

# XIV

## THE STRUCTURE OF BABYLONIAN TALMUD MENAHOT

Whether or not the Talmud of Babylonia is carefully organized in large-scale, recurrent structures and guided by a program that we may call systematic forms the principal question addressed by an academic commentary. The preceding chapters therefore have pointed toward the presentation set forth here.

By “structure” I mean, a clearly-articulated pattern that governs the location of fully-spelled out statements. By “system,” I mean, a well-crafted and coherent set of ideas that explain the social order of the community addressed by the writers of a document, a social philosophy, a theory of the way of life, world view, and character of the social entity formed by a given social group. I see a collective, anonymous, and political document, such as the one before us, as a statement to, and about, the way in which people should organize their lives and govern their actions. At issue then in any document such as the remarkable one before us is simple: does this piece of writing present information or a program, facts to whom it may concern, or a philosophically and aesthetically cogent statement about how things should be?

The connection between structure and system is plain to see. From the way in which people consistently frame their thoughts, we move to the world that, in saying things one way rather than in some other, they wish to imagine the world in which they wish to live, to which they address these thoughts. For if the document exhibits structure and sets forth a system, then it is accessible to questions of rationality. We may ask about the statement that its framers or compilers wished to make by putting the document together as they did. But if we discern no structure and perceive no systematic inquiry or governing points of analysis, then all we find here is inert and miscellaneous information, facts but no propositions, arguments, viewpoints.

Now the Talmud commonly finds itself represented as lacking organization and exhibiting a certain episodic and notional character. That view moreover characterizes the reading and representation of the document by learned and experienced scholars, who have devoted their entire lives to Talmud study and exegesis. It must follow that upon the advocate of the contrary view — the one implicit in the representation of the document for academic analysis — rests the burden of proof. I set forth the allegation that the Talmud exhibits a structure and follows a system and therefore exhibits a commonly-intelligible rationality. The claim to write an academic commentary explicitly states that proposition. For the tractate before us, I have therefore to adduce evidence and argument.

I maintain that through the normal procedures of reasoned analysis we may discern in the tractate a well-crafted structure. I hold that the structure made manifest, we may further identify the purpose and perspective, the governing system of thought and argument, of those who collected and arranged the tractate's composites and put them together in the way in which we now have them. By "structure" I mean, how is a document organized? and by "system," what do the compilers of the document propose to accomplish in producing this complete, organized piece of writing? The answers to both questions derive from a simple outline of the tractate as a whole, underscoring the types of compositions and composites of which it is comprised. Such an outline tells us what is principal and what subordinate, and how each unit — composition formed into composites, composites formed into a complete statement — holds together and also fits with other units, fore and aft. The purpose of the outline then is to identify the character of each component of the whole, and to specify its purpose or statement. The former information permits us to describe the document's structure, the latter, its system.

While the idea of simply outlining a Talmud-tractate beginning to end may seem obvious, I have never made such an outline before, nor has anyone else.\* Yet, as we shall now see, the character of the outline dictates all further analytical initiatives. Specifically, when we follow the layout of the whole, we readily see the principles of organization that govern. These same guidelines on organizing discourse point also to the character of what is organized: complete units of thought, with a beginning, middle, and end, often made up of smaller, equally complete units of thought. The former we know as composites, the latter as compositions.

\*I have provided complete outlines for the Mishnah and for the Tosefta in relationship to the Mishnah, and, not always in outline form, for the Midrash-compilations of late antiquity as well.

Identifying and classifying the components of the tractate — the composites, the compositions of which they are made up — we see clearly how the document coheres: the plan and program worked out from beginning to end. When we define that plan and program, we identify the facts of a pattern that permit us to say in a specific and concrete way precisely what the compilers of the tractate intended to accomplish. The structure realizes the system, the program of analysis and thought that takes the form of the presentation we have before us. From what people do, meaning, the way in which they formulate their ideas and organized them into cogent statements, we discern what they proposed to do, meaning, the intellectual goals that they set for themselves.

These goals — the received document they wished to examine, the questions that they brought to that document — realized in the layout and construction of their writing, dictate the points of uniformity and persistence that throughout come to the surface. How people lay out their ideas guides us into what they wished to find out and set forth in their writing, and that constitutes the system that defined the work they set out to accomplish. We move from how people speak to the system that the mode of discourse means to express, in the theory that modes of speech or writing convey modes of thought and inquiry.

We move from the act of thought and its written result backward to the theory of thinking, which is, by definition, an act of social consequence. We therefore turn to the matter of intention that provokes reflection and produces a system of inquiry. That statement does not mean to imply I begin with the premise of order, which sustains the thesis of a prior

system that defines the order. To the contrary, the possibility of forming a coherent outline out of the data we have examined defines the first test of whether or not the document exhibits a structure and realizes a system. So everything depends upon the possibility of outlining the writing, from which all else flows. If we can see the order and demonstrate that the allegation of order rests on ample evidence, then we may proceed to describe the structure that gives expression to the order, and the system that the structure sustains.

The present work undertakes the exegesis of exegesis, for the Talmud of Babylonia, like its counterpart in the Land of Israel, is laid out as a commentary to the Mishnah. That obvious fact defined the character of my academic commentary, since we have already faced the reality that our Bavli-tractate is something other than a commentary, though it surely encompasses one. The problems that captured my attention derived from the deeper question of how people make connections and draw conclusions. To ask about how people make connections means that we identify a problem — otherwise we should not have to ask — and what precipitated the problem here has been how a composition or a composite fits into its context, when the context is defined by the tasks of Mishnah-commentary, and the composition or composite clearly does not comment on the Mishnah-passage that is subjected to comment.

The experience of analyzing the document with the question of cogency and coherence in mind therefore yields a simple recognition. Viewed whole, the tractate contains no gibberish but only completed units of thought, sentences formed into intelligible thought and self-contained in that we require no further information to understand those sentences, beginning to end. The tractate organizes these statements as commentary to the Mishnah. But large tracts of the writing do not comment on the Mishnah in the way in which other, still larger tracts do. Then how the former fit together with the latter frames the single most urgent question of structure and system that I can identify.

Since we have already examined enormous composites that find their cogency in an other than exegetical program, alongside composites that hold together by appeal to a common, prior, coherent statement — the Mishnah-sentences at hand — what justifies my insistence that an outline of the document, resting on the premise that we deal with a Mishnah-commentary, govern all further description? To begin with, the very possibility of outlining Babylonian Talmud tractate Sotah derives from the simple fact that the framers have given to their document the form of a commentary to the Mishnah. It is in the structure of the Mishnah-tractate that they locate everything together that they wished to compile. We know that is the fact because the Mishnah-tractate defines the order of topics and the sequence of problems.

Relationships to the Mishnah are readily discerned; a paragraph stands at the head of a unit of thought; even without the full citation of the paragraph, we should find our way back to the Mishnah because at the head of numerous compositions, laid out in sequence one to the next, clauses of the Mishnah-paragraph are cited in so many words or alluded to in an unmistakable way. So without printing the entire Mishnah-paragraph at the head, we should know that the received code formed the fundamental structure because so many compositions cite and gloss sentences of the Mishnah-paragraph and are set forth in sequence dictated by the order of sentences of said Mishnah-paragraph. Internal evidence alone suffices, then, to demonstrate that the structure of the tractate rests upon the Mishnah-tractate cited and discussed here. Not only so, but the sentences of the Mishnah-

paragraphs of our tractate are discussed in no other place in the entire Talmud of Babylonia in the sequence and systematic exegetical framework in which they are set forth here; elsewhere we may find bits or pieces, but only here, the entirety of the tractate.

That statement requires one qualification, and that further leads us to the analytical task of our outline. While the entire Mishnah-tractate of Sotah is cited in the Talmud, the framers of the Talmud by no means find themselves required to say something about every word, every sentence, every paragraph. On the contrary, they discuss only what they choose to discuss, and glide without comment by large stretches of the tractate. A process of selectivity, which requires description and analysis, has told the compilers of the Talmud's composites and the authors of its compositions\* what demands attention, and what does not. Our outline has therefore to signal not only what passage of the Mishnah-tractate is discussed, but also what is not discussed, and we require a general theory to explain the principles of selection ("making connections, drawing conclusions" meaning, to begin with, making selections). For that purpose, in the outline, I reproduce the entirety of a Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of a Talmudic composite, and I underscore those sentences that are addressed, so highlighting also those that are not.

This statement requires refinement. I do not know that all available compositions have been reproduced, and that the work of authors of compositions of Mishnah-exegesis intended for a talmud is fully exposed in the document as we have it. That is not only something we cannot demonstrate — we do not have compositions that were not used, only the ones that were — but something that we must regard as unlikely on the face of matters. All we may say is positive: the character of the compositions that address Mishnah-exegesis tells us about the concerns of the writers of those compositions, but we cannot claim to outline all of their concerns, on the one side, or to explain why they chose not to work on other Mishnah-sentences besides the ones treated here. But as to the program of the compositors, that is another matter: from the choices that they made (out of a corpus we cannot begin to imagine or invent for ourselves) we may describe with great accuracy the kinds of materials they wished to include and the shape and structure they set forth out of those materials. We know what they did, and that permits us to investigate why they did what they did. What we cannot know is what they did not do, or why they chose not to do what they did not do. People familiar with the character of speculation and criticism in Talmudic studies will understand why I have to spell out these rather commonplace observations. I lay out an argument based on evidence, not on the silences of evidence, or on the absence of evidence — that alone.

It follows that the same evidence that justifies identifying the Mishnah-tractate as the structure (therefore also the foundation of the system) of the Talmud-tractate before us also presents puzzles for considerable reflection. The exegesis of Mishnah-exegesis is only one of these. Another concerns the purpose of introducing into the document enormous compositions and composites that clearly hold together around a shared topic or proposition, e.g., my appendix on one theme or another, my elaborate footnote providing information that is not required but merely useful, and the like. My earlier characterization of composites as appendices and footnotes signalled the fact that the framers of the document chose a not-entirely satisfactory way of setting out the materials they wished to include here, for large components of the tractate do not contribute to Mishnah-exegesis in any way at all. If these intrusions of other-than-exegetical compositions were proportionately modest, or of topical composites negligible in size, we might dismiss them as appendages, not structural components that bear much of the weight of the edifice as a whole. Indeed, the language that I chose for identifying and defining these composites —

footnotes, appendices, and the like — bore the implication that what is not Mishnah-commentary also is extrinsic to the Talmud's structure and system.

But that language served only for the occasion. In fact, the outline before us will show that the compositions are large and ambitious, the composites formidable and defining. Any description of the tractate's structure that dismisses as mere accretions or intrusions so large a proportion of the whole misleads. Any notion that "footnotes" and "appendices" impede exposition and disrupt thought, contribute extraneous information or form tacked-on appendages — any such notion begs the question: then why fill up so much space with such purposeless information? The right way is to ask whether the document's topical composites play a role in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the compilers of the Talmud. We have therefore to test two hypotheses:

**1.** the topical composites ("appendices," "footnotes") do belong and serve the compilers' purpose,

or

**2.** the topical composites do not participate in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud and do not belong because they add nothing and change nothing.

The two hypotheses may be tested against the evidence framed in response to a single question: is this topical composite necessary? The answer to that question lies in our asking, what happens to the reading of the Mishnah-tractate in light of the topical composites that would not happen were we to read the same tractate without them? The outline that follows systematically raises that question, with results specified in due course. It suffices here to state the simple result of our reading of the tractate, start to finish: the question of structure, therefore also that of system, rests upon the position we identify for that massive component of the tractate that comprises not Mishnah-commentary but free-standing compositions and composites of compositions formed for a purpose other than Mishnah-commentary.

The principal rubrics are given in small caps. The outline takes as its principal rubrics two large-scale organizing principles.

The first is the divisions of the Mishnah-tractate to which the Talmud-tractate serves as a commentary. That simple fact validates the claim that the tractate exhibits a fully-articulated structure. But the outline must also underscore that the Mishnah-tractate provides both more and less than the paramount outline of the Talmud-tractate. It is more because sentences in the Mishnah-tractate are not analyzed at all. These untreated Mishnah-sentences are given in bold face lower case caps, like the rest of the Mishnah, but then are specified by underlining and enclosure in square brackets.

Second, it is less because the structure of the tractate accommodates large composites that address topics not defined by the Mishnah-tractate. That brings us to the second of the two large-scale modes of holding together both sustained analytical exercises and also large sets of compositions formed into cogent composites. These are treated also as major units and are indicated by Roman numerals, alongside the Mishnah-paragraphs themselves; they are also signified in small caps. But the principal rubrics that do not focus on Mishnah-commentary but on free-standing topics or propositions or problems are not given in boldface type. Consequently, for the purposes of a coherent outline we have to

identify as autonomous entries in our outline those important composites that treat themes or topics not contributed by the Mishnah-tractate.

## **I. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 1:1**

**A. ALL MEAL OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL WAS TAKEN NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED “NOT FOR THEIR OWN NAME” ARE VALID FOR OFFERING UP, AND, IN THE CASE OF THE RESIDUE, FOR THE PRIESTS’ EATING.**

**BUT THEY HAVE NOT GONE TO THEIR OWNER’S CREDIT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION**

1. I:1: Why formulate matters as “But (they have not gone to their owner’s credit in fulfillment of an obligation),” and not simply state, “and (they have not gone to their owner’s credit in fulfillment of an obligation)”?

2. I:2: This further accords with the position of Raba, for Raba has said, “As to a burnt-offering that one slaughtered not under the proper designation, it is forbidden to toss its blood under some other than the proper designation but the blood can be tossed only within the rules governing the burnt offering.”

3. I:3: But they have not gone to their owner’s credit in fulfillment of an obligation: May we say that the Mishnah-paragraph does not accord with the position of R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority....

4. I:4: There is furthermore a contradiction not only between Simeon’s position and that of the Mishnah-paragraph but also between two statements in the name of R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority. Conclusion: As to the statement of R. Simeon, because the rites pertaining to it indicate that he is dealing with a dry one, is based on a supposition as to the reasoning that is behind the law, for R. Simeon is the one who commonly presents speculation on the reasoning behind the law of Scripture. Therefore, a wrongful intention that is not obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as an intention that can invalidate an offering, but one that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating the offering.

**B. TESTING THE PROPOSITION: A WRONGFUL INTENTION THAT IS NOT OBVIOUSLY WRONG IS TREATED BY THE ALL-MERCIFUL AS AN INTENTION THAT CAN INVALIDATE AN OFFERING, BUT ONE THAT IS OBVIOUSLY WRONG IS TREATED BY THE ALL-MERCIFUL AS INCAPABLE OF INVALIDATING THE OFFERING**

a. I:5: If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: If the priest pinched the neck of a bird designated as a burnt offering and so performed the rite above the red line, declaring the intentionality of doing so under the classification of the sin offering of a bird rather than a burnt offering, the owner’s obligation should then be carried out, since the rite that has been applied to the bird offering clearly indicates that it is a burnt offering. For if it were a bird

made as a sin offering, the rite would have been carried out below the red line since the burnt offering of a bird is prepared above the red line, and the sin offering, below. Here the priest has said he was intending the one but done the other, so treating the bird as a burnt offering; the owner should then have carried out his obligation; but the law is that that is not the case

**b. I:6:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: If the priest squeezed out the blood of a bird designated as a burnt offering and so performed the rite above the red line, declaring the intentionality of doing so under the classification of the sin offering of a bird rather than a burnt offering, should be accepted, with the owner's obligation carried out, since the rite that has been applied to the bird offering clearly indicates that it is a burnt offering. For if it were a bird made as a sin offering, the rite would have been carried out below the red line, and would have sprinkled the blood on the side of the altar

**c. I:7:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: a bird prepared as a sin offering, the blood of which he sprinkled below the line around the altar for the sake of a bird prepared as a burnt offering should be acceptable, for the rites concerning it prove that, whatever the intention of the priest, it is a bird prepared as a sin offering, for if it were a bird prepared as a burnt offering, the priest would have performed the tossing of the blood above the red line and drained out the blood there as well!

**d. I:8:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: Most Holy Things that one slaughtered at the northern side of the altar that is, at the correct location, but for the sake of Lesser Holy Things should be accepted, for the rites concerning it prove that, whatever the intention of the priest, for if they were Lesser Holy Things, he would have performed the rite at the southern side of the altar!

**e. I:9:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: Lesser Holy Things that the priest slaughtered at the south side of the altar for the sake of Most Holy Things should be accepted, for the rites concerning it prove that, whatever the intention of the priest, they are Lesser Holy Things, for if they were Most Holy Things, then the priest would have prepared them at the northern side of the altar.

**f. I:10:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: a burnt offering that the officiating priest slaughtered with the intention of classifying it as a sin

offering should be acceptable, for the one is a male and the other a female and the statement of the officiating priest is nullified by the facts of the case, which speak for themselves.

**g. I:11:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: A Passover offering that the officiating priest slaughtered under the classification of a guilt offering should be acceptable, for the one is a year old, the other two years old.

**h. I:12:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: A goat that the officiating priest slaughtered in the classification of a guilt offering should be acceptable, since the he goat has wool and the other hair so people will know the difference merely from the facts of the case!

**i. I:13:** If it is the fact that an expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offer and simply null, then how about the following case: A calf and a bullock that one slaughtered in the classification of a Passover offering or a guilt offering should be accepted, for a calf or a bullock cannot ever be designated as the Passover offering or as a guilt offering!

#### **C. REVERTING TO I:4: THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN SIMEON'S STATEMENTS**

**1. I:14:** As to the contradiction between the statements of Simeon, Raba said, "There is really no contradiction. In the one case we speak of the handful of a meal offering taken for the sake of some other meal offering, in the other, he took a handful of meal offering but classified it as some sort of animal offering. The case of taking a handful of meal offering for the sake of some other meal offering from the one the owner had designated is covered by the statement, "And this is the law of the meal offering," (Lev. 6: 7), meaning, one law for all meal offerings and so whatever the priest said, the offering fulfills the donor's obligation. But when he classified the meal offering as an animal offering, it does not carry out the owner's obligation, in line with "and this is the law of the meal offering" — but it is not written, "of the animal offering."

**a. I:15:** Secondary comment on the foregoing solutions to the stated problem.

**b. I:16:** As above.

#### **D. EXCEPT FOR THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF JEALOUSY OF A SUSPECTED ADULTERESS.**

**THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SUSPECTED ADULTERESS FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL WAS TAKEN NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED, OR WHICH ONE PUT INTO A UTENSIL, AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED UP NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED, OR FOR FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED AND NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED , OR**



**NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED AND FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED, ARE INVALID.**

**HOW SO IN A CASE OF DOING ONE OF THE AFORE-LISTED ACTIONS IS IT OR FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED AND NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED? IF ONE DID ONE ACTION FOR THE SAKE OF THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND ANOTHER ACTION FOR THE SAKE OF A FREEWILL MEAL OFFERING. OR HOW DO WE DEFINE A CASE OF DOING ONE OF THE AFORE-LISTED ACTIONS OR NOT FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL OFFERING WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED AND FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MEAL WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED FOR THE SAKE OF A FREEWILL MEAL OFFERING AND FOR THE SAKE OF THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER.**

1. II:1: Now there is no problem with reference to the meal offering of the sinner too poor to present anything else, because the meal offering is explicitly classified by the All-Merciful as a sin offering and what is designated for the purpose of a sin offering cannot be presented for any other purpose: “He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon, for it is a sin offering” (Lev. 5:11). But as to the meal offering of jealousy, where in Scripture do we find such a rule?

**E. THE STATUS OF THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY GRAIN, THE HANDFUL OF WHICH ONE TOOK WITH THE INTENTION OF MAKING THE OFFERING FOR SOME PURPOSE OTHER THAN THAT FOR WHICH IT WAS ORIGINALLY DESIGNATED**

1. II:2: Said Rab, “The meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is invalid, since the purpose of the offering is so as to render permitted the new grain, and this presentation having been designated for some other purpose, simply has not accomplished the goal for which it is intended. And so you may state in connection with the guilt offering presented by a Nazirite, and the guilt offering presented by person afflicted with the skin ailment. That is to say, If one slaughtered them with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is invalid, since the purpose of the offering is so as to render the person fit, and this presentation having been designated for some other purpose, simply has not accomplished the goal for which it is intended.”

a. II:3: Gloss of a tangential detail of the foregoing.

2. II:4: And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is valid, vs. Rab: “The meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is invalid”, but the residue is not to be eaten until another meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain is validly presented so as to render the former permitted to the priests.”

a. II:5: This statement of R. Simeon b. Laqish was not stated explicitly but only inferred.

**3. II:6:** And Raba said, “The meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is valid, vs. Rab: “The meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated is invalid”, and the residue may be eaten and it is not necessary to present another meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain validly so as to render the former permitted to the priests. For improper intentionality takes effect only if it is expressed by one who is suitable for carrying out the offering, and in connection with that which is suitable for the offering, and in a location that is suitable for the offering.”

**F. OTHER OFFERINGS THAT ARE IMPROPER BUT MAY NONETHELESS BE ACCEPTABLE:  
THE STATUS OF THE TEREFAH-BEAST**

**1. II:7:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: When Scripture says, “Even of the herd” (Lev. 1: 3), which one need not make explicit, that clause serves to exclude from use on the altar a terefah-beast. But is that proposition not a matter of an argument a fortiori and no verse of Scripture should be required? If a blemished beast, which is permitted for use by an ordinary person, is forbidden for use by the Most High, a terefah beast, which is forbidden for use by an ordinary person, surely should be forbidden for use by the Most High!...And if you propose to answer, then I reply: when Scripture says, “Even of the herd” (Lev. 1: 3), which one need not make explicit, that clause serves to exclude from use on the altar a terefah-beast.

**a. II:8:** Gloss of foregoing. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”?

**l. II:9:** Secondary continuation of the foregoing: Said R. Aha bar Abba to R. Ashi, “Even within the position of R. Aqiba it is possible to formulate a challenge.”

**b. II:10:** Continuation of the problem of II:8. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”? Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “It is because it is possible to say: ‘The case of one who compounds the incense can prove the contrary, for what he makes is forbidden to an ordinary person but permitted to the Most High.’”

**c. II:11:** As above. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”? Said Mar b. Rabina, “It is because it is possible to say: ‘the Sabbath will prove otherwise, for it is forbidden to an ordinary person but permitted to the Most High since food for God may be prepared at the altar on that day, while food for mortals may not be cooked on that day.’”

**d. II:12:** As above. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”? Said R. Adda bar Abba, “It is because it is possible to say: ‘A garment of mixed species can prove to the contrary, for it is forbidden to an ordinary person and yet permitted to the Most High.’”

**e. II:13:** As above. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”? Said R. Shisha bar R. Idi, “It is because it is possible to say:

‘The argument then proves circular, in which case we prove the proposition on the strength of a polythetic argument, namely:

**f.** II:14: As above. What is the meaning of, “And if you propose to answer”? Rather, said R. Ashi, “It is because it is possible to say that to begin with the initial proposal of the argument is flimsy. For to begin with, whence did you plan to prove that a terefah-animal might not be offered on the altar? It is from the case of the blemished animal. But that case is exceptional. For the distinctive trait of the blemished animal is that the priest who presents an offering is comparable to the beast that is offered and both may be blemished by the same disfigurements, which is not the case with a terefah-priest, who may offer an offering even though he suffers from a life-threatening ailment.

**l.** II:15: Gloss of foregoing.

**g.** II:16: But, in the end, is the fact that the terefah-beast may not be offered on the altar proven from the cited verse. When Scripture says, “Even of the herd” (Lev. 1: 3), which one need not make explicit, that clause serves to exclude from use on the altar a terefah-beast? Is it not derived from the following:

## **II. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 1:2A-J**

**A. ALL THE SAME ARE THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND OF ALL OTHER SORTS OF MEAL OFFERINGS, THE HANDFUL OF WHICH WAS TAKEN BY A NON-PRIEST, A PRIEST MOURNING HIS NEXT OF KIN, A PRIEST WHO IS IN THE STATUS OF ONE WHO HAS IMMERSED ON THE SELFSAME DAY AND AWAITS SUNSET TO COMPLETE THE RITE OF PURIFICATION A TEBUL-YOM, A PRIEST LACKING PROPER PRIESTLY VESTMENTS, A PRIEST WHOSE RITES OF ATONEMENT HAD NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED, A PRIEST WHOSE HANDS AND FEET HAD NOT BEEN WASHED, AN UNCIRCUMCISED PRIEST, AN UNCLEAN PRIEST, A PRIEST WHO WAS SEATED, A PRIEST WHO WAS STANDING ON UTENSILS, ON A BEAST, ON THE FEET OF HIS FELLOW — HE HAS RENDERED IT INVALID.**

**1.** I:1: What need to I have to formulate the Tannaite rule in the language, All the same are the meal offering of a sinner and of all other sorts of meal offerings? Why not formulate matters as, “Every meal offering from which the handful was taken by a non-priest, a priest mourning his next of kin, a priest who is in the status of one who has immersed on the selfsame day and awaits sunset to complete the rite of purification a tebul-yom, a priest lacking proper priestly vestments, a priest whose rites of atonement had not yet been completed, a priest whose hands and feet had not been washed, an uncircumcised priest, an unclean priest, a priest who was seated, a priest who was standing on utensils, on a beast, on the feet of his fellow — he has rendered it invalid. It was necessary to formulate the matter in this way on account of R. Simeon’s position. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

**a.** I:2: Parallel problem: With reference to M. **Zeb. 2:1A**: All animal offerings, the blood of which was received by a non-priest, a priest

mourning his next of kin, a priest who was in the status of one who had immersed on that selfsame day and was awaiting sunset to complete the rites of purification *tebul yom*, a priest lacking proper priestly garments, a priest whose atonement is not yet complete, a priest whose hands and feet are not washed, an uncircumcised priest, an unclean priest, a priest who was sitting down, a priest standing on utensils, on a beast, on the feet of his fellow, — he has rendered it invalid, the passage likewise should read, All the same are a sin offering of fat and all other offerings, the blood of which was received by a non-priest, a priest mourning his next of kin, a priest who was in the status of one who had immersed on that selfsame day and was awaiting sunset to complete the rites of purification *tebul yom*, a priest lacking proper priestly garments, a priest whose atonement is not yet complete, a priest whose hands and feet are not washed, an uncircumcised priest, an unclean priest, a priest who was sitting down, a priest standing on utensils, on a beast, on the feet of his fellow, — he has rendered it invalid, and, in line with what has just been said, we should have stated, “It was necessary to formulate the matter in this way on account of R. Simeon’s position.” Therefore, since the Tannaite formulation is, All animal offerings, and not, except..., the intent is to include every offering without exception even the sin offering, and Simeon concurs. Here too, if the Tannaite formulation had been, All..., since it does not then say, “except,” it would have included every offering.

3. I:3: All the same are the meal offering of a sinner and of all other sorts of meal offerings, the handful of which was taken by a non-priest...he has rendered it invalid: said Rab, “If a non-priest did take the handful he should put it back.”

**B. IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH HIS LEFT HAND, HE HAS RENDERED IT INVALID. BEN BETERAH SAYS, “LET HIM PUT IT BACK, AND GO AND TAKE UP A HANDFUL IN HIS RIGHT HAND.”**

1. II:1: What is so special about the left hand that it has to be specified here?

a. II:2: Secondary expansion on the foregoing.

I. II:3: Gloss of the foregoing.

II. II:4: Continuation of the gloss. Includes a reference to a case in which he put the meal offering back into a utensil that is lying on the ground, which accounts for the inclusion of the following systematic exposition of the general theme of taking the handful from a utensil on the ground, and other rules.

**C. RULES ON TAKING THE HANDFUL: 1. FROM A UTENSIL THAT IS LYING ON THE GROUND; 2 MIXING THE MEAL WITH OIL**

1. II:5: The question was addressed to R. Sheshet: “What is the law on taking the handful from a utensil that is lying on the ground?”

2. II:6: Said Raba, “It is obvious to me that one may take the handful of meal offering from a utensil that is lying on the ground, for so we find that in the taking away of the dishes of frankincense, that is how the rite is carried on. Furthermore, one may sanctify the meal offering by putting the meal into a utensil that is lying on

the ground, for we find that that is the case with setting down the dishes of frankincense.” Raba raised the question: “As to the sanctification of the handful of meal offering, what is the rule? Do we derive the law from the analogy of the rule covering the meal offering itself and therefore the utensil may be left on the ground, and if meal offering is put into it, it is sanctified? Or do we derive the rule from the analogy of the law covering receiving the blood which may not be received in a utensil lying on the ground?”

**a.** II:7: Gloss of foregoing. How do we know that if the blood was divided, when it was being received, into separate utensils, it is not sanctified?

**b.** II:8: Continuation of II.7.

**I.** II:9: Reversion to a tangential detail in the foregoing.

**A.** II:10: Gloss of the foregoing gloss.

**B.** II:11: Continuation of the foregoing.

**1.** II:12: Reversion to a tangential detail in the foregoing.

**2.** II:13: Continuation of the foregoing.

**3.** II:14: As above.

**4.** II:15: As above.

**3.** II:16: It has been stated: The meal offering that one mixed with oil outside of the walls of the Temple court — R. Yohanan said, “It is invalid.” And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “It is valid.”

**4.** II:17: It has been stated: The meal offering that was diminished before the handful was taken from it — R. Yohanan said, “Let the priest bring more meal from his own resources and make up the lacking volume.” And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “Let the priest not bring more meal from his own resources and make up the lacking volume.”

**5.** II:18: It has been stated: The meal offering, the remainder of which was found to be lacking between the taking of the handful and the burning of the handful — R. Yohanan said, “One may nonetheless offer up the handful of meal offering on account of it.” And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, ““One may not offer up the handful of meal offering on account of it.”

**D. IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH HIS LEFT HAND, HE HAS RENDERED IT INVALID:**

**1.** III:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this rule?

**a.** III:2: Continuing the analysis of the proof-text.

**b.** III:3: As above.

**c.** III:4: As above.

**E. IF HE TOOK A HANDFUL AND THERE CAME UP IN HIS HAND A PEBBLE OR A GRAIN OF SALT OR A GRAIN OF FRANKINCENSE, IT THE PEBBLE, ETC. HAS RENDERED IT INVALID:**

**1.** IV:1: Why list all of these items individually?

**F. FOR THEY HAVE SAID, “THE HANDFUL WHICH IS TOO MUCH OR WHICH IS TOO LITTLE IS INVALID.” WHAT IS A CASE OF A HANDFUL WHICH IS TOO MUCH? A CASE IN WHICH ONE TOOK AN OVERFLOWING HANDFUL. AND ONE WHICH IS TOO LITTLE? A CASE IN WHICH ONE TOOK UP A HANDFUL WITH HIS FINGERTIPS.**

1. V:1: How come that the operative consideration is that it is too much or too little? Why not simply disqualify the handful by reason of interposition in that the stone separates the flour from the fingers and so interposes and invalidates the handful?

2. V:2: Said Abbaye to Raba, “How do they take the handful?” He said to him, “The usual way” : using all the fingers of the hand, including the little finger.

3. V:3: Said R. Pappa, “It is obvious to me that “a full handful” refers to the way in which people ordinarily take a handful.” R. Pappa raised this question, “If the priest took the handful with his fingertips, or with the sides of his hands, or from below upwards : he cupped his hand and pressed it, palm upwards, into the flour and thus took a handful — what is the law?”

4. V:4: Said R. Pappa, “It is obvious to me that “his hands full” refers to the way in which people ordinarily fill the hands.”

R. Pappa raised this question, “If the priest filled his hands with his fingertips, or if he filled the hands one by one and then brought them together — what is the law?”

5. V:5: R. Pappa raised this question, “If the priest stuck the handful to the side of the utensil rather than pouring it to the bottom — what is the law? Do we require putting it inside the utensil and that condition has been met here, or must it be put down inside of the utensil, which condition has not been met here?”

6. V:6: Mar bar R. Ashi raised the question, “If the priest turned the utensil upside down and put the handful of meal on the bottom of the utensil, what is the law? Do we require putting it inside the utensil and that condition has been met here, or must the rite be done in the correct manner, and that condition has not been met here?”

### **III. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 1:2K-L, 1:3A**

**A. WHAT DOES ONE DO? HE STRETCHES OUT HIS FINGERTIPS OVER THE PALM OF HIS HAND. IF HE PUT IN TOO MUCH OF ITS OIL OR PUT IN TOO LITTLE OIL...IT IS INVALID.**

1. I:1: what is the meaning of put in too much oil? Said R. Eleazar, “For instance, if one designated for the mixture two logs of oil and the oil was mixed with the flour, so that to all appearances there are here two meal offerings.”

**B. OR PUT IN TOO LITTLE FRANKINCENSE, IT IS INVALID**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If he put in too little incense, even only two grains, it is valid,” the words of R. Judah. And R. Simeon says, “If there lacked one grain, it is valid; if less, it is invalid” (T. **Men. 1:17F-G**).

a. II:2: Said R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan, “In this matter there are three contending positions. R. Meir the anonymous version of our

Mishnah-paragraph takes the view that a handful of frankincense is required at the outset and a handful at the end. R. Judah maintains that a handful of frankincense is required at the outset, but even if there are only two grains at the end, that suffices. R. Simeon holds that a handful of frankincense is required at the outset, but even if there is only two grain at the end, that suffices. And all three of them interpret one and the same verse of Scripture.”

**b. II:3:** Moreover R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan said, “The dispute concerns frankincense offered along with the meal offering and the offering is valid with however little frankincense, but as to an offering made up only of frankincense, all parties concur that there must be a handful to begin with and a handful at the end.

**c. II:4:** Moreover R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan said, “The dispute concerns only frankincense offered along with the meal offering, but as to frankincense that is offered in dish all parties concur that there must be two handfuls to begin with and two handfuls at the end a handful of frankincense in each dish throughout the time the dishes are set on the table until they are taken away to be burned up.”

**d. II:5:** R. Ammi and R. Isaac Nappaha disputed the matter. One said, “The dispute concerns frankincense that is presented along with a meal offering, but as to frankincense that is presented on its own, all parties concur that there has to be a handful at the beginning and a handful at the end.” And the other said, “As is the dispute concerning frankincense that is presented along with a meal offering, so runs the dispute as to frankincense that is presented on its own.”

**6. II:6:** or put in too little frankincense, it is invalid: Therefore if he put in too much it is valid. But, in contradiction to that implication, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If he put in too much, it is invalid.

**7. II:7:** And said R. Ammi bar Hama, “If someone designated two handfuls of frankincense and then lost one of them before taking up the handful of flour, the offering remains valid, for the handfuls of frankincense have not yet been designated for this particular meal offering.

**8. II:8:** And said R. Ammi bar Hama, “If one set apart four handfuls of frankincense for the two dishes of frankincense to be set with the showbread, and two of them were lost before the dishes were removed, the offering is valid, for the handfuls of frankincense have not yet been designated for this particular meal offering.

#### **IV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 1:3B-X, 1:4A-O**

**A. HE WHO TAKES UP THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT ITS RESIDUE OUTSIDE, OR AN OLIVE’S BULK OF ITS RESIDUE OUTSIDE, TO BURN A HANDFUL THEREOF OUTSIDE, OR AN OLIVE’S BULK OF A HANDFUL THEREOF OUTSIDE, OR TO BURN ITS FRANKINCENSE OUTSIDE — IT IS INVALID. BUT EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT. IF HE TAKES UP THE HANDFUL**

OF MEAL OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT ITS RESIDUE ON THE NEXT DAY, OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF ITS RESIDUE ON THE NEXT DAY, TO BURN A HANDFUL THEREOF ON THE NEXT DAY, OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF A HANDFUL THEREOF ON THE NEXT DAY, OR TO BURN ITS FRANKINCENSE ON THE NEXT DAY, IT IS REFUSE. AND THEY ARE LIABLE TO EXTIRPATION ON ITS ACCOUNT. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: IN EVERY CASE IN WHICH ONE TAKES THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING, OR PUTS IT INTO A UTENSIL, OR CONVEYS IT, OR OFFERS IT UP, WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT SOMETHING WHICH IS USUALLY EATEN THE RESIDUE OR TO OFFER UP SOMETHING WHICH IS USUALLY OFFERED UP THE MEAL OFFERING — OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER PLACE, IT IS INVALID. IF ONE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT THE RESIDUE OR TO OFFER UP THE MEAL OFFERING OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME, IT IS REFUSE. AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION. AND THE FOREGOING RULE APPLIES ON CONDITION THAT THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE IS OFFERED IN ACCORD WITH ITS REQUIREMENT. HOW IS THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE OFFERED IN ACCORD WITH ITS REQUIREMENT? IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL IN SILENCE WITHOUT IMPROPER INTENTION AND PUT IT INTO THE UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO DO SO OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING THAT WHICH IS EATEN OR OFFERING UP THAT WHICH IS OFFERED UP OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME, AND THEN PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP IN SILENCE WITHOUT IMPROPER INTENTION, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT THAT WHICH IS EATEN OR TO BURN THAT WHICH IS BURNED OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME ONLY — THIS IS A CASE IN WHICH THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE IS OFFERED UP IN ACCORD WITH ITS REQUIREMENT.

HOW IS THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE NOT OFFERED IN ACCORD WITH ITS REQUIREMENT? IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING THAT WHICH IS EATEN OR BURNING THAT WHICH IS BURNED OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER PLACE, AND THEN PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING THAT WHICH IS EATEN OR BURNING THAT WHICH IS BURNED OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING OR BURNING OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME, AND THEN PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING OR BURNING OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER PLACE, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING OR BURNING OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER PLACE IN ADDITION TO TIME — AND LIKEWISE THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SUSPECTED ADULTERESS OF WHICH ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL NOT FOR THEIR OWN NAME, AND PUT INTO THE UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED UP WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION OF EATING OR BURNING OUTSIDE OF THEIR PROPER TIME, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OR BURN OUTSIDE OF THEIR PROPER TIME, AND THEN PLACED IT INTO THE UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND OFFERED IT UP NOT FOR THEIR OWN NAME, OR IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO A UTENSIL AND CONVEYED AND



**OFFERED IT UP NOT FOR THEIR OWN NAME AT ALL — THIS IS A CASE IN WHICH THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE HAS NOT BEEN OFFERED UP IN ACCORD WITH ITS REQUIREMENT. IF ONE DID SO TO EAT AN OLIVE’S BULK OUTSIDE AND AN OLIVE’S BULK ON THE NEXT DAY, AN OLIVE’S BULK ON THE NEXT DAY AND AN OLIVE’S BULK OUTSIDE, A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK OUTSIDE AND A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK ON THE NEXT DAY, A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK ON THE NEXT DAY AND A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK OUTSIDE — IT IS INVALID. BUT EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT. SAID R. JUDAH, “THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: IF THE IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING TIME CAME BEFORE THE IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING PLACE, IT IS REFUSE. AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION. BUT IF THE IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING PLACE CAME BEFORE THE IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING TIME, IT IS INVALID. BUT EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT.” AND SAGES SAY, “BOTH THIS AND THAT ARE INVALID. BUT EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT.”**

WHAT FOLLOWS IS A FREE-STANDING ANALYTICAL DISCOURSE, NOT A COMMENT ON ANY COMPONENT OF THE FOREGOING.

I.1: The question was raised, “In the opinion of him who says, ‘The residue that was found to be lacking between the taking of the handful and the offering up thereof, the priest may burn the handful on account of the residue,’ in which matter we had further established the fact that that residue nonetheless may not be eaten, what is the law on the following issue: can the burning takes effect over the status of the residue that the improper intentionality expressed by the priest when burning the handful to eat the residue which may not be eaten at all, lacking the proper volume outside of the proper time will classify the residue as refuse, and also can the burning so affect the status of the residue as to remove the residue from the coverage of the laws of sacrilege for after the handful is burned, the residue is no longer subject to the law of sacrilege; here, even after the burning, the priests cannot eat the residue, so it may be that the law of sacrilege still applies. This inquiry raises a marvelous problem, identifying the interstitial character of the residue found lacking, that is, the case treated in connection with a prior Mishnah-paragraph altogether. In point of fact we have not a comment on the Mishnah-paragraph but a secondary problem generated by a variety of rules; the location of the problem here is obviously on account of the pertinence, to the solution of the problem, of a few lines of our Mishnah-paragraph.

## **V. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 1:4P-Q**

**A. IF ONE TOOK UP THE HANDFUL WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK AND TO OFFER UP A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK AT THE WRONG TIME OR IN THE WRONG PLACE, IT IS INVALID. FOR IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING EATING AND IMPROPER INTENTION CONCERNING OFFERING UP DO NOT JOIN TOGETHER.**

1. I.1: If one intends to eat half an olive’s bulk and to burn half an olive’s bulk, it is valid. For eating and burning are not joined together: The operative consideration

here is that the intentionality concerns eating and burning. But if the officiating priest expressed the intentionality of eating what is fit for eating and of eating what is not fit for eating that is, he would burn the sacrificial parts, which are not fit for eating, then they would combine. But the first clause nonetheless teaches, ...intending to eat something which is usually eaten meat, or to burn something which is usually burned entrails, outside of its proper place which is, the Temple court for Most Holy Things, the walled city of Jerusalem for Lesser Holy Things — it is invalid and the meat may not be eaten. And extirpation does not apply to it. So the rule applies to what is usually eaten, but not to what is not usually eaten!

2. I:2: Who is the Tannaite authority behind this rule?

## **VI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:1**

**A. HE WHO TAKES THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT ITS RESIDUE OR TO BURN ITS HANDFUL ON THE NEXT DAY — R. YOSÉ AGREES IN THIS CASE THAT IF THE SACRIFICE IS REFUSE AND THEY WHO EAT IT ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION.**

1. I:1: How come the framer of the passage includes the language, R. Yosé agrees in this case that if the sacrifice is refuse and they who eat it are liable on its account to extirpation? Because he wishes further to go on to say, If he does so with the improper intention to burn its frankincense on the next day, R. Yosé says, “It the sacrifice is invalid. And extirpation does not apply to it.” What might you otherwise have supposed? That the operative consideration in the mind of R. Yosé is that he maintains that improper intentionality with regard to only one aspect of the conduct of the rite that permits the priests to eat the residue of the meal offering does not take effect so as to impart to the offering the status of refuse.

**B. IF HE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO BURN ITS FRANKINCENSE ON THE NEXT DAY, R. YOSÉ SAYS, “IT THE SACRIFICE IS INVALID. AND EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT.” AND SAGES SAY, “IT IS REFUSE. AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION.” THEY SAID TO HIM, “WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS CASE OF THE MEAL OFFERINGS AND FRANKINCENSE AND THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE?” HE SAID TO THEM, “THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE — ITS BLOOD AND ITS FLESH AND ITS SACRIFICIAL PARTS ARE OF ONE GENRE. BUT THE FRANKINCENSE IS NOT FROM THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH IS FLOUR.”**

1. II:1: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Yosé takes the position that improper intentionality concerning the conduct of one of the rites that permits the priests to eat the meal offering does not have the power to render refuse another component of the same rites that permit the priests to eat the meal offering. So too, you may say in the case of the two dishes of frankincense that are presented with the showbread, that improper intentionality concerning the conduct of one of the rites that permits the priests to eat the meal offering in this case, dealing with one of the two dishes of frankincense does not have the power to render refuse another component of the same rites the other of the two dishes in context that permit the priests to eat the meal offering.”

2. II:2: Said R. Yannai, “If, after the burning of the handful, the frankincense was picked from the flour and burned upon the altar by a non-priest, the rite is invalid.” How come? Said R. Jeremiah, “It is because the matter of bringing near pertains to it.” When the non-priest hands the frankincense to the officiating priest, he has helped to “bring near” the frankincense, and that is essential to the rite and must be done only by a priest, and not, even partially as in this case, by a non-priest. He therefore takes the view that bringing near, even now involving actual walking, is classified as bringing near, and, further, that bringing near by a non-priest is invalid and invalidates the rite.

## **VII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:2A-E**

**A. IF HE SLAUGHTERED TWO LAMBS WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT ONE OF THE LOAVES THAT ACCOMPANY THAT RITE ON THE NEXT DAY AFTER THE FESTIVAL — IF HE BURNED THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE, WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT ONE OF THE ROWS ON THE NEXT DAY — R. YOSÉ SAYS, “THAT PARTICULAR LOAF OR THAT PARTICULAR ROW TO WHICH HE GAVE THOUGHT IMPROPERLY TO EAT ON THE NEXT DAY IS REFUSE. AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION. BUT THE SECOND LOAF OF BREAD OR ROW IS INVALID. AND EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT.” AND SAGES SAY, “BOTH THIS AND THAT ARE REFUSE, AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION.”**

1. I:1: Said R. Huna, ““R. Yosé took the position that improper intentionality concerning the conduct of one of the rites that permits the priests to eat the right thigh of the lamb does not have the power to render refuse another component of the same rites that permit the priests to eat the left thigh of the same lamb.”

2. I:2: R. Yohanan raised this question: “If the officiating priest expressed in regard to the loaves of the thank offering, or in regard to the baked meal offering an intention that imposes the status of refuse, what is the law?”

3. I:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who slaughters an animal sacrifice with the expressed intention of eating a half olive’s bulk of the meat on the next day, and at the time of tossing the blood gave further thought to burn a half olive’s bulk of the sacrificial parts on the next day — the offering is refuse, and liability to extirpation is incurred on account of that intentionality, for slaughtering the animal and tossing the blood are acts that are deemed to join together (T. **Zeb. 2:14A-C**).

## **VIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:2F-I**

**A. IF BEFORE THE TOSSING OF THE BLOOD OR BURNING OF THE INCENSE, ONE OF THE LOAVES OR ONE OF THE ROWS WAS MADE UNCLEAN, R. JUDAH SAYS, “BOTH OF THEM GO OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING. FOR AN OFFERING MADE IN BEHALF OF THE CONGREGATION IS NOT TO BE DIVIDED.” AND SAGES SAY, “THE UNCLEAN REMAINS SUBJECT TO ITS UNCLEANNESS, BUT THE CLEAN ONE MAY BE EATEN.”**

1. I:1: Said R. Eleazar, “The dispute pertains to the situation prior to the tossing of the blood, but as to that prevailing afterward, The unclean remains subject to its uncleanness, but the clean one may be eaten.”

## **IX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:3**

**A. AN IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE THANK OFFERING MAKES THE BREAD BROUGHT ALONG WITH THE THANK OFFERING REFUSE, BUT AN IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE BREAD DOES NOT MAKE THE THANK OFFERING REFUSE. HOW SO? HE WHO SLAUGHTERS THE THANK OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF IT ON THE NEXT DAY — IT AND THE BREAD ARE MADE REFUSE. IF HE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF THE BREAD ON THE NEXT DAY, THE BREAD IS MADE REFUSE, BUT THE THANK OFFERING IS NOT MADE REFUSE. IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE LAMBS MAKE THE BREAD REFUSE, BUT IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE BREAD DOES NOT MAKE THE LAMBS REFUSE. HOW SO? HE WHO SLAUGHTERS THE LAMBS WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF THEM ON THE NEXT DAY — THEY AND THE BREAD ARE MADE REFUSE. IF HE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF THE BREAD ON THE NEXT DAY, THE BREAD IS MADE REFUSE, BUT THE LAMBS ARE NOT MADE REFUSE.**

1. I:1: What is the operative consideration here? May one say that it is on account of that which R. Kahana said? For, said R. Kahana, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the loaves that accompany the thank offering are classed as the think offering? It is on the basis of the statement of Scripture, ‘He shall offer for the sacrifice of the thank offering unleavened cakes’ (Lev. 7:12).” But then, the contrary should also be the case and improper intentionality concerning the cakes should affect the thank offering itself, contrary to the rule, If he does so with the improper intention to eat of the bread on the next day, the bread is made refuse, but the thank offering is not made refuse!

2. I:2: R. Eleazar raised this question to Rab: “He who slaughters a thank offering with the expressed intention of eating an olive’s bulk of it and of its bread half of the meat, half of the bread on the next day, what is the law ? As to imparting the status of refuse to the thank offering, there is no problem for me. Since the whole of it will not be rendered refuse by reason of an improper intentionality concerning the bread, can there be any question concerning the intentionality that is expressed concerning ‘of its meat and of its bread’? Where it is a problem for me, it concerns whether or not the bread is given the status of refuse? Does the meat of the thank offering join together in such a way as to impart the status of refuse to the bread, or is that not the case?”

a. I:3: Different version of the foregoing.

b. I:4: Different version of the foregoing.

c. I:5: As above.

## **X. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:4**

**A. IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE MAKES THE DRINK OFFERINGS REFUSE, (“ONCE THEY HAVE BEEN SANCTIFIED IN A UTENSIL,” THE WORDS OF R. MEIR) — BUT IMPROPER INTENTIONALITY CONCERNING THE DRINK OFFERINGS DO NOT MAKE THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE REFUSE. HOW SO? HE WHO SLAUGHTERS THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF IT ON THE NEXT DAY — IT AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS ARE MADE REFUSE. IF HE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO OFFER UP PART OF THE DRINK OFFERINGS ON THE NEXT DAY, THE DRINK OFFERINGS ARE MADE REFUSE, BUT THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE IS NOT MADE REFUSE.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “On account of drink offerings that are presented with an animal offering people are liable on regard to the laws of refuse, because the blood of the offering is what permits the drink offerings to be consumed, when it is properly offered up,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “They are not liable on their account by reason of the laws of refuse, because someone may present his animal offering today and the drink offerings twenty days later. Said to them R. Meir, “Also I for my part has stated the rule in reference to a case in which one has sanctified the drink offerings in a utensil.” They said to him, “Even though one has sanctified the drink offerings in a proper utensil, one can still transfer them to some other offering” (T. [Zeb. 5:1A-D](#)). Consequently they cannot be rendered refuse through an intention expressed during the slaughtering of the animal offering, since they are not specifically bound to that offering.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “On account of the log of oil of a person afflicted with the skin ailment are people liable because of the laws of refuse, for the blood of the guilt offering is required to permit the application of the oil to the places of the body of the person afflicted by the skin ailment on which the oil is to be placed,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “They are not liable on that account because of the laws of refuse, because someone may present his guilt offering today and the log of oil ten days from now.” Said to them R. Meir, “Also I for my part has stated the rule in reference to a case in which the oil has come with this particular guilt offering.” They said to him, “Even though one has sanctified the oil in a proper utensil, one can still transfer it to the guilt offering of some other person afflicted with the skin ailment” (T. [Zeb. 5:2A-D](#)).

## **XI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 2:5**

**A. IF ONE FORMED AN IMPROPER INTENTION, SUCH THAT HE HAS MADE REFUSE THE HANDFUL OF MEAL FOR THE MEAL OFFERING BUT NOT THE FRANKINCENSE, THE FRANKINCENSE BUT NOT THE HANDFUL — R.MEIR SAYS, “IT IS REFUSE, AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION.” AND SAGES SAY, “EXTIRPATION DOES NOT APPLY TO IT, UNTIL THROUGH IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OR OFFER UP THE WHOLE OUTSIDE THE PROPER TIME HE WILL RENDER REFUSE THE WHOLE OF THAT WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE FOR THE PRIESTS TO EAT.” BUT SAGES CONCUR WITH R. MEIR IN THE CASE OF THE**

**MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY NEITHER OF WHICH IS ACCOMPANIED BY INCENSE, THAT IF ONE HAS IMPARTED THE STATUS OF REFUSE TO THE HANDFUL OF THE MEAL OFFERING, IT IS REFUSE, AND THEY ARE LIABLE TO EXTIRPATION ON ITS ACCOUNT. FOR IT IS SOLELY THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WHICH RENDERS THE OFFERING PERMISSIBLE.**

**IF ONE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT THE TWO LOAVES ON THE NEXT DAY, OR IF HE BURNED ONE OF THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE, WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT BOTH ROWS ON THE NEXT DAY — R. MEIR SAYS, “IT IS REFUSE, AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT TO EXTIRPATION.” AND SAGES SAY, “IT IS NOT REFUSE UNTIL ONE WILL IMPART THE STATUS OF REFUSE TO THE WHOLE OF THAT WHICH RENDERS THE SACRIFICE PERMISSIBLE.” IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT OF IT ON THE NEXT DAY, IT IS REFUSE, BUT ITS FELLOW IS VALID. IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE LAMB INTENDING TO EAT ITS FELLOW ON THE NEXT DAY, BOTH ARE VALID.**

1. I:1: Said Rab, “The dispute pertains to a case in which he offered up the handful in silence as is required, expressing no improper intentionality but then he offered the frankincense with the expression of an improper intentionality. But if he offered up the handful of the meal offering with an expressed, improper intentionality, but the frankincense in silence, all parties concur that it is refuse. For whatever one does in silence follows the intentionality by definition, not a disqualifying one, since it is done in silence that is originally expressed.” And Samuel said, “The dispute pertains even to that other case.”

2. I:2: In session Raba stated the matter just now set forth. Objected R. Aha bar R. Huna to Raba, “Under what circumstances? In the case of the taking of the handful, placing it in a utensil, and carrying it each act of service is a singleton. But if one has come to the burning of the fistful and the frankincense, if the priest presents the handful with the stated intention that makes it refuse and the frankincense in silence, or the handful of meal in silence and the frankincense with such a refuse-making intention, R. Meir says, “It is refuse, and they are liable on its account to extirpation.” And sages say, “It involves the penalty of extirpation only if the priest will express the refuse-making intention in regard to the entire sequence of rites that render the meal permissible for the priests to eat.” Now in any event, it has been indicated, the handful of meal in silence and the frankincense with such a refuse-making intention, and in such a case R. Meir dissents and here the second act is not done with the same intention as the first, so he must maintain that one can assign to the offering the status of refuse even in regard to only part of the rite that renders the meat permissible for eating.

a. I:3: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

I. I:4: Reconsideration of a detail of the foregoing.

3. I:5: The question was raised: if at the moment of bringing the handful of meal offering near to the altar, one expressed an intentionality leading to the classification of the offering as refuse, what is the law?

4. I:6: If the priest burned a bit of the handful the size of a sesame seed, with the improper intention to eat on the next day a bit of the handful the size of a sesame seed of the residue, and he did this again and again until the whole of the handful had disappeared in this way — in this case, there is a dispute among R. Hisda, R. Hamnuna, and R. Sheshet.

5. I:7: Said the sharp-witted intellects of Pumbedita, “The intentionality that imparts to the offering the status of refuse that is expressed during one service of burning concerning another such service imparts to the offering the status of refuse. And that is the case even within the position of rabbis, who hold that the improper intentionality that produces the status of refuse may take effect even in reference to the conduct of only part of the rite that permits the offering to be eaten. That conception applies to a case in which the improper intentionality concerned the residue of the meal offering, leaving the frankincense untouched; but here, where the officiating priest has expressed the refuse-intention about the frankincense, it is as though he had expressed the improper intentionality in the context of the entirety of the service presenting the whole of that which renders the offering permitted.”

6. I:8: In session before Abbaye, R. Menassia bar Gada stated in the name of R. Hisda, “The intentionality that imparts to the offering the status of refuse that is expressed during one service of burning concerning another such service does not impart to the offering the status of refuse. And that is the case even within the position of R. Meir, who has ruled that the improper intentionality that produces the status of refuse may take effect even in reference to the conduct of only part of the rite that permits the offering to be eaten. That conception applies to a case in which the improper intentionality concerned the residue of the meal offering, since it is the handful not the remainder that renders the residue permissible; but here, since the handful does not render the frankincense permissible for the status of the frankincense does not depend on the burning of the handful, it also does not affect the status, as to refuse, of the frankincense.”

7. I:9: Said R. Hamnuna, “This matter was fed to me by R. Hanina, and to me it is worth all the rest of the things that I have learned, namely: if the priest burned the handful of meal offering with the expressed intention of burning the frankincense on the next day, to eat the residue on the next day, the offering is refuse. What is at stake here? If he proposes to tell us that intentionality that imparts to the offering the status of refuse that is expressed during one service of burning concerning another such service does impart to the offering the status of refuse, then the passage should be phrased in this wise: if the priest burned the handful of meal offering with the expressed intention of burning the frankincense on the next day omitting: and to eat the residue on the next day. And if he proposes to say that intentionality that imparts to the offering the status of refuse that is expressed during the service involving only part of the rite that renders the offering permissible to the priests imparts to the offering the status of refuse, then the passage should be phrased in this wise: if the priest burned the handful of meal offering with the expressed intention of eating the residue on the next day, the offering is refuse. And if his intent was to make both points, then he should have framed the matter in this way: if the priest burned the handful of meal offering with



the expressed intention of burning the frankincense on the next day and to eat the residue on the next day, the offering is refuse.”

8. I:10: A Tannaite authority repeated before R. Isaac bar Abba, “If the officiating priest burned the handful of meal offering with the expressed intention of eating the residue the next day, in the opinion of all parties, it is refuse.”

## **XII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:1**

**A. HE WHO TAKES THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT USUALLY EATEN, TO OFFER UP SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT USUALLY OFFERED UP, IT IS VALID. R. ELIEZER DECLARES THE OFFERING INVALID.**

**IF ONE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT SOMETHING WHICH IS USUALLY EATEN, TO OFFER UP SOMETHING WHICH IS USUALLY OFFERED UP, IN A VOLUME LESS THAN AN OLIVE’S BULK — IT IS VALID. IF HE DOES SO WITH THE IMPROPER INTENTION TO EAT A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK AND TO OFFER UP A HALF-OLIVE’S BULK — IT IS VALID. FOR EATING AND OFFERING UP DO NOT JOIN TOGETHER.**

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

a. I:2: Said R. Zira to R. Assi, “If that is the basis for the position of R. Eliezer, then the penalty of extirpation should also be imposed in such a case! And should you say that that is indeed the fact, you are the one who has said in the name of R. Yohanan, ‘R. Eliezer concedes that he is not liable to the penalty of extirpation.’”

## **XIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:2A-C**

**A. IF ONE DID NOT POUR OIL OVER THE FINE FLOUR, DID NOT MINGLE THE OIL WITH UNLEAVENED CAKES, DID NOT BREAK UP THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN, DID NOT SALT IT, DID NOT WAVE IT IF SUCH IS REQUIRED, AS IN THE CASE OF THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OMER AND OF THE WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY, DID NOT BRING IT NEAR:**



1. I:1: If one did not pour oil over the fine flour: What is the meaning of the language, did not pour oil? If we should say that he did not pour any oil at all, then Scripture has indicated that that is an indispensable part of the rite so how could the offering be valid? Rather, it was not a priest, but a non-priest, who did the pouring.

**B. OR IF HE BROKE IT UP INTO BIG PIECES OR DID NOT ANOINT IT WITH OIL AFTER BAKING — THE MEAL OFFERINGS SO PREPARED ARE VALID:**

1. II:1: Now if he did not break it up into pieces at all, it is valid, if he broke it into big pieces, should there be any problem? Of course it should be valid. What is the meaning of big pieces? It is that there were many pieces and the cakes had been broken into too many small pieces.

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

**C. ANY PASSAGE IN WHICH THE WORDS ‘TORAH’ AND ‘STATUTE’ OCCUR IN REGARD TO ANY RITE, THE MEANING IS ONLY TO SIGNIFY THAT THAT MATTER IS INDISPENSABLE TO THE PROPER PERFORMANCE OF THE RITE**

a. II:3: Discussion of an exegetical principle subordinate in the foregoing: Said Rab, “Any passage in which the words ‘Torah’ and ‘statute’ occur...”

I. II:4: Gloss of the foregoing. Rab has said, “In any passage in which the rite of the meal offering is repeated in some other verse besides Lev. 2, 6:7-11, the purpose of doing so is only to indicate that the details are indispensable.” And Samuel said, “The bruised grain and the oil are indispensable to one another, but no other detail of the rite is indispensable.”

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

A. II:6: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

1. II:7: As above.

2. II:8: As above.

3. II:9: As above.

4. II:10: As above.

5. II:11: As above ?

**D. ...DID NOT SALT IT:**

1. III:1: “You shall salt” (Lev. 2:13) — what purpose does this clause serve?

2. III:2: “Nor shall you allow salt to be lacking.” Since the word for “be lacking” uses the same consonants as those in the word Sabbath, the meaning is: produce salt that has no Sabbath but is produced winter and summer, and what is that? It is salt from Sodom.

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

a. III:4: Gloss of a proof-text in the foregoing.

4. III:5: Scripture in any event therefore says, “You shall salt.” How is this done?

5. III:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The salt that is on the sacrificial limbs is subject to the laws of sacrilege. That which is on the ramp and altar is not available for benefit, but the laws of sacrilege do not apply (T. **Men. 6:4A-B**)

6. III:7: We have learned in the Mishnah: They ordained concerning salt and wood, that priests should be able to make use of them” (M. **Sheq. 7:1A**). Said Samuel, “That rule pertains only to using salt for their offerings, but not for eating the meat.”

a. III:8: Comment on the foregoing.

b. III:9: As above.

I. III:10: Secondary gloss.

1. III:11: As above.

#### **XIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:2D-H**

**A. IF ITS HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING WAS MIXED WITH THE HANDFUL OF ITS FELLOW MEAL OFFERING — WITH THE MEAL OFFERING OF PRIESTS, WITH THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED PRIEST, WITH THE MEAL OFFERINGS BROUGHT WITH DRINK OFFERINGS — IT IS VALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IN THE CASE OF MIXTURE WITH THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED PRIEST OR WITH THE MEAL OFFERING BROUGHT WITH DRINK OFFERINGS, IT IS INVALID. FOR IN THE CASE OF ONE, ITS MIXTURE IS THICK, AND IN THE CASE OF THE OTHERS, ITS MIXTURE IS THIN, AND EACH ABSORBS FROM THE OTHER:”**

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

a. I:2: Secondary development of the foregoing.

b. I:3: Secondary development of the foregoing.

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

absorbs from the other, what difference does that make? What we have here, after all, are the mixture of two things of like kind! The handful here is made up of oil and water, mixed with one of the meal offerings, which has oil. The oil in the handful is disregarded, so that the flour of the handful will neutralize the oil of the other meal offering that it has absorbed, and the result is that the handful has too much oil and is invalid.

3. I:5: It has been stated: if the priest poured oil on the handful of meal offering that was taken from a sinner's meal offering — R. Yohanan says, "It is invalid." R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "He himself to begin with wipes up with it the remains of the log of oil and then offers it up."

4. I:6: Raba raised the question: "As to a handful of meal offering the oil of which was squeezed out onto the wood leaving too little oil in the meal offering, what is the law? What is attached to an offering is classified as the offering since the wood with the oil on it will later on be joined to the handful and burned together on the altar, it is as though the oil were still in the handful, so that the oil is not lacking, or is it not classified as the offering?"

## **XV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:3A-I**

**A. TWO MEAL OFFERINGS FROM NEITHER ONE OF WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD BEEN TAKEN AND WHICH HAVING FALLEN INTO A SINGLE UTENSIL WERE MIXED UP TOGETHER — IF ONE CAN TAKE THE HANDFUL FROM THIS ONE BY ITSELF AND FROM THAT ONE BY ITSELF, BOTH ARE VALID. AND IF NOT, THEY ARE INVALID. THE HANDFUL TAKEN FROM A MEAL OFFERING WHICH WAS MIXED UP WITH A MEAL OFFERING FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN — HE SHOULD NOT OFFER IT THE MIXTURE UP. AND IF HE OFFERED IT UP, THIS ONE FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD BEEN TAKEN GOES TO THE CREDIT OF ITS OWNER. AND THIS ONE FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN DOES NOT GO TO THE CREDIT OF ITS OWNER. IF ITS HANDFUL WAS MIXED UP WITH ITS RESIDUE, OR WITH THE RESIDUE OF ITS FELLOW, HE SHOULD NOT OFFER IT UP. BUT IF HE OFFERED IT UP, IT GOES TO THE CREDIT OF THE OWNER.**

1. I:1: Said R. Hisda, "Carrion is neutralized in a larger quantity of properly slaughtered meat, for it is not possible for properly slaughtered meat to become carrion, but properly slaughtered meat is not neutralized in carrion meat, since carrion meat can become properly slaughtered meat, since, when it has putrefied and is no longer edible, the uncleanness attaching to it is removed." And R. Hanina said, "Whatever can become like the other is not neutralized, but whatever cannot become like the other is neutralized." It is the substance that is going to be neutralized that is taken into account, that is, the substance that forms the smaller part of the mixture; if it can become like what constitutes the greater part of the mixture, the mixture is then a mixture of like kinds and neutralization does not take place.

2. I:2: When R. Kahana went up to the Land of Israel, he found the sons of R. Hiyya in session, stating, "A tenth of an ephah of flour designated for use for a meal offering which one divided and left in two halves in the mixing utensil, which a person who has completed his rite of purification but awaits sunset to complete

the rite of purification touched one of the two parts, what is the law? When we have learned the rule in the Mishnah, A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering (M. Hag. 3:2C-D), that rule pertains in particular to a case in which the components that are contained in the common utensil touch one another. But in a case in which they are not touching one another, that is not the case? Or perhaps there is no differentiating the one from the other case?”

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

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

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

## **XVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:3J-L**

**A. IF THE HANDFUL WAS MADE UNCLEAN AND ONE NONETHELESS OFFERED IT UP, THE PRIEST’S FRONTLET EFFECTS ACCEPTANCE. IF IT WENT FORTH BEYOND THE VEILS AND ONE OFFERED IT UP, THE PRIEST’S FRONTLET DOES NOT EFFECT ACCEPTANCE. FOR THE PRIEST’S FRONTLET EFFECTS ACCEPTANCE FOR THAT**

**WHICH IS UNCLEAN, BUT IT DOES NOT EFFECT ACCEPTANCE FOR THAT WHICH GOES FORTH BEYOND THE VEILS:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things” (Exo. 28:38) the high priest’s head plate atones for faults in connection with the offering — and what is the iniquity for which the head plate atones? If you should say that it is for the sin of making the offering refuse, lo, it is stated to the contrary, “It shall not be accepted” (Lev. 19: 7). If you say, it is the sin of leaving the meat over beyond the proper time, lo, it is stated, “Neither shall it be imputed to him” (Lev. 7:18). Lo, it can bear the iniquity only for the sin of uncleanness, for that is remitted from the prevailing prohibition when it comes to the offering of the community.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If the blood of an offering was made unclean and inadvertently was sprinkled, it is acceptable; if this was done deliberately, it is not accepted. That rule pertains only to an individual’s offering, but in the case of an offering in behalf of the entire community, the offering is acceptable whether made inadvertently or deliberately. In the case of an offering presented by a gentile, whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, the offering is not acceptable.

**XVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:4A-B**

**A. IF BEFORE THE HANDFUL WAS OFFERED UP ITS RESIDUE WAS MADE UNCLEAN, IF ITS RESIDUE WAS BURNED, IF ITS RESIDUE WAS LOST, IN ACCORD WITH THE REASONING OF R. ELIEZER, IT IS VALID, AND IN ACCORD WITH THE REASONING OF R. JOSHUA, IT IS INVALID.**

1. I:1: Said Rab, “But that is the case only if all of the residue was made unclean. Only then does Joshua maintain that one may not burn the handful. But the handful, the residue of which was made unclean only in part, is not covered by the law.”

a. I:2: Gloss of foregoing.

b. I:3: Further gloss of a detail of I:1: What is the source of this rule that the blood may be sprinkled even though only an olive’s bulk of fat remained? Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Ishmael, and some assigned it in the name of R. Joshua b. Hanania, “Said Scripture, ‘And he shall burn the fat for a sweet savor to the Lord’ (Lev. 17: 6) — that refers to sprinkling the blood on account of the fat, even if there is no valid meat.” “And the priest shall sprinkle the blood...and burn the fat...,” which clearly shows that the sprinkling is performed on account of the fat.

**XVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:4C-E**

**A. IF THE MEAL OFFERING WAS NOT IN A UTENSIL OF SERVICE, IT IS INVALID. R. SIMEON DECLARES VALID:**

1. I:1: Said R. Judah b. R. Hiyya, “What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon? Scripture has said, ‘It is most holy, as the sin offering and as the guilt

offering' (Lev. 6:10) — if the priest comes to perform the service with his hand, he does it with his right hand, as he would for the sin offering; if he comes to perform the act of service with a utensil, he does so with the left hand, as with a guilt offering." And R. Yannai said, "Once he has taken a handful from the utensil of service, he may offer it up and burn it even in his girdle, even in a potsherd." R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "All with regard to the handful that it must be sanctified in a utensil of service." : all that Simeon permits is to take out the handful after it has been sanctified in a utensil of service and to offer it with the hand upon the altar.

#### **B. IF ONE OFFERED UP ITS HANDFUL TWO TIMES, IT IS VALID:**

1. II:1: Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "Halves, but not halves of halves." And R. Yohanan said, "Halves, and even halves of halves."
2. II:2: It has been stated: As to him who offers up the handful of the meal-offering, at what point does that act render the residue of the meal-offering permitted for eating by the priests? R. Hanina said, "When the fire covers all of it." R. Yohanan said, "When the fire catches over the greater part of it."
3. II:3: Said Rabin bar R. Ada to Raba, "Your disciples say, 'said R. Amram, "It has been taught on Tannaite authority: "I only know that what is ordinarily offered by night, for example, limbs and the fat parts of the offering, may be offered up and burned after sunset and permitted to continue burning through the night. How do I know that things that are ordinarily offered by day, for instance, the handful, frankincense, incense offering, meal offering of the priests, anointed high priest's meal offering, and the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings, also may be offered up and burned after sunset?" "But have you not said, 'things that are ordinarily offered by day'?"
4. II:4: Said R. Assi, "When R. Eleazar was setting forth the laws of meal offerings, he asked this question: 'The handful which one put on the altar and upon which one then put the wood pile — what is the law? Is this a manner of burning or is it not a manner of burning?"
5. II:5: Hezekiah raised this question: "The limbs which one put on the altar and upon which one then put the wood pile — what is the law? Is this a manner of burning or is it not a manner of burning? 'Upon the wood' is what Scripture has said (Lev. 1: 8), and that is meant literally? Or perhaps, since another verse states, 'whereto the fire has consumed the burnt offering on the altar' (Lev. 6: 3), he may do it either way?"
6. II:6: R. Isaac Nappaha raised the question: "What is the law concerning limbs that one set by the side of the wood pile?"

### **XIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:5**

#### **A. THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING: THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLER PART OF IT IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE GREATER PART OF IT:**

1. I:1: What is the scriptural basis?

#### **B. THE TENTH OF THE EPHAH: THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLER PART OF IT IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE GREATER PART OF IT.**

1. II:1: What is the scriptural basis?

**C. WINE: THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLER PART OF IT IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE GREATER PART OF IT:**

1. III:1: What is the scriptural basis?

**D. OIL: THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLER PART OF IT IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE GREATER PART OF IT.**

1. IV:1: What is the scriptural basis?

**E. FLOUR AND OIL IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER. IF ONE IS INVALIDATED, THE OTHER IS AS WELL:**

1. V:1: What is the scriptural basis?

**F. THE HANDFUL OF MEAL OFFERING AND FRANKINCENSE IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. VI:1: What is the scriptural basis?

## **XX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:6**

**A. THE TWO GOATS OF YOM KIPPUR IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. I:1: The term “statute” appears in this regard (Lev. 16:34).

**B. THE TWO LAMBS OF ASERET PENTECOST/SHABUOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. II:1: The term “shall be,” appears in this regard (Lev. 23:17).

**C. THE TWO LOAVES OF BREAD IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER**

1. III:1: The term “shall be,” appears in this regard (Lev. 23:17).

**D. THE TWO ROWS OF SHOWBREAD IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. IV:1: The term “statute” appears in this regard (Lev. 16:34).

**E. THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. V:1: The term “statute” appears in this regard (Lev. 24: 9).

**F. THE ROWS OF SHOWBREAD AND THE DISHES OF INCENSE IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. VI:1: The term “statute” appears in this regard.

**G. THE TWO KINDS OF CAKES WHICH PERTAIN TO THE OFFERING OF THE NAZIRITE,**

1. VII:1: The term “ so he must do” appears in this regard (Num. 6:21).

**H. THE THREE KINDS USED FOR THE RED COW,**

1. VIII:1: The term “statute,” appears in this regard (Num. 19: 2).

**I. THE FOUR KINDS USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE THANK OFFERING,**

1. IX:1: The thank offering is set forth along with the offering of the Nazirite, “With the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving” (Lev. 7:13), and a



master has said, “‘of his peace offerings’ encompasses the peace offering of the Nazirite.”

**J. THE FOUR KINDS WHICH ARE IN THE LULAB LEV. 23:40,**

1. X:1: It is stated, “This shall be the law of the leper” (Lev. 14: 2).

**K. THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE PERSON AFFLICTED WITH THE SKIN AILMENT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. XI:1: It is written, “You shall take” (Lev. 23:40) — one act of taking of them all.

**L. THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS OF BLOOD OF THE RED COW IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. XII:1: The term “statute,” appears in this regard (Num. 19: 2).

**N. THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS OF BLOOD BETWEEN THE BARS ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT , AND THOSE WHICH ARE ON THE VEIL OF THE HOLY OF HOLIES, AND THOSE WHICH ARE ON THE GOLDEN ALTAR IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER M. ZEB. 5:1.**

1. XIII:1: In respect to the sprinklings on the day of atonement, it is because the term “statute,” appears in this regard (Lev. 16:34).

2. XIII:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The seven acts of sprinkling the blood of the Red Cow that one carried out not for the purpose for which the act was originally designated or not properly aimed are in valid. As to acts of sprinkling the blood that must be performed inside the Temple, by contrast, or acts of sprinkling the liquids for the purification rite of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, if they were made for some purpose other than that for which they were originally designated, they are invalid, but if they were not directed in the right place, they still are valid (T. **Zeb. 1:9F, H**).

a. XIII:3: Secondary gloss of the foregoing.

## **XXI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 3:7**

**A. THE SEVEN BRANCHES OF THE CANDLESTICK IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER. AND ITS SEVEN LAMPS IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

1. I:1: how come? In their regard, “shall be” is stated (Exo. 25:36): “their knops and their branches shall be of one piece with it.

**B. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE LAMPSTAND AND CANDLESTICK**

1. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A lampstand is suitable only when made from a gold bar. If one made it from filings, it is invalid. If one made it from other kinds of metal, it is valid. You turn out to rule, what is valid in the case of a lampstand is invalid in the case of a trumpet. What is valid in the case of a trumpet is invalid in the case of a lampstand (T. **Hul. 1:19A-C**).

a. I:3: Information required to complement the foregoing.



2. I:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: All utensils that Moses made were valid both for him and for generations to come, but the trumpets that he made were valid for him but invalid for coming generations.

3. I:5: R. Pappa b. R. Hanina recited as a Tannaite formulation in the presence of R. Joseph: “The candlestick derived from a single mass of gold; if it was made of silver, it is valid; if of tin, lead, or a tin alloy — Rabbi declares it unfit. And R. Yosé b. R. Judah declares it fit. If it was made of wood, bone, or glass, all parties concur that it is unfit.”

4. I:6: Said Samuel in the name of an elder, “The height of the candlestick was eighteen handbreadths, three for the base and its flower on top of it, two handbreadths unadorned, one handbreadth for the cup, knop, and flower, two handbreadths unadorned, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, one handbreadth unadorned, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, then one handbreadth plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches emerge, one on each side, rising up to the same height as the candlestick, then two handbreadths unadorned; that left three handbreadths in which were three cups, a knop, and a flower.”

5. I:7: “And the flowers and lamps and tongs of gold, of finished gold” (2Ch. 4:21) — What is the meaning of “finished gold”?

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

7. I:9: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “An ark made of fire, a table made of fire, and a candlestick made of fire came down from heaven; Moses saw them and copied the pattern: ‘And see that you make them after their pattern, which is being shown you in the mountain’ (Exo. 25:40).”

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

b. I:11: The Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael: “Three matters gave Moses difficulties until the Holy One, blessed be he, showed him with his finger how to make them: the candlestick, how to identify the new moon, and the difference between clean and unclean creeping things. the candlestick: ‘and this was the work of the candlestick’ (Num. 8: 4). how to identify the new moon: ‘This month shall be to you the beginning of months’ (Exo. 12: 2). and the difference between clean and unclean creeping thing: ‘And these are those that are unclean’ (Lev. 11:29).”

## **C. THE TWO PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE MEZUZAH IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER, AND EVEN THE SHAPE OF ONE LETTER IMPAIRS THEIR VALIDITY.**

1. II:1: That’s obvious! Said R. Judah said Rab, “No, it was required to deal only with the matter of the tittle of the letter Y which had to be fully imprinted.”

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

**a. II:3:** Illustrative case.

**b. II:4:** Illustrative case.

**D. TOPICAL APPENDIX: THE SHAPES OF LETTERS OF THE TORAH; HOW THE LETTERS ARE WRITTEN FOR USE IN THE TORAH**

**1. II:5:** Prologue on the topic of the jots and tittles of the letters of the Torah: Said R. Judah said Rab, "At the time that Moses went up on high, he found the Holy One in session, affixing crowns to the letters of the words of the Torah. He said to him, 'Lord of the universe, who is stopping you from regarding the document as perfect without these additional crowns on the letters?' He said to him, 'There is a man who is going to arrive at the end of many generations, and Aqiba b. Joseph is his name, who is going to interpret on the basis of each point of the crowns heaps and heaps of laws.'"

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

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

**4. II:8:** said Rab, 'He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point may finish off even in the middle of a column.' Here is the refutation: He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point should not finish off in the middle of a columns one might with other pentateuchs, but he should gradually diminish each line as he goes along until he gets to the bottom of a column.

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

**b. II:10:** The rule that a scroll with four mistakes in each column must be put away pertains, however, if letters are missing, but if there are too many letters, we do not take account of the matter. And if letters are missing, why is that not the case?

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

**5. II:12:** Continuing II:8: said Rab, 'He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point may finish off even in the middle of a column.' Here is the refutation: He who is writing a scroll of the Torah and reaches the finishing point should not finish off in the middle of a columns one might with other pentateuchs, but he should gradually diminish each line as he goes along until he gets to the bottom of a column.

**6. II:13:** It has been stated: Rabbis say, "One may finish even in the middle of the line." R. Ashi said, "In the middle of a line in particular."

**7. II:14:** Said R. Joshua bar Abba said R. Giddal said Rab, “The last eight verses of the Torah must be read in the public lection in the synagogue by one person alone.”

**8. II:15:** And said R. Joshua bar Abba said R. Giddal said Rab, “He who buys a scroll of the Torah in the market is like one who has merely grabbed a religious duty by buying it in the market. But he who writes one out for himself is regarded by Scripture as though he had personally received it at Mount Sinai.”

**9. II:16:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person should make use of parchment-sheets of from three to eight columns, less or more than that he should not use. He should not put in too many columns, since it would look like a mere letter, nor should he put in too few columns, for the eyes would wander. The width of the column should be sufficient for the word “according to your families” to be written three times that is, thirty letters in breadth.

**a. II:17:** It has been stated: R. Hananel said Rab said, “The decided law is that one may write the Name above the line.” Rabbah bar bar Hana said R. Isaac b. Samuel said, “The decided law is that one erases the word that was written and write the Name instead.”

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

**I. II:19:** Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

**II. II:20:** As above.

**III. II:21:** As above.

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

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

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

**13. II:25:** So too it has been stated: Said Rabbah bar bar Hanah said R. Yohanan, and some say, said R. Aha bar bar Hanah said R. Yohanan, “A doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah that was written in lines of two words each is valid, so long as it is not in the form of a tent or tail-like.”

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

**15. II:27:** Said R. Helbo, “I saw R. Huna rolling up the doorpost marker containing parchments with verses of the Torah beginning at ‘one’ and ending at

‘hear.’ He also left the space between the sections closed beginning the second passage on the same line as the ending of the first.”

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

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

**18. II:30:** Said R. Helbo, “I saw R. Huna, planning to take a seat on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah law, invert a utensil on the ground, put the scroll on it, and then take a seat on the couch. He took the position that it is forbidden to sit on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah is lying. And he differs from Rabbah bar Hannah.” For said Rabbah bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “It is permitted to sit on a couch on which a scroll of the Torah is lying.” “And should someone murmur to you to contradict you, ‘There is the case in which R. Eleazar who was sitting on his bed and remembered that a scroll of the Torah was lying on it, so he slipped off and took a seat on the ground, so it appeared as though he had been bitten by a snake,’ you may reply to him, ‘In that case, the scroll of the Torah in fact was lying on the ground.’”

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

**20. II:32:** And said R. Judah said Samuel, “If one hung the doorpost marker on a stick and attached the stick to the doorpost, it is invalid.”

**21. II:33:** And said R. Judah said Samuel, “The religious duty is to locate it within the contained space of the door on the side where the door shuts, within the framework of the doorpost.”

**22. II:34:** And said R. Judah said Samuel, “If one wrote it in two columns, it is invalid.”

**23. II:35:** And said R. Judah said Samuel, “In regard to the doorpost marker, be guided by the hinge.”

**a. II:36:** The exilarch built a house and said to R. Nahman, “Put up the doorpost marker for me.” Said R. Nahman, “First put the doorposts in place.”

**24. II:37:** Said R. Judah said Rab, “If one affixed it like a bolt horizontally, it is invalid.”

**25. II:38:** Said R. Zira said R. Mattena said Samuel, “The religious duty of the door marker is to place it at the start of the upper third of the doorpost.” And R. Huna said, “One raises it above the ground by a handbreadth and removes it from the lintel by a handbreadth, but otherwise the entire area of the doorpost is suitable for affixing the door marker.”

**26. II:39:** Said Raba, “The religious duty is to place it in the handbreadth nearest to the street.”

**27. II:40:** Said R. Hanina, “Come and take note that the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not the same as the trait of a mortal. The mortal trait is that the king is seated on the throne inside, and the people guard him outside. But the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not the same. His servants take up their seats inside, and he guards them from the outside, as it is said, ‘The Lord your keeper, the Lord is the shade on your right hand’ (Psa. 121: 5).”

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

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

**30. II:43:** And said Raba, “Doors that are faulty are exempt from the requirement of having a doorpost marker.”

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

**32. II:45:** Said Rabbah said R. Judah, “An entrance lodge has to have two door post markers.”

**33. II:46:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A gatehouse that leads into a garden and thence to an out house R. Yosé says, “It is classified as an outhouse.” And sages say, “It is classified as the gatehouse and requires a doorpost marker.”

**34. II:47:** It has been stated: A staircase open from a downstairs room to the upper chamber with a door closing the foot of the stairs — Said R. Huna, “If it has only a single door, it has to have a single doorpost market, but if it has two doors bottom and top floors, it has to have two of them.”

**35. II:48:** Said Amemar, “A door in the corner has to have a doorpost marker.”

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

**I. II:50:** Gloss of foregoing.

**36. II:51:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And you shall write them” (Deu. 6: 9) — is it possible to suppose that one should write the scriptural portions that go into the doormarkers on the stones of the house? Here we find a reference to “writing,” and elsewhere we find a usage of the word “writing.” Just as elsewhere, the writing is to be on a scroll, so here too it is to be on a scroll.

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

**E. THE FOUR PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE WHICH ARE IN PRAYERBOX (TEFILLIN) IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER, AND EVEN THE SHAPE OF ONE LETTER IMPAIRS THEIR VALIDITY.**

1. III:1: That's self-evident! What else is new! Said R. Judah said Rab, "The law was required, specifically, to deal with the case of the tittle of the letter Y."

**F. TOPICAL APPENDIX: THE TEFILLIN. RULES AND REGULATIONS IN GENERAL**

1. III:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "The word for frontlets referring to phylacteries occurs three times, two times lacking the indication of the plural, one time including that full spelling at Deu. 6:8, 9:18, and Exo. 13:16. that indicates there are four sections of Scripture to be inserted into the phylacteries," the words of R. Ishmael and that explains why all four are required. R. Aqiba says, "It is not necessary to resort to such a proof, for the letters for the first half of the word, in the Katpi language, stand for two, and the letters for the second half of the word, in Afriki, stand for the word two."

2. III:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Might one suppose that one should write them on four pieces of hide, then put them into four compartments made out of four pieces of hide? Scripture says, And for a memorial between your eyes" (Exo. 13: 9) — "I have spoken to you concerning a single memorial, not two or three memorials."

3. III:4: "And there has to be a blank space between each portion of Scripture," the words of Rabbi. And sages say, "It is not required." But they concur that between each one and the next there has to be a line or thread, and if the divisions between the compartments are not readily discerned from the outside, they are null.

4. III:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: How does one write out the prayerbox? "The prayer-parchment tefillah that is to be placed upon the hand, one writes out on a single hide, but if he wrote it out on four pieces of hide and then put it into a single box, he has carried out his obligation. But they have to be bound together, in line with the verse, 'and it shall be for a sign for you on your hand' (Exo. 13: 9), and just as from the outside it appears as a single sign, so from the inside it must be one sign," the words of R. Judah. R. Yosé says, "It is not required to do it that way."

5. III:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: What is the order of verses of Scripture in the prayer-parchment tefillah that is to be placed upon the head? "Sanctify to me" (Exo. 13: 1-10), "and it shall be when the Lord shall bring you" (Exo. 13:11-16), on the right side; "Hear O Israel" (Deu. 6: 4-9) and "And it shall come to pass if you hearken diligently" (Deu. 11:13-21) are on the left side.

6. III:7: Said R. Hananel said Rab, "If one reversed the order of the scriptural lections, the prayer-parchments tefillin are invalid."

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

8. III:9: Abbayye said, "The duct that is provided to the prayer parchment is a law given to Moses at Sinai."

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

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

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

**12. III:13:** A Tannaite statement: The fact that the boxes containing the prayer-parchments have to be square is a law revealed to Moses at Sinai.

**13. III:14:** Said R. Huna, “As to the boxes containing the prayer parchments, so long as the external sides of the box are whole, they are valid.” R. Hisda said, “If two of them were split, they are valid, but if three, they are not.”

**a. III:15:** Story.

**14. III:16:** Said R. Pappa, “Straps that hang down from the prayer-parchment box of the head that have been cut short are acceptable.”

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

**a. III:18:** Story.

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

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

**18. III:21:** “And all the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon you, and they shall fear you” (Deu. 28:10) — It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer the Elder says, “This refers to the boxes of the prayer-parchment that is worn on the head.”

**19. III:22:** “And I will take away my hand and you shall see my back” (Exo. 33:23) Said R. Hana bar Bizna said R. Simeon the Pious, “This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be he, showed Moses how to tie the knot of the the boxes of the prayer-parchment .”

**20. III:23:** Said R. Judah, “The knot of the the boxes of the prayer-parchment has to be placed up high, so that Israel will be up high, and not below; and it should be facing the front, so that Israel will be in front and not behind.”

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

**22. III:25:** Said R. Hisda, “If one interrupted with talk between putting on one box containing prayer-parchment and the next, he has to go back and say the blessing.”

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

**24. III:27:** A Tannaite statement: When he puts it on, he puts on the one for the hand and then he puts on the one for the head, and when he takes it off, he takes off the one for the head and afterward he takes off the one for the hand.

**25. III:28:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: When putting on the prayer-parchment boxes, at what point does one say a blessing over them? It is at the moment at which one puts them on.

**a. III:29:** Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

**26. III:30:** Said R. Eleazar, “Whoever puts on the boxes containing prayer-parchments after sundown violates an affirmative commandment.” R. Yohanan said, “He violates a negative one.”

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

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

**29. III:33:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Your hand” (Exo. 13: 9) — this refers to the left hand. You say that this refers to the left hand. But perhaps it refers only to the right? Scripture says, “Yes, my hand has laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand has spread out the heavens” (Isa. 48:13), and further, “Her hand he has put to the tent pin and her right hand to the workmen’s hammer” (Jud. 5: 6), and “Why do you withdraw your hand, even your right hand” Draw it out of your bosom and consume them”: (Psa. 74:11).

**30. III:34:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A left handed person puts on his boxes containing prayer parchments on his right hand, for in his case that functions as the left.

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

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

**a. III:37:** Gloss of foregoing. The master has said, “‘On your hand’ refers to the biceps muscle; ‘between your eyes’ speaks of the skull.” What is the scriptural source for this rule?

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

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

**G. THE FOUR FRINGES IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER, FOR THE FOUR OF THEM CONSTITUTE A SINGLE COMMANDMENT. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “THE FOUR OF**



**THEM CONSTITUTE FOUR DISTINCT COMMANDMENTS SO THEY DO NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER:"**

1. IV:1: What is at stake between the two positions? R. Joseph said, "At issue is a linen garment that has woollen show-fringes." Rabbah bar Abina said, "At issue is a garment with five corners."
2. IV:2: Said R. Shisha b. R. Idi, "Someone who cut off a corner of his garment has done nothing, for he has made it into a five cornered garment and it has to have show fringes anyhow."
3. IV:3: Said R. Mesharshayya, "Someone who cut off a corner of his garment has done nothing. What is the reason? It is as though he has simply spread it out and it still has to have show fringes."
4. IV:4: Said R. Dimi of Nehardea, "If someone sewed together the folded corners of his garment, he has done nothing. If it is the fact that he does not need them, he should just cut them off and discard them."

**H. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, "THE FOUR OF THEM CONSTITUTE FOUR DISTINCT COMMANDMENTS:"**

1. V:1: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "The decided law is in accord with R. Ishmael."
2. V:2: Rabina was going along behind Mar b. R. Ashi on one of the Sabbaths prior to the Festival, when the corner of the master's garment with its show-fringes tore off. Rabina did not tell him about it. When he got home and Rabina said that it had torn away there in the street, he said to him, "If you had told me about it then, I would forthwith have taken it off."

**XXII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:1**

**A. THE ABSENCE OF BLUE IN THE FRINGES DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE WHITE, AND THE ABSENCE OF WHITE DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE BLUE.**

1. I:1: May we say that the Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority.
  - a. I:2: There is then no problem with the clause, The absence of blue does not impair the validity of the white, even though the blue was inserted first, it is not invalid. But what is the meaning of the clause, and the absence of white does not impair the validity of the blue? This ought to mean that even though the white was inserted first, it is not invalid. But that is the proper order of precedence.
  - b. I:3: Said Raba, "But then does the matter of color make any difference anyhow?" If most garments are white and the fringes that are like the color of the garment go in first, then the color of the garment makes no difference.
2. I:4: And what is the minimum length of the cut back threads?
3. I:5: The question was raised: "Enough must be left to make a loop with it" to make a loop of all the threads together, or each separately?

**4. I:6:** R. Ashi raised the question, “If the cut back threads are so thick that one cannot make a loop with them, though if they were not so thick, one could have made a loop with them, what is the law?”

**5. I:7:** And who is the Tannaite authority who differs from Rabbi at I:1?

**a. I:8:** Said Raba, “That yields the inference that one has to make a knot after each joint of the show fringes, for if you should maintain that that is not the rule, then how could the sons of R. Hiyya have said, “If the blue threads are cut back, the show fringes are valid; if the hyssop twigs are cut back, they are valid (T. **Par. 12:2A**)? Once the upper knot became loose, all would be undone?” Since a thread has snapped close to the last knot, it would inevitably follow that this knot would become undone, and if there were no other knots at each joint, the entire fringe would become undone, in which case it certainly cannot be valid.

**b. I:9:** Further said Raba, “That yields the inference that the upper knot is required by the law of the Torah, for if you maintain that it is required only on the authority of rabbis, why is it necessary for the Torah to permit inserting woolen fringes in a linen garment? That would have been obvious, for if one fastens wool and linen with only a single stitch, that does not constitute a connection anyhow. Merely threading woolen strands through the linen garment would not violate the law against mixing linen and wool, and there was no necessity for the Torah to permit doing so in the case of the show fringes.

## **B. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE SHOW-FRINGS**

**1. I:10:** Said Rabbah b. R. Adda said R. Adda said Rab, “If a thread snapped at the top, it is invalid.” The entire thread has broken away.

**2. I:11:** In session, Rabbah was stating in the name of Rab, “The thread that is The thread used for winding the fringe counts in the number of threads which are to be eight in all, and this is one of them.”

**3. I:12:** In session, Rabbah was stating in the name of Samuel, “If the greater part of the fringe was wound around and two thirds were not left hanging loose as locks, it is nonetheless valid.”

**4. I:13:** R. Hiyya b. R. Nathan repeated the matter in this way: “Said R. Huna said R. Sheshet said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said, Rab, ‘ “If the greater part of the fringe was wound around and two thirds were not left hanging loose as locks , it is nonetheless valid.

**a. I:14:** What is the minimum measure of a joint? It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabbi says, “It has to be long enough so that the thread can be wrapped around once, a second, then a third time.”

**5. I:15:** A Tannaite statement: He who makes fewer joints should make no fewer than seven, and he who wants to make more of them should make no more than thirteen.

**6. I:16:** A Tannaite statement: When one commences winding, he starts with the white thread: “the corner,” Scripture states, meaning, the same color as the corner is to be used first.

**a. I:17:** One time, in session, Rab and Rabbah bar Hannah noticed a man passing by, wearing a garment that was entirely blue, to which were affixed fringes that were entirely round about. The entire fringe had been covered with windings of thread, so no part hung loose like hairlocks. Said Rab, “That cloak is nice enough, but the fringes aren’t very nice!”

**7. I:18:** Said Samuel in the name of Levi, “White threads of wool carry out the obligation of a linen garment to have show fringes.”

**a. I:19:** That differs from what R. Nahman said, for said R. Nahman, “Garments made of silk are exempt from the requirement of having show fringes.”

**8. I:20:** Our rabbis have repeated on Tannaite authority: A linen garment, as to fringes — The House of Shammai declare exempt. And the House of Hillel declare liable (M. **Eduyyot 4:10G-I**).

**a. I:21:** Said Raba bar R. Hana to Raba, “Then let ten people put in show-fringes into a linen garment and walk about the market place and popularize the rule!” that the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only in connection with the religious duty of wearing show-fringes.

**I. I:22:** R. Zira removed fringes from his linen garment. R. Zira said, “It is a precautionary decree against the possibility that one will use the cloak as a night wrap and the wrap is exempt from the requirement of show fringes unless it is worn by day; then the mixed species will be prohibited.”

**II. I:23:** And said Raba, “This is what I have to say, — and in the West it is stated in the name of R. Zira in accord with my opinion: ‘If the garment is of cloth and the corners of leather, it is liable to the obligation of having show fringes. If the garment is made of leather and the corners of cloth, it is exempt.’”

**9. I:24:** Said Raba said R. Sehora said R. Huna, “If a person put fringes in the corners of a three cornered garment and then added a fourth corner and put a fringe into that, it is still invalid, on the grounds of ‘You shall make’ (Deu. 22:12) — not using what is already in hand.”

**a. I:25:** Gloss of the foregoing.

**10. I:26:** Said R. Zira said R. Mattena said Samuel, “A garment that has show fringes is not subject to the violation of the law against mixed species of linen and wool, and that is the fact even though the garment in any event is exempt from the requirement of having show fringes.”

**11. I:27:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A garment that is doubled over is required to have show fringes. And R. Simeon declares it exempt. But both parties concur that if one doubled it over and then sewed it together, it is obligated to have show fringes.

**a. I:28:** Rabbah bar R. Huna visited the household of Raba bar R. Nahman. He saw that he was wearing a garment that was doubled over, with show fringes inserted in the folded corners. It became unfolded, and the show fringes turned out to be above in the middle of the garment. He said to him, "Is this not the corner of which the All-Merciful has written in the Torah?"

**12. I:29:** Said R. Tubi bar Qisna said Samuel, "Clothing that are put away in a chest are obligated to have show fringes on them. Samuel concedes in the case of a garment that an old man made for his shroud that there is no obligation to put show fringes on such a garment when it is laid away."

**13. I:30:** Said Rabbah said R. Judah, "A garment that was torn more than three fingerbreadths from the corner may be sown up; but if it is within three fingerbreadths of the corner, it may not be sown up." The fringes are put in within three fingerbreadths of the corner. The garments had fringes, but a corner with the fringe roe off. If the piece torn off was more than three fingerbreadths' distance on each side from the corner, it is still a garment; the fringe is still a fringe and may be sewn to the rest of the garment and remain valid. If it was less than three fingerbreadths square, it is not a garment any longer, the fringe is not a fringe, and it may not be sewn to the rest of the garment so as to serve as a fringe, since the fringe has lost its character as such.

**14. I:31:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: For a garment that is entirely blue, every color of show fringes will serve to carry out the requirement of show fringes except for imitation blue for the fringe must be of two colors, threads of real blue and of another color; it is not permitted to have a fringe of real blue and imitation blue.

**15. I:32:** It was stated: Rab said, "Show fringes may not be removed from one garment and put into another." And Samuel said, "Show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another."

**a. I:33:** Gloss of I:31.

**16. I:34:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: How many threads does one put into the hole of the corner, to form the fringes? The House of Shammai say, "Four fingerbreadths." And the House of Hillel say, "Three." And how far must the threads hang down beyond the hem? The House of Shammai say, "Four." And the House of Hillel say, "Three."

**17. I:35:** Said R. Huna, "Four threads are to be inserted in the garment within the distance of four fingerbreadths from the corner, and they must hang down for four fingerbreadths." R. Judah say, "Three within three, and they must hang down for three."

**18. I:36:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "Show fringes" (Num. 15:38) — The sense of the word means only that which hangs loose, in line with the usage in the following verse of Scripture: "And he took me by a fringe of my head" (Eze. 8: 3).

**19. I:37:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one put the show fringes at the tip of the corner or at the selvedge of the garment the closely woven

binding at the edge of the garment that prevents unravelling, it is valid. R. Eliezer b. Jacob declares invalid in both cases.

**20. I:38:** Said R. Jacob said R. Yohanan, “And it must be set off from the corner by a distance equivalent to the first joint of the thumb.”

**a. I:39:** And the teaching of R. Pappa the threads must be inserted within three fingerbreadths of the corner, and they must hang down for four fingerbreadths and also that of R. Jacob And it must be set off from the corner by a distance equivalent to the first joint of the thumb are required.

**b. I:40:** Rabina and R. Sama were in session before R. Ashi. R. Sama noticed that the edges around the hole in the corner of Rabina’s cloak were frayed, and therefore the show fringe was less than the distance of the first joint of the thumb from the corner, so he said to him, “Does my lord not accept what R. Jacob taught.”

**c. I:41:** R. Aha bar Jacob would take four threads, double them over, insert them into the garment, and then make them into a loop and pull them tight, so the threads hung down from the garment .. He took the view that there must be eight threads in the hole of the garment, the same number as the threads that hang loose.

**21. I:42:** R. Nahman found R. Ada bar Ahbah inserting the threads and saying the blessing, “...to make show fringes.”

**a. I:43:** When R. Huna died, R. Hisda undertook to point out contradictions between sayings of Rab: “Did Rab really say, ‘Inserting show fringes does not have to be accompanied by the recitation of a blessing’? And lo, said R. Judah said Rab, ‘How on the basis of Scripture do we know that show fringes of a gentile are invalid? As it is said, “Speak to the children of Israel and command them to make show fringes” (Num. 15:38). It is the children of Israel that are commanded to make show fringes, and not gentiles.”

**I. I:44:** Continuation of the foregoing.

**II. I:45:** As above.

**III. I:46:** As above.

**IV. I:47:** As above.

**22. I:48:** R. Judah said Rab said, “If one made show-fringes out of the hanging web or woof of a woven garment, or out of sewing threads, the fringes are not valid. If he made them out of tuft attached for that purpose to a garment, the fringes are valid. Attaching the tuft to the garment was for the purpose of making the show-fringes, while simply drawing out an available thread and twisting it would not constitute purposefully making show-fringes.”

**23. I:49:** Said Abbaye to R. Samuel b. R. Judah, “As to the blue thread, how do you dye it?”

**a. I:50:** Continuation of the foregoing.

**24. I:51:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The blue dye is not subject to testing, and it may be purchased only from an expert. The boxes containing prayer parchments are subject to examination, but nonetheless may be purchased only from an expert. Scrolls of the Torah and doorpost markers are subject to testing and may be purchased from an ordinary person.

**a. I:52:** Gloss of foregoing.

**b. I:53:** Illustrative story.

**c. I:54:** As above.

**25. I:55:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who purchases from an Israelite in the marketplace a garment that already bears show fringes — lo, the blue thread is assumed to be validly dyed. If he purchases it from a gentile, or a merchant, it is valid. If he buys it from a common person, it is assumed to be invalid, and that is so even though they have said, “Someone is not permitted to sell to a gentile a garment that bears show fringes unless he removes the threads that belong to it.”

**a. I:56:** Illustrative story.

**26. I:57:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: All are obligated to carry out the religious duty of affixing to their garments show-fringes: priests, Levites, Israelites. R. Simeon exempts women, because it is a religious duty that is imposed only through the advent of a fixed time, and women are exempt from all religious duties that depend on the advent of a fixed time for applicability.

**a. I:58:** Gloss of foregoing. The foregoing statement is self-evident and hardly requires specification, for if these classifications of persons — priests, Levites, Israelites — are not obligated, then who in the world would be?

**b. I:59:** As above. What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon?

**27. I:60:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Precious are Israelites, for the Holy One, blessed be he, has surrounded them with religious duties to protect them: boxes containing prayer parchments on their heads and boxes containing prayer parchments on their arms, show fringes on their garments, doorpost markers containing Torah-statements on their doors. And concerning the commandments David said, “Seven times a day I praise you for your righteous ordinances” (Psa. 119:164). When David entered the bath house and saw himself standing naked, he said, ‘Woe is me, that I should stand naked, without a single religious duty. But when he remembered the circumcision that is marked in his flesh, his mind was eased. And after he went out, he said a Psalm, “To the choir master according to the Sheminit” the eighth, here taken as a reference to circumcision on the eighth day after birth (Psa. 12:10; and Scripture further states, “The angel of the Lord encamps around those who fear him and delivers them” (Psa. 34: 8) (T. **Ber. 6:24A-F**).

**28. I:61:** R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “Whoever has boxes containing prayer parchments on his heads and boxes containing prayer parchments on his arms, show fringes on his garments, doorpost markers containing Torah-statements on

his doors — all this strengthens him against sinning, as it is said, ‘A threefold cord is not quickly broken’ (Qoh. 4:12), and further, ‘The angel of the Lord camps around about them that fear him and delivers them’ (Psa. 34: 8).”

**29. I:62:** It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Meir would say, “Why is blue singled out among all the colors for use in the show fringes? Because blue is like the sea, and the sea is like the firmament, and the firmament is like the throne of glory: ‘And there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone’ (Exo. 24:10), and ‘The likeness of a throne is the appearance of a sapphire stone’ (Eze. 1:26).”

**30. I:63:** It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Meir would say, “Greater is the penalty for neglecting the white thread than the penalty of neglecting the blue.”

**31. I:64:** It has been taught on Tannaite authority:

**32.** Meir would say, “A person is obligated to receive one hundred blessings every day, as it is said, ‘And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God require of you’ (Deu. 10:12).”

**a. I:65:** Story.

**32. I:66:** It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “A person must recite three blessings every day: ‘Praised are you, O Lord, who has not made me a gentile,’ ‘Praised are you, O Lord, who did not make me a boor,’ and ‘Praised are you, O Lord, who did not make me a woman’” (T. [Ber. 6:18A](#)).

**33. I:67:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The essence blood of the hillazon-mollusc is like the sea in color, and the shape is like a fish. It emerges once in seventy years. And with its blood they dye the blue thread of the show fringes.

**34. I:68:** It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Nathan, “You have not got even the most minor religious duty specified in the Torah, the reward of which is not enjoyed in this world, but as to the world to come, I do not even know how great it is. Go and learn that lesson from the religious duty of the show fringes.”

**35. I:69:** Said R. Judah, “A borrowed cloak for the first thirty days is exempt from the requirement of show fringes. From that point it is liable.”

## **C. THE ABSENCE OF THE BOX CONTAINING PRAYER-PARCHMENTS TEFILLAH FOR THE HAND DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THAT FOR THE HEAD, AND THAT FOR THE HEAD DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THAT FOR THE HAND.**

**1. II:1:** Said R. Hisda, “The law pertains only in a case in which the person has the two required boxes. But if he does not have them both, then the absence of one will invalidate the other.”

**2. II:2:** Said R. Sheshet, “Whoever does not put on boxes containing prayer parchments violates eight commandments of affirmative action, and whoever does not have show fringes on his garment violates five commandments of affirmative action.”

**3. II:3:** And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Whoever does put on boxes containing prayer parchments lengthens his life, as it is said, ‘The Lord upon them, they shall

live, and altogether therein is the life of my spirit; wherefore recover me and make me live' (Is. 38:16).”

### **XXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:1C-D**

**A. THE ABSENCE OF FLOUR AND THE OIL WHICH ACCOMPANY DRINK OFFERINGS DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE WINE, AND THE ABSENCE OF WINE DOES NOT IMPAIR THEIR VALIDITY.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And their meal offerings and their drink offerings” (Num. 29:18) — first present the meal offering, then present the drink offerings. Rabbi says, ““A sacrifice and drink offerings” (Lev. 23:37) — first present the sacrifice, and then present the drink offerings.”

**B. THE OMISSION OF ANY ONE OF THE SPRINKLINGS OF BLOOD WHICH ARE TO BE PLACED ON THE OUTER ALTAR DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER:**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that each of the acts of tossing the blood on the outer altar on its own effects atonement, even if the whole is sprinkled with only a single action? “And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord your god” (Deu. 12:27).

### **XXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:2**

**A. THE ABSENCE OF BULLOCKS AND THE RAMS AND THE HE-LAMBS SEVEN LAMBS, ABSENCE OF ONE BULLOCK, AND TWO RAMS OFFERED WITH THE TWO LOAVES ON SHABUOT AND TWO BULLOCKS, ABSENCE OF A RAM, AND SEVEN LAMBS FOR THE ADDITIONAL OFFERING OF SHABUOT DO NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER:**

1. I:1: The absence of bullocks and the rams: which ones? If one should say those of the Festival of Tabernacles, in that connection it is written of them, “After the ordinance” (Num. 29:12) “After the ordinance” (Num. 29:12) meaning, exactly this way and in no other, so if a bullock or ram and so on should be omitted, the entire rite is nullified, contrary to the Mishnah’s rule; hence Tabernacles’ offerings of bullocks, rams, and so on cannot be under discussion here.

2. I:2: the rams: which ones? If one should say those of the occasions just now mentioned, on those occasions only one ram is mentioned but the Mishnah speaks of a plural! If you maintain that they are the ones of Pentecost that are specified in the book of Leviticus Lev. 23:18, with the two loaves, inclusive of two rams, the expression “shall be” is used in that regard and that means every item is indispensable, contrary to our rule! In point of fact they are the ones of Pentecost that are specified in the book of Leviticus Lev. 23:18, and this is the sense of the Mishnah’s rule: the absence of the rams that are specified in the book of Leviticus will not invalidate the offering of the ram that is specified in the book of Numbers, and the absence of the ram that is specified in the book of Numbers will not invalidate the rams that are specified in the book of Leviticus.



3. I:3: “And in the day of the new moon it shall be a young bullock without blemish, and six lambs and a ram, they shall be without blemish” (Eze. 46: 6): What purpose is served by the reference to “a bullock” here?

4. I:4: “Thus says the Lord God, in the first month in the first day of the month you shall take a young bullock without blemish, and you shall offer it as a sin offering in the sanctuary” (Eze. 45:18): “A sin offering”? But in point of fact it is a burnt offering so Num. 28:21! Said R. Yohanan, “This passage is Elijah destined to interpret.”

5. I:5: “The priest shall not eat of anything that dies of itself or is torn, whether it be fowl or beast” (Eze. 44:31): Is it the fact that priests may not eat that kind of food, but Israelites may eat it? Obviously not! Said R. Yohanan, “This passage is Elijah destined to interpret.”

6. I:6: “And so you shall do on the seventh day of the month for every one who errs and for him that is simple, so shall you make atonement for the house” (Eze. 45:20): “Seven:” said R. Yohanan, “These refers to a case in which seven tribes sinned, in which case the offering is made even though they do not make up a majority of the community and the special sin offering of a bullock is brought for the community when the greater part has sinned, Lev. 4:13.”

7. I:7: And so you shall do on the seventh day of the month for every one who errs and for him that is simple, so shall you make atonement for the house” (Eze. 45:20): “New:” if they innovated in the law, e.g., by claiming that the prohibited fat is permitted.

8. I:8: “And so you shall do on the seventh day of the month for every one who errs and for him that is simple, so shall you make atonement for the house” (Eze. 45:20): “for him that is simple:” this teaches that people are liable to present the special sin offering of a bullock only if the court’s ruling was made in ignorance, and the community acted inadvertently.

9. I:9: Said R. Judah said Rab, “That man is to be remembered for good, by name of Hanina b. Hezekiah, for if it were not for his efforts, the book of Ezekiel would have been hidden away, for what he says contradicts the teachings of the Torah. What did he do to save the situation? He took up three hundred barrels of oil with him to an upper room and stayed there until he had ironed out all the problems.”

**B. R. SIMEON SAYS, “IF THEY HAD FUNDS FOR MANY BULLOCKS BUT DID NOT HAVE FUNDS FOR DRINK OFFERINGS SUFFICIENT FOR ALL OF THEM , LET THEM BRING A SINGLE BULLOCK AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS. BUT LET THEM NOT OFFER UP ALL OF THEM WITHOUT THEIR MEAL AND DRINK OFFERINGS.”**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And he shall prepare a meal offering, an ephah for the bullock and an ephah for the ram and for the lambs according as his means suffice and a hin of oil to an ephah” (Eze. 46: 7): Said R. Simeon, “But is it the fact that the quantity of flour for a meal offering is the same for bullocks and for rams? That is not the fact, the bullock gets three tenths of an ephah, the ram, two tenths, so Num. 15: 6, 9 . Rather, if they had enough flour for many bullocks but not enough for the drink offerings, they ought to present one bullock and its drink offerings, but should not offer all of them without drink

offerings. If they had enough for many rams but not for the meal offerings, they should present one ram and its meal offerings but not all of them without meal offerings.”

## **XXV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:3**

**A. THE ABSENCES OF THE BULLOCK AND THE RAMS AND THE HE-LAMBS AND THE HE-GOAT OF PENTECOST/SHABUOT DO NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE BREAD. NOR DOES THE ABSENCE OF THE BREAD IMPAIR THEIR VALIDITY.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And you shall present with the bread seven lambs without blemish” (Lev. 23:18): “‘And you shall present with the bread.’ that statement indicates that it is an obligation along with the bread offering so one may not be presented without the other. ‘seven lambs without blemish.’ even though there is no bread offering. If so, why then does Scripture state, ‘And you shall present with the bread’? This teaches that the obligation to present the lambs was not incurred before the obligation to present the bread offered was incurred, which was when they entered the Land of Israel, not before,” the words of R. Tarfon.

**B. “THE ABSENCE OF BREAD IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE LAMBS, BUT THE ABSENCE OF LAMBS DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE BREAD,” THE WORDS OF R. AQIBA. SAID SIMEON B. NANNOS, “THAT IS NOT SO. BUT THE ABSENCE OF LAMBS IMPAIRS THE VALIDITY OF THE BREAD, AND ABSENCE OF THE BREAD DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE LAMBS. FOR SO DO WE FIND THAT, WHEN THE ISRAELITES WERE IN THE WILDERNESS, FOR FORTY YEARS THEY OFFERED UP LAMBS WITHOUT BREAD SINCE THEY HAD ONLY MANNA. LIKEWISE HERE, LET THEM OFFER UP LAMBS WITHOUT BREAD.” SAID R. SIMEON, “THE LAW IS IN ACCORD WITH THE OPINION OF BEN NANNOS. BUT THE OPERATIVE CONSIDERATION THEREFOR IS NOT IN ACCORD WITH HIS OPINION. FOR EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS WAS OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS. BUT EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS WAS NOT OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS INCLUSIVE OF THAT UNDER DISCUSSION. WHEN THEY CAME TO THE LAND, BOTH THESE AND THOSE WERE OFFERED. AND ON WHAT ACCOUNT DO I RULE, ‘LET THE LAMBS BE OFFERED WITHOUT BREAD’? FOR THE LAMBS ONCE THE BLOOD IS SPRINKLED ON THE ALTAR RENDER THEIR OWN OFFERING PERMISSIBLE WITHOUT BREAD SO THAT THE PRIESTS MAY THEN EAT THEIR SHARE. BUT AS TO BREAD WITHOUT LAMBS, IT HAS NOTHING WHICH RENDERS IT PERMISSIBLE FOR PRIESTLY USE.”**

1. II:1: What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Aqiba?
2. II:2: Said R. Yohanan, “All concur that if they were dependent upon one another, then the absence of the one invalidates the absence of the other.
3. II:3: Said Ulla, :”In the West they raised this question: ‘Does the fact that the two lambs together with the two loaves have to be waved together before the Lord form the basis of interdependence so that the absence of the one will invalidate the other, or is that not the case?’”

**4. II:4:** Said R. Judah bar Hanina to R. Huna b. R. Joshua, “And lo, when the clause is written, ‘They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest,’ it is set forth after the rite of waving, and nonetheless Ben Nanos and R. Aqiba disagree on the matter of whether the lambs may be offered in the absence of the loaves or vice versa, but one certainly may be offered without the other; so the waving that is set forth at the outset of the verse creates no interdependence at all between the lambs and the loaves.”

**a. II:5:** Continuation of II:4: But does the act of slaughtering create interdependency?

**b. II:6:** Continuation of II:5: Said R. Jeremiah, “If you maintain that waving creates interdependency, then if the bread offering was lost after waving, the lambs also should perish. If the lambs should perish, the bread offering also should perish. If, on the other hand, you take the view that waving does not create interdependency, then if one presented bread offerings and lambs and they were properly waved, and then the bread offering was lost, and other bread was brought to replace it, does that other bread have to be waved or does it not have to be waved?”

**5. II:7:** Said Abbaye to Raba, “What differentiates the two lambs of Pentecost, which effect the sanctification of the bread and which are indispensable to the rite of the bread, from the seven lambs, the bullock of Pentecost, and the rams, which do not effect the sanctification of the bread, and the absence of which does not invalidate the bread offering?” He said to him, “It is because the one has been made interdependent with the other through being waved in common.”

**6. II:8:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If the two loaves were presented on their own without the lambs, since the loaves are principal in the offering, are to be waved; they then are left to spoil and are taken away to the place of burning (T. **Men. 6:19B-C**: the words of R. Aqiba). Said Rabbah, “In point of fact they are presented to be eaten. But this is a precautionary decree, lest in the coming year lambs should be available, and the priests might say, ‘Well, least year did we not eat the bread without the lambs? Now too let’s eat the bread without offering the lambs,’ and they may not know that last year they just didn’t have lambs, so they were permitted to eat the bread by itself, but now that they do have lambs, it is the lambs that render eating the bread permissible.”

**a. II:9:** Said Rabbah, “On what basis do I make this statement? It is in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: Said R. Judah, “Testified Ben Bukhri in Yabneh: ‘Any priest who pays the sheqel does not sin.’ Said to him Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, ‘Not so. But any priest who does not pay the sheqel sins. But the priests expound this Scriptural verse for their own benefit: “And every meal offering of the priest shall be wholly burned, it shall not be eaten” (Lev. 6:23). Since the omer, Two Loaves, and Show Bread are ours, how if we contribute are they to be eaten?”” (M. **Sheq. 1: 4**). Now in this discussion, what is the situation with the two loaves? If we say that they are presented with an animal offering, then one can have asked, ‘Don’t the priests make a freewill offering of a thank offering and its loaves and also eat them?’ : therefore the priests’ argument cannot apply

to this case. So do we not deal with a case in which they are presented on their own! And it is stated as the Tannaite formulation, how if we contribute are they to be eaten! It follows that when presented on their own, they are presented so as to be eaten.”

**b.** II:10: R. Joseph said, “In point of fact they are presented to be burned, and this is the operative consideration that they are not burned right away: it is because Holy Things are not burned on a festival day.”

**c.** II:11: Raba said, “They are presented for eating. But it is a precautionary decree on account of the considerations raised by Rabbah. But the law that the two loaves are presented and to be eaten even on their own derives not from the passage presented by him but from this verse: ‘You shall bring out of your dwellings two loaves for waving, for firstfruits to the Lord’ (Lev. 23:17): just as first fruits are presented on their own, so the two loaves may be offered on their own; just as the firstfruits are presented so as to be eaten, so the two loaves are presented so as to be eaten.”

**7.** II:12: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The lambs that are presented at Pentecost sanctify the bread only when they are slaughtered. How so? “If the officiating priest slaughtered them for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is likewise sanctified. If the officiating priest slaughtered them not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is not sanctified. If the officiating priest slaughtered them for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is sanctified but not sanctified,” the words of Rabbi.

**a.** II:13: Gloss of the foregoing.

**8.** II:14: R. Samuel bar R. Isaac asked R. Hiyya bar Abba, “As to the lambs presented on Pentecost that one slaughtered for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated but the blood of which one tossed not or the classification for which the beasts were originally designated — as to the bread that accompanies them, what is the law on eating it?”

**9.** II:15: R. Jeremiah raised this question to R. Zira: “Lambs that are presented for Pentecost that one slaughtered within the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and the bread associated with which was lost — what is the law as to tossing the blood for some other purpose e.g., classifying the offering as a peace offering, so that it may be permitted to eat the meat of the animals anyhow since if there is no bread, the lambs can be peace offerings?”

**10.** II:16: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one slaughtered two lambs that were accompanied by four loaves instead of two, one chooses two of them and waves them, and as to the rest, when they have been redeemed, they may be eaten.

**a.** II:17: Continuation of the analysis of the foregoing.

**b.** II:18: As above.

**14.** II:19: R. Hanina Tirta repeated as a Tannaite rule in the presence of R. Yohanan, “If one slaughtered four lambs that were accompanied by two loaves instead of two, one tosses the blood of two of them for the Pentecost offering, and then chooses two of them and tosses their blood not for the purpose for which they were originally designated but as peace offerings, for if you do not take that position, you cause the loss of the last two lambs. : the second pair of lambs would be invalid and could not be eaten, for since they were once fit to be offered under their correct designated and were slaughtered under that same original designation but now have been rejected, if they are offered under some other classification, they cannot be valid.”

**a.** II:20: Continuation of the analysis of the foregoing.

**15.** II:21: When R. Isaac came, he repeated as a Tannaite rule: “Lambs for Pentecost that one slaughtered not for the classification for which the animals were originally designated are unfit; they are to be left to rot and then taken to the burning place.”

**16.** II:22: Rabbah bar bar Hannah repeated as a Tannaite formulation in the presence of Rab: “Lambs presented for Pentecost that one slaughtered as rams so the officiating priest said he was now slaughtering rams, meaning, sheep in their second year are valid, but they do not carry out the obligation of their owner.”

## **XXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:4**

**A. THE ABSENCE OF CONTINUAL OFFERINGS DAILY WHOLE OFFERINGS DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS, AND THE ABSENCE OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS DOES NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF THE CONTINUAL OFFERINGS, AND THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS DO NOT IMPAIR THE VALIDITY OF ONE ANOTHER.**

**1.** I:1: R. Hiyya bar Abin addressed this question to R. Hisda, “In the case of the community’s not having sufficient resources for both the daily whole offerings and for the additional offerings, which of them takes precedence? Now under what circumstances does this problem arise? If we say that it was the daily whole offerings of that day and also the additional offerings of that day, then it is self-evident that the daily whole offerings take priority, for they represent what is the more frequent and the more holy the daily whole offering being presented on the Sabbath prior to the additional offering. Rather, we must be dealing here, in order for the question to arise, with the daily whole offerings for tomorrow and the additional offerings for today. Then the issue is this: should we give precedence to the daily whole offerings, for they are the more regular, or to the additional offerings, for they are the more holy?”

**a.** I:2: Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “Rather than six, there should be seven, for lo, there has to be the lamb for the daily whole offering of the morning for Tuesday!” He said to him, “By this same reasoning of yours, there should be eight! For we have to take into account a lamb for the daily whole

offering of the evening on Friday assuming that, as of this reckoning, that one had not been offered.”

**B. IF THEY DID NOT OFFER A LAMB IN THE MORNING, LET THEM OFFER IT AT TWILIGHT. SAID R. SIMEON, “UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES? WHEN THEY WERE SUBJECT TO CONSTRAINT OR IN ERROR. BUT IF THEY DELIBERATELY DID NOT OFFER A LAMB IN THE MORNING, THEY SHOULD NOT OFFER IT AT TWILIGHT.”**

1. II:1: Who in the world brought up the subject of the dedication of the golden altar! The formulation of the rule is seriously flawed, and this is how it should be reformulated: If they did not offer a lamb in the morning, let them not offer it at twilight. Under what circumstances? In a case in which the altar had not been consecrated. But if the altar had been consecrated, then If they did not offer a lamb in the morning, let them offer it at twilight. Said R. Simeon, “Under what circumstances? When they were subject to constraint or in error. But if they deliberately did not offer a lamb in the morning, they should not offer it at twilight.” If they did not burn the incense in the morning, they should burn it at twilight.

2. II:2: What is the scriptural source of this rule?

**C. IF THEY DID NOT BURN THE INCENSE IN THE MORNING, THEY SHOULD BURN IT AT TWILIGHT.**

1. III:1: But if they deliberately did not offer a lamb in the morning, they should not offer it at twilight: now is the altar to be left empty because the priests have sinned?

**D. SAID R. SIMEON, “BUT ALL OF IT THE INCENSE OFFERING IS OFFERED AT TWILIGHT. FOR THEY DEDICATED THE GOLDEN ALTAR ONLY WITH INCENSE OF SWEET SPICES THAT ARE OFFERED IN THE AFTERNOON, AND THE ALTAR OF THE BURNT OFFERING ONLY BY THE CONTINUAL OFFERING IN THE MORNING:**

1. IV:1: But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “by the incense of sweet spices that are offered in the morning”?

**E. AND THE TABLE ONLY BY THE SHOWBREAD THAT WAS LAID ON THE TABLE ON THE SABBATH, AND THE CANDLESTICK ONLY BY THE SEVEN LAMPS KINDLED IN THE AFTERNOON:”**

1. V:1: But if the show bread was put on the table on a weekday, would it not then have been dedicated, but it would in any event have been sanctified? That is not possible, since putting the showbread on the table on the weekday does not sanctify the bread in any way at all!

2. V:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: That is the sole offering of incense that was offered by an individual on the outer altar, and it was a ruling only for a special occasion.

a. V:3: Then is the implication that while an individual may not make an offering on the outer altar, on the inner altar he may do so? And, furthermore, is it on the outer altar that the individual may not do so, but on the outer altar the community may do so? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:

b. V:4: Said R. Pappa, “What we have before us is a formulation of ‘it goes without saying,’ namely: it is not necessary to say that the community may not make such an offering on the outer altar, for we find no such case; further, an individual obviously may not offer incense on the inner altar, there being no such case. But even an individual may not offer incense on the outer altar, even though the heads of the tribes did so, for that was a ruling only for a special occasion.”

## **XXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:5**

**A. THE GRIDDLE CAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST WERE NOT OFFERED IN HALF TENTHS OF AN EPHAH AT A TIME. BUT ONE BRINGS A WHOLE TENTH AND DIVIDES IT, AND OFFERS HALF IN THE MORNING AND HALF AT TWILIGHT. AND A PRIEST WHO OFFERED HALF IN THE MORNING AND DIED, AND IN WHOSE PLACE ON THAT SAME DAY THEY APPOINTED ANOTHER PRIEST — THE LATTER, AT TWILIGHT SHOULD NOT BRING A HALF-TENTH OF AN EPHAH FROM HIS OWN PROPERTY, NOR HALF OF THE TENTH OF THE FIRST PRIEST. BUT HE BRINGS A WHOLE TENTH AND DIVIDES IT AND OFFERS HALF. AND THE OTHER HALF IS LEFT TO PERISH. IT TURNS OUT THAT TWO HALVES ARE OFFERED, AND TWO HALVES ARE LEFT TO PERISH.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Had Scripture said, “For a meal offering, a half,” I might have reached the conclusion that he brings a half tenth from his own resources in the morning and offers it, and a half tenth from his own resources in the evening and offers that. But Scripture says, “half of it in the morning,” meaning, he must offer half of a whole tenth. So he brings a whole tenth and divides it, offering half in the morning and half in the evening. If the half that was to be offered towards evening became unclean or lost, might I then say he should bring a half-tenth from his own resources and presents it? Scripture states, “And half of it in the evening,” meaning he must offer half of a whole tenth. So he has to bring another whole tenth and divide it, offering half and leaving the other half to perish, with the result that two halves are offered and two halves left to perish.

2. I:2: A Tannaite authority repeated before R. Nahman, “As for the half left over by the first high priest and the half left over by the second, they are left to be spoiled, then they are taken away to the burning place.”

3. I:3: It was stated: As to the griddle cakes of the high priest, how were they prepared? R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan said, “One bakes them first of all in an oven and then fries them : on a griddle after smearing them with oil.” R. Assi said R. Hanina said, “One fries them and afterward bakes them in an oven.

4. I:4: We have learned in the Mishnah there: The baked cakes of a high priest: their kneading and their rolling out are done inside. And they override the prohibitions of the Sabbath. Grinding their grain and sifting it do not override the Sabbath (M. **Men. 11:3A-D**). How on the basis of Scripture do we know that kneading may be done on the Sabbath?

a. I:5: It has been taught on Tannaite authority along the lines of what Raba has said: “...on a griddle’ (Lev. 6:14) teaches that it has to be done

in a utensil of service. "...with oil" — with an addition of oil. But I do not know how much is to be added. Lo, I reason in the following way: here we find a reference to "oil" and in the context of the meal offering along with the lambs of the daily whole offering we find a reference to "oil." Just as in that case, there must be three logs of oil to the tenth ephah of fine flour, so here too there must be three logs of oil to the tenth ephah of fine flour.

I. I:6: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

## **XXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 4:5I-L**

**A. IF THEY DID NOT APPOINT ANOTHER PRIEST IN PLACE OF THE ONE WHO DIED, OF WHOSE PROPERTY WAS IT OFFERED? R. SIMEON SAYS, "OF THE COMMUNITY." R. JUDAH SAYS, "OF THE HEIRS OF THE DECEASED."**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "A high priest who died and in place of whom another priest was not appointed — how on the basis of Scripture do we know that the offering that he yet owes derives from the property of his heirs? Scripture says, 'The anointed priest that will be in his place from among his sons shall offer it' (Lev. 6:15). Might one suppose that they then offer it a half tenth at a time? Scripture says, 'it,' meaning, the whole of it, and not half of it," the words of R. Judah.

a. I:2: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

b. I:3: As above.

c. I:4: As above.

d. I:5: As above.

I. I:6: As above.

II. I:7: as above.

A I:8: As above.

**B. AND THE WHOLE TENTH WAS OFFERED:**

1. II:1: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, "R. Yohanan raised this question: 'Is the meaning, the whole tenth both of the morning and of dusk, or perhaps while the whole tenth of the morning is offered, the one of dusk is annulled?'"

a. II:2: Secondary development of the foregoing.

b. II:3: Secondary development of the foregoing.

I. II:4: Analytical question pursuing the problem of the foregoing: R. Yohanan presented this question: "A high priest who died and in place of whom another was not appointed — from the viewpoint of rabbis, is the quantity of required incense to be doubled or not? Do we say that, since the quantity of fine flour that pertains to him has had to be doubled, so too the quantity of incense has to be doubled? Or perhaps what has been expressly stated, the rule is what it is, and where it has not been expressly stated, it is not?"



## **XXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:1**

**A. ALL MEAL OFFERINGS ARE BROUGHT UNLEAVENED, EXCEPT FOR THE LEAVENED CAKES OF THANK OFFERINGS AND THE TWO LOAVES OF BREAD OF PENTECOST, WHICH ARE BROUGHT AS LEAVENED BREAD:**

1. I:1: R. Perida asked R. Ammi, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that all meal offerings are brought unleavened?”

2. I:2: 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?”

a. I:3: A further story involving Perida.

I. I:4: Continuation of the topic of the foregoing.

II. I:5: Continuation of the topic of the foregoing.

III. I:6: Continuation of the topic of the foregoing.

**B. 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.”**

1. II:1: What is the meaning of the phrase, it would be either too little or too much?

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The meal offering that is leavened, the two loaves of Pentecost, the ten of thank offerings may not be leavened with apples. In the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel they said, “They do.”

3. II:3: 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, 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.” R. Isaac bar Abdimi said, “As to the meal offering of the poor sinner, one mixes it with water and it remains entirely valid.”

a. II:4: The issue of measuring something as is is pursued in a different context altogether.

I. II:5: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

A. II:6: Gloss of the gloss.

## **XXX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:2**

**A. ALL THOSE MEAL OFFERINGS THAT MUST BE UNLEAVENED ARE KNEADED IN LUKEWARM WATER. AND ONE WATCHES THEM, THAT THEY NOT LEAVEN.**

**AND IF THE RESIDUE BECAME LEAVENED, ONE TRANSGRESSES A NEGATIVE COMMANDMENT. 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).**

1. I:1: 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?

a. I:2: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

**B. AND THEY ARE LIABLE ON ACCOUNT OF LEAVENING IN CONNECTION WITH KNEADING IT, ROLLING IT, AND BAKING IT.**

1. II:1: 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.”

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A firstling which suffered from congestion of blood (M. **Bekh. 5:2D**) — “They do not draw blood from it in a place on which one makes a blemish. But they draw blood from it in a place on which one does not make a blemish,” the words of R. Meir. 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.” R. Simeon says, “Also: It is slaughtered on account of that blemish.” R. Judah says, “Even if it is on the point of death, they do not draw blood from it.” 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). 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. The dispute concerns only one who blemishes an already-blemished animal.”

3. II:3: 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.”

a. II:4: Gloss of foregoing.

b. II:5: As above.

4. II:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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? Scripture adds, “meal offering.” How do I know that the same law applies to all other meal offerings? Scripture says, “Every meal offering.” “Which you shall bring to the Lord” means, what is valid, not what is not valid, on which basis they said, He who leavens a valid meal offering is liable, but he who leavens an invalid one is not.

**a. II:7:** 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. II:8:** 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?”

**5. II:9:** Reversion to II.6 and gloss of the proof. 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”? It is required in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: “‘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. R. Aqiba says, “It serves to encompass under the law prohibiting leavening the show bread.”

**6. II:10:** Continuation of the foregoing. But as to the meal offering that is brought with drink offerings, it is prepared with fruit juice, and in any event fruit juice does not cause leavening!

**a. II:11:** 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,” 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. II:12:** As above.

**c. II:13:** As above.

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

8. II:15: It has been stated: 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) — R. Yohanan said, “He is liable.” R. Eleazar said, “He is exempt from liability.”

a. II:16: Secondary gloss of foregoing.

I. II:17: As above.

A. II:18: As above.

9. II:19: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “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. How do I know that the same rule applies to part of it? Scripture says, “any leaven” (Lev. 2:11). And how do I know that the same rule applies to the mixture of it? Scripture states, “for any leaven” (Lev. 2:11).

10. II:20: It has been stated: He who offers up leaven or honey on the altar — 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.” Abbaye said, “He is not flogged for violating a negative commandment that encompasses a number of distinct prohibitions” : he is not flogged for offering the mixture.

### **XXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:3**

**A. THERE ARE MEAL OFFERINGS WHICH REQUIRE OIL AND FRANKINCENSE, OIL BUT NOT FRANKINCENSE, FRANKINCENSE BUT NOT OIL, NEITHER OIL NOR FRANKINCENSE. AND THESE ARE THEY THAT REQUIRE OIL AND FRANKINCENSE: THE MEAL OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, AND THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN THE BAKING PAN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN THE FRYING PAN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE CAKES, AND OF THE WAFERS, THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED PRIEST, THE MEAL OFFERING OF GENTILES, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF WOMEN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OMER. THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH IS BROUGHT WITH DRINK OFFERINGS REQUIRES OIL BUT DOES NOT REQUIRE FRANKINCENSE. THE SHOWBREAD REQUIRES FRANKINCENSE BUT DOES NOT REQUIRE OIL. THE TWO LOAVES, THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY REQUIRE NEITHER OIL NOR FRANKINCENSE.**

1. I:1: Said R. Pappa, “All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes.” 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.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “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. For one might have maintained the following: Is the opposite to that proposition not a matter of logic? 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. Scripture says, “You shall add oil to it” but not onto the show bread.

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

b. I:4: As above.

c. I:5: As above.

d. I:6: As above.

## **XXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 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. IF ONE PUT OIL ON IT, HE HAS INVALIDATED IT. IF HE PUT FRANKINCENSE ON IT, HE SHOULD GATHER IT UP AND REMOVE IT:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “he shall not add oil to it.” And if he did so, he has invalidated the offering. “or lay frankincense on it.” Might one suppose that if he did so, he has invalidated it? Scripture says, “...for it is a sin offering.” It is a valid sin offering even though it has had frankincense put upon it.

2. I:2: 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?”

3. I:3: 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.”

4. I:4: 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.”

5. I:5: 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. 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.**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “He shall not put on it oil and he shall not give...” might one suppose that Scripture speaks of two priests’ doing so? Scripture says, “upon it,” meaning that the verse refers to the meal offering and not to the priest. 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? Scripture states, “upon it,” meaning, upon the actual meal offering.

### **XXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 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. THESE ARE OFFERINGS WHICH REQUIRE WAVING BUT DO NOT REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR: THE MEAL OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, AND THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN THE BAKING PAN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN THE FRYING PAN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF CAKES, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF WAFERS, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF PRIESTS, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF AN ANOINTED PRIEST, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF GENTILES, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF WOMEN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER. 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. AND WHATEVER IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE TAKING OF A HANDFUL IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE ACT OF BRINGING NEAR.”**

1. I:1: Said R. Pappa, “All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes.”

2. I:2: What is the source in Scripture of this statement that meal offerings that are listed have to be brought near the altar? It is as our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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,” 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? Scripture says explicitly, “meal offering.” How do I know that I should encompass all meal offerings? Scripture says, using the accusative particle, “the meal offering.” How do I know that the law encompasses the meal offering of a poor sinner? Scripture says, using the accusative particle, “the meal offering.”

### **XXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:6-7**

**A. THESE ARE OFFERINGS WHICH REQUIRE WAVING AND DO NOT REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR: THE LOG OF OIL OF THE PERSON HEALED OF THE SKIN AILMENT; HIS GUILT OFFERING:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And the priest will take one of the male lambs and offer it up as a guilt-offering” (Lev. 14:12) — This teaches that they the beast and the log of oil require waving all at once. And how do we know that, if he waved this one by itself and the other one by itself, he has fulfilled the obligation? 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. Might one think that he should wave and go back and wave again? Scripture says, “And he will wave... a

waving” — a waving, and not wavings. “Before the Lord” (Lev. 14:12) — in the east

a. I:2: But lo, it has been said, “‘Before the Lord’ — might one suppose that means on the west side”?

**B. AND FIRST FRUITS — THIS IS IN ACCORD WITH THE OPINION OF R. ELIEZER B. JACOB.**

1. II:1: Where is the passage in which R. Eliezer b. Jacob figures?

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

**C. AND THE SACRIFICIAL PARTS OF THE PEACE OFFERINGS OF AN INDIVIDUAL; AND THEIR BREAST AND THIGH. BOTH THOSE OF ISRAELITE MEN AND WOMEN BUT NOT THOSE OF OTHERS —**

1. III:1: What is the sense of this statement?

2. III:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Say to the people of Israel:” The children of Israel present a wave offering, and idolators do not present a wave offering. Since “children” uses the Hebrew for “sons,” we conclude that the sons of Israel wave offerings, and women do not wave offerings.

3. III:3: It has further been taught on Tannaite authority: “The children of Israel:” I know only that the waving is done by sons of Israel. How do I know that the law encompasses proselytes and freed slaves? Scripture says, “who offers the sacrifice.”

4. III:4: How is it done?

5. III:5: 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)!

**D. AND THE TWO LOAVES OF BREAD, AND THE TWO LAMBS OF PENTECOST. HOW DOES ONE CARRY OUT THE RITE?**

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the first fruits as a wave offering before the Lord with the two lambs:” Might one suppose that he should put the lambs upon the bread, so that the bread was placed below? Scripture says, “with the two lambs.” If it is “with the two lambs,” then might one think that the bread was on top of the lambs? Scripture says, “with the bread of the first fruits.”

a. IV:2: Gloss of foregoing.

**E. 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, AS IT IS WRITTEN, “WHICH IS WAVED AND WHICH IS RAISED UP:”**

**THE WAVING WAS AT THE EAST OF THE ALTAR, AND THE BRINGING NEAR OF THE WEST AT THE SOUTHWESTERN CORNER. AND THE WAVINGS COME BEFORE THE BRINGINGS NEAR. THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OMER ON THE SIXTEENTH OF**



**NISAN. AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY REQUIRE BOTH WAVING AND BRINGING NEAR. THE SHOWBREAD AND THE MEAL OFFERING BROUGHT WITH DRINK OFFERINGS REQUIRE NEITHER WAVING NOR BRINGING NEAR.**

1. V:1: 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.” In the West the matter was repeated in this way: 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.”

2. V:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “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. And sages say, “That is the case only with the breast and thigh.”

**F. 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 REQUIRE LAYING ON OF HANDS WHILE THE ANIMAL IS YET ALIVE, AND WAVING OF THE SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS, BUT WAVING DOES NOT APPLY TO THEM WHILE THEY ARE ALIVE. THE SACRIFICES OF PEACE OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY THE LAMBS OF PENTECOST REQUIRE WAVING WHILE THEY ARE ALIVE AND WHEN THEY ARE SLAUGHTERED, BUT THE LAYING ON OF HANDS DOES NOT APPLY TO THEM THE GUILT OFFERING OF THE PERSON HEALED OF THE SKIN AILMENT REQUIRES LAYING ON OF HANDS AND WAVING WHILE IT IS ALIVE, BUT WAVING DOES NOT APPLY TO IT WHEN IT HAS BEEN SLAUGHTERED.”**

1. VI:1: But may not not be argued a fortiori that the peace offering of the individual while yet alive should be waved: 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! 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.

2. VI:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Five people who presented a single offering — one waves the beast in behalf of all of them. In the case of a woman, the priest waves her offering in her behalf.

### **XXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:8**

**A. 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. 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.**

**AND WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A BAKING PAN AND A FRYING PAN? BUT: “THE FRYING PAN HAS A COVER, AND THE BAKING PAN HAS NO COVER,” THE WORDS OF R. YOSÉ THE GALILEAN:**

1. I:1: “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. 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:”**

1. II:1: 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).

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The House of Shammai say, “He who says, ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is a baking pan’ — the vow must stand until Elijah comes.” 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.

### **XXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 5:9**

**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. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IF HE WANTED, HE MAY BRING ONE BAKED IN A STOVE WHICH IS A KIND OF OVEN:”**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “...baked in the oven.” But not baked on a double stove or baked on mud bricks or baked on Arabian pots. 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.” 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.

**B. 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, R. SIMEON PERMITS, BECAUSE IT IS ONE KIND OF OFFERING:**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “When you present:” Should you present — treating the matter now as optional. “an offering of meal.” 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? 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.” Said R. Simeon, “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. On that basis, if one wanted to bring cakes, he may do so, and if he wanted to bring, wafers, he

may do so, 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**).

**a.** II:2: 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?

**b.** I:3: R. Yosé b. R. Judah takes the same position as his father!

### **XXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:1**

**A. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WAS BROUGHT ON THE SABBATH FROM THREE SEAHs OF BARLEY AND ON A WEEKDAY, FROM FIVE.” AND SAGES SAY, “ALL THE SAME ARE THE SABBATH AND THE WEEKDAY: FROM THREE SEAHs WAS IT BROUGHT.” R. HANANIAH, PREFECT OF THE PRIESTS, SAYS, “ON THE SABBATH THE BARLEY WAS REAPED BY ONE MAN, AND WITH ONE SICKLE, AND INTO ONE BASKET, AND ON A WEEKDAY BY THREE MEN, INTO THREE BASKETS, WITH THREE SICKLES.” AND SAGES SAY, “ALL THE SAME ARE THE SABBATH AND THE WEEKDAY: IT IS DONE BY THREE MEN, INTO THREE BASKETS, WITH THREE SICKLES.”**

**1.** I:1: Now there is no unclarity about the position of rabbis. They take the view that the tenth ephah of finest flour can be gotten out of three seahs of grain, and therefore it makes no difference whether it is a Sabbath or a weekday. But from the perspective of R. Ishmael, what is his premise? If he takes the view that a tenth ephah of finest flour can come only from five seahs of grain, then even on the Sabbath, that is the volume to be cut. And if it can derive from three, then even on a weekday, that is the volume that should be cut!

**a.** I:2: Secondary amplification of implicit principle in the foregoing; authorities who adopt that principle.

**b.** I:3: As above. Secondary amplification of implicit principle in the foregoing; authorities who adopt that principle.

**c.** I:4: As above. Secondary amplification of implicit principle in the foregoing; authorities who adopt that principle.

**2.** I:5: It has been stated: If one slaughtered two animals as sin offerings in behalf of the community but requires only one of them — Said Rabbah, and some say, R. Ammi, “He is liable for slaughtering the second but not for slaughtering the first, even though atonement has been achieved for him through the second, and even though the first turned out to be scrawny.”

**a.** I:6: Rabina asked R. Ashi, “If after slaughtering the second beast the first beast turned out to be scrawny in its entrails, what is the law? Do we adopt as our criterion the intention of the person, and this person obviously intended to perform a forbidden act? Or are we guided by the actuality of the deed, which turns out not to have been forbidden after all?”

**I.** I:7: Said Rabbah, “If for a sick person a single fig was prescribed on the Sabbath, as a means of saving a life, and ten people ran and

came back together with ten figs, they are not liable, and that is the ruling even if one came in sequence after the other, and even if the men got better after eating the first fig.” Asked Raba, “If for a sick person two figs were prescribed on the Sabbath, as a means of saving a life, and there were two figs on two stalks and three figs on one stalk, which one should be bring back? We bring back two for him, because that is what is appropriate for him? Or perhaps we bring back three for him, for then there is less picking of produce on the Sabbath?”

### **XXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:2**

**A. THE REQUIREMENT OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY IS TO BRING IT FROM BARLEY GROWING NEARBY TO JERUSALEM. IF THE CROP DID NOT RIPEN NEAR JERUSALEM IN TIME FOR USE ON NISAN 16 THEY BRING IT FROM ANY PLACE:**

1. I:1: The requirement of the offering of the first sheaf of barley is to bring it from barley growing nearby to Jerusalem: how come?

**B. M'SH S: IT WAS BROUGHT FROM GAGGOT SERIFIN, AND THE GRAIN FOR THE TWO LOAVES FROM THE VALLEY OF EN SOKHER.**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority When the kings of the Hasmonean house fought one another, Hyrcanus was outside and Aristobulus was inside Jerusalem. Every day the people inside would lower a basket of denars, and those outside would raise up animals for the daily whole-offering. There was there among the besieging forces an elder, who was familiar with Greek learning. He spoke with them concerning Greek learning, saying to them, “So long as they carry out the Temple service, they will not be given over into your hands.” The next day when the insiders lowered a basket of denars, the outsiders sent up a pig. When the pig got half way up the wall, it dug its hoof into the wall. The land of Israel quaked and moved four hundred square parasangs. At that time they ruled, “It is cursed for someone to raise pigs, and it is cursed for anyone to teach Greek learning to his son.” Concerning that year, we have learned: It was brought from Gaggot Serifin “roofs of cone shaped huts”, and the grain for the two loaves Lev. 23:17 from the valley of En Sokher “Eye Socket”

**C. HOW TO DETERMINE THE MEANINGS OF UNFAMILIAR WORDS: TESTIMONY OF NATIVE SPEAKERS**

1. II:2: “roofs of cone shaped huts:” When the time for presenting the sheaf of first barley-grain, they did not know whence they would get it. They issued a proclamation. A deaf-mute came forward and made a gesture with one hand toward the roof, and with the other toward a cone-shaped hut. Said Mordecai to them, “Is there any place around here that is called Gaggot Serifin or Serifin Gaggot?”

2. II:3: “Eye Socket:” When the time for presenting the sheaf of two loaves of bread, they did not know whence they would get it. They issued a proclamation. A deaf-mute came forward and made a gesture with one hand toward this eye, and

with the other toward the socket of a bolt. Said Mordecai to them, "Is there any place around here that is called En Sokher or Sokher Ein?" They went out looking and found it."

3. II:4: There were these three women who brought three pairs of doves. One said, "It is for my flux," the next, "it is for my sea," and the third, "it is for my season."

4. II:5: So everyone on the Sanhedrin knew seventy languages just as well! For said R. Yohanan, "They seat on a sanhedrin only people of stature, wisdom, good appearance, mature age, who can recognize sorcery, and speak seventy languages, so that there should be no need of a sanhedrin to listen to testimony through an interpreter."

### **XXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:3**

**A. HOW DID THEY DO IT? AGENTS OF THE COURT GO FORTH ON THE EVE OF THE AFTERNOON BEFORE THE FESTIVAL OF PASSOVER. AND THEY MAKE IT INTO SHEAVES WHILE IT IS STILL ATTACHED TO THE GROUND, SO THAT IT WILL BE EASY TO REAP. AND ALL THE VILLAGERS NEARBY GATHER TOGETHER THERE ON THE NIGHT AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF PASSOVER, SO THAT IT WILL BE REAPED WITH GREAT POMP. ONCE IT GETS DARK ON THE NIGHT OF THE SIXTEENTH OF NISAN, HE SAYS TO THEM, "HAS THE SUN SET?" THEY SAY, "YES." "HAS THE SUN SET?" THEY SAY, "YES." "WITH THIS SICKLE?" THEY SAY, "YES." "WITH THIS SICKLE?" THEY SAY, "YES." "WITH THIS BASKET?" THEY SAY, "YES." "WITH THIS BASKET?" THEY SAY, "YES." ON THE SABBATH, HE SAYS TO THEM, "SHALL I REAP ON THIS SABBATH?" THEY SAY, "YES." "SHALL I REAP ON THIS SABBATH?" THEY SAY, "YES." "SHALL I REAP?" THEY SAY, "REAP." "SHALL I REAP?" THEY SAY, "REAP"- THREE TIMES FOR EACH AND EVERY MATTER. AND THEY SAY TO HIM, "YES, YES, YES." ALL OF THIS POMP FOR WHAT PURPOSE? BECAUSE OF THE BOETHUSIANS, FOR THEY MAINTAIN, "THE REAPING OF THE BARLEY FOR THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY IS NOT DONE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE FESTIVAL."**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: These are the days on which there is to be no fasting, and on some of them also, mourning is forbidden as well: from the first until the eighth day of Nisan, during which the Daily Whole Offering was set up, mourning is forbidden; from the eighth of Nisan until the close of the Festival of Passover, during which time the date for the Festival of Pentecost was reestablished, fasting is forbidden

a. I:2: Amplification of foregoing.

b. I:3: Amplification of foregoing.

c. I:4: Amplification of foregoing.

d. I:5: Amplification of foregoing.

e. I:6: Amplification of foregoing.

f. I:7: Amplification of foregoing.

2. I:8: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And you shall count for yourself” (Lev. 23:15) — the duty of counting is incumbent on every person. “On the morrow after the Sabbath” (Lev. 23:16) — that is, on the day after the festival of Passover. But perhaps that refers to the day after the Sabbath that commemorates creation? R. Yosé bar Judah says, “Lo, Scripture says, ‘You shall count fifty days’ (Lev. 23:16) — every time you make a count, it shall not be for more than fifty days. Now if you maintain that the cited verse speaks of the day after the Sabbath, meaning, after the Sabbath of creation, then sometimes the count might reach fifty one, or fifty-two, or fifty-three, or fifty-four, or fifty-five, or fifty-six!” R. Judah b. Batera says, “That proof is hardly required. 66A Lo, Scripture says, ‘And you shall count for yourself’ (Lev. 23:15) — the duty of counting is incumbent on every person. So the counting depends upon the decision of the court, and the meaning cannot be the Sabbath that commemorates creation, in which case the counting would be in everybody’s hands.” R. Yosé says, “‘On the morrow after the Sabbath’ (Lev. 23:16) — that is, on the day after the festival of Passover. You say that it is on the day after the festival of Passover. But perhaps that refers to the day after the Sabbath that commemorates creation? Can you really say so? Now does Scripture say, ‘from the morrow after the Sabbath with respect to Passover’? And is not ‘from the morrow after the Sabbath’ stated without further explanation? Now is not the entire year filled with Sabbaths? Then go and reckon what Sabbath is under discussion? And, furthermore, here we find a reference to ‘from the morrow after the Sabbath,’ and elsewhere we find the same language ‘counting fifty days to the morrow after the seventh Sabbath’. Just as ‘from the morrow after the Sabbath’ refers to a festival day and the beginning of the festival day specifically, Pentecost, to which reference is made here, so ‘on the morrow after the Sabbath’ used here refers to the festival and the beginning of the festival hence, the morrow after the Sabbath that is the first day of Passover.”

a. I:9: Gloss of foregoing.

l. I:10: Gloss of the gloss.

## **XL. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:4A-J**

**A. THEY REAPED IT, AND THEY PUT IT INTO BASKETS, THEY BROUGHT IT TO THE COURT OF THE TEMPLE. “THEY DID PARCH IT IN FIRE, SO AS TO CARRY OUT THE REQUIREMENT THAT IT BE PARCHED WITH FIRE,” THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. AND SAGES SAY, “WITH REEDS AND WITH STEMS OF PLANTS DO THEY FIRST BEAT IT TO THRESH IT, SO THAT IT NOT BE CRUSHED. AND THEY PUT IT INTO A TUBE. AND THE TUBE WAS PERFORATED, SO THAT THE FIRE AFFECT ALL OF IT.” THEY SPREAD IT OUT IN THE COURT, AND THE BREEZE BLOWS OVER IT. THEY PUT IT INTO A GRIST MILL AND TOOK OUT THEREFROM A TENTH EPHAH, WHICH IS SIFTED THROUGH THIRTEEN SIEVES:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “... new ears parched with fire” (Lev. 2:14) — this refers to fresh ears of grain. This teaches the following: “They parched it in fire, so as to carry out the requirement that it be parched with fire,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “The language at hand does not bear

the meaning of parching, but it bears a different meaning. “With reeds and with stems of plants they beat it first, so that it is not crushed. And they put it into a tube, and the tube was perforated, so that the fire affects all of it.”

2. I:2: Continuation of the foregoing.

3. I:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

4. I:4: As above.

**B. AND THE RESIDUE IS REDEEMED AND EATEN BY ANYONE. AND IT IS LIABLE FOR THE DOUGH OFFERING, BUT EXEMPT FROM TITHES. R. AQIBA DECLARES IT LIABLE FOR BOTH DOUGH OFFERING AND TITHES.**

1. II:1: Said R. Kahana, “R. Aqiba would say, ‘Smoothing the pile of grain which is the moment at which, when owned by an ordinary Israelite, the grain becomes subject to the tithes that belongs at that time to the Temple does not exempt the grain from having to be tithed when an Israelite later on buys it.’”

2. II:2: Said Raba, “It is obvious to me that the smoothing down of the pile of grain that is sanctified exempts the grain from the obligations of tithing should an Israelite later purchase it, since, when the grain was smoothed down and so rendered liable to tithes, it belonged to the sanctuary and was exempt. And even R. Aqiba declares it liable in that case only on the principle, ‘for Temple money is permitted to be used only for what is necessary for the Temple’s own purpose.’ But, in general, all concur that the smoothing down of grain in the possession of the Temple exempts it from the obligation of tithes as what is exempt at the moment at which the obligation pertains remains so thereafter.”

3. II:3: As regards the rule pertaining to smoothing the pile of grain that belongs at that moment to a gentile and whether or not the gentile’s ownership renders the grain exempt from the obligation of tithing, there is a conflict of Tannaite formulations.

4. II:4: Rolling out dough belonging to the Temple at the time of rolling out, at which the dough is liable to the separation of dough offering leaves the dough permanent exempt from dough offering.

5. II:5: Raba raised this question: “What affect upon the status of the dough as to liability to tithes does the rolling out of the dough by a gentile produce?”

## **XLI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:4L-O, 6:5A-C**

**A. HE CAME ON THE SIXTEENTH OF NISAN TO THE TENTH EPHAH OF FLOUR, AND PUT IN ITS OIL AND FRANKINCENSE. HE POURED IN OIL AND MINGLED IT AND WAVED IT. AND HE BROUGHT IT NEAR AND TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL AND OFFERED IT UP. AND THE RESIDUE IS EATEN BY THE PRIESTS.**

**AFTER THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WAS OFFERED, THEY GO OUT AND FIND THE MARKET OF JERUSALEM FULL OF MEAL AND PARCHED GRAIN OF NEW PRODUCE — “NOT WITH THE APPROVAL OF SAGES,” THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. R. JUDAH SAYS, “WITH THE APPROVAL OF SAGES DID THEY DO SO.”**

1. I:1: But does R. Judah not make a precautionary decree to take account of the fact that people may eat the produce before the offering of the first sheaf of barley,



which is what marks the point at which it is permitted to eat produce of the new growing season? Then it may be objected: R. Judah says, “They seek out leaven on the night of the fourteenth, on the fourteenth in the morning, and at the time of removal.” If one did not search for leaven at the first time, he does it the second or third. After the sixth hour on the fourteenth of Nisan, he does not search for it, since if during the search he finds leaven, he might eat it and so violate the law; this contradicts the position of Judah in our rule. And sages say, “If one did not seek out leaven on the night of the fourteenth, he may seek it out on the fourteenth. If he did not seek it out on the fourteenth, let him seek it out at the appointed time 11 A.M. to 12 noon on the fourteenth. If he did not seek it out at the appointed time, let him seek it out after the appointed time to nightfall.” And what he wishes to hold over for food until the time for burning leaven, let him leave in a discrete place, so that it shall not require examination afterward (M. **Pes. 1:3A-E**).

## **XLII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:5D-I**

**A. AFTER THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WAS OFFERED, NEW PRODUCE WAS PERMITTED FORTHWITH. AND FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE DISTANT FROM JERUSALEM IT IS PERMITTED FROM NOONTIME AND THEREAFTER ON THE SIXTEENTH OF NISAN. AFTER THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED, RABBAN YOHANAN B. ZAKKAI ORDAINED THAT THE DAY OF WAVING OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, THE SECOND DAY OF PASSOVER SHOULD BE WHOLLY PROHIBITED IN RESPECT TO NEW PRODUCE. SAID R. JUDAH, “AND IS IT NOT SO THAT IT IS PROHIBITED BY THE TORAH, AS IT IS SAID, ‘TO THIS SELFSAME DAY’ (LEV. 23:14)? ON WHAT ACCOUNT ARE THOSE WHO ARE DISTANT FROM JERUSALEM PERMITTED TO MAKE USE OF NEW PRODUCE FROM NOONTIME AND THEREAFTER? BECAUSE THEY ARE CERTAIN THAT THE COURT IS NOT SLOVENLY IN DEALING WITH IT.**

**1. I:1:** Both Rab and Samuel said, “When the house of the sanctuary was standing, the offering of the sheaf of first barley served to permit new produce. In the time in which the house of the sanctuary is not standing, daybreak on the sixteenth of Nisan is what renders the new produce permitted. On the basis of what reading of Scripture does this ruling stand? There are two pertinent clauses: ‘Until you have presented’ (Lev. 23:14), and ‘Until this selfsame day’ (Lev. 23:14). How so? The one speaks of the age in which the house of the sanctuary stood, the other, of the age in which the house of the sanctuary did not stand.” Both R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “Even when the house of the sanctuary was standing, it was daybreak on the sixteenth of Nisan that rendered the new produce permitted.”

**a. I:2:** R. Pappa and R. Huna b. R. Joshua would eat new grain only on the night of the sixteenth of Nisan, which of course marks the beginning of the seventeenth of Nisan.

## **XLIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:6**

**A. THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY RENDERED THE PRODUCE OF THE NEW CROP PERMITTED IN THE COUNTRY, AND THE TWO LOAVES OF**

**PENTECOST, RENDERED NEW PRODUCE PERMITTED FOR THE MEAL OFFERING IN THE SANCTUARY. BEFORE THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, THEY DO NOT BRING FROM NEW PRODUCE, GRAIN THAT IS TO BE USED FOR MEAL OFFERINGS, FIRST FRUITS, AND THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH ACCOMPANIES DRINK OFFERINGS ALONG WITH BEASTS. AND IF ONE BROUGHT GRAIN FOR ANY OF THESE BEFORE THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, IT IS INVALID. AS TO BRINGING GRAIN FOR ANY OF THESE BEFORE THE TWO LOAVES — ONE SHOULD NOT DO SO . AND IF ONE BROUGHT GRAIN FROM THE NEW CROP FOR USE IN PREPARING THEM, IT IS VALID.**

1. I:1: ...one may not bring from new produce, grain that is to be used for meal offerings, first fruits, and the meal offering which accompanies drink offerings along with beasts. And if one brought grain for any of these before the offering of the first sheaf of barley, it is invalid. As to bringing grain for any of these items before the two loaves — one should not do so. And if one brought grain from the new crop for use in preparing them, it is valid: R. Tarfon was in session, raising this problem: “What is the reason for the contrast between the law on what is offered prior to the presentation of the sheaf of first barley and what is offered before the presentation of the two loaves?”

a. I:2: Gloss of foregoing.

2. I:3: Rami bar Hama raised this question: “If the two loaves are presented not in the proper order, what is the law on their permitting what is forbidden before that time?” In the ordinary course grain is sown sometime before the offering of the sheaf of new barley, so that before the grain is permitted for use as meal offerings, that is, after the offering of the two loaves, the two periods affecting grain have *passee* in normal sequence; first the offering of the sheaf of barley, second, the offering of the two loaves. What if the grain always permitted for meal offerings after these two points have passed, without regard to the sequence?”

3. I:4: Rami bar Hama raised this question: “Does the presentation of the two loaves permit for use in the Temple what is only in bud, or solely what is fully formed?” : only the first that had shown a distinct shape at the time of the presentation of the two loaves may be brought later as first fruits, but not produce that was then only in bud. What is the definition of “only in bud” and of “fully formed”?

**B. COMPOSITE OF OTHER THEORETICAL QUESTIONS ON THE STATUS OF GRAIN, FORMED MAINLY AROUND THE NAME OF RAMI BAR HAMA, AND SUBORDINATE QUESTIONS SECONDARY TO HIS**

1. I:5: Raba b. R. Hanan raised this question: “Does the presentation of the sheaf of first barley permit the use of wheat that has been sown in the ground already, or is that not the case?”

2. I:6: As to wheat grain sown in the soil as seed: does the law against overreaching which does not pertain to real estate apply to wheat that has been sown in the ground or is that not the case?



3. I:7: Is an oath taken concerning wheat that has been sown or is that not the case? An oath is not imposed concerning transactions of real estate; is what is sown in the ground classified as real estate or not?
4. I:8: Rami bar Hama raised this question: “What is the law about grains of wheat found in cattle dung, or grains of barley found in animal dung?”
5. I:9: Rami bar Hama raised this question: “What is the law if an elephant swallowed an Egyptian basket and excreted it?”
6. I:10: R. Zira raised this question: “If wheat fell from the clouds, what is the law?”
7. I:11: R. Simeon b. Pazzi raised this question: “If an ear of grain that had reached a third of its growth prior to the presentation of the sheaf of first barley was plucked out before that time and was replanted after that time and it grew some more, what is the law? Is the operative criterion the status of the root of the grain, so the offering of the first sheaf of barley has permitted use of the grain? Or perhaps the operative criterion is the status of the additional growth of the plant, so that it is permitted only after the next year’s offering of first barley is presented?”
8. I:12: Raba raised this question: “What is the rule with regard to tithing?”
9. I:13: R. Hanina b. Minyumi raised this question to Abbaye, “As to a plant growing in a pot that had no hole, what is the law?” The pot seals off this plant from the ground. May one tithe produce grown in another such pot in behalf of what is grown in this pot.
10. I:14: R. Abbahu raised this question: “If an ear of grain that had been in the pile when the pile was smoothed off was replanted and then designated as heave offering while it was attached to the ground, what is the law? Is it that, once one smoothed out the pile, the ear of grain was classified as grain that was liable to tithing but not yet tithed at all, so therefore, when it was later on classified as heave offering, even though it was in the ground, it is sanctified and thus, correctly designated as heave offering? Or perhaps since it was replanted when in the classification of grain that was liable to tithing but not yet tithed at all, that status has been removed?”
11. I:15: Said R. Tabyomi b. Qisna said Samuel, “He who sows mixed seeds in a pot that has no hole — the crop that grows is nonetheless forbidden.”

#### **XLIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:7**

##### **A. LOAVES OF BREAD MADE FROM WHEAT, BARLEY, SPELT, OATS, AND RYE ARE LIABLE TO DOUGH OFFERING.**

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: spelt is classified as wheat; oats and rye are classified as barley; spelt is the same as gulba; oat is the same as dishra; rye is the same as foxtail.
2. I:2: Only these Loaves of bread made from wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye are liable to dough offering, but not loaves of bread made from rice or millet. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

**B. AND THEY JOIN TOGETHER WITH ONE ANOTHER TO FORM THE VOLUME OF DOUGH LIABLE TO THE DOUGH OFFERING.**

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: grain, flour, and dough are deemed joined together to form a single entity. For what purpose is this rule required?

**C. AND THEY ARE PROHIBITED AS TO THE PROHIBITION OF NEW PRODUCE BEFORE THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY**

1. III:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the prohibition of new produce prior to the waving of the sheaf of first barley pertains solely to the five kinds of grain that are listed before us?

**D. ..AND ARE PROHIBITED TO BE REAPED BEFORE THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY.**

1. IV:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the prohibition of reaping new produce prior to the waving of the sheaf of first barley pertains solely to the five kinds of grain that are listed before us?

2. IV:2: What is the meaning of before the offering of the first sheaf of barley?

**E. AND IF THEY TOOK ROOT BEFORE THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY RENDERS THEM PERMITTED FOR REAPING. AND IF NOT, THEY ARE PROHIBITED UNTIL THE COMING OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WILL HAVE BEEN BROUGHT.**

1. V:1: Said R. Eleazar to R. Josiah, the one who was his contemporary, "You are not to go into session until you have explained to me the following: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that the offering of the first sheaf of barley renders permitted only what has taken root by that time?"

## **XLV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 6:8-9**

**A. BEFORE THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, THEY MAY REAP THE CROP IN IRRIGATED FIELDS IN VALLEYS, BUT THEY MAY NOT HEAP IT UP:**

1. I:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Benjamin says, "One verse of Scripture states, 'When you reap the harvest thereof, then you shall bring the sheaf' (Lev. 23:10) so it is permitted to reap prior to presenting the sheaf of first barley, and another verse states, 'The first of your reaping unto the priest' (Lev. 23:10) so the barley that is cut for the sheaf must be the first that is reaped, and there may be no reaping prior to that. How so? From an area from which you may present the grain, you are not permitted to reap prior to that, but from an area that will not produce the grain that you are going to present, you may reap prior to the presentation of the sheaf."

**B. THE PEOPLE OF JERICHO REAP, WITH SAGES' APPROVAL, AND THEY HEAP UP THE GRAIN, NOT WITH SAGES' APPROVAL. BUT SAGES DID NOT STOP THEM.**

1. I:1: From whom have you heard a statement that in some cases, sages stopped people from doing something, and in others they didn't?

**C. BEFORE THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, ONE REAPS UNRIPE GRAIN AND FEEDS IT TO CATTLE. SAID R. JUDAH, "UNDER WHAT**

**CIRCUMSTANCES? WHEN ONE BEGINS TO REAP BEFORE THE CROP REACHES A THIRD OF ITS FULL GROWTH.” R. SIMEON SAYS, “ALSO: BEFORE THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, ONE MAY REAP AND FEED IT TO CATTLE EVEN AFTER IT HAS REACHED A THIRD OF ITS FULL GROWTH.”**

1. III:1: We have learned in the Mishnah: And these landmarks establish the boundaries of a field for purposes of designating peah: a river, pond, private road, public road, public path, private path that is in use in the hot season and in the rainy season, uncultivated land, newly broken land, and an area sown with a different type of seed. And as regards one who harvests young grain for use as fodder — the area he harvests establishes the boundaries of a field,” the words of R. Meir. But sages say, “The area he harvests does not establish the boundaries of a field, unless he has also ploughed the stubble under” (M. **Peah 2: 1**). Cutting down unripe grain for fodder is not regarded as reaping.

**D. BEFORE THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, THEY REAP IF THE GROUND IS NEEDED FOR SEEDLINGS, OR AS A STATION FOR MOURNING, OR TO PREVENT THE INTERRUPTION OF THE ACTIVITY OF THE HOUSE OF STUDY.**

1. IV:1: What is the scriptural basis for that ruling?

**E. ONE SHOULD NOT HOWEVER MAKE THEM INTO BUNDLES, BUT HE LEAVES THEM IN SMALL HEAPS.**

1. V:1: How come?

**F. THE CORRECT EXECUTION OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY IS THAT IT BE BROUGHT FROM STANDING GRAIN. IF ONE DID NOT FIND STANDING GRAIN, HE MAY BRING IT FROM SHEAVES. THE CORRECT EXECUTION OF THE REQUIREMENT IS THAT IT COME FROM FRESH GRAIN. IF ONE DID NOT FIND FRESH GRAIN, HE MAY BRING IT FROM DRIED GRAIN:**

1. VI:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And when you bring a meal offering of first fruits” (Lev. 2:14): What is the purpose of this statement? Since the requirement of the offering of the first sheaf of barley is that it be brought from standing grain, how do I know that, if one did not find standing grain, he may bring it from sheaves? Scripture states, “you bring.”

**G. THE CORRECT EXECUTION OF THE REQUIREMENT IS THAT ONE REAP IT BY NIGHT:**

1. VII:1: But have we not learned in the Mishnah: The entire night is valid for cutting the wheat for the omer, and for offering up the fats and the sacrificial parts. This is the governing principle: Any act whose religious requirement applies by day is valid when done at any time of the day, and a matter whose religious requirement applies by night is valid when done at any time of the night (M. **Meg. 2: 6**)? Now the passage therefore treats as equivalent the night and the day, so that, just as what is to be done by day is not valid when done by night, so what is to be done by night is not valid when done by day

a. VII:2: Secondary development of the foregoing.

**H. IF IT IS REAPED BY DAY, IT IS VALID.**

1. VIII:3: And it overrides the rules of the Sabbath: Which authority have you heard to take the position that if it is reaped by day, it is valid? It is Rabbi. And yet it is stated, And it overrides the rules of the Sabbath so that is because it can only be done then. Now that speaks of reaping the barley, does it not? But we just said that in Rabbi's view, reaping the barley for the sheaf of first grain does not override the Sabbath!

## **XLVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:1**

### **A. AND THESE ARE MEAL OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL IS TAKEN:**

1. I:1: Said R. Pappa, "All offerings enumerated in our Mishnah-paragraph must be made up of ten cakes." 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. ...AND THE RESIDUE OF WHICH BELONGS TO THE PRIESTS:**

1. II:1: What is the scriptural basis for this position?

2. I:2: Rabina said, "The fact that the residue of the offering of first barley and of the meal offering presented by the woman accused of unfaithfulness, both of which are made of barley, is eaten by the priests, derives from the following Tannaite statement of Levi.

### **C. THE MEAL OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, AND THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN, THE MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A FRYING PAN, AND THE LOAVES, AND THE WAFERS, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF GENTILES:**

### **AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF WOMEN, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A SINNER, AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF A WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY.**

1. III:1: Said R. Huna, "Peace offerings of gentiles are to be classified as burnt offerings." No part may be eaten, they are wholly burned; their meal offerings also must be wholly burned."

a. III:2: But does the rule that a gentile may not present a Nazirite offering derive from the stated source?

b. III:3: In accord with which authority cited at III:1 is the following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: Said R. Simeon, "Seven rules did the court ordain, and this foregoing one is one of them. A gentile who sent his burnt offering from overseas and sent drink offerings with it — they are offered from what he has sent. But if not, they are offered from public funds. And so too a proselyte who died and left animals designated for sacrifices — if it has drink offerings, they are offered from his estate. And if not, they are offered from public funds. And it is a condition imposed by the court on a high priest who died, that his meal offering should derive from public funds" (M. **Sheq. 7: 6**). May we then say this rule which allows gentiles to present drink offerings is in accord with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, not with R. Aqiba?

c. III:4: In accord with which Tannaite authority is the following, which our rabbis have taught as a Tannaite statement: “All who are native shall do these things in this way, in offering an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the Lord” (Num. 15:13) — but then a gentile does not present drink-offerings. Might one suppose that his burnt-offering will not require drink offerings? Scripture states, “...in this way....” Now in accord with whom is that formulation? For it cannot be either R. Yosé the Galilean or R. Aqiba!

**D. R. SIMEON SAYS, “FROM THE MEAL OFFERING OF A PRIEST WHO WAS A SINNER THE HANDFUL IS TAKEN EVEN THOUGH THE WHOLE OF IT IN ANY CASE IS OFFERED ON THE ALTAR, AND THE HANDFUL IS OFFERED BY ITSELF, AND THE RESIDUE THEREOF IS OFFERED BY ITSELF:”**

1. IV:1: What is the scriptural basis for this position?

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

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

a. IV:4: Complement to the foregoing.

b. IV:5: As above.

4. IV:6: Rabina raised this question: “If a priest ate the sacrificial parts of an offering, which are supposed to be burned up, what is the law? As regards the non-priest, I have no problem and the priests are like non-priests in that neither class of person may eat parts of the offering that are supposed to be burned on the altar. Where I have a problem it pertains to his being liable to penalty for having violated the law, ‘it shall be wholly burned.’”

## **XLVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:2**

**A. THE MEAL OFFERING OF PRIESTS AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF AN ANOINTED PRIEST AND THE MEAL OFFERING BROUGHT WITH DRINK OFFERINGS BELONG TO THE ALTAR WITHOUT THE REMOVAL OF THE HANDFUL. AND THE PRIESTS HAVE NO PORTION IN THEM. IN THIS REGARD THE RIGHT OF THE ALTAR IS GREATER THAN THE RIGHT OF THE PRIESTS.**

1. I:1: Are there no other instances? What about the burnt offering! There is its hide, which is assigned to the priests. And lo, there is the case of the burnt offering of a bird! Its crop and feathers are not offered, so here is an offering that is not wholly burned up on the altar. Lo, there is the matter of drinking offers! These flow down into the pits. So what is the meaning of In this regard? It serves to exclude the opinion of Samuel

**B. THE TWO LOAVES OF BREAD AND THE SHOWBREAD BELONG TO THE PRIESTS. AND THE ALTAR HAS NO PORTION IN THEM. AND IN THIS REGARD THE RIGHT OF THE PRIESTS IS GREATER THAN THE RIGHT OF THE ALTAR.**

1. II:1: Are there no other instances? What about the sin offering presented of a bird. But there is its blood which is sprinkled on the side of the altar. So what about the log of oil of the leper? There there are sprinklings. So what is the

meaning of In this regard? It serves to exclude the position of him who says, “The two loaves, if presented on their own without the lambs of Pentecost are to be burned.” So we are informed that in that regard the priests enjoy a perpetual right to them.

### **XLVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:3**

**A. ALL MEAL OFFERINGS THAT ARE PREPARED IN A UTENSIL A BAKING PAN OR A FRYING PAN REQUIRE THREE APPLICATIONS OF OIL: POURING OIL INTO THE UTENSIL, STIRRING THE MEAL INTO THE OIL AND THEN AGAIN PUTTING OIL INTO THE UTENSIL PRIOR TO THEIR PREPARATION:**

1. I:1: that are prepared in a utensil: what is excluded by this qualification? Said R. Pappa, “It is meant to exclude a meal offering baked in the oven.”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “If your offering is a meal offering on a griddle, it shall be of choice flour with oil mixed in, unleavened. Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering.” This teaches that the offering requires the use of a utensil for its preparation and presentation.

**B. “AND AS TO THE LOAVES BAKED IN AN OVEN, ONE STIRS THEM WITH OIL ,” THE WORDS OF RABBI. AND SAGES SAY, “THE FINE FLOUR ALONE WAS MIXED WITH OIL.”**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “it shall be of choice flour with oil mixed in.” “...choice flour with oil mixed in.” This teaches that one mixes the oil into the fine flour. Rabbi says, “And as to the loaves baked in an oven, one stirs them with oil (M. **Men. 6:3C**).” They said to him, “But in connection with the cakes that accompany the thank offering, is it not said, ‘Flour mixed with oil’ (Lev. 23:13)?” And it is possible to stir in only with flour. How does one do this? One puts oil into the flour and stirs it in, then oil into a utensil and prepares it, and stirs it, and mixes the flour with oil.” Tosefta’s version: “How does one do this? He puts oil into the utensil and fries it. Then he puts oil into the flour and stirs it and breaks it up. And he then pours oil on it as one pours oil on pounded beans” (T. **Men. 8:5C-D**).

a. II:2: That was a good argument that sages addressed to Rabbi.

**C. THE LOAVES REQUIRE STIRRING. THE WAFERS ARE ANOINTED:**

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “unleavened cakes with oil mixed in.” But not wafers are saturated in oil. Now is the contrary to that proposition not a matter of logic? If cakes, which do not require to be spread with oil, do require saturation in oil, wafers, which do require to be spread with oil, should surely require saturation in oil! Accordingly, it is necessary for Scripture to make the point explicit, when it says, “unleavened cakes with oil mixed in.” But wafers are not saturated in oil.

a. III:2: Gloss of foregoing.

**D. HOW DOES ONE ANOINT THEM? IN THE FORM OF A CHI, AND THE REMAINDER OF THE OIL IS EATEN BY THE PRIESTS:**

1. IV:1: What is the meaning of in the form of a chi?

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: In the case of a meal offering baked in the oven that is made up half of cakes and half of wafers as Simeon has said it may be, one brings along a single log of oil and divides it up, half for the cakes, half for the wafers. The cakes are mixed with the oil, the wafers anointed. As to anointing the wafer, it must be done over the whole of the surface, with the residue put into the cakes.

3. IV:3: It has further been taught on Tannaite authority: As to wafers that are presented on their own, one brings along a log of oil and anoints them, and then does the same until all of the oil in the log is used up. R. Simeon b. Judah in the name of R. Simeon says, "One anoints it in the form of a Chi, and the residue of the oil is eaten by the priests."

## **XLIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:4A**

### **A. ALL MEAL OFFERINGS THAT ARE PREPARED IN A UTENSIL REQUIRE BREAKING UP FOR THE TAKING OF THE HANDFUL:**

1. I:1: that are prepared in a utensil: what is excluded by the qualifying language?

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "Break it into bits and pour oil on it; it is a meal offering." This serves to extend the rule of breaking up to all meal-offerings. Might one suppose that that same rule extends also to the two loaves and the show bread? Scripture says, "it...."

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

## **L. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:4B-H**

### **A. AS TO THE MEAL OFFERING OF AN ISRAELITE: ONE FOLDS IT ONE INTO TWO, THEN TWO INTO FOUR PARTS, AND DIVIDES IT AT EACH FOLD. AS TO THE MEAL OFFERING OF PRIESTS: ONE FOLDS IT ONE INTO TWO, THEN TWO INTO FOUR PARTS BUT DOES NOT DIVIDE IT. AS TO THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED PRIEST: ONE DID NOT FOLD IT UP:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "You shall break..." (Lev. 2: 6): Might one suppose that it is into two parts? Scripture says, "in pieces." Since it says "in pieces," might I suppose that it is to be into crumbs? Scripture says, "it." "It" must be broken into pieces, but the pieces are not to be further broken up.

### **B. R. SIMEON SAYS, "THE MEAL OFFERING OF PRIESTS AND THE MEAL OFFERING OF AN ANOINTED PRIEST ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENT OF BREAKING UP. FOR THEY ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE TAKING OF A HANDFUL. AND ANYTHING WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE TAKING OF A HANDFUL IS NOT SUBJECT TO BREAKING UP." AND ALL OF THEM ARE TO BE BROKEN UP INTO PIECES AT LEAST THE SIZE OF OLIVE'S BULKS.**

1. II:1: Said R. Joseph, "As to habisa, if it contains pieces of bread an olive bulk in size, to begin with one says the blessing over it, 'Who brings forth bread from the earth.' And at the end one says the Grace after Meals consisting of three blessings. If it does not contain pieces of bread the size of



an olive, to begin with one says the blessing over it, ‘Who creates various kinds of food.’”

## **LI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:5**

**A. AS TO ALL MEAL OFFERINGS THE FLOUR USED THEREFOR REQUIRE THREE HUNDRED ACTS OF RUBBING TO REMOVE DIRT AND FIVE HUNDRED ACTS OF BEATING TO REMOVE HUSKS:**

1. I:1: a Tannaite statement: one rubs once, beats twice, rubs twice, beats three times and does that sequence of actions a hundred times, yielding three hundred rubbings and five hundred beatings.

2. I:2: R. Jeremiah raised this question: “Does the movement of the hand to and fro count as one rubbing or as two?”

**B. AND RUBBING AND BEATING APPLY TO GRAINS OF WHEAT. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “ALSO: TO THE DOUGH.”**

1. II:1: The question was raised: is the intent “also to the dough but not to the grounds of wheat,” or is it, “the dough too”?

**C. “ALL MEAL OFFERINGS OF LOAVES OR WAFERS ARE BROUGHT TEN AT A TIME, EXCEPT FOR SHOWBREAD, WHICH ARE BROUGHT TWELVE AT A TIME,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH:**

1. III:1: In respect to the show bread, this is explicitly stated at Lev. 24: 5. With respect to the griddle cakes presented by the high priest, the same rule derives from the verbal analogy provided by the appearance of the word “statute” both in this context and in the context of the show bread. But how on the basis of Scripture do we know that all other meal offerings are to be made up of ten cakes?

**D. R. MEIR SAYS, “ALL OF THEM ARE BROUGHT TWELVE AT A TIME:”**

1. IV:1: What is the premise of this position? If it is that a rule that is derived by an argument a fortiori may go and teach a lesson through an argument based on the congruence of other shared traits but not verbal ones in context, then he should adopt as the governing analogy the griddle cakes presented by the high priest, for the indicative traits of resemblance are the more numerous.

**E. “EXCEPT FOR THE LOAVES OF THE THANK OFFERING, WHICH ARE BROUGHT TEN AT A TIME:”**

1. V:1: With respect to the cakes of the thank offering, that is explicitly articulated, and as to the cakes of the Nazirite, that is in line with what a master has said: “‘his peace offerings’ (Lev. 7:13) serves to encompass the peace offerings of the Nazirite.”

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

3. V:3: Said R. Huna, “If a meal offering baked in the oven was baked as only a single cake, it serves to carry out one’s obligation. What is the scriptural basis for that position? It is that the word ‘unleavened’ (Lev. 2: 4) is written without the vowel-letter and so is interpreted as though in the singular.”



## **LII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:6**

**A. THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WAS OFFERED OF A TENTH OF AN EPHAH OF FLOUR TAKEN FROM THREE SEAHs.**

1. I:1: What is the operative consideration?

**B. THE TWO LOAVES OF BREAD COME FROM TWO TENTHS TAKEN FROM THREE SEAHs:**

1. II:1: Since it derives from wheat, even though it derives from the produce of the new growing season, a tenth of really fine flour could be derived by sifting only two seahs of the grain.

**C. THE SHOWBREAD COMES FROM TWENTY-FOUR TENTHS TAKEN FROM TWENTY-FOUR SEAHs TWENTY-FOUR LOAVES, EACH OF TWO TENTHS.**

1. III:1: What is the operative consideration?

2. III:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: In the case of all meal offerings, if the number of tenth-measures of flour used was too big or too small, the offering is invalid. If the number of seahs of grain was too big or too small, the offering is valid cf. T. **Men. 8:15**.

## **LIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 7:7**

**A. THE MEAL OFFERING OF THE OFFERING OF THE FIRST SHEAF OF BARLEY WAS SIFTED THROUGH THIRTEEN SIEVES EACH FINER THAN THE FORMER AND THE TWO LOAVES WERE SIFTED THROUGH TWELVE SIEVES. AND THE SHOWBREAD WAS SIFTED THROUGH ELEVEN SIEVES:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: One made use of a thin and a thick sieve, a thin one so that it will hold the fine flour, and a thick one so that it will hold the refuse. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "The thirteen sieves were located one on top of the other. The lowest of all of them was so made as to hold the fine flour" (T. **Men. 8:14J-K**).

**B. R. SIMEON SAYS, "THERE IS NO PRESCRIBED LIMIT, BUT FLOUR THAT WAS SIFTED AS MUCH AS NECESSARY DID ONE BRING, AS IT IS SAID, AND IN THE CASE OF SHOWBREAD 'YOU WILL TAKE FINE FLOUR AND BAKE IT'— THAT IT SHOULD BE SIFTED AS MUCH AS NECESSARY."**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "And you shall take fine flour and bake it into twelve loaves of it; two tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. And you shall set them in two rows, six in a row, upon the table of pure gold. And you shall put pure frankincense with each row, that it may go with the bread as a memorial portion to be offered by fire to the Lord. Every Sabbath day Aaron shall set it in order before the Lord continually on behalf of the people of Israel as a covenant for ever. And it shall be for Aaron and his sons, and they shall eat it in a holy place, since it is for him a most holy portion out of the offerings by fire to the Lord, a perpetual due" (Lev. 24: 5-9): "fine flour and bake it." How do

we know that one may also take wheat for baking the twelve loaves of bread under discussion here? Scripture says, “You shall take fine flour.”

#### **LIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:1**

**A. THE FLOUR FOR THE LOAVES OF THE THANK OFFERING WAS BROUGHT FROM FIVE SEAHs BY THE JERUSALEM MEASURE, WHICH ARE SIX BY THE WILDERNESS MEASURE EQUIVALENT TO TWO EPHAHS — THE EPHAH IS THREE SEAHs BY THE WILDERNESS MEASURE — TWENTY TENTHS OF AN EPHAH:**

**TEN TENTHS OF AN EPHAH FOR WHAT WAS TO BE LEAVENED, AND TEN FOR WHAT WAS TO BE UNLEAVENED. TEN FOR WHAT WAS TO BE LEAVENED — A TENTH OF AN EPHAH FOR A LOAF. AND TEN FOR WHAT WAS TO BE UNLEAVENED. AND IN THE UNLEAVENED PART ARE THREE KINDS: LOAVES, WAFERS, AND OIL-SOAKED CAKES. THERE TURN OUT TO BE THREE AND A THIRD TENTHS OF AN EPHAH FOR EACH KIND, THREE LOAVES FOR EACH TENTH OF AN EPHAH. AND, IF WE GO BY THE JERUSALEM MEASURE, FIFTEEN QABS FOR THAT WHICH WAS UNLEAVENED, AND FIFTEEN FOR THAT WHICH WAS LEAVENED. FIFTEEN FOR THAT WHICH WAS UNLEAVENED: A QAB AND A HALF PER LOAF. AND FIFTEEN FOR THAT WHICH WAS LEAVENED: AND IN THAT WHICH WAS UNLEAVENED WERE THREE KINDS: LOAVES AND WAFERS AND SOAKED CAKES. THEY TURN OUT TO BE FIVE QABS FOR EACH KIND, TWO LOAVES PER QAB.**

1. I:1: the ephah is three seahs: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that the ephah is three seahs of grain?
2. I:2: Said Samuel, “They may not increase the size of the measures whether or not people concur by more than a sixth, nor the coins by more than a sixth, and he who makes a profit must not profit by more than a sixth.”

#### **LV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:2D-I**

**A. AND FROM ALL OF THEM DID ONE TAKE ONE LOAF OF EACH KIND OUT OF TEN AS HEAVE OFFERING, AS IT IS SAID, “AND HE SHALL OFFER ONE OUT OF EACH OFFERING AS A HEAVE OFFERING TO THE LORD” (LEV. 8:14) — “ONE” — THAT HE SHOULD NOT TAKE A BROKEN ONE; “OUT OF EACH OFFERING” — THAT ALL THE OFFERINGS SHOULD BE EQUIVALENT TEN LOAVES FOR EACH KIND OF ANIMAL, AND THAT HE SHOULD NOT TAKE TWO LOAVES FROM ONE OFFERING AND NONE AT ALL FOR ITS FELLOW THAT IS, HE SHOULD TAKE ONE LOAF OF EACH KIND, “TO THE PRIEST WHO TOSSES THE BLOOD OF THE PEACE OFFERINGS IT SHALL BELONG” (LEV. 8: 14) — AND THE REMAINDER OF THE BREAD IS EATEN BY THE OWNER.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And of such he shall offer one cake from each offering, as an offering that is raised up to the Lord; it shall belong to the priest who throws the blood of the peace offerings.” The one cake is to be taken from the mass of cakes that are joined together. “one.” meaning that one should not take half a loaf of five, but rather, a whole loaf of ten.

- a. I:2: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. I:3: Gloss of the foregoing.

l. I:4: Gloss of the gloss.

c. I:5: Gloss of the opening Tannaite demonstration.

d. I:6: As above.

## **LVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:2A-C**

**A. FOR THE BREAD BROUGHT WITH CONSECRATION OFFERING, THEY BROUGHT THE OFFERINGS LIKE THE UNLEAVENED BREAD OF THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH GOES WITH THE THANK OFFERING: LOAVES AND WAFERS AND OIL- SOAKED CAKES:**

**THE WAFERS OF THE NAZIRITE'S MEAL OFFERING CONSISTED OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE UNLEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK OFFERING: TEN UNLEAVENED LOAVES AND TEN UNLEAVENED WAFERS. BUT SOAKED CAKES ARE NOT BROUGHT ALONG WITH IT**

1. I:1: oil-soaked cakes: What is the scriptural source for this rule?

2. I:2: Said R. Hisda, "A high priest that is presented for service in the cult requires two tenths of an ephah of fine flour, one for his anointing, the other for his initiation rite."

**B. THE NAZIRITE'S OFFERING TURN OUT TO BE TEN JERUSALEM QABS FIVE FOR UNLEAVENED LOAVES, FIVE FOR UNLEAVENED WAFERS WHICH ARE SIX TENTHS OF AN EPHAH; AND SOMETHING LEFT OVER SIX AND TWO-THIRDS TENTHS:**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "his peace offerings:" this serves to encompass the peace offerings brought by a Nazirite, indicating that Sifra lacks: they the Nazirite's offering turn out to be ten Jerusalem qabs five for unleavened loaves, five for unleavened wafers which are six tenths of an ephah; and something left over six and two-thirds tenths.

a. II:2: What is the exegesis behind this reading?

## **LVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:3A-D**

**A. HE WHO SLAUGHTERS THE THANK OFFERING INSIDE THE TEMPLE COURT, WHILE ITS BREAD OFFERING IS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE WALL — THE BREAD IS NOT SANCTIFIED.**

1. I:1: What is the meaning of outside the wall? R. Yohanan said, "Outside the wall of Bethpage." R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "Outside of the wall of the courtyard."

**B. IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE THANK OFFERING BEFORE ITS BREAD OFFERING HAD FORMED A CRUST IN THE OVEN —EVEN IF ALL OF THEM THE LOAVES FORMED A CRUST EXCEPT FOR ONE OF THEM — THE BREAD IS NOT SANCTIFIED.**

1. II:1: What is the source in Scripture of this rule?

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: People may fulfill their obligation to eat unleavened bread on Passover by eating unleavened bread that is only partly baked, or with unleavened bread prepared in a stew pot.

a. II:3: Said Raba, “And that is the rule in the case of loaves of the thank offering.”

3. II:4: It has been stated: A thank offering that one slaughtered in connection with eighty loaves of bread — Hezekiah said, “Forty of the loaves among the eighty have been sanctified.” R. Yohanan said, “Forty of the loaves among the eighty have not been sanctified.”

## **LVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:3E-L**

**A. IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT INTENDING TO EAT ITS FLESH OR TO TOSS THE BLOOD OR TO OFFER UP THE SACRIFICIAL PARTS OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER TIME OR OUTSIDE OF ITS PROPER PLACE, THE BREAD IS SANCTIFIED AND IS DEEMED REFUSE:**

1. I:1: In accord with the position of which authority is our Mishnah-paragraph’s rule?

a. I:2: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. I:3: Gloss of the foregoing.

2. I:4: It has been stated: A sin offering that one slaughtered with the expressed intention of tossing the blood or eating the meat outside of the proper time, and the sacrificial parts of which were put up onto the altar — the are not to be taken down again. If the intention was to sprinkle the blood or eat the meat outside of the proper place, and the sacrificial parts went up onto the altar — Raba said, “If is to be taken down. Rabbah said, “It is not to be taken down.

**B. IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE THANK OFFERING, AND IT TURNED OUT TO BE TEREFAH, THE BREAD IS NOT SANCTIFIED. IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT AND IT TURNED OUT TO BE BLEMISHED — R. ELIEZER SAYS, “IT THE BREAD IS SANCTIFIED.” AND SAGES SAY, “IT IS NOT SANCTIFIED.”**

**IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT NOT FOR ITS OWN NAME ,AND SO WITH THE RAM OF CONSECRATION, AND SO THE TWO LAMBS OF ASERET WHICH ONE SLAUGHTERED NOT FOR THEIR OWN NAME, THE BREAD IS NOT SANCTIFIED.**

1. II:1: and so with the ram of consecration: Said R. Pappa, “The Tannaite authority of the passage before us has left out the case of the ram of the Nazirite offering, because it is commonly offered, but introduces the case of the ram of the consecration offering which happened only once in all of history!”

## **LIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:4A-C**

**A. DRINK OFFERINGS WHICH WERE SANCTIFIED IN A UTENSIL, AND THE ANIMAL SACRIFICE WITH WHICH THEY WERE BROUGHT TURNED OUT TO BE INVALID — IF THERE IS THERE ANOTHER ANIMAL SACRIFICE REQUIRING DRINK OFFERINGS, LET THEM BE OFFERED WITH IT. AND IF NOT, LET THEM BE INVALIDATED BY BEING KEPT OVERNIGHT.**

1. I:1: Said Zeiri, “The drink offerings are consecrated only by the act of slaughtering the designated animal offering” but prior to that moment they may serve some other purpose than the one for which they are planned. What is the Scriptural basis of that view?”

**B. IF THERE IS THERE ANOTHER ANIMAL SACRIFICE REQUIRING DRINK OFFERINGS, LET THEM BE OFFERED WITH IT. AND IF NOT, LET THEM BE INVALIDATED BY BEING KEPT OVERNIGHT**

1. II:1: But lo, has not R. Hisda said, “Oil that one has designated for use for a particular meal offering is invalid for use for some other meal offering so how can this be used for some other offering, having been designated for the one that was not made”? Said R. Yannai, “The court itself stipulates in its heart concerning the drinks, that if they are required, they are necessary for that offering and are so used, but, if not, then they shall be used for another offering.”

a. II:2: Now does R. Simeon take the view, “The court itself stipulates in its heart”? And lo, said R. Idi bar Abin said Amram said R. Isaac said R. Yohanan, “Daily whole offerings that were designated but then not required for offering in the name of the community and which are left over at the end of the month and could not be used for offering in the next month, in the opinion of R. Simeon are not subject to redemption when they are unblemished so he does not assume that the stipulation of the court that, if they are not used as needed, they are secular to begin with, is valid, but in the opinion of sages, they are redeemed even without a blemish”!

## **LX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:4D-M**

**A. THE OFFSPRING OF A THANK OFFERING AND A BEAST DESIGNATED AS ITS SUBSTITUTE, AND HE WHO SETS ASIDE HIS THANK OFFERING, AND IT WAS LOST, AND HE SEPARATED ANOTHER IN ITS PLACE AND THEREAFTER THE LOST ONE WAS FOUND — WHEN THEY ARE OFFERED, AS THEY MUST BE, THEY DO NOT REQUIRE BREAD, AS IT IS SAID, “AND HE SHALL OFFER UP WITH THE SACRIFICE OF THE THANK OFFERING” — THE ONE WHICH IS OFFERED AS A THANK OFFERING REQUIRES BREAD, BUT ITS OFFSPRING, AND THAT WHICH IS BROUGHT IN ITS PLACE, AND ITS SUBSTITUTE DO NOT REQUIRE BREAD.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: What is the purpose of the statement, “If he offers it for a thanksgiving offering”? How do you know the basis for the following ruling: He who designated a beast for his thanksgiving offering, which was lost, and who then designated another in its stead, and did not suffice to offer it before the first was found, so that lo, both of them are available — how do we know that he brings whichever one of them he prefers, and brings with it the requisite bread offering, and that as to the second, he presents it without the bread offering? Scripture says, “If he offers it for a thanksgiving offering.”

2. I:2: Now in this connection R. Hanina sent word in the name of R. Yohanan, “They repeated this rule only in connection with the case after atonement had been carried out with the offering of the mother animal, but if it was before atonement

had been carried out, it would have required the bread offering.” If both animals are available, whichever is offered, whether the original thank offering or the offspring or substitute, requires a bread offering.

**a. I:3:** So too it has been stated: Said R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan, “Beasts designated to serve in place of a free will offering, whether presented before or after atonement, has to have a bread offering, for it is classified as an additional thank offering. The offspring of a thank offering that is given as a free will offering, whether before or after atonement, does not have to have an accompanying bread offering. It is simply a surplus thank offering. The offspring of a thank offering presented by reason of an obligation, if this is before atonement, has to have a bread offering; if it is after atonement, it does not have to have a bread offering.”

**b. I:4:** Said Samuel, “In any circumstances in which, in the case of a sin offering, the designated beast is left to die, the cases are, the offspring of a sin offering, the beast designated as a substitute of a sin offering, a sin offering the owner of which has died, a sin offering that was lost and the owner had atoned through another, and a sin offering that is too old, in the case of a thank offering, there is no obligation to present a bread offering. In any circumstances in which, in the case of a sin offering, the beast is sent out to pasture until blemished then is sold and the funds used for a sin offering, the counterpart situation in the instance of a thank offering will involve the presentation of a bread offering.”

**I. I:5:** Secondary gloss of the foregoing.

**3. I:6:** Said Rabbah, “If someone said, ‘This animal shall be a thank offering, and these are the loaves that will accompany it,’ if the bread was lost, presents other bread with the thank offering. If the animal designated as the thank offering was lost, he may not designate another to go along with the bread.”

**4. I:7:** And said Raba, “He who designated money for the purchase of an animal as a thank offering and there was a surplus of funds after the purchase of the beast presents with the money the loaves for the beast. If he designated money for the purchase of a bread offering to accompany a thank offering and some was left over. he may not use the surplus to present a thank offering.”

**5. I:8:** And said Raba, “He who designated an animal to serve as a thank offering, and the animal was lost, and who then went and designated another in stead of the first, and that too was lost, and then went and designated another instead, and then the first two beasts turned up, so that lo, all three of them are available, attains atonement through the first. The second, then does not require a bread offering. But the third requires a bread offering since it replaces the second, but since the second was not offered, the third cannot be regarded as the surplus of the thank offering but rather as an additional thank offering which requires the bread offering. If he achieved atonement with the third, then the second offered in sequence does not require a bread offering, but the first does require a bread offering. If it was with the middle one, then the two on either side do not require bread offerings.”

**6. I:9:** Said R. Zira, “So too is the rule for a sin offering: he who designated an animal to serve as a sin offering, and the animal was lost, and who then went and designated another in stead of the first, and that too was lost, and then went and designated another in instead stead, and then the first two beasts turned up, so that lo, all three of them are available, attains atonement through the first. The second, then is left to die. But the third is left to pasture until blemished, then when blemished is sold, and the proceeds are used to purchase another offering. If he achieved atonement with the third, then the second offered in sequence is left to die., but the first is left to pasture until blemished, then when blemished is sold, and the proceeds are used to purchase another offering. If it was with the middle one, then the two on either side do not require are left to die.”

**a. I:10:** Gloss of the foregoing.

**7. I:11:** R. Hiyya presented as a Tannaite statement: “An animal designated for a thank offering that was confused with a beast that had been declared a substitute for that animal, and one of the animals died — the other has no remedy but must be left to die. For what should the owner do? Should he present a bread offering with the surviving beast as he must do if it is a thank offering? Perhaps it is the beast designated as a substitute, and not the original. Should he then not present a bread offering with it? Perhaps the surviving beast is the one originally designated as a thank offering.

**8. I:12:** Said those who debate in the presence of Rabbi, “Let him present a bread offering and say, ‘If this first beast was the designated thank offering, then since that is the offering, this is the bread offering that accompanies it. If not, then let the bread be unconsecrated.’”

**a. I:13:** Gloss of foregoing.

**b. I:14:** As above.

**c. I:15:** In session, R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta before R. Nahman stated, “But then let him bring a beast and a bread offering and state, ‘If the first beast was a substitute for a thank offering, then this is the thank offering and this is the bread that accompanies it. If this one before us is the original thank offering, then this bread is the bread offering that is required for it, and the animal before us will be the substitute of the thank offering.’”

**9. I:16:** R. Ila fell ill. Abbaye and rabbis came by and went into session stating, “If the law accords with the position of R. Yohanan, who has said, ‘The bread may be sanctified even though it is located outside of the wall of the sanctuary when the thank offering itself is slaughtered,’ let the man bring the bread offering and put it down outside of the wall of the courtyard and say, ‘If the original beast was the thank offering, then this is its bread. And if not, then let the bread be dismissed as unconsecrated.’”

**10. I:17:** Rabina visited Mahurayya. Said R. Dimi b. R. Huna of Mahurayya to Rabina, “Let the man bring a beast and make this declaration: ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is a thank offering,’ and then let him bring another animal and along with it eighty cakes and make this declaration: ‘If the first beast was the substitute, then

these two other beasts are thank offerings, and here are the eighty cakes that are going to serve the two of them. If the first beast was a thank offering, then the beast concerning which I said, ‘Lo, incumbent upon me is a thank offering,’ will be a thank offering, and here are the eighty cakes for the two, and let the third beast serve merely as security.”

## **LXI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:5**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A THANK OFFERING” BRINGS IT AND ITS BREAD FROM THAT WHICH IS UNCONSECRATED NOT PURCHASED WITH SECOND-TITHE COINS.**

1. I:1: Said R. Huna, “He who says, ‘Lo, incumbent on me are loaves of bread to accompany a thank offering’ must bring both the thank offering and the bread that accompanies it. What is the operative consideration? That man most certainly knows that bread without an animal designated as a thank offering is simply not offered, so what he meant to say was ‘a thank offering and its bread,’ and when he said, ‘loaves of bread to accompany a thank offering,’ what he said was simply the conclusion of the thought.”

2. I:2: Since it is the fact that if someone vowed to present a thank offering without bread, he has to bring the bread anyhow, why is that the rule? Is this not merely the case in which one has taken a vow that contains within itself the grounds for its own remission? And such a vow is null!

a. I:3: Gloss of the proof-text used in the foregoing.

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “A THANK OFFERING FROM THAT WHICH IS UNCONSECRATED, AND ITS BREAD FROM TITHE,” BRINGS ITS BREAD FROM THAT WHICH IS UNCONSECRATED. HE WHO SAYS, “A THANK OFFERING FROM TITHE AND ITS BREAD FROM THAT WHICH IS UNCONSECRATED,” BRINGS THE THINGS JUST AS HE HAS SPECIFIED.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “A THANK OFFERING — IT AND ITS BREAD FROM TITHE,” BRINGS THE THINGS JUST AS HE HAS SPECIFIED.**

1. II:1: brings the things just as he has specified? But has he no alternative but to bring it as specified?

**C. BUT EVEN IN THIS CASE HE SHOULD NOT BRING IT FROM WHEAT WHICH ITSELF IS SECOND TITHE, BUT ONLY WITH WHEAT PURCHASED BY COINS USED FOR THE REDEMPTION OF SECOND TITHE.**

1. III:1: R. Nahman and R. Hisda both said, “The stated rule refers only to grains of wheat that are themselves designated as second tithe, but he may present the offering from grains of wheat that have been purchased with coins that have been exchanged for produce in the status of second tithe.”

2. III:2: R. Jeremiah went into session before R. Zira, and, in session, he stated, “The stated rule refers only to grains of wheat that are themselves designated as second tithe, but he may present the offering from grains of wheat that have been purchased with coins that have been exchanged for produce in the status of second tithe.”



3. III:3: Said R. Ammi, “He who assigned to the purpose of buying an animal for a peace offering money exchanged for produce in the status of second tithe — the coins are not assigned to the sole purpose of buying such an animal but may be used for any other purpose. How come not? Because the sanctity of the peace offering is insufficiently strong to take over the sanctity attaching to second tithe.”

4. III:4: It has been stated: He who assigned to the purpose of buying an animal for a peace offering money exchanged for produce in the status of second tithe — R. Yohanan said, “The status of the peace offering takes over.” R. Eleazar says, “The status of the peace offering does not take over.”

## **LXII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 8:6**

**A. HOW ON THE BASIS OF SCRIPTURE DO WE KNOW THAT HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A THANK OFFERING,” SHOULD BRING IT ONLY FROM UNCONSECRATED BEASTS? AS IT IS SAID, “AND YOU WILL SLAUGHTER A PASSOVER TO THE LORD, YOUR GOD, OF THE FLOCK OR OF THE HERD” (DEU. 16: 2) — AND DOES NOT THE PASSOVER DERIVE ONLY FROM LAMBS OR GOATS? IF SO, WHY IS FLOCK OR HERD SAID? BUT: IT IS TO COMPARE WHATEVER DERIVES FROM THE FLOCK OR FROM THE HERD TO THE PASSOVER. JUST AS THE PASSOVER, WHICH IS BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION, IS BROUGHT ONLY FROM UNCONSECRATED BEASTS, SO EVERYTHING WHICH IS BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION IS BROUGHT ONLY FROM UNCONSECRATED BEASTS. THEREFORE: HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A THANK OFFERING,” “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING PEACE OFFERINGS” — SINCE THEY ARE BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION, SHOULD BRING THEM ONLY FROM UNCONSECRATED FUNDS. AND DRINK OFFERINGS UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD DERIVE ONLY FROM UNCONSECRATED FUNDS.**

1. I:1: But how on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule covering the Passover offering?

a. I:2: Analysis of the premise of the foregoing.

b. I:3: As above.

c. I:4: As above.

2. I:5: In a Tannaite formulation it was repeated in the name of R. Aqiba: “‘This is the Torah of the burnt offering, of the meal offering, of the sin offering, of the guilt offering, of the consecration offering, and of the sacrifice of peace offerings’ (Lev. 7:37) all of which are covered by the same rule: “‘the meal offering:’ just as the burnt offering becomes holy if it absorbs that which is holy, so everything else becomes holy if it absorbs that which is holy.”

a. I:6: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. I:7: As above.

c. I:8: As above.

### **LXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:1**

**A. ALL MEAL OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY AND OF THE INDIVIDUAL DERIVE FROM WHEAT GROWN IN THE LAND OF ISRAEL OR FROM WHEAT GROWN ABROAD, FROM FRESH PRODUCE WHEAT, GROWN IN THE PRESENT YEAR OR FROM OLD WHEAT, GROWN IN THE PRECEDING YEAR, EXCEPT FOR THE OFFERING OF A SHEAF OF THE FIRST CROP OF BARLEY AND TWO LOAVES OF BREAD, WHICH DERIVE ONLY FROM NEW WHEAT, GROWN IN THE PRESENT YEAR AND FROM WHEAT GROWN IN THE LAND.**

1. I:1: The rule of the Mishnah does not accord with the Tannaite figure behind that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: The offering of a sheaf of the first crop of barley that derives from grain grown in the past year is valid. The two loaves of bread that derive from grain grown in the past year are valid. But in both cases the full and proper accomplishment of the religious duty is not entirely effected. In the case of the offering of a sheaf of the first crop of barley, because it is written, “You shall present for the meal offering of your first fruits” (Lev. 2:12), and in the case of the two loaves, “out of your dwellings” (Lev. 23:16), but not from produce grown outside of the land; “out of your dwellings,” even from a storeroom.

2. I:2: The authority of our passage and the one who takes the contrary view differ only with regard to new produce. But as to whether or not the produce has to derive from the Land, they concur, the sheaf of first barley and the grain for the two loaves must derive from produce of the Land of Israel and not from produce grown abroad. In accord with whom do they take that position?

3. I:3: We have learned in the Mishnah: Those who guard the aftergrowths of the Seventh Year to protect the barley for the first sheaf of barley offering receive their salary from the heave offering of the sheqel chamber (M. **Sheq. 4:1E**). Rammi bar Hama objected to R. Hisda, “We have learned in the Mishnah: Those who guard the aftergrowths of the Seventh Year to protect the barley for the first sheaf of barley offering receive their salary from the heave offering of the sheqel chamber (M. **Sheq. 4:1E**). But in contradiction: ‘It is for food’ (Lev. 25: 6), and not for burning. How can the aftergrowth be used for the purpose of the barley offering, since a handful of it has to be burned?” He said to him, “The All-Merciful says, ‘Throughout your generations’ (Lev. 23:14) — and you propose an argument for nullifying the practice?”

4. I:4: It has been stated: R. Yohanan said, “‘You shall bring fresh.’” R. Eleazar said, “‘The first of your harvest’ (Lev. 23:10) — and not the end of your harvest.” : and by taking last year’s produce for the first sheaf of barley grain, the priest would offer it at the time that last year’s harvest had already come to an end.

5. I:5: There we have learned in the Mishnah: They do not bring firstfruits from any produce other than the seven kinds for which the land of Israel was noted, i.e. , wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives used for oil, and dates for honey (Deu. 8: 8), not from dates of the hill country, not from fruits of the valley, and not from olives used for oil which are not of the choicest kind (M. **Bik. 1:3A-D**). Said Ulla, “If one presented such produce, he has not sanctified them as first fruits.”

a. I:6: Extension of the foregoing.

b. I:7: Continuation of the foregoing.

**B. BUT ALL OF THEM DERIVE ONLY FROM THE CHOICEST PRODUCE.**

**AND WHAT IS DEEMED TO BE THE CHOICEST PRODUCE? MIKHMAS AND ZANUHAH ARE ALPHA AS TO FINE FLOUR. SECOND TO THEM IS HAPHARAYIM IN THE VALLEY. ALL LANDS WERE VALID AS SOURCES FOR THE GRAIN, BUT FROM HERE DID THEY BRING THE FLOUR FOR THE MEAL OFFERING.**

1. II:1: Said Yuhna and Mamre to Moses, "Are you bringing straw to Hafaraim?" He said to them, "So people say: bring herbs to Herbville."

**LXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:2**

**A. THEY DO NOT BRING WHEAT FOR FLOUR FOR THE MEAL OFFERING EITHER FROM A MANURED FIELD OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD OR FROM A TREE-PLANTED FIELD. BUT IF THEY BROUGHT WHEAT FROM THESE AREAS, IT IS VALID. HOW DOES ONE DO IT? ONE BROKE UP FRESH GROUND IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE SABBATICAL CYCLE, AND IN THE SECOND OF THE SABBATICAL CYCLE SOWS IT SEVENTY DAYS BEFORE PASSOVER, AND IT PRODUCES ABUNDANT FLOUR. HOW DOES ONE EXAMINE IT THE FLOUR? THE TEMPLE TREASURER STICKS HIS HAND INTO IT THE FLOUR. IF DUST CAME UP ON IT HIS HAND, IT IS INVALID, UNTIL ONE WILL SIFT IT AFRESH.**

1. I:1: How does one do it? One broke up fresh ground in the first year of the sabbatical cycle, and in the second year of the sabbatical cycle sows it seventy days before Passover, and it produces abundant flour: The question was raised, "What is the meaning of the question? Is the sense, One broke up fresh ground in the first year of the sabbatical cycle, and in the second year of the sabbatical cycle one breaks up the fresh ground again and then sows it seventy days before Passover? Or is the meaning, One broke up fresh ground in the first year of the sabbatical cycle, and in the second year of the sabbatical cycle sows it without breaking it up again?"

2. I:2: Said R. Yohanan, "Barley for the sheaf of first barley may derive only from fields in the south of the land of Israel, on which the sun rises and on which the sun sets. Half of the field was broken up, the other half sown."

a. I:3: Tannaite complement.

I. I:4: Case.

**B. AND IF IT HAD BECOME MAGGOTY, IT IS INVALID:**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If the greater part of the fine flour had become maggots, it is invalid. If the greater part of the wheat had become maggots, it is invalid.

2. II:2: R. Jeremiah raised the question, "Does this mean the greater part of each grain, or the greater part of the entire volume?"

3. II:3: Raba raised this question: "If one sanctified maggoty flour for use as a meal offering, what is the law? Does he get flogged on that account on the count

of sanctifying what is blemished, on the grounds that since it is unfit, it is as if it were blemished? Or perhaps the consideration of a blemish pertains only to a beast?”

4. II:4: We have learned in the Mishnah: And any piece of wood in which a worm is found is invalid for use on the altar M. Mid. 2:5J. Said Samuel, “That rule pertains only to wood that is damp, but if the wood is dry, the worms can be scraped off and the wood validated.” Raba raised this question: “If one sanctified such wood, what is the law? Does he get flogged on that account on the count of sanctifying what is blemished, on the grounds that since it is unfit, it is as if it were blemished? Or perhaps the consideration of a blemish pertains only to a beast?”

### **LXV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:3**

**A. TEQOAH IS ALPHA FOR OLIVE OIL. ABBA SAUL SAYS, “SECOND TO IT IS REQEB IN TRANSJORDAN.” ALL LANDS WERE VALID, BUT FROM HERE DID THEY BRING OIL.**

1. I:1: “And Joab sent to Tekoa and summoned from there a wise woman” (2Sa. 14: 2): What distinguished Tekoa? Said R. Yohanan, “Since people there were used to consuming olive oil, wisdom was common among them.”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “...may he dip his foot in oil.” this teaches that the territory of Asher gushes oil like a spring. They say that once upon a time the people of Laodicea were short of oil. They appointed a Hammer: deputy and said to him, “Go and buy oil for us for ten thousand talents.” He went to Tyre and said to them, “I need oil worth ten thousand talents.” They said to him, “Go to so-and-so.” He went to the house of So-and-so but did not find him. They said to him, “Lo, he is out in the field.” He went and found him harrowing under the olive trees. He said to him, “I need oil worth ten thousand talents.” He said to him, “Wait until I finish this tree.” When he had finished the work on that tree, taking his utensils and going along, the deputy said, “This man can’t have enough oil to fill my order of ten thousand talents’ worth. I guess the Jews are just kidding around with me.”

**B. THEY DO NOT BRING OLIVES FOR OLIVE OIL FROM A MANURED FIELD OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD OR FROM A FIELD AMONG THE TREES OF WHICH SEED WAS SOWN. AND IF ONE DID BRING OLIVES FOR THE OIL FROM SUCH FIELDS, THE OIL PRODUCED THEREFROM IS VALID.**

1. II:1: And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: They do not bring it from a manured field, but if they did so, it is invalid, for it is only the sap of the olive (T. **Men. 9:8A**)? Said R. Joseph, “There is no contradiction. The one stands for the view of R. Hiyya, the other, of R. Simeon b. Rabbi. For R. Hiyya would throw it away, and R. Simeon b. Rabbi would dip his food into it.

2. II:2: Six months with oil of myrrh” (Est. 2:12): What is oil of myrrh?

3. II:3: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “Olives for olive oil from a manured field refers to olives that are not a third grown. And why is it used for smearing? Because it serves as a depilatory and skin-softener.”

**C. THEY DO NOT BRING IT FROM UNRIPE OLIVES. AND IF ONE DID BRING IT FROM SUCH A SOURCE, IT IS INVALID. THEY DO NOT BRING OIL PRODUCED FROM DRIED OLIVES WHICH HAD BEEN SOAKED IN WATER, NOR FROM PICKLED OLIVES, NOR FROM SEETHED OLIVES. AND IF ONE DID BRING IT FROM SUCH A SOURCE, IT IS INVALID.**

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Oil produced from olives that had been soaked in water, seethed or boiled, olive oil of lees, olive oil that had a bad smell — lo, this is deemed blemished for the altar (T. **Men. 9:8B**). That sort of oil one may not present, and if he did so, it is invalid.

2. III:2: Raba raised this question: “If one sanctified such oil, what is the law? Does he get flogged on that account on the count of sanctifying what is blemished, on the grounds that since it is unfit, it is as if it were blemished? Or perhaps the consideration of a blemish pertains only to a beast?”

### **LXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:4**

**A. THERE ARE THREE WAYS OF PREPARING OLIVES, AND EACH ONE OF THEM PRODUCES THREE KINDS OF OIL. THE FIRST WAY OF PREPARING THE OLIVE IS AS FOLLOWS: ONE GATHERS IT FROM THE TOP OF THE OLIVE TREE, AND CRUSHES IT, AND PUTS IT INTO A BASKET — R. JUDAH SAYS, “AROUND THE SIDES OF THE BASKET OOOING DOWN TO THE BOTTOM — THIS IS THE FIRST KIND OF OIL PRODUCED IN THE FIRST OF THE THREE WAYS. ONE PRESSED THEM UNDER THE BEAM. R. JUDAH SAYS, “UNDER STONES” — THIS IS THE SECOND KIND OF OIL PRODUCED BY THE FIRST OF THE THREE WAYS. ONE WENT AND GROUND AND PRESSED THEM. THIS IS THE THIRD KIND OF OIL. THE FIRST KIND OF OIL IS USED FOR THE CANDELABRUM, AND THE REST FOR MEAL OFFERINGS. THE SECOND WAY OF PREPARING OLIVES IS AS FOLLOWS: ONE GATHERS THE OLIVES WHEN THEY ARE AT THE LEVEL OF THE TOP OF THE ROOF, AND PRESSES THEM, AND PUTS THEM INTO THE BASKET — R. JUDAH SAYS, “AROUND THE SIDES OF THE BASKET” — THIS IS THE FIRST KIND OF OIL PRODUCED IN THE SECOND WAY. ONE PRESSED THEM UNDER THE BEAM — R. JUDAH SAYS, “UNDER STONES” — THIS IS THE SECOND. ONE GROUND AND PRESSED THEM — THIS IS THE THIRD. THE FIRST KIND OF OIL IS USED FOR THE CANDELABRUM, AND THE REST FOR MEAL OFFERINGS. THE THIRD WAY OF PREPARING OLIVES IS AS FOLLOWS: SINCE THE OLIVES ARE ON THE LOWEST BRANCHES, IN THE SHADE, AND WILL NOT RIPEN ON THE TREE, ONE PACKS THEM IN THE HOUSE, UNTIL THEY ARE FULLY RIPE, AND BRINGS THEM UP AND DRIES THEM ON THE TOP OF THE ROOF, AND CRUSHES AND PUTS THEM INTO A BASKET — R. JUDAH SAYS, “AROUND THE SIDES OF THE BASKET” — THIS IS THE FIRST. ONE PRESSED IT UNDER THE BEAM — R. JUDAH SAYS, “UNDER STONES” — THIS IS THE SECOND. ONE WENT AND GROUND AND PRESSED IT — THIS IS THE THIRD. THE FIRST IS FOR THE CANDELABRUM, AND THE REST FOR MEAL OFFERINGS.**

1. I:1: The question was raised: is the language of the Mishnah-paragraph so spelled as to yield “to pick single berries” or “to allow the olives to remain on the tree until fully ripe”?

a. I:2: Gloss of the foregoing.

## **LXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:5**

**A. THE FIRST KIND OF OIL, DERIVING FROM THE FIRST PROCESS — THERE IS NOTHING BETTER THAN IT. THE SECOND KIND OF OIL DERIVING FROM THE FIRST PROCESS AND THE FIRST KIND OF OIL DERIVING FROM THE SECOND PROCESS ARE EQUIVALENT.**

1. I:1: But lo, you have said, The first kind of oil is used for the candelabrum, and the rest for meal offerings! So how can they be equal? Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “What is the sense of ‘equal’? They are all equally suitable for meal offerings.”

**B. THE THIRD KIND OF OIL PRODUCED BY THE FIRST PROCESS AND THE SECOND PRODUCED BY THE SECOND PROCESS AND THE FIRST PRODUCED BY THE THIRD PROCESS ARE EQUIVALENT. THE THIRD KIND OF OIL PRODUCED BY THE SECOND PROCESS AND THE SECOND KIND OF OIL PRODUCED BY THE THIRD PROCESS ARE EQUIVALENT. THE THIRD KIND OF OIL PRODUCED BY THE THIRD PROCESS — THERE IS NOTHING BENEATH IT.**

**ALSO: MEAL OFFERINGS MIGHT LOGICALLY BE DEEMED TO REQUIRE THE PUREST KIND OF OIL: NOW IF THE OIL USED FOR THE CANDELABRUM, WHICH IS NOT DESTINED TO BE EATEN, REQUIRES THE PUREST KIND OF OLIVE OIL, MEAL OFFERINGS, WHICH ARE DESTINED TO BE EATEN, LOGICALLY SHOULD REQUIRE THE PUREST KIND OF OLIVE OIL. SCRIPTURE THEREFORE STATES, “PURE OLIVE OIL BEATEN FOR THE LIGHT” (EXO. 20:27) — AND NOT PURE OLIVE OIL BEATEN FOR MEAL OFFERINGS.**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Pure:” “Pure” means only “clear. That is oil that oozes by itself without pressure. R. Judah says, “‘beaten,’ and beaten means only pounded. Might I then suppose that pounded oil is not valid for meal offerings? Scripture states, ‘and a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mixed with a fourth part of a sin of beaten oil’ (Exo. 29:40). Then why does Scripture say, ‘for the light’ (if beaten oil is valid for meal offerings? To avoid excessive expense.”

2. II:2: “Command the children of Israel to bring to you pure olive oil beaten for the light” (Lev. 24: 2): Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani, “‘...to you..., and not to me, I don’t need any light.”

3. II:3: The table was on the north side and the candlestick on the south side. Said R. Zeriqa said R. Eleazar, “‘I don’t need the food and I don’t need the light.”

4. II:4: And for the house he made windows broad and narrow” (1Ki. 6: 4): “Broad” outside, “narrow” inside, “since I don’t need the light.”

5. II:5: “Outside the veil of the testimony in the tent of meeting” (Lev. 24: 3) — This serves as testimony for everyone in the world that the Presence of God is in Israel.

a. II:6: Gloss of the foregoing.

## **LXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 9:6-7**

**A. AND FROM WHENCE DID THEY BRING WINE? QARUTIM AND HATTULIM ARE ALPHA AS TO WINE. SECOND TO THEM ARE BET RIMMAH AND BET LABAN IN THE HILLS, AND KEFAR SIGNAH IN THE VALLEY. ALL LANDS WERE VALID, BUT FROM HERE DID THEY BRING IT.**

**THEY DO NOT BRING THE WINE FROM GRAPES GROWN EITHER IN A MANURED FIELD, OR IN AN IRRIGATED FIELD, OR FROM VINEYARDS SOWN WITH SEED BETWEEN THE VINES. AND IF THEY BROUGHT IT FROM SUCH AREAS, IT IS VALID.**

**THEY DO NOT BRING WINE WHICH DERIVES FROM SUN-DRIED GRAPES. AND IF THEY BROUGHT IT FROM SUCH A SOURCE, IT IS VALID.**

**THEY DO NOT BRING SWEET, OR SMOKED, OR BOILED WINE. AND IF ONE DID BRING SUCH KINDS OF WINE, IT IS INVALID.**

1. I:1: Now lo, the Mishnah has stated: They do not bring wine which derives from sun-dried grapes. And if they brought it from such a source, it is valid. But this too is sweet wine!

**B. “THEY DO NOT BRING LAST YEAR’S WINE,” THE WORDS OF RABBI. AND SAGES DECLARE VALID.**

1. II:1: Said Hezekiah, “What is the scriptural basis for the position of Rabbi? Scripture has said, ‘For a lamb, wine’ (Num. 28:14). Just as the lamb must be within its first year, so the wine must be within its first year.”

**C. THEY DO NOT BRING WINE MADE FROM GRAPES GROWN ON TRELLISED VINES, BUT ONLY FROM VINES GROWING FROM THE GROUND AND FROM VINEYARDS WHICH ARE TENDED.**

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: it must come from vines that are worked twice a year.

a. III:2: R. Joseph had a garden, which he hoed more than is common, and it produced wine that could absorb twice the common amount of water when it was diluted.

**D. THEY DID NOT COLLECT IT IN LARGE STORE UTENSILS BUT IN LITTLE JARS.**

1. IV:1: A Tannaite statement: Reference is made to a medium sized pitcher shaped Lydian utensil. They should be put away not two by two but one by one (cf. T. **Men. 9:D**).

**E. AND ONE DOES NOT FILL THE JARS UP TO THEIR RIMS, SO THAT ITS FRAGRANCE SPREADS. ONE DOES NOT DRAW THE WINE FROM ITS MOUTH, BECAUSE OF THE SCUM, OR FROM ITS BOTTOM, BECAUSE OF THE LEES. BUT ONE DRAWS IT FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE MIDDLE-THIRD OF THE JAR.**

**HOW DOES ONE TEST IT? THE TEMPLE TREASURER SITS, WITH A REED IN HIS HAND. WHEN IT TOSSED OFF THE FROTH, THEN HE STRUCK IT WITH THE REED AS A SIGN THAT IT IS TO BE SEALED:**

1. V:1: A Tannaite statement: When the froth of lees burst forth, the Temple treasurer would knock it with his stick cf. T. **Men. 9:11**.



**F. R. YOSÉ BAR JUDAH SAYS, “WINE ON WHICH SCUM CAME UP IS INVALID, AS IT IS SAID, ‘AND THEY SHALL BE TO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, AND THEIR MEAL OFFERING’ (NUM. 29:23), AND ‘THEY SHALL BE UNTO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, ALSO THEIR DRINK OFFERING’ (NUM. 29:31).”**

1. VI:1: R. Yohanan raised this question: “If one sanctified it, what is the law? Does he get flogged on that account on the count of sanctifying what is blemished, on the grounds that since it is unfit, it is as if it were blemished? Or perhaps the consideration of a blemish pertains only to a beast?”

2. VI:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Rams derived from Moab, lambs from Hebron, calves from Sharon, doves from the Royal Mountain. R. Judah says, “They get lambs the height of which was the same as their breadth.”

3. VI:3: “I have set watchmen on your walls, Jerusalem; they shall never remain silent day or night, you who are those who make mention of the Lord, take no rest” (Isa. 62: 6): So what do they say? Said Raba bar R. Shila, “This is what they say: ‘You will arise and have compassion on Zion’ (Psa. 102:14).”

## **LXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:1**

**A. TWO DRY MEASURES WERE IN THE SANCTUARY: A TENTH EPHAH MEASURE, AND A HALF-TENTH EPHAH MEASURE. R. MEIR SAYS, “A TENTH MEASURE, ANOTHER TENTH MEASURE, AND A HALF-TENTH MEASURE.”**

1. I:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Meir says, “What is the meaning of the statement of Scripture, ‘a tenth, a tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 28:29)? It is to teach you that there were two tenth-ephah measures in the Temple, one that is heaped up, one that is not heaped up. With this one that was heaped up did one measure the flour for all meal offerings. With this one that was not heaped up did one measure the flour for the cakes of an anointed priest” (T. **Men. 10:1A-D**). And sages say, “There was there only a single tenth-ephah measure, as it is said, ‘And one tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 29: 4). If so, why does Scripture state, ‘a tenth, a tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 28:29)? It serves to encompass the use of a half-tenth measure.”

**B. A TENTH MEASURE: HOW DID IT SERVE? IN IT DID ONE MEASURE FLOUR FOR ALL MEAL OFFERINGS.**

**ONE DID NOT MEASURE EITHER WITH A THREE-TENTHS MEASURE FOR THE MEAL OFFERING OF A BULLOCK, OR WITH A TWO-TENTHS MEASURE FOR THE MEAL OFFERING OF A RAM, BUT THEY MEASURED THEM WITH TENTH MEASURES. A HALF-TENTH MEASURE: HOW DID IT SERVE? IN IT DID ONE MEASURE THE BAKED CAKES OF A HIGH PRIEST, HALF A TENTH-EPHAH MEASURE FOR THE MORNING, HALF A TENTH-EPHAH MEASURE FOR TWILIGHT.**

1. II:1: ...did one measure! But to the contrary: The griddle cakes of the high priest were not offered in half tenths of an ephah at a time. But one brings a whole tenth and divides it, and offers half in the morning and half at twilight. Said R. Sheshet, “What is the sense of ...did one measure? It is, did divide.”



**a. II:2:** Rami bar Hama addressed this question to R. Hisda: “In R. Meir’s view, was the half-tenth measure to be heaped up or level?”

**I. II:3:** Rami bar Hama further addressed this question to R. Hisda: “As to the griddle cakes of the high priest, how were they divided into cakes? Was it by hand or by some instrument?”

**II. II:4:** Rami bar Hama further addressed this question to R. Hisda: “As to the table, what is the law on its sanctifying the handfuls of frankincense that are heaped up on it and not put into dishes? Since the table has that effect of sanctifying the show bread, should it also sanctify the handfuls set on the table? or perhaps the table sanctifies what is appropriate to it but not what is not appropriate to it?”

## **LXX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:2**

**A. SEVEN LIQUID MEASURES WERE IN THE SANCTUARY: A HIN, AND A HALF-HIN, AND A THIRD-HIN, AND A FOURTH-HIN, A LOG, AND HALF-LOG, AND A QUARTER-LOG.**

**1. I:1:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “There were seven liquid measures in the sanctuary, a quarter log, a half log, a log, a quarter hin, a third hin, a half hin, and a hin,” the words of R. Judah. R. Meir says, “A hin, a half hin, a third hin, a quarter hin, a log, a half log, and a quarter log” (T. **Men. 10:2A-C**). R. Simeon says, “There was no hin there, and for what purpose would a hin serve? And what then can I put in its place? There was no need for a hin-measure. It was used only for Moses’ anointing oil, Exo. 30:24. But there was a further measure of a log and a half = an eighth-hin, in which one did measure out oil for the high priest’s meal offering. A log and a half in the morning, and a log and a half at twilight.” They said to him, “There was a half log measure at hand, and one could therefore measure the log and a half of oil with the half log measure.” He said to them, “Even within your position, there was no need even for a half log measure, since at hand was the quarter log measure, and it was possible to measure what was needed by the quarter log. But as a matter of fact, this is the encompassing rule that prevailed in the Temple: a utensil that served for a given standard of measure may not be used for another standard of measure” (cf. T. **Men. E-G**). R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, “Notches were in the hin: ‘Up to here for a bullock a half-hin of oil and wine,’ ‘up to here for a ram a third-hin,’ ‘up to here for a lamb a fourth hin, (Num. 28:14).’”

**a. I:2:** Gloss of the foregoing.

**b. I:3:** As above.

**c. I:4:** As above.

**B. R. ELEAZAR B. SADOQ SAYS, “NOTCHES WERE IN THE HIN: ‘UP TO HERE FOR A BULLOCK A HALF-HIN OF OIL AND WINE,’ ‘UP TO HERE FOR A RAM A THIRD-HIN,’ ‘UP TO HERE FOR A LAMB A FOURTH HIN.’”**

**R. SIMEON SAYS, “THERE WAS NO HIN THERE, AND FOR WHAT PURPOSE WOULD A HIN SERVE? THERE WAS NO NEED FOR A HIN-MEASURE. IT WAS USED ONLY FOR MOSES’ ANOINTING OIL. BUT THERE WAS A FURTHER MEASURE OF A LOG AND A HALF, IN WHICH ONE DID MEASURE OUT OIL FOR THE HIGH PRIEST’S MEAL OFFERING. A LOG AND A HALF IN THE MORNING, AND A LOG AND A HALF AT TWILIGHT.”**

**1. I:1:** Does he not then hold the tradition that there were seven liquid measures in the sanctuary?

### **LXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:3**

**A. A QUARTER-LOG: HOW DID IT SERVE? IT SERVED TO MEASURE OUT THE QUARTER-LOG OF WATER FOR THE PERSON AFFLICTED WITH THE SKIN AILMENT, AND A QUARTER-LOG OF OIL FOR THE NAZIRITE:**

**1. I:1:** In session Rabbi raised this question: “Why was the quarter log measure anointed at all in that anointing served so that the utensil would sanctify whatever was poured into it? If it was to sanctify the quarter log of oil for the person afflicted with the skin ailment, in point of fact that took place outside of the camp so it did not have to be sanctified, and if it was to sanctify the quarter log of oil for the Nazirite, in point of fact, the bread offering of the Nazirite was sanctified solely by the act of slaughtering the ram and not by the oil!”

**B. A HALF-LOG: HOW DID IT SERVE? IT SERVED TO MEASURE OUT THE HALF-LOG OF WATER FOR THE WOMAN ACCUSED OF ADULTERY:**

**1. II:1:** In session Rabbi raised this question: “Why was the quarter log measure anointed at all in that anointing served so that the utensil would sanctify whatever was poured into it? If it was it was for the water to be used for the woman accused of adultery, was it unconsecrated to begin with? Is it not written, ‘holy water’ (Num. 5:17) which had already been consecrated? And if it is to sanctify the half log of oil used for the thank offering, as a matter of fact, the bread of the thank offering was sanctified only when the thank offering itself was slaughtered.”

**2. II:2:** Said R. Yohanan said Rabbi, “In the case of a lamp that during the night accidentally went out, both the oil and the wick are then classified as unfit. What does the priest have to do? First he has to clean it out, then put in fresh oil and wick, then relight it.”

**3. II:3:** In session R. Zeriqa raised this question: “When he puts in the oil, is it the same volume as he put in to begin with, or is it only enough to keep the lamp lit through the rest of the night?”

**4. II:4:** Said R. Huna b. R. Judah said R. Sheshet, “The lamp at the top of each branch of the candlestick in the Temple was flexible; although the whole candlestick, including the lamps, was beaten out of one piece of gold, the ends of the branches that supported the lamps were made thin and flexible so that the whole lamp could be turned in any direction and cleaned out well.”

**a. II:5:** Tannaite restatement of the same issue.

**C. AND A HALF-LOG OF OIL FOR THE THANK OFFERING:**

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "...then he shall offer with the thank offering unleavened cakes mixed with oil, unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes of fine flour well mixed with oil" (Lev. 7:12): R. Aqiba says, "Why does Scripture twice refer to 'oil'? Had Scripture referred to 'oil' only one time, I might have maintained that lo, this is in the same category as all other meal offerings as to the requirement of a log of oil. When Scripture refers to 'oil' repeatedly, we know that the use of one inclusionary statement after another serves only to diminish the matter at hand. Consequently, the purpose is to diminish the requirement of oil to only a half-log."

**D. AND WITH A LOG DID ONE MEASURE OUT OIL FOR ALL MEAL OFFERINGS.**

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "'And a tenth of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil for a cereal offering mixed with oil for a meal offering and a log of oil' (Lev. 14:21) — This teaches that every tenth requires a log of oil," the words of sages. R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob say, "Even a cereal offering of sixty tenths requires only its single log of oil, as it is said, 'for its cereal offering, and a log of oil' (Lev. 14:21)"

**E. EVEN FOR THE MEAL OFFERING CONTAINING SIXTY TENTHS DID ONE MEASURE OUT SIXTY INDIVIDUAL LOGS. R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAYS, "EVEN A MEAL OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS GETS ONLY ITS ONE LOG, AS IT IS SAID, 'FOR A MEAL OFFERING, AND A LOG OF OIL' (LEV. 14: 21)."**

**SIX LOGS = A HALF-HIN THE DRINK OFFERINGS OF A BULLOCK, FOUR LOGS = A THIRD-HIN FOR A RAM:**

1. VI:1: What is the source in Scripture for this rule?

**F. THREE LOGS = A QUARTER-HIN FOR A LAMB, AND THREE AND A HALF FOR THE LAMP, A HALF-LOG FOR EACH LIGHT.**

1. VII:1: What is the source in Scripture for this rule?

## **LXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:4**

**A. THEY STIR TOGETHER THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH ACCOMPANIES DRINK OFFERINGS OF RAMS ALONG WITH THAT FOR DRINK OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS, THE MEAL OFFERING WHICH ACCOMPANIES DRINK OFFERINGS OF LAMBS ALONG WITH THAT FOR DRINK OFFERINGS OF LAMBS, THOSE OF AN INDIVIDUAL ALONG WITH THOSE OF THE COMMUNITY, THOSE OF ONE DAY ALONG WITH THOSE OF THE PRECEDING DAY FOR DRINK OFFERINGS MAY BE OFFERED UP TO TEN DAYS AFTER THE SACRIFICE WHICH THEY ACCOMPANY.**

1. I:1: An objection was raised to the foregoing: "And he shall burn it" (Lev. 3:11) — he may not mix the fat portions of one offering with those of another. Said R. Yohanan, "The Mishnah speaks of a case in which the mixing had already taken place but not to begin with."

**B. BUT THEY DO NOT STIR THE DRINK OFFERINGS OF LAMBS ALONG WITH THE DRINK OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS OR RAMS ALL. AND IF ONE STIRRED THEM THESE BY THEMSELVES AND THOSE BY THEMSELVES, AND THEY THEN BECOME**

**CONFUSED, THEY ARE VALID. IF BEFORE ONE STIRRED THEM THEY BECAME CONFUSED, IT IS INVALID.**

**THE LAMB WHICH IS BROUGHT WITH THE SHEAF OF FIRST BARLEY THAT IS WAVED — EVEN THOUGH ITS MEAL OFFERING WAS DOUBLED TWO TENTHS INSTEAD OF ONE, ITS DRINK OFFERINGS WERE NOT DOUBLED BUT EACH LAMB GETS THREE LOGS OF WINE AND OIL:**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And the cereal offering with it shall be two tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, to be offered by fire to the Lord, a pleasing odor” (Lev. 23:13): This teaches that the requirement for the lamb that was offered with the sheaf of first barley is doubled a cereal offering of two tenths of an ephah. Might one suppose that, just as the usual requirement for the cereal offering is doubled to two tenths, so the requirement of the wine offering should be doubled as well? Scripture says, “wine, a fourth of a hin.”

2. II:2: Said R. Yohanan, “The guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment that one slaughtered under some other than the designation that originally applied to the beast requires drink offerings, for if you do not say so, you invalidate the offering” And it could not be offered at all; it is not permissible to offer it as another offering, since it was originally designated as a guilt offering, and it is not a free will offering, since a guilt offering is obligatory, so it can only be offered as the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment and therefore has to have drink offerings.”

### **LXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:5**

**A. ALL MEASURES WHICH WERE IN THE SANCTUARY WERE HEAPED UP, EXCEPT FOR THAT OF THE HIGH PRIEST, WHICH HE DID HEAP UP INTO ITS OWN MIDST.**

1. I:1: Who is the authority behind our rule? If you say that it is R. Meir at M. 10:1, in his opinion, only one measure was heaped up; and if you say it is rabbis in that same context, in their view there was only one tenth measure, and that was levelled!

**B. LIQUID MEASURES: THEIR OVERFLOW WAS CONSECRATED. AND DRY MEASURES: THEIR OVERFLOW WAS UNCONSECRATED. R. AQIBA SAYS, “THE LIQUID MEASURES ARE CONSECRATED, THEREFORE, THEIR OVERFLOW IS CONSECRATED. AND DRY MEASURES ARE UNCONSECRATED, THEREFORE, THEIR OVERFLOW IS UNCONSECRATED.” R. YOSÉ SAYS, “NOT ON THIS ACCOUNT, BUT THE REASON IS THAT BY ADDING A SURPLUS, WHAT IS IN THE LIQUID MEASURE IS STIRRED UP, BUT BY ADDING A SURPLUS WHAT IS IN THE DRY MEASURE IS NOT STIRRED UP.”**

1. II:1: What is at issue here? The first of the two authorities holds that the liquid measures were anointed inside and out, dry measures were anointed inside but not out; R. Aqiba takes the view that liquid measures were anointed inside and out but dry measures were not anointed at all; R. Yosé maintains that both liquid and dry measures were anointed on the inside, not on the outside. But this is the operative

consideration: by adding a surplus, what is in the liquid measure is stirred up, but by adding a surplus what is in the dry measure is not stirred up.

2. II:2: So even if the liquids are stirred up, what difference does that make? The person has the intention of sanctifying only what he requires in any event!

3. II:3: We have learned in the Mishnah: R. Ishmael says, “The surplus of the drink offerings goes for purchase of animals for sacrifice for ‘dessert’ the unused time of the altar (M. Sheq. 4:4C). What is the meaning of “the surplus of the drink offerings”?

## **LXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:6**

**A. ALL OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE DRINK OFFERINGS, EXCEPT FOR THE FIRSTLING, TITHE OF CATTLE, THE PASSOVER, THE SIN OFFERING, AND THE GUILT OFFERING.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “...and you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire or a burnt offering or a sacrifice, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, or at your appointed feasts (Num. 15: 3): “May I infer that whatever is offered as an offering by fire requires a drink offering, even a meal offering? Scripture refers specifically to a burnt-offering. I know only that that is the case of a burnt offering. How do I know that the same rule applies to peace-offerings? Scripture alludes to a “sacrifice.” How about a thank offering? Scripture refers to “or a sacrifice.”

a. I:2: Gloss of foregoing. Why does R. Jonathan find a verse necessary to make the point that he wants to make?

b. I:3: As above. The master has said: “How about a thank offering? Scripture refers to ‘or a sacrifice.’” Is a thank offering not a sacrifice and, since it is, the reference is superfluous!

c. I:4: As above. But let Scripture state only, “In fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill offering” and not specify “a burnt offering” which would have been covered, as it is ordinarily votive?

d. I:5: As above. But now that you have determined that the term “or” was set forth for an exposition such as has been spelled out making the point that a burnt offering of any one animal or the herd or flock has to be accompanied by drink offerings, what need do I have for “or” in the verse, “in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a free will offering” to indicate disjunction = this or that?

e. I:6: As above. What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “or in your appointed seasons”?

f. I:7: As above. What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “and when you prepare a bullock for a burnt offering or for a sacrifice” (Num. 15:12)?

g. I:8: As above. What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or for peace offerings” (Num. 15: 8)?

**h.** I:9: As above. And from the perspective of R. Josiah, what need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “of the herd or of the flock”?

**i.** I:10: As above. And what need was there for the verse, “So you shall do for every one according to their number” (Num. 15:12)?

**B. BUT THE SIN OFFERING OF THE PERSON AFFLICTED WITH THE SKIN AILMENT AND HIS GUILT OFFERING REQUIRE DRINK OFFERINGS:**

**1.** II:1: What are the scriptural foundations of the Mishnah’s rule?

**a.** II:2: But the rule governing both the sin offering and the guilt offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment surely can be derived from “the sacrifice:” so why are two distinct words demanded? For a master has said, “How do we know the rule governing the sin offering and the guilt offering? Scripture says, ‘and the meat of the sacrifice’”!

**b.** II:3: “The sacrifice” refers to the sin offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment. But might I say that this refers to the sin offering and guilt offering of a Nazirite?

**c.** II:4: “for the burnt-offering” — this refers to the purification-offering of the leper: But might one not say, “This refers to the burnt offering presented by a woman after childbirth”?

**d.** II:5: At Num. 15: 6, what need is there for a reference to “for a ram”? The drink offerings for a ram are prescribed at Num. 28:12, 14.

**e.** II:6: At Num. 15: 6, what need is there for a reference to “or for a ram”? It encompasses a sheep in its thirteenth month between the age of a lamb and the age of a ram; it too is classified as a ram and has to have drink offerings.

**2.** II:7: “Thus it shall be done for each bull or ram or for each of the male lambs or the kids, according to the number that you prepare, so shall you do with every one according to their number:” Why does Scripture state, “For each bull?” For one might have reasoned wrongly, as follows: the animal drawn from the flock requires drink offerings, and so does one drawn from the herd. If I draw an analogy, in that the Torah has made a distinction between the drink offerings required of a lamb and those required of a ram, so I should draw a distinction between the drink offerings required for a calf and those required for an ox. So the Torah specifies to the contrary: “Thus it shall be done for each bull or ram or for each of the male lambs or the kids,” indicating that the Torah has made no distinction between the drink offerings brought for a calf and those brought for an ox

**3.** II:8: Said R. Pappa, “Raba examined us with the following question: ‘How much should be the drink offerings presented with a ewe in its second year?’ And we answered him on the basis of the following Mishnah-teaching: “Calf” signifies drink offerings for offerings from the herd, large or small, male or female, (M. **Sheq. 5:3D**), except for rams” so a ewe in its second year requires the drink offerings of a lamb.

## **LXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:7**

**A. ALL OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY DO NOT RECEIVE LAYING ON OF HANDS, EXCEPT FOR THE BULLOCK WHICH IS BROUGHT ON ACCOUNT OF THE COMMUNITY'S TRANSGRESSION OF ANY OF THE COMMANDMENTS AND THE GOAT WHICH IS SENT FORTH. R. SIMEON SAYS, "ALSO: THE GOATS WHICH ARE BROUGHT ON ACCOUNT OF IDOLATRY."**

**1.** I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: All offerings of the community do not receive laying on of hands, except for the bullock which is brought on account of the community's transgression of any of the commandments Lev. 4:15 and the goat which is sent forth Lev. 16:21, "and goats which are brought on account of idolatry Num. 15: 2," the words of R. Simeon. R. Judah says, "Goats that are presented on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands. And what does one bring in their stead? The goat which is sent forth."

**a.** I:2: Said R. Jeremiah, "Each party is consistent with views expressed elsewhere."

**b.** I:3: But surely R. Simeon must concede that all of the sections of the people are covered by the final phrases of the verse at hand!

**2.** I:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "...The elders of the community shall lay their hands upon the head of the bull before the Lord, and the bull shall be slaughtered before the Lord." "The bullock requires the laying on of hands, but goats that are brought on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands," the words of R. Judah. R. Simeon says, "The ox requires the laying on of hands by the elders. The goats brought on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands by the elders. But only Aaron does it." For R. Simeon says, "Every sin offering brought by the community, the blood of which is brought within, requires the laying on of hands" (T. **Men. 10:9A-B**).

**a.** I:5: And as to R. Simeon, how on the basis of Scripture does he prove that the goats that are presented on account of idolatry require the laying on of hands?

**b.** I:6: And from the perspective of Rabina, who has said, "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," what need does he have for a verse of Scripture to make this point?

**B. ALL OFFERINGS OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE LAYING ON OF HANDS, EXCEPT FOR THE FIRSTLING, TITHE OF CATTLE, AND THE PASSOVER:**

**1.** II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "his offering" (Lev. 3: 1): and not a firstling. But is the opposite not a matter of logic? If peace offerings, which are not consecrated from the womb, require laying on of hands, the firstling, which is consecrated from the womb, surely should require the laying on of hands. That is why it is necessary for Scripture to make matters explicit: "his offering:" and not a firstling. "his offering" (Lev. 3: 1): and not a beast designated as tithe.



**C. AND THE HEIR OF A MAN WHO DIED BEFORE BRINGING A VOWED SACRIFICE LAYS ON HANDS AND BRINGS DRINK OFFERINGS AND HAS THE POWER TO EFFECT SUBSTITUTION:**

1. III:1: R. Hananiah repeated as a Tannaite formulation before Raba, “The heir does not lay hands on his father’s offering, and the heir does not have the power to effect an act of substitution with an animal designated for an offering by his father.”

a. III:2: Gloss of a proof-text of the foregoing: What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Judah?

**LXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:8**

**A. ALL LAY ON HANDS, EXCEPT FOR THE DEAF-MUTE, THE IDIOT, AND THE MINOR, THE BLIND PERSON, AND THE GENTILE.**

1. I:1: Now there is no problem in understanding the exclusion of the the deaf-mute, the idiot, and the minor, for they are held not to possess the power of intentionality. And there is no problem in understanding the exclusion of the gentile, since it is written “the children of Israel” (Lev. 1: 2), so that only Israelites may lay on hands, but gentiles may not do so. But on what basis is the blind person excluded?

**B. AND THE SLAVE, AND THE AGENT, AND THE WOMAN**

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering.” It must be his hand, not that of his son. “...his hand:” and not that of his slave. “...and he shall lay his hand:” and not the hand of his agent

a. II:2: What need is there for all of these distinct proofs?

**C. AND LAYING ON OF HANDS CONSTITUTES THE RESIDUE OF THE REQUIREMENT WHICH MAY, IN FACT, BE OMITTED WITHOUT AFFECTING THE EFFICACY OF ATONEMENT.**

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Since we have found that the atonement takes place only through the tossing of the blood of the sacrifice on the altar, why does Scripture say, “and he shall lay his hand ...and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1: 2)? Is it the fact that the laying on of hands effects atonement? And is it not the fact that atonement is only through the blood, as it is said, “For the blood is what makes atonement by reason of the life” (Lev. 17:11)? It is to teach the rule that if one has treated as a mere minor detail the laying on of hands, Scripture regards it as though he has not achieved atonement.

a. III:2: So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority along these same lines with respect to the rite of waving the offering.

**D. IT IS DONE ON THE HEAD OF THE ANIMAL:**

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “...his hand upon the head:” but not his hand upon the neck. “...his hand upon the head:” and not on the



back. "...his hand upon the head:" and not on the breast The laying on of hands is at the horns of the beast, not at the shoulders.

a. IV:2: So what need do I have for all these distinct details?

2. IV:3: The question was raised: if one put the hands on the sides of the head, what is the law?

3. IV:4: R. Jeremiah raised this question: "Would a cloth placed between the hands and the beast's head constitute an interposition, or is that not the case?"

#### **E. WITH BOTH HANDS:**

1. V:1: What is the source in Scripture for this rule?

a. V:2: R. Eleazar went and stated this tradition in the house of study, but he did not state it in the name of R. Simeon b. Laqish.

#### **F. AND IN THE PLACE IN WHICH THEY LAY ON HANDS THERE DO THEY SLAUGHTER THE ANIMAL.**

**AND FORTHWITH AFTER LAYING ON OF HANDS IS THE ACT OF SLAUGHTER, WHICH IS NOT THE RULE FOR LAYING ON OF HANDS.**

1. VI:1: What does this mean since obviously if the slaughter of the beast is done right after the laying on of hands, it surely will take place in the same location?

### **LXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 10:9**

**A. A MORE STRICT RULE APPLIES TO LAYING ON OF HANDS THAN TO WAVING, AND TO WAVING THAN TO LAYING ON OF HANDS. FOR: ONE PERSON WAVES FOR ALL ASSOCIATED WITH THE SACRIFICE, BUT ONE PERSON DOES NOT LAY ON HANDS FOR ALL ASSOCIATED WITH THE SACRIFICE. A MORE STRICT RULE APPLIES TO WAVING. FOR: WAVING APPLIES TO OFFERINGS OF AN INDIVIDUAL AND TO OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY, TO LIVING ANIMALS AND TO SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS, TO SOMETHING ANIMATE AND TO SOMETHING INANIMATE, WHICH IS NOT THE RULE FOR LAYING ON OF HANDS.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The word "his offering" recurs, to encompass all the partners in a given offering each of whom lays on hands. But does the opposite of that proposition not derive from an argument from logic? If waving, which applies to animals both living and already slaughtered, is excluded in the case of offerings of partnerships, laying on of hands, which applies only to living beasts, surely should be omitted in the case of partnerships. That is why Scripture is required to make the point that the word "his offering" recurs, to encompass all the partners in a given offering each of whom lays on hands

### **LXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:1**

**A. THE TWO LOAVES OF PENTECOST ARE KNEADED ONE BY ONE AND BAKED IN THE OVEN ONE BY ONE ONE, THEN THE NEXT.**

**THE TWELVE LOAVES OF SHOW BREAD ARE KNEADED ONE BY ONE AND BAKED TWO BY TWO. AND IN A MOLD DID ONE MAKE THEM. AND WHEN HE TAKES THEM**

**FROM THE OVEN, HE PUTS THEM INTO ANOTHER MOLD, SO THAT THEIR SHAPES WILL NOT BE SPOILED.**

**1. I:1:** What is the source of this rule?

**2. I:2:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And you shall set them:” into the mould. There were three molds there. One was for the bread in the oven, one was for the dough, and one was for when one took the bread out of the oven. And one puts the dough into the mould so that they will not spoil the bread (T. **Men. 11:3A-B**).

**3. I:3:** It has been stated: As to the show bread, how do they make it? R. Hanina said, “Like a broken box.” : in the shape of an open box with two of the sides, front and back, removed; each cake had a base and two sides that rode perpendicularly. R. Yohanan said, “Like a rocking ship (T. **Men. 11:6B**).” like the sides of a ship that narrowed downwards until the keel is reached; the side of each cake narrowed downwards, until at the bottom there was only a fingerbreadth between the sides, like a V.

**a. I:4:** Gloss of foregoing.

**b. I:5:** As above.

**4. I:6:** The question was raised: was the show bread invalidated on the journeys when the Tabernacle was dismantled, since when that took place, the show bread was taken off the table, or was the show bread not invalidated on the journeys? R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi: One of them said, “It was invalidated.” The other of them said, “It was not invalidated.”

**a. I:7:** Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

**I. I:8:** As above.

## **LXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:2**

**A. ALL THE SAME ARE THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHOW BREAD: THEIR KNEADING AND THEIR ROLLING OUT ARE DONE OUTSIDE THE TEMPLE COURTYARD, AND THEIR BAKING, INSIDE. AND THEY DO NOT OVERRIDE THE PROHIBITIONS OF THE SABBATH.**

**1. I:1:** There is a contradiction in the body of the rule! You say first of all, their kneading and their rolling out are done outside the Temple courtyard, so dry measures were not sanctified, and then you say, and their baking, inside, so the dry measures were sanctified!

**B. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ALL ACTS OF PREPARING THEM ARE INSIDE.” R. SIMEON SAYS, “ONE SHOULD ALWAYS BE ACCUSTOMED TO STATE THE RULE AS FOLLOWS : ‘THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHOW BREAD ARE VALID IF MADE IN THE COURTYARD AND ARE VALID IF MADE IN BETHPAGE.’”**

**1. II:1:** Said R. Abbahu bar Kahana, “And both authorities interpret the same verse of Scripture: ‘And it is in a manner common, yes, though it were sanctified this day in the utensil’ (1Sa. 21: 6). R. Judah takes the view that David found the priests baking the show bread on a weekday, and said to them, ‘Are you baking it on a

weekday? Since it will then have been sanctified today by being kept in a utensil of service, it will then be invalidated by being kept overnight so it is wrong to bake it on a weekday.’ R. Simeon maintains that David found the priests baking the show bread on the Sabbath and said to them, ‘Should you not have baked it on a weekday? For in any event it is not the oven that sanctifies the bread but the table and the bread will be put there only on the Sabbath.’”

### **LXXX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:3-6**

**A. THE BAKED CAKES OF A HIGH PRIEST: THEIR KNEADING AND THEIR ROLLING OUT ARE DONE INSIDE. AND THEY OVERRIDE THE PROHIBITIONS OF THE SABBATH. GRINDING THEIR GRAIN AND SIFTING IT DO NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. A GENERAL PRINCIPLE DID R. AQIBA STATE, “ANY SORT OF WORK WHICH IT IS POSSIBLE TO DO ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH, AND ANY SORT OF WORK WHICH IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO DO ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES OVERRIDE THE SABBATH.**

**ALL MEAL OFFERINGS ARE SUBJECT TO PREPARATION IN A CONSECRATED UTENSIL IF THEY ARE PREPARED INSIDE, AND ARE NOT SUBJECT TO PREPARATION IN A CONSECRATED UTENSIL IF THEY ARE PREPARED OUTSIDE.**

1. I:1: They asked Rabbi, “How do we know this?”

**B. HOW SO? THE TWO LOAVES: THEIR LENGTH IS SEVEN HANDBREADTHS, AND THEIR BREADTH, FOUR, AND THEIR HORNS SMALL PIECES OF DOUGH PLACED ON THE FOUR UPPER CORNERS, LIKE THE HORNS OF THE ALTAR, FOUR FINGERBREADTHS HIGH. THE SHOW BREAD: ITS LENGTH IS TEN HANDBREADTHS, AND ITS BREADTH, FIVE, AND ITS HORNS, SEVEN FINGERBREADTHS. R. JUDAH SAYS, “SO THAT YOU NOT ERR MAKE USE OF THE MNEMONIC: ZDDYHZ = 7, 4, 4, 10, 5, 7.” BEN ZOMA SAYS, “AND YOU SHALL PLACE ON THE TABLE SHOW BREAD IN MY SIGHT BEFORE MY FACE CONTINUALLY (EXO. 25:30 — THAT IT SHOULD HAVE A FACE.”**

**“THE TABLE: ITS LENGTH IS TEN HANDBREADTHS AND ITS BREADTH, FIVE, TWO AMAHS BY ONE, AND THE AMAH IS FIVE HANDBREADTHS, THE SHOW BREAD: ITS LENGTH IS TEN HANDBREADTHS AND ITS BREADTH, FIVE. ONE SETS IT LENGTHWISE AGAINST THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO AND A HALF HANDBREADTHS DOES HE DOUBLE OVER AS A WALL UPWARD ON THIS SIDE AND ON THAT OF THE BREAD. IT TURNS OUT THAT ITS LENGTH FILLS THE WHOLE BREADTH OF THE TABLE,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. R. MEIR SAYS, “THE TABLE: ITS LENGTH IS TWELVE HANDBREADTHS, AND ITS BREADTH, SIX. THE AMAH IS SIX HANDBREADTHS. THE SHOW BREAD: ITS LENGTH IS TEN HANDBREADTHS AND ITS BREADTH, FIVE. ONE SETS IT LENGTHWISE AGAINST THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO HANDBREADTHS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE BREAD DOES HE DOUBLE TURN UP AS A WALL, WITH TWO HANDBREADTHS SPACE IN THE MIDDLE BETWEEN THE TWO SETS OF SIX LOAVES, SO THAT THE WIND BLOWS BETWEEN THEM PREVENTING MOULD:”**

1. II:1: Said R. Yohanan, “In the opinion of him who says that two and a half handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will be seen that the

table sanctified everything that was placed on it, up to a height of fifteen handbreadths, and according to the position of him who maintains that the two handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will emerge that the table sanctified everything that was placed on it to a height of twelve.”

2. II:2: Said R. Yohanan, “In the opinion of him who says, ‘The rim was beneath the table,’ a board that can be used on either side lacking a rim or edge to mark its surface is susceptible to uncleanness. In the opinion of him who says, ‘The rim was above the surface of the table,’ whether or not a board that can be used on either side lacking a rim or edge to mark its surface is susceptible to uncleanness is subject to doubt.”

3. II:3: It follows that the table is subject to receiving uncleanness. Yet it is a wooden utensil that was made to be stationary, and a wooden utensil that is made to be stationary is not susceptible to uncleanness. Why not? To be susceptible to uncleanness, we require that it be comparable to a sack. Just as the sack is movable whether full or empty, so anything that is movable whether full or empty will be susceptible to uncleanness.

4. II:4: But you can derive the rule that the table is subject to receiving uncleanness from the simple fact that it was overlaid with gold and therefore is a metal utensil, which is susceptible to uncleanness even though made to remain stationary, not being similar to a sack. For we have learned in the Mishnah: The table and the side table which were damaged or which one covered with marble and on which one left a place for placing the cups are unclean. R. Judah says, “A place for leaving pieces” (M. [Kel. 22: 1](#)). So if there was sufficient room it is susceptible, but if not, it is not. It follows that if a utensil is overlaid, its status is dictated by the classification of the material used in the overlay.

**C. ABBA SAUL SAYS, “THERE IN THE OPEN AREA (F) DID THEY SET THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE OF THE SHOW BREAD.” THEY SAID TO HIM, “HAS IT NOT ALREADY BEEN STATED, AND YOU SHALL PUT PURE FRANKINCENSE UPON EACH ROW (LEV. 24: 7)?” HE SAID TO THEM, “AND HAS IT NOT ALREADY BEEN SAID, ‘AND NEXT TO HIM SHALL BE THE TRIBE OF MANASSEH’?”**

**FOUR GOLDEN PROPS WERE THERE AT THE CORNERS OF THE TABLE, WITH THEIR HEADS SHAPED INTO BRANCHES LIKE A Y, WITH WHICH THEY WOULD SUPPORT THEM THE LOAVES OF BREAD, TWO PROPS FOR THIS ROW OF BREAD, AND TWO FOR THAT ROW. AND THERE WERE, INSERTED INTO THE PROPS TWENTY-EIGHT GOLDEN RODS REEDS, EACH SHAPED LIKE HALF OF A HOLLOW REED, FOURTEEN FOR THIS ROW, AND FOURTEEN FOR THAT ROW.**

1. III:1: What is the source in Scripture for this rule?

2. III:2: To the proposition that the rule in fact derives from the Torah, objected Raba, “We have learned in the Mishnah: Neither the work of ordering of the reeds nor the work of their removal overrides the Sabbath. Now if the requirement that there be rods derives from the Torah, why should they not override the restrictions of the Sabbath?”

**D. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE SIZE OF THE CUBIT MEASURED IN HANDBREADTHS**

**1. III:3:** With reference to the dispute on the size of the handbreadth, "...the amah is five handbreadths," the words of R. Judah. R. Meir says, "...The amah is six handbreadths", we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Meir says, "All the cubit measures were middle-sized, except for the golden altar and the horns and the circuit and the base of the altar." R. Judah says, "The cubit of building was six handbreadths and of utensils five" (M. **Kel. 17:10**). Said R. Yohanan, Both of them interpret the same verse of Scripture: 'And these are the measures of the altar by cubits — the cubit is a cubit and a handbreadth : the ordinary cubit, which measured six handbreadths, was one cubit and one handbreadth by the standard of the cubit spoken of in this verse, for the latter cubit measured only five handbreadths, and all parts of the altar mentioned in this verse were measured by a cubit of five handbreadths. The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span, and this shall be the base of the altar' (Eze. 43:13).

**a. III:4:** Gloss of foregoing. In the assumption that the height from the base to the rim was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths, and the verse, "the bottom shall be a cubit and a cubit the breadth" mean that the height from the base that rose up one cubit to the rim which one one cubit wide was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths, let us consider the following.

**b. III:5:** As above. And how big was a medium size cubit? Said R. Yohanan, "Six handbreadths." Said R. Yosé bar Abin, "So we too have learned in the Mishnah: R. Meir says, 'The table: its length is twelve handbreadths, and its breadth, six. The amah is six handbreadths.'"

**c. III:6:** As above. There we have learned in the Mishnah: As to the Eastern Gate, on it is a picture of the Walled City of Shushan, through which the high priest who burns the red cow, and the cow, and all who assist in its rite, go forth to the Mount of Olives (M. **Mid. 1:3E-G**). How come?

**I. III:7:** Secondary gloss of the foregoing.

**II. III:8:** As above.

**A. III:9:** As above.

## **E. REVERSION TO THE EXPOSITION OF THE MISHNAH'S PROPOSITION**

**1. III:10:** Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Had Scripture stated, "And you shall take fine flour and bake it into twelve loaves of it; two tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. And you shall set them in two rows" (Lev. 24: 5), but not added, "six in a row," I might have supposed that one row would be made of up four cakes, the other of eight. Scripture therefore had to say, "six in a row." And had Scripture stated, "in two rows, six in a row," but not added, "twelve," I might have supposed that there were to be three rows, each of six cakes, so Scripture had to say, "twelve." And had Scripture said both "Twelve" and also "in rows," but not "in two rows" or "six in a row," I might have supposed there were to be three rows, each of four cakes. So Scripture had to tell us, "in two rows" and "six in a row." Without all three expressions we should not have known the

rule. How was it done? He puts two rows of six loaves each, but if he put out one of four and one of eight, he has not carried out his obligation. If he put out two rows of seven cakes each — Rabbi says, “They treat the one on top as though it were not there” (T. **Men. 11:14**).

**F. NEITHER THE WORK OF ORDERING OF THE REEDS NOR THE WORK OF THEIR REMOVAL OVERRIDES THE SABBATH. BUT ONE ENTERS ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, DRAWS THEM OUT, AND PLACES THEM PARALLEL TO THE LENGTH OF THE TABLE.**

**ALL THE UTENSILS WHICH WERE IN THE SANCTUARY ARE LAID OUT LENGTHWISE PARALLEL TO THE LENGTH OF THE TEMPLE.**

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: All utensils in the sanctuary were placed with the length parallel to the length of the house, except for the ark, the length of which was parallel to the breadth of the house north to south. So it was placed, and so its staves were placed.

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Ten tables did King Solomon make, as it is written, ““He made ten tables as well, and placed them in the Temple, five on the right side and five on the left” (2Ch. 4: 8). Now if you take the view that five were at the right of the entry, five on the left of the entry, then it would turn out that tables were placed on the south side of the place, while the Torah says, “And you shall put the table on the north side” (Exo. 26:35). But the table that Moses made stood in the middle, with five tables to the right, five to the left all on the north

3. IV:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Ten candlesticks did King Solomon make, as it is written, “And he made the ten candlesticks of gold according to the ordinance concerning them, and he set them in the Temple, five on the right, five on the left” (2Ch. 4: 7).

4. IV:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: One Tannaite statement formulates this rule: the tables stood in the inner half of the sanctuary, while another Tannaite statement formulates that rule: the tables stood in the inner third of the sanctuary.

5. IV:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “The tables were set lengthwise from east to west,” the words of Rabbi. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “From north to south.”

a. IV:6: Gloss of foregoing. Now from the perspective of him who said that the tables stood lengthwise, east to west, there is no problem in explaining how the ten tables were placed in the twenty cubits each one being two cubits long, one wide; the twenty cubits furthest from the entrance to the sanctuary can contain them, if they were placed head to head in a long line, so there is one table twenty cubits long by one cubit wide. But from the perspective of him who maintains that they stood lengthwise north to south, how could the ten tables fit into the twenty cubits for the sanctuary was twenty cubits wide, and the tables were placed parallel with the width of the sanctuary! Furthermore, how in the world did the priests get into the Holy of Holies with the tables as a barrier the

entire width of the area? And furthermore, five tables would then be on the south side! And furthermore, where was there room for the table of Moses which is supposedly between the other tables, so where would there be space for eleven?

6. IV:7: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: While ten tables did Solomon make, they laid out the show bread only on the table made by Moses: “And the table on which the show bread was” (1Ki. 7:48). While ten candlesticks did Solomon make, they lit only the candlestick made by Moses: “And the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof, to burn every evening” (2Ch. 13:11). R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, “On all of them did they set out the bread: ‘And the tables on which was the show bread’ (2Ch. 4:19). And all of them did they light: ‘And the candlesticks with their lamps, that they should burn according to the ordinance before the sanctuary, of pure gold’ (2Ch. 4:20).”

a. IV:8: Proof of a proposition taken for granted in the foregoing.

#### **G. A DISCIPLE OF A SAGE AS A SANCTIFIED UTENSIL**

1. IV:9: “Which you broke and you shall put them into the ark” (Deu. 10: 2): It was taught as a Tannaite statement by R. Joseph: “This teaches that both the tablets and the broken pieces of the tablets were placed into the ark. “On this basis we learn that a disciple of a sage who for no fault of his own forgot his learning is not to be humiliated.”

1. IV:10: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “On occasions the nullification of the Torah may serve as a foundation for the Torah by ceasing to study in order to perform a religious deed: ‘which you did break,’ for the Holy One, blessed be he, said to Moses, ‘You did well to break them.’”

3. IV:11: And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “A disciple of a sage who turned sour is not to be humiliated in public: ‘Therefore you shall stumble in the day, and the prophet also shall stumble with you in the night’ (Hos. 4: 5).”

4. IV:12: And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “However forgets a single thing that he has learned transgresses a negative commandment: ‘Only take heed for yourself and keep your soul diligently, lest you forget the things’ (Deu. 4: 9).”

5. IV:13: Both R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar said, “The Torah was given in forty days, and the soul was formed in forty days. Whoever guards his Torah-learning has his soul guarded, and whoever does not guard his Torah learning does not have his soul guarded.”

### **LXXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:7**

**A. TWO TABLES WERE INSIDE THE PORCH, AT THE INSIDE OF THE DOOR OF THE HOUSE, ONE OF MARBLE, AND ONE OF GOLD. ON THE ONE OF MARBLE DO THEY SET THE SHOW BREAD WHEN IT IS BROUGHT IN, AND ON THE ONE OF GOLD WHEN IT IS TAKEN OUT. FOR IN MATTERS OF HOLINESS, THEY PLACE SOMETHING ON A HIGHER LEVEL OF SANCTIFICATION, BUT THEY DO NOT LOWER SOMETHING TO A LOWER LEVEL OF SANCTIFICATION.**



AND ONE OF GOLD IS INSIDE, ON WHICH IS ARRAYED THE SHOW BREAD CONTINUALLY. FOUR PRIESTS ENTER IN, TWO IN WHOSE HANDS ARE TWO ROWS OF SHOW BREAD, AND TWO IN WHOSE HANDS ARE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE. AND FOUR GO IN BEFORE THEM, TWO TO TAKE OUT THE TWO ROWS OF BREAD, AND TWO TO TAKE OUT THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE. THOSE WHO BRING THEM IN STAND AT THE NORTH SIDE OF THE TABLE, WITH THEIR FACES TO THE SOUTH. THOSE THAT BRING THEM OUT STAND AT THE SOUTH WITH THEIR FACES TO THE NORTH. THESE DRAW OUT THE OLD LOAVES AND THESE LAY DOWN THE NEW ONES.

AND A HANDBREADTH OF ONE NEW ROW LIES UP AGAINST A HANDBREADTH OF ANOTHER, AS IT IS SAID, “BEFORE ME PERPETUALLY” (EXO. 25:30). R. YOSÉ SAYS, “EVEN THOUGH THESE TAKE AWAY THE OLD LOAVES AND THEN THE OTHERS PUT DOWN THE NEW LOAVES, THIS TOO WAS DEEMED TO CARRY OUT THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE BREAD BE SET FORTH PERPETUALLY.”

1. I:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé says, “Even though these take away the old loaves and then the others put down the new loaves, that means nothing. How then do I interpret ‘before me continually’? It means that the table should never be left overnight without bread.”

2. I:2: Said R. Ammi, “On the basis of what R. Yosé has said that ‘continually’ means that some old show bread was on the table for a while in the morning, the new in the evening, we may draw the conclusion that even if a person has repeated only a single lesson in the morning and only a single lesson in the evening, he has carried out the religious duty, ‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth’ (Jos. 1: 8).”

a. I:3: Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “Even if a person only recited the Shema morning and evening, he has carried out the religious duty, ‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth’ (Jos. 1: 8).”

b. I:4: Ben Damah, son of R. Ishmael’s sister, “As to someone like myself, who has studied the entire Torah, what is the law about my studying the wisdom of Greece?” In his regard he recited this verse, “‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night’ (Jos. 1: 8). So go, find a time that is neither day nor night, and that is when you may study the wisdom of Greece.”

c. I:5: A Tannaite authority of of the household of R. Ishmael: “Words of Torah should not be a mere obligation to you, but you also are not permitted to exempt yourself from studying them.”

d. I:6: Said Hezekiah, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘Yes, he has allured you out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness’ (Job. 36:16)? Come and take note of how the Holy One blessed be he is really not like mortal. A mortal may well entice someone out of the ways of life into the ways of death, but the Holy One, blessed be he, entires someone out of the ways of death into the ways of life, as it is written, Yes, he has allured you out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness’ (Job. 36:16). ‘...out of the mouth of



straits' refers to Gehenna, which has a narrow mouth, so that its smoke is piled up in its midst. And lest you maintain that just as its mouth is narrow, so the whole of it is narrow, the verse states, 'deep and large' (Isa. 30:33). And lest you say that it is not made ready for a king, the verse states, 'Yes, for the king is it prepared' (Isa. 30:33). And lest you say there is no word in it: 'The pile thereof is fire and much word' (Isa. 30:33), and lest you say this being saved from Gehenna is all that Torah-study gets you, 'and that which is set on your table if full of fatness' (Job. 36:16)."

**B. THEY WENT FORTH AND PUT THEM DOWN ON THE GOLDEN TABLE WHICH WAS ON THE PORCH. AND THEY BURNED THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE THAT HAD BEEN REMOVED. AND THE LOAVES ARE DIVIDED AMONG THE PRIESTS.**

**IF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH, THE LOAVES ARE DIVIDED IN THE EVENING. IF IT COINCIDED WITH THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, THE GOAT OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IS EATEN IN THE EVENING.**

**THE BABYLONIANS WOULD EAT IT RAW, BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT SQUEAMISH.**

1. II:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians, but since the Palestinian sages loathe the Babylonians, they call them Babylonians."

## **LXXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:8**

**A. IF ONE SET OUT THE BREAD ON THE SABBATH BUT SET OUT THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNED THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE ON THE NEXT SABBATH, IT IS INVALID. IT WAS ONLY ON THE TABLE SIX DAYS. AND THEY ARE NOT LIABLE ON THEIR ACCOUNT THE LOAVES OF BREAD BECAUSE OF VIOLATION OF THE RULES OF REFUSE, REMNANT, AND UNCLEANNESS. THE BREAD IS NOT SANCTIFIED. IF ONE SET OUT THE BREAD AND THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE ON THE SABBATH AND BURNED THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE AFTER THE SABBATH, IT IS INVALID. AND THEY ARE NOT LIABLE ON THEIR ACCOUNT BECAUSE OF VIOLATION OF THE LAWS OF REFUSE, REMNANT, AND UNCLEANNESS. IF ONE SET OUT THE BREAD AND THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNED THE DISHES ON THE NEXT SABBATH, IT IS INVALID. THEY HAVE NOT BEEN LEFT FROM SABBATH TO SABBATH.) HOW SHOULD ONE DO IT? LET HIM LEAVE IT FOR THE COMING SABBATH THIRTEEN DAYS IN ALL:**

THE FOLLOWING SERVES THE CITED MISHNAH-PASSAGE AND IS INSERTED HERE ONLY BECAUSE OUR MISHNAH-PARAGRAPH CONTRIBUTES A FACT TO THE ANALYTICAL PROOF-PROCESS

1. I:1: There we have learned in the Mishnah: The supervisor said to them, "Go and see whether the time for slaughtering the sacrifice has come." If it has come, he who sees it says, "It is daylight!" Mattithiah b. Samuel says, "He says, 'Has the whole east gotten light?' 'To Hebron?' And he says, 'Yes.'"

And why were they required to do this? For once the moonlight came up, and they supposed that the eastern horizon was bright, and so they slaughtered the daily whole offering and had to bring it out to the place of burning. They

brought the high priest down to the immersion hut. This governing principle applied in the Temple: Whoever covers his feet and defecates requires immersion, and whoever urinates requires sanctification the washing of hands and feet (M. **Yoma 3:1-2**). Now why was this required that people make sure the first light of day had dawned? Because once the penumbra of the moon came up, and people imagined that the east was lit up. They slaughtered the daily whole offering but had then to bring it out to the place of slaughter and make the high priest go down into the immersion-pool.

### **LXXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 11:9**

**A. THE TWO LOAVES ARE EATEN, NEITHER EARLIER THAN TWO DAYS NOR LATER THAN THREE DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED. HOW SO? IF THEY ARE BAKED ON THE EVE OF THE FESTIVAL AND EATEN ON THE FESTIVAL, THAT WOULD BE AN EXAMPLE OF EATING THEM TWO DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED. IF THE FESTIVAL FELL AFTER THE SABBATH, THEY ARE EATEN THREE DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED. THE SHOW BREAD IS EATEN NEITHER LESS THAN NINE NOR MORE THAN ELEVEN DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED. HOW SO? IF IT IS BAKED ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH AND EATEN ON THE SABBATH IN THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THAT WOULD BE AN EXAMPLE OF EATING THEM NINE DAYS AFTER THEY ARE BAKE. IF THE FESTIVAL COINCIDED WITH THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, IT IS EATEN TEN DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED. IN THE CASE OF TWO FESTIVAL DAYS OF THE NEW YEAR THAT IS, IF THE NEW YEAR BEGAN ON THURSDAY AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ON THE FOLLOWING SABBATH, IT IS EATEN ELEVEN DAYS AFTER BEING BAKED.**

**AND BAKING IT DOES NOT OVERRIDE EITHER THE SABBATH OR THE FESTIVAL. RABBAN SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAYS IN THE NAME OF R. SIMEON, SON OF THE PREFECT, "IT OVERRIDES THE FESTIVAL, BUT IT DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE FAST DAY."**

THE FOLLOWING SERVES THE CITED MISHNAH-PASSAGE AND IS INSERTED HERE ONLY BECAUSE OUR MISHNAH-PARAGRAPH CONTRIBUTES A FACT TO THE ANALYTICAL PROOF-PROCESS

1. I:1: Said Rabina, "In the opinion of him who says, 'Votive offerings and free will offerings are not offered on the Festival Day,' you may not say that by the law of the Torah they may be offered, while rabbis issued a precautionary decree to prevent deferring those offerings until the festival since that would represent accumulating work to be done on the Festival; even by the law of the Torah they may not be offered, for the two loaves are obligatory for that day Pentecost, so there is no reason to take into account the possibility of one's deferring the offering until the Festival for they cannot be presented before the appropriate day. And yet our Mishnah states: And baking it does not override either the Sabbath or the festival."

## **LXXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:1**

**A. MEAL OFFERINGS AND DRINK OFFERINGS WHICH WERE MADE UNCLEAN BEFORE ONE HAS SANCTIFIED THEM IN A CONSECRATED UTENSIL ARE SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION FOR MONEY, WHICH IS DEEMED CONSECRATED IN THEIR STEAD.**

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

**B. IF THEY ARE MADE UNCLEAN AFTER ONE HAS SANCTIFIED THEM IN A CONSECRATED UTENSIL, THEY ARE NOT SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION.**

**FOWL AND WOOD AND FRANKINCENSE AND A UTENSIL OF SERVICE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION AT ALL, FOR THE RULE THAT PERMITS REDEMPTION OF A BLEMISHED OFFERING IS STATED ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH OFFERINGS OF CATTLE.**

1. II:1: But that’s obvious. They are, after all, sanctified as to their physical body, not merely as to their value!

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

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

4. II:4: Again reverting to the issue of I:1, R. Kahana said, “If meal offerings and drink offerings became unclean, they may be redeemed. If they are clean, they may not be redeemed but must be used on the altar.” So did R. Oshaia say, “If meal offerings and drink offerings became unclean, they may be redeemed. If they are clean, they may not be redeemed but must be used on the altar.” R. Eleazar says, “All of them if unclean may be redeemed, if clean, may not be redeemed, except for the tenth ephah of the meal offering of the poor sinner. For lo, the Torah has said, ‘...from his sin’ in the one case, and, in the other, ‘for his sin.’”

5. II:5: Again reverting to the issue of I:1, said R. Oshaia, “I have heard that in the opinion of R. Simeon, if a meal offering was turned into refuse by reason of the officiating priest’s improper intention to eat the residue of the meal outside of the proper place or time, it does not fall into the classification of food such as to be subject to the laws of food uncleanness....”

a. II:6: Expansion of the foregoing.

b. II:7: As above.

c. II:8: As above.

d. II:9: As above.

## **LXXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:2**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN,” BUT BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A FRYING PAN, OR HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A FRYING PAN,” BUT BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN — WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT, HE HAS BROUGHT AS A SEPARATE FREEWILL OFFERING. BUT HIS OBLIGATION FOR THE ORIGINAL PLEDGE HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT.**

1. I:1: All of the specified cases had to be spelled out. For if the Tannaite framer of the passage had catalogued only the first cases, He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering prepared in a baking pan,” but brought one prepared in a frying pan, or he who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering prepared in a frying pan,” but brought one prepared in a baking pan (M. 5: 8) — what he has brought, he has brought as a separate freewill offering, we should have supposed that the operative consideration was that he had promised a meal offering prepared on a griddle and brought one prepared in a pan.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: what he has brought, he has brought. But his obligation he has not carried out. R. Simeon says, “He has even carried out his obligation.”

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO OFFER THIS FINE FLOUR AS A MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN,” BUT BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A FRYING PAN, OR HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING THIS FINE FLOUR AS A MEAL OFFERING PREPARED IN A FRYING PAN,” BUT BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A BAKING PAN — LO, THIS IS INVALID.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS OF AN EPHAH OF FINE FLOUR PREPARED IN A SINGLE UTENSIL,” BUT BROUGHT IT IN TWO UTENSILS, OR, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS OF AN EPHAH OF FINE FLOUR PREPARED IN TWO UTENSILS,” BUT HE BROUGHT IT IN ONE UTENSIL — WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT, HE HAS BROUGHT. BUT HIS OBLIGATION HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO OFFER THESE IN ONE UTENSIL,” BUT BROUGHT THEM IN TWO UTENSILS, OR HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO OFFER THESE IN TWO UTENSILS,” BUT HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE UTENSIL — LO, THESE ARE INVALID. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS OF AN EPHAH OF FINE FLOUR IN A SINGLE UTENSIL,” BUT BROUGHT THEM IN TWO UTENSILS, IF THEY SAID TO HIM, “IN A SINGLE UTENSIL DID YOU VOW TO BRING THE OFFERING,” BUT HE THEN OFFERED THEM IN A SINGLE UTENSIL, THEY ARE VALID. BUT IF HE OFFERED THEM IN TWO UTENSILS, THEY ARE INVALID FOR THEY CANNOT NOW BE DEEMED A SEPARATE FREEWILL OFFERING.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS EPHAHS OF FINE FLOUR IN TWO UTENSILS,” BUT BROUGHT THEM IN ONE UTENSIL, IF THEY SAID TO HIM, “IN TWO UTENSILS DID YOU VOW TO BRING THEM,” BUT HE THEN OFFERED THEM IN TWO UTENSILS, THEY ARE VALID. IF HE GAVE THEM IN A SINGLE UTENSIL, THEY ARE DEEMED TO BE EQUIVALENT TO TWO MEAL OFFERINGS WHICH WERE CONFUSED:**

1. II:1: But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The utensils of service have not sanctified the meal offerings that were put into them, so why not just transfer what was put into a pan into the griddle, rather than declaring the contents invalid! Said Abbaye, “‘The utensils of service have not sanctified the meal offerings that were put into them,’ so far as offering them on the altar, but they have sanctified them in such wise that they can before invalid” if taken out of the utensils assigned to them.

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

### **LXXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:3**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING MADE OF BARLEY,” IN ANY CASE MUST BRING ONE MADE OF WHEAT:**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING MADE OF MEAL,” MUST BRING ONE MADE OF FINE FLOUR.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING WITHOUT WINE AND FRANKINCENSE,” MUST BRING ONE WITH OIL AND FRANKINCENSE.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING MADE OF A HALF-TENTH,” MUST BRING ONE MADE OF A WHOLE TENTH.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING MADE OF A TENTH AND A HALF-TENTH,” BRINGS ONE MADE OF TWO WHOLE TENTHS OF AN EPHAH OF FINE FLOUR. R. SIMEON DECLARES FREE OF THE OBLIGATION TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING IN ANY OF THE FOREGOING CASES, FOR IN SO SPECIFYING, HE HAS NOT VOLUNTEERED A FREEWILL MEAL OFFERING IN THE WAY IN WHICH PEOPLE VOLUNTEER TO MAKE A FREEWILL MEAL OFFERING:**

1. I:1: Why should this be the case, for we have a vow and grounds for remitting it right along side for by the additional words, “of barley,” he obviously meant to annul his expressed vow, since everyone knows that only wheat may be offered as a meal offering and not barley!

2. I:2: In session R. Nahman stated this tradition. Objected Raba to R. Nahman, “He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering made of meal,” must bring one made of fine flour. But here is a case in which he did not make the matter of the meal offering explicit at all!”

### **LXXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:4A-I**

**A. A MAN VOLUNTEERS TO MAKE A FREEWILL OFFERING OF A MEAL OFFERING CONSISTING OF SIXTY TENTHS AND BRINGS IT IN A SINGLE UTENSIL.**

**IF HE SAID, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING OF SIXTY-ONE TENTHS OF AN EPHAH,” HE BRINGS SIXTY IN A SINGLE UTENSIL, AND ONE IN A**

**SINGLE UTENSIL. FOR SO DOES THE COMMUNITY BRING ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL SUKKOT WHICH COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH SIXTY-ONE TENTHS. IT IS ENOUGH FOR THE INDIVIDUAL TO FALL SHORT OF THE COMMUNITY BY ONE TENTH.**

**SAID R. SIMEON, “AND ARE NOT THESE FOR BULLOCKS, AND THESE FOR RAMS, AND THEY ARE NOT MIXED UP WITH ONE ANOTHER FOR THE QUANTITY OF OIL FOR THE TENTHS IS NOT UNIFORM? BUT THE REASON IS THAT UP TO SIXTY TENTHS OF AN EPHAH CAN BE MIXED TOGETHER.” THEY SAID TO HIM, “ARE SIXTY MIXED TOGETHER, AND SIXTY-ONE NOT MIXED TOGETHER?” HE SAID TO THEM, “SO IT IS IN ALL MEASURES PRESCRIBED BY SAGES: IN FORTY SEAHs OF WATER ONE IMMERSSES. IN FORTY SEAHs OF WATER LESS A SINGLE QARTOB, ONE CANNOT IMMERSSE.”**

**1. I:1:** This question was raised before R. Judah bar Ilai: How do we know that if he said, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a meal offering of sixty-one tenths of an ephah,” he brings sixty in a single utensil, and one in a single utensil?” R. Judah bar Ilai, the principal speaker on all occasions, commenced discourse by stating, “For so does the community bring on the first festival day of the Festival Sukkot which coincides with the Sabbath sixty-one tenths. It is enough for the individual to fall short of the community by one tenth.” Said to him R. Simeon, “And are not these for bullocks, and these for rams, and they are not mixed up with one another for the quantity of oil for the tenths is not uniform? In the case of some the mixture is thick, with some, thin; some are mixed in the morning, some at night not all the sixty one tenths were offered at one time, some being included in the tenth offered with the daily whole offering of the morning, some in the evening. So they may not be mixed one with the other.”

**a. I:2:** So even though they may not be mixed one with the other, what difference does it make? Have we not learned in the Mishnah: If one did not mingle the oil with unleavened cakes, the meal offerings so prepared are valid (M. **Men. 3:2A, C**)? Said R. Zira, “In the case of any mixture that is suitable for mixing, the mixing is not indispensable to the proper performance of the rite, but in the case of any mixture that is not suitable for mixing, the mixing is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite.”

**b. I:3:** Said R. Bibi said R. Joshua b. Levi, “There was the case involving a certain mule belonging to the household of Rabbi that died, and sages measured the blood that flowed out of it to find out whether it was a quarter-log in volume, which, when congealed, is equal to an olive’s bulk and imparts uncleanness as does the carcass itself.”

### **LXXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:4J**

**A. THEY DO NOT VOLUNTEER AS A FREEWILL OFFERING A SINGLE LOG OF WINE, TWO, OR FIVE. BUT THEY VOLUNTEER AS A FREEWILL OFFERING THREE, FOUR, OR SIX, AND ANY NUMBER MORE THAN SIX.**

FREE-STANDING EXERCISE, UTILIZING THE STATEMENT OF THE MISHNAH FOR  
AN INDEPENDENT PURPOSE

1. I:1: The question was raised: Is there a fixed volume required for drink offerings is what one presents in volume divisible, or is there no fixed volume for drink offerings? Where a certain quantity of wine is offered, is it to be regarded as one whole so that it must be offered together as one drink offering, or may it be divided up and some taken for one offering and the remainder applied in any manner available for it?

**LXXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 12:5**

**A. “THEY VOLUNTEER WINE ALONE, UNACCOMPANIED BY ANY ANIMAL OFFERING AS A FREEWILL OFFERING, BUT THEY DO NOT VOLUNTEER OIL AS A FREEWILL OFFERING,” THE WORDS OF R. AQIBA. R. TARFON SAYS, “THEY VOLUNTEER ALSO OIL AS A FREEWILL OFFERING.” SAID R. TARFON, “JUST AS WE FIND IN THE CASE OF WINE THAT IT IS BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION, AND IT ALSO IS BROUGHT AS A FREEWILL OFFERING, SO IN THE CASE OF OIL, IT IS BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF AN OBLIGATION, AND IT ALSO IS BROUGHT AS A FREEWILL OFFERING.” SAID TO HIM R. AQIBA, “NO. IF YOU HAVE SO STATED THE RULE IN CONNECTION WITH WINE, IT IS BECAUSE IT IS OFFERED IN FULFILLMENT OF ONE’S OBLIGATION ENTIRELY BY ITSELF. BUT WILL YOU SAY SO IN CONNECTION WITH OIL, WHICH IS NOT OFFERED IN FULFILLMENT OF ONE’S OBLIGATION ENTIRELY BY ITSELF?”**

1. I:1: Said Raba, “On the basis of both authorities we may derive the conclusion that a person may voluntarily present a meal offering with drink offerings but without a sacrifice every day.”

**B. TWO PEOPLE DO NOT VOLUNTEER AS A FREEWILL OFFERING A SINGLE TENTH. BUT THEY VOLUNTEER AS A SINGLE FREEWILL OFFERING A BURNT OFFERING AND PEACE OFFERINGS, AND IN THE CASE OF FOWL, EVEN A SINGLE BIRD.**

1. II:1: What is the operative consideration? Is it because it is written, ‘brings’ (Lev. 2: 1) in the singular? In respect to the burnt offering, the singular, “brings” occurs (at Lev. 1: 3). And if you say that the reason is that in connection with the burnt offering, the plural you is used, “your burnt offerings” (Num. 29:39), well, with respect to meal offerings, we find the plural you, “and your meal offerings” (Num. 29:39).

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

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



## **XC. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:1-2**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A TENTH,” BRINGS ONE TENTH. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING TENTHS” BRINGS TWO TENTHS.**

1. I:1: so what else is new? What was at stake was the following clause, He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring tenths” brings two tenths. So that’s obvious too! The smallest number of the plural, “tenths,” is two! the meal offering was singled out through the use, in that context, of the word ‘soul’?

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TENTHS BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS SIXTY TENTHS THE MAXIMUM OFFERED BY AN INDIVIDUAL:**

1. II:1: Who is the Tannaite authority behind this ruling?

**C. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING” BRINGS ANY ONE OF THE FIVE KINDS HE WANTS TO. R. JUDAH SAYS, “HE BRINGS A MEAL OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, FOR IT IS THE DISTINCTIVE ONE AMONG ALL TYPES OF MEAL OFFERINGS.”**

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement explaining the position of Judah: Since Scripture commenced with reference to the meal offering of fine flour, that is the principal kind of meal offering.

**D. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL OFFERING” OR “SOME KIND OF MEAL OFFERING” BRINGS ONE OF THE FIVE KINDS.**

1. IV:1: R. Pappa presented this question: “If the man said, ‘Kinds of a meal offering,’ what is the law? Shall I conclude that since the man said, ‘kinds...,’ he has made a statement involved two such offerings, and the term ‘meal offering’ refers to any sort of meal offering, since all of them fall into that classification in line with the verse, ‘and this is the law of the meal offering’ (Lev. 6: 7)? Or perhaps, since the man has said, ‘meal offering,’ he has referred to one meal offering, and then what is the sense of ‘kinds of a meal offering’? This is the sense of what he has said, ‘Of the various kinds of the meal offering, incumbent on me is one meal offering.’”

**E. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING MEAL OFFERINGS” OR “SOME KIND OF MEAL OFFERINGS” BRINGS TWO OF THE FIVE KINDS.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID WHICH KIND BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS ALL FIVE KINDS.**

1. V:1: Who is the Tannaite authority behind this ruling?

a. V:2: Said R. Kahana to R. Ashi, “And lo, there is the consideration of doubt concerning the meal offering that is presented with the drink offerings. Where a person forgot the kind of meal offering he offered, he should also bring the meal offering that accompanies the drink offering as a sixth kind. For lo, said Raba, ‘Every day one may volunteer a meal offering accompanying drink offerings.’”



**F. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID A MEAL OFFERING OF TENTHS, BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS A MEAL OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS. RABBI SAYS, “LET HIM BRING MEAL OFFERINGS OF EVERY NUMBER OF TENTHS FROM ONE TO SIXTY.”**

1. VI:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “He who says, ‘I expressly said a meal offering of tenths and I determined them for a single utensil,’ but I don’t know what number I specified,” must present a meal offering of sixty tenths, “the words of sages. And Rabbi says, “He has to bring a meal offering of tenths from one to sixty, which are one thousand eight hundred and thirty tenths.” “If he said, I specified a certain number of tenths of a certain kind, but I do not know what kind I specified, or what number I specified,’ he has to present five kinds of meal offering, each made up of sixty tenths, that is, three hundred,” the words of sages. And Rabbi says, “He has to bring five kinds of meal offering, and of each kind every number of tenths from one to sixty, all told nine thousand one hundred and fifty tenths  $1830 \times 5$ ” (T. **Men. 12:13A-B, 12:14A-B**).

a. VI:2: What is at issue between them?

### **XCI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:3-4**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING WOOD” SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN TWO BUNDLES OF WOOD.**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “...offering...” (Lev. 2: 1) — this teachings that wood may be presented as a free will offering. And how much must the offering be? Two logs. So too Scripture says, “And we cast lots for the offering of wood” (Neh. 10:35) — Rabbi says, “Since the wood offering is classified as an ‘offering,’ it has to be salted and also brought near the altar at the southwestern corner, like the meal offering.”

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING FRANKINCENSE” SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN A HANDFUL.**

1. II:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring to the altar” presents frankincense, for dedication without explanation to the altar refers to frankincense. If he specified, “I specified an offering for the altar but I do not know what I said,” he has to bring something of everything that is offered entirely upon the altar (T. **Men. 13:3B-C**)

**C. THEY ARE FIVE SORTS OF RULES PERTINENT TO HANDFULS: HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING) FRANKINCENSE” SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN A HANDFUL. HE WHO VOLUNTEERS A FREEWILL OFFERING OF A MEAL OFFERING BRINGS WITH IT A HANDFUL OF FRANKINCENSE. HE WHO OFFERS UP A HANDFUL OUTSIDE IS LIABLE. AND TWO DISHES REQUIRE TWO HANDFULS OF FRANKINCENSE.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING GOLD” FOR THE UPKEEP OF THE TEMPLE SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN A GOLDEN DENAR.**

1. III:1: But perhaps he meant to say, “a bar”?

**D. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING SILVER” SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN A DENAR OF SILVER:**

1. IV:1: But perhaps he meant to say, “a bar”?

**E. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING COPPER” SHOULD NOT BRING LESS THAN THE VALUE OF A SILVER MA’AH. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID HOW MUCH I SHOULD GIVE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” MUST BRING UNTIL HE WILL STATE, “I DID NOT INTEND THAT MUCH.”**

1. V:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “He must present nothing less than a small copper hook.”

2. V:2: He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring iron:” It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Others say, “He must present no less than a ‘scarecrow to keep off ravens.”

## **XCII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:5**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING WINE” MUST NOT BRING LESS THAN THREE LOGS THOSE FOR THE DRINK OFFERINGS OF A LAMB, THE SMALLEST VOLUME:**

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Home born” (Num. 15:13) — this teaches that one may present wine as a votive offering.

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING OIL” MUST NOT BRING LESS THAN A LOG THE SMALLEST VOLUME, THAT FOR A TENTH OF FLOUR. RABBI SAYS, “THREE LOGS.”**

1. II:1: What is at issue between them?

**C. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID HOW MUCH I SHOULD GIVE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS IN ACCORD WITH WHAT IS BROUGHT ON THE DAY OF THE MOST ABUNDANT OFFERING OF WINE OR OIL WHICH IS THE FIRST DAY OF TABERNACLES WHEN IT COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH.**

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: it must be an offering equivalent to that of the first day of the Festival of Tabernacles that coincides with the Sabbath thirteen bullocks, two rams, eighteen lambs, six logs of oil per bullock, four per ram, three per lamb, so too for oil, 140 in all

## **XCIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:6-8**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A BURNT OFFERING” BRINGS A LAMB THE SMALLEST ACCEPTABLE BURNT OFFERING. R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAYS, “OR A TURTLEDOVE, OR A PIGEON A FOWL ALSO IS ACCEPTABLE AS A BURNT OFFERING.”**

1. I:1: They really do not differ, for each makes his ruling in accord with local custom as he knows it.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering for a sela for the altar” should present a lamb.” For you have nothing that is offered on the altar that is worth only a sela except for a lamb.

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID THAT I SHOULD OFFER A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS A BULLOCK AND A CALF.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID THAT I SHOULD OFFER A BEAST OF THE CATTLE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” MUST BRING A BULLOCK, A CALF, A RAM, A GOAT, AND A LAMB. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID WHAT I SHOULD OFFER BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” 107B ADDS TO THEM A TURTLEDOVE AND A PIGEON, HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A THANK OFFERING AND PEACE OFFERINGS” BRINGS A LAMB. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID THAT I SHOULD BRING A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS A BULLOCK, A HEIFER, A YOUNG BULLOCK, AND A YOUNG HEIFER. HE WHO SAYS, “I EXPRESSLY SAID THAT I SHOULD BRING A BEAST OF CATTLE, BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID” BRINGS A BULLOCK, A HEIFER, A YOUNG BULLOCK, A YOUNG HEIFER, A RAM, A EWE, A LAMB, A SHE-LAMB, A GOAT, A SHE-GOAT, A YOUNG RAM, AND A EWE-LAMB. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING AN OX” BRINGS IT AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF A MANEH. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A YOUNG BULLOCK” BRINGS IT AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS, TO THE VALUE OF FIVE SELAS. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A RAM” BRINGS IT AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF TWO SELAS. “... A LAMB” BRINGS IT AND ITS DRINK OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF A SELA. “... AN OX TO THE VALUE OF A MANEH” BRINGS ONE AT THE VALUE OF A MANEH, EXCLUSIVE OF THE VALUE OF ITS DRINK OFFERINGS. “... A YOUNG BULLOCK TO THE VALUE OF FIVE SELAS” BRINGS ONE OF THE VALUE OF FIVE SELAS, EXCLUSIVE OF THE VALUE OF ITS DRINK OFFERINGS. “... A RAM AT THE VALUE OF TWO SELAS” BRINGS ONE FOR TWO SELAS EXCLUSIVE OF THE VALUE OF ITS DRINK OFFERINGS. “... A LAMB AT THE VALUE OF A SELA” BRINGS ONE AT THE VALUE OF A SELA, EXCLUSIVE OF THE VALUE OF ITS DRINK OFFERINGS. “... AN OX AT THE VALUE OF A MANEH,” AND HE BROUGHT TWO FOR A MANEH HAS NOT CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION, EVEN IF THIS ONE IS WORTH A MANEH LESS A DENAR, AND THE OTHER ONE IS WORTH A MANEH LESS A DENAR “... A BLACK ONE” AND HE BROUGHT A WHITE ONE, “A WHITE ONE” AND HE BROUGHT A BLACK ONE, HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION. “... A SMALL ONE” AND HE BROUGHT A LARGE ONE — HE HAS CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION. RABBI SAYS, “HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION.”**

1. II:1: Why? Let him produce a bull, for anyhow, that ought to carry out his obligation which is the largest of any that he might have promised?

2. II:2: There we have learned in the Mishnah: Thirteen shofar-shaped chests were in the sanctuary (M. **Sheq. 6:5A**). For what? Said Hezekiah, “The six priestly families. Sages put in the money chests so that they should remain at peace with one another. The money in these chests was for times when the altar was vacant. By taking money from the chest of the group that was officiating that day, the priests were kept from quarreling.

## **XCIV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:9A-F**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “THIS OX IS A BURNT OFFERING,” AND IT BECAME BLEMISHED, IF HE WANTS, HE MAY BRING WITH THE PROCEEDS FOR THE SALE OF THE OX TWO OXEN.**

1. I:1: But have you not stated, “... an ox at the value of a maneh,” and he brought two for a maneh has not carried out his obligation? The case of an ox that had become blemished is different.

**B. HE WHO SAYS, “THESE TWO OXEN ARE A BURNT OFFERING,” AND THEY GOT BLEMISHED, IF HE WANTS, BRINGS WITH THEIR PROCEEDS ONE OX. RABBI PROHIBITS DOING SO.**

1. II:1: How come Rabbi prohibits this arrangement?

2. II:2: The question was raised: if a different species was presented for the original species, what is the law? Where an ox that had been assigned for an offering was blemished, may one present ram s with the money paid for the ox?

3. II:3: But Rabbi prohibits, for one may not mix the meal offerings that accompany the two rams; each has to be presented in its own utensil, so the present offering, with two meal offerings, is different from the original, which required only one. The operative consideration here is that one may not mix the meal offerings. But if it were permitted to mix the meal offerings, then such a procedure would have been permitted.

4. II:4: In the case of animals that are unblemished, if one pledged a calf and presented a bullock, or a lamb and presented a ram, he has carried out his obligation.

**C. HE WHO SAYS, “THIS RAM IS A BURNT OFFERING,” AND IT BECAME BLEMISHED, IF HE WANTS, BRINGS WITH ITS PROCEEDS A LAMB.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “THIS LAMB IS A BURNT OFFERING,” AND IT BECAME BLEMISHED, IF HE WANTS, BRINGS WITH ITS PROCEEDS A RAM. RABBI PROHIBITS DOING SO.**

1. III:1: Said R. Menassaya bar Zebid said Rab, “The ruling that with the proceeds of the blemished ox, one may present two applies only in a case in which he said, ‘This ox will be a burnt offering.’ But if he had said, ‘This ox is incumbent on me as a burnt offering,’ the man has assumed a fixed obligation to present one burnt offering in terms of the vow, one and not two.”

## **XCV. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:9G-L**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “ONE OF MY LAMBS IS DEDICATED, AND “ONE OF MY OXEN IS DEDICATED” — IF HE HAD TWO, THE LARGER OF THEM IS DEDICATED.**

**IF HE HAD THREE, THE MIDDLE-SIZED ONE IS DEDICATED. IF HE SAID, “I EXPRESSLY SAID WHICH ONE I SHOULD GIVE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I EXPRESSLY SAID,” IF HE SAID, “FATHER SAID TO ME WHICH ONE TO GIVE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT HE SAID “ — THE LARGEST AMONG THEM IS DEDICATED.**

1. I:1: It therefore follows that when one sanctifies something, he does so in a generous spirit. And then note what follows: If he had three, the middle-sized one is dedicated. It therefore follows that when one sanctifies something, he does so in a niggardly spirit.

2. I:2: So what should he do?

### **XCVI. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:10A-J**

**A. HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A BURNT OFFERING” OFFERS IT IN THE SANCTUARY. AND IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS, HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION.**

**HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I PLEDGE MYSELF TO BRING A BURNT OFFERING WHICH I SHALL OFFER IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS” OFFERS IT IN THE SANCTUARY. BUT IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS, HE HAS CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, “THIS IS NO BURNT OFFERING.” HE WHO SAYS, “LO, I AM A NAZIRITE” SHAVES IN THE SANCTUARY. AND IF HE SHAVED IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS, HE HAS NOT CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION. IF HE SAID, “LO, I AM A NAZIRITE, AND I SHALL SHAVE THAT IS, BRING THE OFFERINGS ON THE OCCASION OF MY SHAVING IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS” SHAVES IN THE SANCTUARY. BUT IF HE SHAVED IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS, HE HAS CARRIED OUT HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, “THIS IS NO NAZIRITE.”**

1. I:1: How can you say he has carried out his obligation? Lo, all he has done is kill the beast but the actual offering takes place only in Jerusalem!

a. I:2: And R. Yohanan takes the same view as that which R. Hamnuna has said, for said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “If someone said, ‘Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering, which I shall offer in the house of Onias,’ but the man then offered it in the Land of Israel not in the Temple, he has carried out the obligation, though he is subject to the sanction of extirpation for offering an animal outside of the Temple, but the obligation has been met.”

### **XCVII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:10K-O**

**A. THE PRIESTS WHO SERVED IN THE HOUSE OF ONIAS ARE NOT TO SERVE IN THE SANCTUARY IN JERUSALEM:**

1. I:1:Said R. Judah, “A priest who slaughtered an animal in the Temple for idolatry — the offering nonetheless is a sweet savor.” Said R. Isaac bar Abdimi, “What verse of Scripture makes that point? ‘Because they ministered to them before their idols and became a stumbling block of iniquity to the house of Israel; therefore I have lifted up my hand against them, says the Lord God, and they shall bear their iniquity’ (Eze. 44:12), followed by, ‘And they shall not come near to me to minister to me in the priest’s office’ (Eze. 44:13). Thus only if they performed an act of service to idols are they disqualified, but the act of slaughter is not a priestly act of service since non-priests can do it.”

2. I:2: It has been stated: If a priest erred and inadvertently sprinkled the blood in the service of an idol — R. Nahman said, “The offering made in the Temple nonetheless is a sweet savor.” R. Sheshet said, “The offering made in the Temple is not a sweet savor.”

a. I:3: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

4. I:4: If a priest prostrated himself to idolatry — R. Nahman said, “The offering made in the Temple nonetheless is a sweet savor.” R. Sheshet said, “The offering made in the Temple is not a sweet savor.”

5. I:5: If a priest acknowledged the divinity of idolatry — R. Nahman said, “The offering made in the Temple nonetheless is a sweet savor.” R. Sheshet said, “The offering made in the Temple is not a sweet savor.”

a. I:6: Gloss of foregoing. All of these disputes were absolutely required. For had we been given only the first of them sprinkling blood, I might have supposed that it was in that case in particular that R. Sheshet took the position that he did, because there the man had done an act of service, but if he had merely slaughtered a beast, which is not classified as an act of service that only a priest can do, I might have thought that he concurs with the view of R. Nahman.

**B. AND ONE NEED NOT SAY THAT THIS APPLIES TO THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED FOR ANOTHER MATTER IDOLATRY, AS IT IS SAID, “NEVERTHELESS THE PRIESTS OF THE HIGH PLACES CAME NOT UP TO THE ALTAR OF THE LORD IN JERUSALEM, BUT THEY ATE UNLEAVENED BREAD AMONG THEIR BRETHREN” (2KI. 23: 9) — LO, THEY ARE LIKE BLEMISHED PRIESTS, TAKING A SHARE AND EATING IT BUT NOT OFFERING UP SACRIFICES.**

1. II:1: Since the passage states, And one need not say, it must follow that the house of Onias is not classified as a Temple to idolatry. Then in accord with whom is this passage framed? It accords with the position of him who has said that the house of Onias is not classified as a Temple to idolatry.

a. II:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

b. II:3: Building on the dispute set forth at II:1, said Mar Qashisha b. R. Hisda to Abbaye, “On the proposition that the Temple of Onias was idolatrous how does R. Meir interpret the verse of Scripture adduced in evidence by R. Judah ‘In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord’ (Isa. 19:19)?” The reference to Isa. 19:18ff. accounts for the inclusion of what follows.

**C. IN THAT DAY SHALL THERE BE AN ALTAR TO THE LORD IN THE MIDST OF THE LAND OF EGYPT AND A PILLAR AT THE BORDER THEREOF TO THE LORD**

a. II:4: “One shall be called the city of Heres”: (Isa. 19:18): What is the meaning of “city of Heres”?

b. II:5: “Bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth” (Isa. 43: 6): “Bring my sons from far:” Said R. Huna, “This refers to the exiles who dwell in Babylonia, who live in tranquility like sons.”

“and my daughters from the ends of the earth.’ This refers to the exiles who dwell in other countries, who, like daughters, do not live in tranquility.”

c. II:6: Said R. Abba bar R. Isaac said R. Hisda, and some say, said R. Judah said Rab, “From Tyre to Carthage people are entirely familiar with Israel and their father who is in heaven. From Tyre to the read: east, and from Carthage and read: west, the nations are not at all familiar with Israel and their father who is in heaven.”

d. II:7: “And in every place offerings are burned and presented to my name” (Mal. 1:11): Do you really think that this is in every place!

e. II:8: A song of ascents: behold, bless you the Lord, all you servants of the Lord, who stand in the house of the Lord in the night seasons” (Psa. 134: 1): What is the meaning of “in the night seasons”?

f. II:9: “This is an ordinance for ever to Israel” (2Ch. 2: 3): Said R. Giddal said Rab, “This refers to the altar that has been built, where Michael, the lead angelic prince, is standing and presented thereon an offering.”

g. II:10: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “That is the meaning of the verse, ‘This is the Torah for the burnt offering, meal offering, sin offering, and guilt offering’ (Lev. 7:37)? Whoever is engaged in Torah-study is as though he offered a burnt offering, meal offering, sin offering, and guilt offering.”

h. II:11: Said Raba, “Why does the verse say, ‘for the burnt offering, for the meal offering,’ when it could as well have said, a burnt offering, a meal offering’?”

i. II:12: Said R. Isaac, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘This is the Torah of the sin offering’ (Lev. 7:16), ‘This is the Torah of the guilt offering’ (Lev. 7: 1)? Whoever engages in the study of the Torah of the sin offering is as though he had offered a sin offering, and whoever engages in the study of the Torah of the guilt offering is as though he had offered a guilt offering.”

## **XCVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Menahot 13:11**

**A . IT IS SAID OF THE BURNT OFFERING OF A BEAST, “AN OFFERING BY FIRE, A SMELL OF SWEET SAVOR” (LEV. 1: 9) AND OF THE BIRD OFFERING, “AN OFFERING BY FIRE, A SMELL OF SWEET SAVOR” (LEV. 1:17) AND EVEN OF THE MEAL OFFERING, “AN OFFERING BY FIRE, A SMELL OF SWEET SAVOR” (LEV. 2: 9) — TO TEACH THAT ALL THE SAME ARE THE ONE WHO OFFERS MUCH AND THE ONE WHO OFFERS LITTLE, ON CONDITION THAT A MAN WILL DIRECT HIS INTENTION TO HEAVEN.**

1. I:1: Said R. Zira, “What is the scriptural verse that serves? ‘Sweet is the sleep of a laboring man, whether he eats a lot or a little’ (Qoh. 5:11).”

2. I:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Simeon b. Azzai, “Come and take note of what is written in the passage that deals with sacrifices: neither the name of God that is el nor the name of God that is elohim but only the Lord.

This is so as not to give contentious folk an occasion to rebel....Now might you say, 'Then it is because God needs the food,' Scripture states, 'If I were hungry, I would not tell you, for the world is mine and the fulness thereof' (Psa. 50:12); 'For every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills; I know all the fowl of the mountains and wild beasts of the field are mine; do I eat the meat of bulls or drink the blood of goats' (Psa. 50:10, 11, 13). I did not order you to make sacrifices so you might say, 'I will do what he wants so he will do what I wants.' You do not make sacrifices for my sake but for your sake: 'you shall sacrifice at your own volition' (Lev. 19: 5)."

**3.** I:3: Another reading of "...you shall sacrifice at your own volition" (Lev. 19: 5): "Sacrifice at your own volition! Slaughter at your own volition!"



## **Points of Structure**

### **1. DOES BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE MENAHOT FOLLOW A COHERENT OUTLINE GOVERNED BY A CONSISTENT RULES?**

Without the Mishnah-tractate before us, we could not account for the order or arrangement of a single composite; with the Mishnah-tractate in hand, we know why a passage takes precedence over another and how the compilers of the whole did their work.

### **2. WHAT ARE THE SALIENT TRAITS OF ITS STRUCTURE?**

A simple order governs throughout, with comments on the Mishnah-paragraph's propositions — language, sources, authority — coming first, then analysis of more theoretical problems, commonly precipitated by the substance of the Mishnah's proposition, to follow.

### **3. WHAT IS THE RATIONALITY OF THE STRUCTURE?**

The compelling logic of coherence derives from the initial decision to assign to the Mishnah priority in all things. Once the Mishnah's order, sequence, and treatment of the subject matter of meal offerings have been assigned the privileged position, all else follows. Without that decision, a considerable range of choices about the formation and organization of received materials, whether legal, exegetical of Scripture, or exegetical of legal formulations of rules (deriving from whatever source), can have been pursued. Nothing in the topic treated in this tractate (and in no other tractate in a sustained and systematic manner) dictated the order and sequence by which sub-divisions are identified and spelled out; but once the Mishnah-tractate's treatment of the topic, in its own words, had been privileged, then this tractate had to take the form — order of subjects, problematic of hermeneutics — that it does, and no other form was possible.

### **4. WHERE ARE THE POINTS OF IRRATIONALITY IN THE STRUCTURE?**

It follows that the sizable composites that coalesce around some other point of structure and order than the requirement of Mishnah-exegesis diverge from the document's rationality. These are given below.

## Points of System

### **1. DOES THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE MENAHOT SERVE ONLY AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME?**

Because some Mishnah-paragraphs, e.g., IV.A, L.B, with their talmud for some other purpose than that dictated by the Mishnah-passage, are ignored in the Talmud's exegesis, we must give a partially negative answer, and, further, because important composites are framed for a purpose other than that of Mishnah-exegesis, we must complement that negative answer with another. So while in structure, order, and generative hermeneutics, the Bavli-tractate is a Mishnah-commentary and nearly the whole of the document's definitive characteristics find their source and explanation in that fact, still, even within the premise of a privileged Mishnah, still the tractate cannot be classified as "merely" a commentary to the Mishnah. But nothing in the a-symmetric composites listed in the next unit tells us what else, besides a commentary, the framers may have have in mind.

### **2. HOW DO THE TOPICAL COMPOSITES FIT INTO THE TALMUD-TRACTATE MENAHOT AND WHAT DO THEY CONTRIBUTE THAT THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME WOULD LACK WITHOUT THEM?**

At the right hand margin I list the items that form mere compilations of information on a topic; these contribute nothing to the design and structure of the tractate. At the left are the items that bear an autonomous and independent, consequential message.

I.B: Testing the Proposition: a wrongful intention that is not obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as an intention that can invalidate an offering, but one that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating the offering

I.E: The Status of the meal offering of the first sheaf of barley grain, the handful of which one took with the intention of making the offering for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated

I:F: Other Offerings that are improper but may nonetheless be acceptable:  
The Status of the Terefah-Beast

II:C: Rules on taking the handful: 1. from a utensil that is lying on the ground;  
2 Mixing the Meal with Oil

XIII:C: Any passage in which the words 'Torah' and 'statute' occur in regard to any rite, the meaning is only to signify that that matter is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite

XXI:A: Topical Appendix on the Lampstand and Candlestick

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

XXI:F: Topical Appendix: The Tefillin.

Rules and Regulations in General

XXII:B: Topical Appendix on the Show-Fringes

XXXLVIII:C: How to determine the meanings of  
unfamiliar words: testimony of native speakers

XLIII:B: Composite of Other Theoretical Questions on the Status of Grain,  
formed mainly around the name of Rami bar Hama,  
and Subordinate Questions Secondary to His

LXXX:D: Topical Appendix on the Size  
of the Cubit Measured in Handbreadths

LXXX:G: A Disciple of a Sage as a Sanctified Utensil

XCVII:C: In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt  
and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord

### **3. CAN WE STATE WHAT THE COMPILERS OF THIS DOCUMENT PROPOSE TO ACCOMPLISH IN PRODUCING THIS COMPLETE, ORGANIZED PIECE OF WRITING?**

The number and proportions of the items that contribute more than relevant but inchoate information prove negligible, when compared to the dimensions of the tractate overall; all the more so when compared to the sizable number and substantial dimensions of the informational-composites catalogued at the right. True, the point of emphasis, the governing status of intentionality, captures our attention. But how will the framer of the Mishnah-tractate itself have responded, if not with recognition and satisfaction? For our tractate and its companion, Zebahim, form massive exercises on the theme of intentionality and the cult. The other consequential composites review routine themes for the Talmud, the comparison of the disciple of a sage to a sanctified utensil, a poetic idea that the tractate surely sustains with ease, and the generalized messianic sentiments tacked on at the end. The upshot is simple. The compilers of the document determined to privilege the Mishnah, and everything they did — everything! — comes in consequence of that decision. Negatively stated, they did nothing that vastly changed the character of the Mishnah or imparted to it propositions or even implications that it did not possess prior to the Talmud-compilers' labors. Yet that obvious result of this sustained labor equally obviously contradicts the simple fact that, when we study the Mishnah in the setting provided for it by the Talmud, the Mishnah emerges vastly re-presented indeed. So everything comes down to one thing, and that is, the intellectual context in which the privileging of the Mishnah takes place, the premises that governed, and, above all, the implicit critique that the work conveyed.