.”
- C. *They are dubious on whether the meal offering is so called by reason of the pan in which it is prepared or by reason of the manner in which it is prepared.*
- D. The House of Hillel say, “There was a utensil in the sanctuary called a baking pan, and it was like a deep mould, and when dough was put in it, it was shaped into Cretan apples and Greek nuts.
- E. “And Scripture says, ‘Whatever is prepared in the pan and on the griddle’ (Lev. 7: 9) — therefore they bear the name that they do by reason of the cooking utensils in which they are prepared, and not by reason of the manner in which it is prepared.”

- A. He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a meal offering baked in the oven” should not bring one baked in a stove, or one baked on hot tiles, or one baked in the cauldrons of Arabs [M. **Kel. 5:10**].
- B. R. Judah says, “If he wanted, he may bring one baked in a stove [which is a kind of oven] .”
- C. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring) a meal offering which is baked,” should not bring one which is half in cakes and half in wafers [i.e., he should bring ten of one kind or the other, not five of each].
- D. R. Simeon permits, because it is one kind of offering.

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

- B. “...baked in the oven:”
- C. But not baked on a double stove or baked on mud bricks or baked on Arabian pots.
- D. R. Judah says, “Why does Scripture refer to ‘oven’ to times [here and at Lev. 7: 9]? It is so as to treat the double stove as valid.”
- E. R. Simeon says, “Why does Scripture refer to ‘oven’ to times? It is to indicate that the act of consecration should intend the cakes to be baked in an oven in particular [following Finkelstein]” [Sifra XX:II.1].
- F. *But does R. Simeon accept this kind of reasoning [holding that the oven sanctifies the offering]? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: R. Simeon says, “One should always be accustomed to state [the rule as follows]: ‘The Two Loaves and the showbread are valid [if made] in the courtyard and are valid [if made] in Bethpage’” [M. **Men. 11:2E-F**]? [Beth Page is outside of the Temple court; if the oven sanctified the offering, it should not be taken out there.]*
- G. *Said Raba, Say: ‘it should be sanctified for the oven’” [Cashdan: when setting aside the flour for this meal offering, one should expressly state that it is to be baked in the oven].*

**II.1** A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring) a meal offering which is baked,” should not bring one which is half in cakes and half in wafers [i.e., he should bring ten of one kind or the other, not five of each]:”

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “When you present:”
- D. Should you present — treating the matter now as optional.
- E. “an offering of meal:”
- F. Said R. Judah, “How do we know that if one said, ‘Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering which is baked,’ he should not bring one which is half in cakes and half in wafers [he should bring ten of one kind or the other, not five of each] [M. **Men. 5:9C**]? ”
- G. “Scripture says, ‘an offering,’ meaning, an offering of a single type does one bring, and not an offering that is a mixture of cakes and wafers.”

- H. Said R. Simeon, [63B] “Now does the word ‘offering’ occur in context twice? But does it not occur only one time? And yet, in that regard, there are references to both cakes and wafers.
- I. “On that basis, if one wanted to bring cakes, he may do so, and if he wanted to bring, wafers, he may do so,
- J. “and if he wanted to bring half cakes and half wafers, he may do so. And when he takes the handful, he stirs in oil and takes the handful of cake from the two of them, and he has fulfilled his obligation” [T. Men. 8:11A-C, with slight variations] [Sifra XXI:I.1-2].
- K. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that he who says, ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is an offering of a baked meal offering,’ he may not present half in cakes and half in wafers? Because it is written, ‘And every meal offering that is baked in the oven and every meal offering that is prepared in the pan and on the griddle shall belong to the priest who offers it. And every meal offering mingled with oil or dry shall all the son so f Aaron have’ (Lev. 7:9, 10). Just as ‘every’ in the second set speaks of two distinct kinds, so ‘every’ in the first set speaks of two distinct kinds” [Cashdan: and the two kinds, cakes and wafers, cannot combine to constitute one offering].

**II.2.** A. *And can R. Judah concede that R. Simeon has rightly spoken [that the two kinds belong to the same offering since ‘offering’ is stated only one time in the relevant verse (Cashdan)]?*

- B. *He may say to you, “Since it is written, ‘with oil’ (Lev. 2: 4) twice in the verse, it is as if the word ‘offering’ has been repeated.”*
- C. *And R. Simeon?*
- D. *If Scripture had not written “with oil” two times, I might have supposed that it is precisely half cakes and half wafers of which the offering must consist, but not of cakes alone or wafers alone. We are so informed that that is not the case.*

**II.3.** A. *R. Yosé b. R. Judah takes the same position as his father!*

- B. *At issue between them is the rule covering a case in which one actually made it that way. [In Yosé’s view, an offering of half cakes and half wafers is invalid; the father would accept such an offering after the fact (Cashdan).]*