

# XIII

---

## BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER THIRTEEN

FOLIOS 104B-110A

13:1-2

13:1

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a tenth,” brings one [tenth].
- B. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] tenths” brings two [tenths].
- C. [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 (M. 12: 4)].
- D. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a meal offering” brings any one [of the five kinds] he wants to.
- E. R. Judah says, “He brings a meal offering of fine flour, for it is the distinctive one among [all types of] meal offerings.”

13:2

- A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] a meal offering” [or] “some kind of meal offering” brings one [of the five kinds].
- B. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] meal offerings” [or] “some kind of meal offerings” brings two [of the five kinds].
- C. [He who says,] “I expressly said [which kind] but I do not know what I expressly said” brings all five kinds.
- D. [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.
- E. Rabbi says, “Let him bring meal offerings of [every number] of tenths from one to sixty.”

- I.1** A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a tenth,” brings one tenth:] *so what else is new?*
- B. *What was at stake was the following clause, He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring tenths” brings two tenths.*
- C. *So that’s obvious too! The smallest number of the plural, “tenths,” is two!*

- D. *It was necessary to make that statement so as to reach the following clause: [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.*

**II.1. A. [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:**

- B. *Who is the Tannaite authority behind this ruling?*
- C. *Said Hezekiah, “It does not accord with Rabbi, for were it Rabbi, has he not said, [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.”*
- D. *And R. Yohanan said, “You may even maintain that it represents the view of Rabbi. It would then refer to a case in which the man said, ‘I specified a particular number of tenths, but I did not assign them for a single utensil,’ in which case he must present sixty tenths in sixty utensils.”*

**III.1 A. [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:”**

- B. *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].*
- C. *Then what about the following: he who says, “Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering” should be required to present it out of the herd, a bullock, since the Scripture commenced [105A] with that sort of burnt offering [even though a bullock is not the correct animal to present as a burnt offering]!*
- D. *And if he said, “of the flock,” he should have to present a lamb [not a goat], since Scripture commenced with reference to that.*
- E. *And if he said, “of birds,” he should have to present turtle doves, since Scripture commenced with reference to that.*
- F. *So then how come we have learned in the Mishnah: [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] [M. 13:6], and R. Judah did not take a contrary position in that case!*
- G. *Rather, it is the principal meal offering because it has no further qualifying language in its name [Cashdan: the meal offering of fine flour is always referred to as “the meal offering” while the others have qualifying language attached].*
- H. *But the Tannaite statement has explained: Since Scripture commenced with reference to the meal offering of fine flour, [that is the principal kind of meal offering].*
- I. *This is the sense of that statement: Which one is the principal kind of meal offering, so that it has no further qualifying language associated with it? It is the one with which Scripture commenced reference.*
- J. *So that’s pretty straight-forward, since R. Judah explicitly spoke of a meal offering of fine flour!*

- K. *True enough, but that was only for mnemonic purposes [to remember that the principal meal offering is the one he specified (Cashdan)].*

**IV.1 A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] a meal offering” [or] “some kind of meal offering” brings one [of the five kinds].**

- B. *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.’”*
- C. *Come and take note: [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] a meal offering” [or] “some kind of meal offering” brings one [of the five kinds]. Then if he had said, “kinds of meal offering,” he would have had to bring two.*
- D. *Then note the conclusion of the same passage: [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] meal offerings” [or] “some kind of meal offerings” brings two [of the five kinds]. Then if he had said, “kinds of meal offering,” he would present only one.*
- E. *Then from this evidence there is no drawing of any conclusion.*
- F. *Come and take note: He who says, “I take upon myself to bring a kind of meal offerings,” must bring two meal offerings of the same kind [T. Men. 12:11B]. Then if he had said, “kinds of meal offering,” he would present only one.*
- G. *But perhaps the implication is that if he had said “kinds of meal offering” he has to bring two meal offerings of two kinds?*
- H. *But has a Tannaite statement formulated matters in this way: “He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to present some kind of meal offerings” brings two meal offerings of a single kind. If he said, “I pledge myself to bring kinds of meal offerings, he has to present two meal offerings of two kinds [cf. T. Men. 12:11B]? Then it follows that if he said, “kinds of meal offering,” he would present only one!*
- I. *But perhaps who is the authority before us? It is R. Simeon, who has said, “One may present the offering half in cakes and half in wafers” The refers to “kinds of meal offering” then is to a meal offering that may be of two such kinds. In the view of rabbis, who held that one may not present a meal offering half in cakes and half in wafers, he would have to present two meal offerings of two kinds.*

**V.1 A. [He who says,] “I expressly said [which kind] but I do not know what I expressly said” brings all five kinds:**

- B. *Who is the Tannaite authority behind this ruling?*
- C. *Said R. Jeremiah, “It is not in accord with R. Simeon, for R. Simeon held the position that he may present the offering half in cakes and half in wafers, and even though we adopt the theory of R. Judah that all meal offerings would consist of ten cakes each, still he would have to present fourteen meal offerings by reason of*

*doubt.*” [Cashdan: for he would have to bring the eleven possible variations of the baked meal offering, that is, ten cakes and no wafers, nine and one, eight and two, and onward, plus the other three kinds of meal offering, fourteen in all.]

- D. *Abbayye said, “You may even maintain that this statement represents the position of R. Simeon. For we indeed have heard that R. Simeon has ruled that one may present a meal offering subject to his own stipulations”* [Cashdan: and therefore in the case of our Mishnah he would only have to bring one baked meal offering of ten cakes and one of ten wafers and declare, “If I had specified to bring it all in cakes or all in wafers, then let the cakes or the wafers be offered in fulfillment of my vow, and the others be a freewill offering, and if I had specified to bring it partly in cakes and partly in wafers, then let that number of each kind that I had specified by offered in fulfillment of my vow and the rest be offered as a free will offering”]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [In the case of a Nazirite who was not sure whether or not he had contracted uncleanness and whether or not he was still a confirmed victim of the skin ailment, who may eat Holy Things after sixty days,] R. Simeon says, ‘On the next day he presents his guilt offering and its log of oil with it and sets them up at Nicanor’s gate and makes the following declaration concerning them: [105B] “If I am a victim of the skin ailment, lo, this is my guilt offering, and if not lo, this is a peace offering given as a free will offering.” This guilt offering then is slaughtered on the north side of the altar, and its blood is to be placed on the thumbs and big toes of the man, and it requires laying on of hands and drink offerings and the waving of the breast and thigh, and it is eaten by the male priests’ [T. Nez. 6:1W-Y].”*
- E. *Now even though a master in the tractate that deals with slaughtering Holy Things [=tractate Zebahim] explained, R. Simeon permitted someone to present an offering and make stipulations about it, to begin with that is only in a case in which there is no other way of making the man fit, but in other cases, that procedure is permitted only after the fact but not de novo,” that distinction in any event pertains to peace offerings. For then the effect of the conditions is to reduce the time available for eating the meat, and so Holy Things are invalidated before the proper time. But in the case of meal offerings, he would permit such a procedure even to begin with and not only after the fact.*
- F. *Said R. Pappa to Abbayye, “But in the view of R. Simeon, who has said, ‘He may present it half in cakes and half in wafers,’ the man turns out to present one tenth out of two tenths and one log of oil out of two.”* [Cashdan: for if this man’s original vow was to present a specified number of cakes and of wafers, his obligation would be fulfilled only by combining the required number of cakes from the meal offering of ten cakes with the required number of wafers from the meal offering of ten wafers, and as each meal offering consisted of one tenth of flour and one log of oil, he would thus be making up one offering from two offerings, and this is not allowed.]
- G. *[He said to him,] “We have in point of fact heard that R. Simeon holds, ‘If one presented one tenth out of two tenths and one log of oil out of two, he has carried out his obligation.”* [Cashdan: if someone was supposed to present a tenth of flour and a log of oil as a meal offering and presented two tenths in separate

utensils and two logs likewise and took half from one and half from the other, he has carried out his obligation].

- H. *Then how does he take out the handful* [Cashdan: from a meal offering made up partly of cakes and partly of wafers, since the cakes and wafers are distinct meal offerings]?
- I. *He makes the following stipulation: "If I specified a meal offering of cakes alone or of wafers alone, then the handful I have taken from the cakes covers the cakes and the handful from the wafers covers the wafers. If I stipulated a meal offering that would be half in cakes and half in wafers, then the handful I have taken from the cakes covers half for the cakes and half for the wafers, and the handful I have taken from the wafers covers half for the cakes and half for the wafers."*
- J. *But lo, the man has to take one handful from the cakes and wafers mixed together* [Cashdan: where the meal offering consists partly of cakes and partly of wafers, the two kinds must be broken into pieces and mixed together, and the handful taken from the mixture], **[106A]** *while here, he takes the handful from the cakes for the wafers and from the wafers for the cakes!*
- K. *But we have indeed heard that R. Simeon takes the position, "If one took a handful and in his hand came up only one of the two kinds, he has carried out his obligation."*
- L. But still, there is the consideration of the residue of the oil. If the man had originally stipulated a meal offering half in cakes and half in wafers, the residue would be put into the cakes, and if he stipulated a meal offering of wafers, the residue would be eaten up by the priests!
- M. *He accords with the position of R. Simeon b. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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."*
- V.2.** A. *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. [Cashdan: 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.'"*
- B. *Subject to doubt is only a meal offering presented by an individual, but not the meal offering accompanying drink offerings that is presented by the community.*
- C. *Subject to doubt is only a meal offering that is brought on its own account, but not one that is presented along with an animal offering.*
- D. *Subject to doubt is only the meal offering that requires frankincense but not one that does not require frankincense.*
- E. *Subject to doubt is only one that requires only a single log of oil, but not one that requires three.*
- F. the meal offering from which a handful is taken but not one from which a handful is not taken.

**VI.1** A. [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:"

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **“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.**
- D. **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.”**
- E. **“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.**
- F. **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 x 5]” [T. **Men. 12:13A-B, 12:14A-B**].**

**VI.2.** A. *What is at issue between them?*

- B. *Said R. Hisda, “At issue is whether or not it is permitted to bring unconsecrated things into the Temple courtyard. Rabbi takes the position that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated things into the Temple courtyard. [Cashdan: therefore the man cannot bring sixty tenths in one utensil and declare that the quantity corresponding to the amount he specified shall be in fulfillment of his vow and the rest remain unconsecrated, since it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the courtyard; he cannot say the rest will be a free will offering, since it is forbidden to mix the offering of obligation with a free will offering. The only solution then is to bring in sixty utensils meal offerings of every number of tenths from one to sixty and declare that the utensil that contains the quantity he specified fulfils his vow and all the rest are free will offerings]. Rabbis take the position that it is permitted to bring unconsecrated things into the Temple courtyard. [Cashdan: he therefore brings sixty tenths in one utensil and declares that what is over and above the amount specified shall be a free will offering.]”*
- C. *Raba said, “All parties concur that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated things into the Temple courtyard. But here what is at issue is whether or not it is permitted to mix an offering that is obligatory with one that is votive. Sages maintain that it is permitted to mix an obligatory and a votive offering, and Rabbi says that it is forbidden.”*
- D. *Said Abbaye to Raba, “From the perspective of rabbis, who have said that it is permitted to mix an obligatory and a votive offering, then should we not have to take out two handfuls [Cashdan: one for the offering of obligation, one for the free will offering]?”*
- E. *The priest takes one handful and then goes and takes another handful.*
- F. *In that case, he is taking a handful from the meal offering that is obligatory for the votive one, and from the votive meal offering for the obligatory one.*
- G. *The donor leaves it up to the intentionality of the priest, saying “What the priest’s handful encompasses the first go around will be the handful for the obligatory offering, and what his hand takes up a second time will be the one for the votive offering.”*
- H. *Then how are the handfuls to be burned?*



- I. *Should he burn the handful of the votive offering first? Then how can he afterward burn the handful of the obligatory one, perhaps the whole meal offering was obligatory, so the remainder has diminished between the taking of the first handful, the one for the obligatory offering, and the taking of the second, the one for the free will offering having already been burned, and a master has said, "If the residue diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning of the handful, the handful may not be burned in behalf of it."*
- J. *And if he burns the handful of the obligatory offering first, how can he afterward burn the handful of the free will offering? [106B] Perhaps the whole of the meal offering was obligatory, and any offering, a portion of which has been put on the fire, is subject to the prohibition, "you shall not burn" (Lev. 2:11) [Cashdan: once the prescribed portion of an offering has been duly offered on the altar, the rest of the offering may not be burned on the altar. How may the second handful be burned on the altar?]*
- K. *Said R. Judah b. R. Simeon b. Pazzi, "It is burned for the purpose of serving as wood, and that is in line with the position of R. Eliezer. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, "For a sweet savor" (Lev. 2:12) you may not take it up on the altar, but you may take it up for fuel.""*
- L. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "But perhaps everybody takes the position that it is permitted to mix a meal offering that is obligatory with one that is votive. But here what is at issue is the position of R. Eliezer itself, with rabbis taking the view that R. Eliezer is right, and R. rejecting the position of R. Eliezer?" [Cashdan: sages in line with Eliezer maintain that the sixty tenths are brought in one utensil, and when the second handful is to be burned, the priest says, "If this utensil also contains a free will offering, then this handful is rightly being burned on its behalf, but if the contents are entirely a meal offering that is obligatory, then the handful is burned as wood and not as an offering. In Rabbis' view, the man cannot bring sixty tenths in one utensil, since he could not burn the second handful.]*
- M. *He said to him, "Well, if one could take the view that, in Rabbi's opinion, it is permitted to mix an obligatory and a votive offering, and also Rabbi does not concur with R. Eliezer, then he could bring sixty tenths in one utensil and one in another, bring the two into contact, and take the handful from each." [Cashdan: he would first take the handful from the larger utensil, containing the sixty tenths, and declare, "If I specified all these tenths for my meal offering, then this is the handful for it, but if not, let this handful serve for the number of tenths specified for my meal offering." Then he would take the handful from the smaller utensil, with the single tenth, and declare that it shall service for the free will meal offering of the smaller utensil and also for the remaining tenths of the first utensil, and this would be quite in order, since the two utensils are in contact. As this solution is not put forward by Rabbi, he must hold that it is forbidden to mix in one utensil an obligatory and a votive meal offering.]*
- N. *Raba said, "Well, as a matter of fact, all parties hold that it is permitted to mix an obligatory and a votive meal offering. And all parties furthermore concur in the position of R. Eliezer. But here, what is at issue is the dispute between R. Eliezer b. Jacob and rabbis. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **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)” [M. Men. 10:3E-F]. *Sages accord with rabbis, who take the view that sixty logs are required for sixty tenths, one for each. Rabbi concurs with R. Eliezer b. Jacob who says that only one log is required. Therefore [if sixty logs are brought in one utensil] we do not know whether to treat the sixty tenths as one meal offering for which one log is enough or as two for which two are required.*”

- O. *R. Ashi said, “What is at issue between them is the case of one who vowed to bring a small beast but presented a big one. Sages take the view that if one who vowed a small beast presented a big one, he has carried out his obligation [so too, if he presented more tenths than he vowed (Cashdan)], and Rabbi maintains that he has not carried out his obligation.”*
- P. *But haven’t they already had that argument? For we have learned in the Mishnah: “... a small one” and he brought a large one — he has carried out his obligation. Rabbi says, “He has not carried out his obligation” [M. Men. 13:8M-O].*
- Q. *Well, it was necessary to set forth disputes on both questions, each in its own terms. For if the dispute had been expressed in the present case alone, I might have supposed that only in the present case do sages take the position that by bringing a larger offering, he has carried out his obligation, since, one way or the other, only one handful is presented, but in the other case, since there are greater sacrificial portions in the larger beast, I might have supposed that they concur with Rabbi that the man has not fulfilled his obligation. And if the dispute was expressed only in that other regard, I might have supposed that only there does Rabbi take the view that he has not fulfilled his obligation, on the grounds that the sacrificial portions are greater, but in this case I might suppose that he would concur with sages. So it was necessary to set forth disputes on both matters, each in its own terms.*

### 13:3-4

#### 13:3

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] wood” should not [bring] less than two bundles of wood.
- B. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] frankincense” should not [bring] less than a handful.
- C. They are five sorts of [rules pertinent to] handfuls:
- D. (1) He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] frankincense” should not [bring] less than a handful.
- E. (2) He who volunteers a freewill offering of a meal offering brings with it a handful of frankincense.
- F. (3) He who offers up a handful outside is liable.
- G. (4-5) And two dishes require two handfuls [of frankincense].

#### 13:4

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] gold” [for the upkeep of the Temple] should not [bring] less than a golden denar.



- B. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] silver” should not [bring] less than a denar of silver.
- C. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] copper” should not bring] less than [the value of] a silver ma’ah.
- D. [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.”

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

- B. “...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.
- C. So too Scripture says, “And we cast lots for the offering of wood” (Neh. 10:35)  
—
- D. Rabbi says, “Since the wood offering is classified as an ‘offering,’ it has to be salted and also brought near the altar [at the southwestern corner, like the meal offering (Cashdan)].”
- E. And said Raba, “In the opinion of Rabbi, it is required also to take a handful out of the wood offering as well.”
- F. And said R. Pappa, “In the opinion of Rabbi, an offering of wood requires another offering of wood as well [namely, wood from the Temple store is required to burn wood of a wood offering].”

**II.1** A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] frankincense” should not [bring] less than a handful:

- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?*
- C. Because it is written, “And he shall take therefrom his handful of fine flour of the meal offering and of the oil thereof and all the frankincense” (Lev. 6: 8).
- D. *Frankincense is compared with taking up the meal offering. Just as taking up the meal offering involves removing a handful, so presenting the frankincense requires the removal of a handful.*

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

- B. **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] [which is frank incense, a burnt offering of cattle, a burnt offering of birds, a wine offering, and a meal offering presented with drink offerings, for these are all offered entirely on the altar (Cashdan)].**
- C. *But is there nothing more? Lo, there is the burnt offering!*
- D. *There is its hide, which is assigned to the priests.*
- E. *And lo, there is the case of the burnt offering of a bird!*
- F. **[107A] *Its crop and feathers are not offered, so here is an offering that is not wholly burned up on the altar.***
- G. *Lo, there is the matter of drinking offerings!*

- H. *These flow down into the pits.*
- I. *And what about the meal offering presented with drink offerings?*
- J. *Since there is the ordinary meal offering eaten by the priests, it is not a type of offering that can be definitely said to be wholly for the altar.*

**III.1** A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] gold” [for the upkeep of the Temple] should not [bring] less than a golden denar.

- B. *But perhaps he meant to say, “a bar”?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “We deal with a case in which he said ‘gold coin.’”*
- D. *So perhaps he meant to say small gold coins?*
- E. *Said R. Pappa, “Small change in gold people don’t make.”*

**IV.1** A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] silver” should not [bring] less than a denar of silver.

- B. *But perhaps he meant to say, “a bar”?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “We deal with a case in which he said ‘silver coin.’”*
- D. *So perhaps he meant to say small coins?*
- E. *Said R. Sheshet, “Where he was, small silver coin did not circulate.”*

**V.1** A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] copper” should not bring] less than [the value of] a silver ma’ah:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “He must present nothing less than a small copper hook.”
- D. *What good is that?*
- E. *Said Abbaye, “With it one could trim wicks and clean lamps.”*

**V.2.** A. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] iron.”

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Others say, “He must present no less than a ‘scarecrow [to keep off ravens].”
- D. *And how much is required?*
- E. *Said R. Joseph, “A cubit square.”*
- F. *Some say, “He must present not less than a cubit square of iron.”*
- G. *What good is that?*
- H. *Said R. Joseph, “For a scarecrow.”*

### 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].
- 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].
- C. Rabbi says, “Three logs [as at A].”
- D. [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].

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

- B. “Home born” (Num. 15:13) — this teaches that one may present wine as a votive offering.
- C. How much?
- D. Three logs.
- E. How do we know that if he wanted to add more, he may do so?
- F. Scripture says, “...will be....”
- G. Might one say he may give less?
- H. Scripture says, “...thus...”

**II.1 A. [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.”**

- B. *What is at issue between them?*
- C. *Rabbis stated before R. Pappa, “At issue between them is the principle, ‘[Freedman:] judge from it and all from it, or judge from it but place the deduction on its own basis.’ [Freedman: whether an analogy must be carried through on all points, so that the case deduced agrees throughout the the case from which the deduction has started; or whether the deduction won by analogy be regulated by the rules of the original case.] [Freedman, Zebahim:] Rabbis take the view, ‘judge from it and all from it,’ so that, just as a meal offering can be donated on its own, so oil can be donated on its own; ‘and all from it’ means, just as a meal offering requires a log of oil, so here too a log of oil is required; just as in the case of a meal offering a handful is removed and the rest is eaten, so in the case of a donation of oil alone, a handful is removed and the rest is eaten. The other party derives the rule from the analogy of the meal offering [but not in all respects, thus} just as a meal offering can be contributed on its own, so oil is contributed on its own. They however treat the deduction in its own terms: it is comparable to a drink offering of wine, and since a drink offering requires three logs, so oil must be an offering of three logs; as the whole of a drink offering is for basis, so the whole of the oil is for the fires.”*
- D. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, “Now if Rabbi had derived the rule from the case of a meal offering, then all parties would concur that the operative principle is, ‘judge from it and all from it.’ But Rabbi derives the rule from the analogy of the ‘homeborn.’”*
- E. *Said R. Huna b. R. Nathan to R. Pappa, “But can you say this? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “‘a meal offering’ — this teaches that one may make a donation of oil on its own, and how much? It must be three logs.’ Now whom do you know who holds that it must be three logs in volume? It is Rabbi. And yet he deduces the rule from the analogy of the meal offering.”*
- F. *He said to him, “If that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority, then that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority.”*

**III.1 A. [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]:**

- B. *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].

### 13:6-9

#### 13:6

- A. [He who says], “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a burnt offering” brings a lamb [the smallest acceptable burnt offering].
- B. R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, “Or a turtledove, or a pigeon [a fowl also is acceptable as a burnt offering].”
- C. [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.
- D. [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.
- E. [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,

#### 13:7

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a thank offering and peace offerings” brings a lamb.
- B. [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.
- C. [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.

#### 13:8

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] an ox” brings it and its drink offerings to the value of a maneh.
- B. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] a young bullock” brings it and its drink offerings, to the value of five selas.
- C. [He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring] a ram” brings it and its drink offerings to the value of two selas.
- D. “... a lamb” brings it and its drink offerings to the value of a sela.
- E. “... an ox to the value of a maneh” brings one at the value of a maneh, exclusive of the value of its drink offerings.
- F. “... 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.
- G. “... a ram at the value of two selas” brings one for two selas exclusive of the value of its drink offerings.
- H. “... a lamb at the value of a sela” brings one at the value of a sela, exclusive of the value of its drink offerings.

- I. "... 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
- J. "... a black one" and he brought a white one,
- K. "a white one" and he brought a black one,
- L. he has not carried out his obligation.
- M. "... a small one" and he brought a large one —
- N. he has carried out his obligation.
- O. Rabbi says, "He has not carried out his obligation."

**I.1 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:]" *they really do not differ, for each makes his ruling in accord with local custom as he knows it.*

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

- B. "Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering for a sela for the altar" should present a lamb."
- C. For you have nothing that is offered on the altar that is worth only a sela except for a lamb.
- D. "I specified an offering valued at a sela but I do not know what I specified" must present every kind of offering valued at a sela that is offered upon the altar [lamb, meal offering, frank incense].

**II.1 A.** [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:

- B. *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]?*
- C. *The rule stands for the position of Rabbi, who takes the position that if one promised a small animal but presented a big one, he has not carried out his obligation.*
- D. *If it is Rabbi's position, then note what follows: "... 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." Shall we then say that the anonymous formulation of the first and final clauses stand for Rabbi's position, while the middle ones stand for the view of rabbis?*
- E. *Yup, the anonymous formulation of the first and final clauses stand for Rabbi's position, while the middle ones stand for the view of rabbis! The Tannaite framer of the passage wanted to make the point that the ruling in the opening part is as a matter of fact subject to dispute between Rabbi and rabbis.*

- II.2.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: Thirteen shofar-shaped chests were in the sanctuary [M. Sheq. 6:5A].* For what?
- B. Said Hezekiah, “For 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.]”
- C. R. Yohanan said, “On account of the abundance of offerings, sages put in the money chests, so that the money would not get mouldy.”
- D. Zeiri said, “They were to cover offerings of a bull, calf, ram, lamb, kid, and goat.”
- E. *This is in accord with the position of Rabbi, who takes the position that if one promised a small animal but presented a big one, he has not carried out his obligation.*
- F. And Bar Peda said, “It served for bullocks, rams, [108A] lambs, goats, surplus funds, and the *ma’ah*.”
- G. *The other sages do not concur with Hezekiah’s explanation, since there is no reason to expect fighting among the priests, since each group served on its assigned day; they do not concur in R. Yohanan’s, because there is no reason to take precautionary measures lest the money get mouldy; they do not concur with Zeiri, because they do not want to interpret a passage solely in line with an individual; and they don’t concur with Bar Padda because there was no need for a separate chest for surplus funds, since was it not the fact that all the other funds were surplus as well?*
- H. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. **What do they do with the surcharges [added in connection with paying the Temple tax of a half-shekel]?**
- J. **“They fall to the fund of the shegels,” the words of R. Meir.**
- K. **R. Eleazar says, “For a free will offering when the altar is unoccupied.” [R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Golden patches for the golden foil for the house of the Holy of Holies.” Ben Azzai says, “The money changers come and collect them as their fee”] [T. Sheq. 1:8K-O].**
- L. And Samuel said, “For the surplus of funds set aside for a sin offering, the surplus of funds set aside for a guilt offering, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a Nazirite, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, the surplus of funds set aside for bird offerings, and the surplus of funds set aside for the meal offering of a poor sinner and the surplus of funds set aside for the tenth of an ephah of the high priest’s meal offering.”
- M. And R. Oshaia said, “For the surplus of funds set aside for a sin offering, the surplus of funds set aside for a guilt offering, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a Nazirite, the surplus of funds set aside for the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, the surplus of funds set aside for bird offerings, and the surplus of funds set aside for the meal offering of a poor sinner.”
- N. *How come Samuel does not frame matters in accord with the position of R. Oshaia?*



- O. *Bird offerings are already covered in so many words in the Mishnah [at M. **Sheq. 6:5**: Thirteen shofar chests were in the sanctuary. And written on them were the following [in Aramaic]: (1) “New sheqels” and (2) “old sheqels,” (3) “bird offerings,” and (4) “young birds for a burnt offering”; (5) “wood” and (6) “frankincense”; (7) “gold for the Mercy seat,” and on six, “for freewill offerings”].*
- P. *Did R. Oshaia repeat that Mishnah without reference to **bird offerings**? We know as fact that R. Oshaia did repeat that Mishnah and include **bird offerings**!*
- Q. *One chest had money for bird offerings, the other, surplus of money set aside for bird offerings.*
- R. *How come R. Oshaia does not frame matters in accord with the position of Samuel?*
- S. *He takes the view of him who holds that the surplus of funds set aside for the purchase of the tenth ephah of fine flour for the high priest is to be left to rot. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The surplus of the meal offering was for free will offerings, and the surplus of the meal offering was left to rot.*
- T. *What can this possibly mean?*
- U. *Said R. Hisda, “This is the sense of the statement: ‘The surplus of the meal offering of the poor sinner was for free will offerings, and the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the high priest’s meal offering is left to rot.’”*
- V. *Rabbah said, “Even the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the high priest’s meal offering was for free will offerings. But this is the sense of the statement: ‘the surplus of the cakes of the thank offering was left to rot.’”*
- W. *There is this dispute:*
- X. *As to the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the high priest’s meal offering:*
- Y. *R. Yohanan said, “It is for free will offerings.”*
- Z. *R. Eleazar said, “It is left to rot.”*
- AA. *An objection was raised: **The surplus [of funds designated for use for] a sheqel tax is unconsecrated. The surplus of [coins collected to purchase] the tenth of an ephah, the surplus of (1) bird offerings for male persons afflicted with flux, (2) bird offerings of female persons afflicted with flux, (3) bird offerings for women who have given birth, (4) sin offerings [M. 2:3F], and (5) guilt offerings — their surplus is for a freewill offering [M. **Sheq. 2:5A-C**]. Does this not refer to the surplus of funds set aside for the tenth of ephah of fine flour for the offering of the high priest?***
- BB. *No, it refers to the surplus of funds set aside to purchase the meal offering of the poor sinner.*

- CC. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "It stands to reason to favor the view of him who says that the surplus of of the tenth of an ephah of the high priest's meal offering is left to rot. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- DD. **"And if his means do not suffice for two turtle doves or two pigeons, he shall bring as his offering for that of which he is guilty a tenth of an ephah [of choice flour for a sin offering; he shall not add oil to it or lay frankincense on it, for it is a sin offering]" (Lev. 5:11): "...for it is a sin offering:"**
- EE. **Said R. Judah, "Lo, the meal offering of the high priest [discussed at Lev. 6:10] is not in the classification of a sin offering and does require frankincense" [Sifra LXII:I.11].**
- FF. This teaches that the tenth ephah of the meal offering of the high priest is not classified as a sin offering and requires frankincense. Since it is not classified as a sin offering, the surplus must be left to rot .

### 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].**
- B. [He who says,] **"These two oxen are a burnt offering," and they got blemished, if he wants, brings with their proceeds one [ox].**
- C. **Rabbi prohibits [doing so].**
- D. [He who says,] **"This ram is a burnt offering," and it became blemished, if he wants, brings with its proceeds a lamb.**
- E. [He who says,] **"This lamb is a burnt offering," and it became blemished, if he wants, brings with its proceeds a ram.**
- F. **Rabbi prohibits [doing so].**
- I.1 A. [108B] [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]:] 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?**
- B. *The case of an ox that had become blemished is different.*
- II.1 A. 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:**
- B. *How come [Rabbi prohibits this arrangement]?*
- C. *It is because it is comparable to a case in which one vowed a big animal and presented a little one. For even though the beasts have been blemished [so that the obligation to present these two beasts in particular no longer pertains], Rabbi still does not permit such an action to begin with.*
- D. *So why should he not differ in the initial case as well?*
- E. *In point of fact Rabbi takes a dissenting position in regard to the entire statement, but he held his peace until rabbis had set forth their entire statement, and then he*

went and stated his disagreement with all that they had said. You may know that that is the fact, for it is stated: **[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].**

F. *That is pretty decisive.*

**II.2.** A. *The question was raised: if a different species was presented for the original species, what is the law? [Cashdan: where an ox that had been assigned for an offering was blemished, may one present ram s with the money paid for the ox?]*

B. **If someone said, “This ox is a burnt offering” and it was blemished should not present with the proceeds a ram, but he may present two rams with the proceeds. 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 (Cashdan)] **[cf. T. Men. 13:9].**

C. *That proves [that one may present a different species, rams, with the proceeds of the original animal, which had been blemished, the ox (Cashdan)].*

D. *If that is the case, then how come specify two rams? He should be able to present a single one, since in line with Rabbi’s position, if the original offering was blemished [so the man is no longer obligated, his vow no longer applying], there is no difference whether a big animal or a little one is presented with the proceeds?*

E. *We have here two Tannaite statements representing the views of Rabbi.*

**II.3.** A. **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 (Cashdan)].”

B. *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. And yet we have learned in the Mishnah: [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] [even though the present offering and the original offering share the trait of requiring only one meal offering (Cashdan)]!*

C. *We have here two Tannaite statements representing the views of Rabbi.*

**II.4.** A. *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.*

B. *The unassigned statement accords with the position of rabbis.*

**III.1** A. **[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]:**

B. 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 [Cashdan: to present one burnt offering in terms of the vow, one and not two]."

- C. *But perhaps the sense of* "it is incumbent on me to present" is, to present this ox in particular?
- D. *Well, if such a statement was made, this is how it was stated:*
- E. 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 shall be a burnt offering' or 'Lo, incumbent on me is that this ox shall be a burnt offering.' But if he said, 'I take upon myself that this ox or its value shall be a burnt offering,' the man has assumed a fixed obligation [Cashdan: to present one burnt offering in terms of the vow, one and not two]."

### 13:9G-L

- G. **He who says, "One of my lambs is dedicated, and "one of my oxen is dedicated" —**
- H. **[if] he had two, the larger of them is dedicated.**
- I. **[If he had] three, the middle-sized one is dedicated.**
- J. **[If he said,] "I expressly said [which one I should give] but I do not know what I expressly said,"**
- K. **[if] he said, "Father said to me [which one to give] but I do not know what [he said]" —**
- L. **the largest among them is dedicated.**

#### **I.1 A. [if] he had two, the larger of them is dedicated:**

- B. *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.
- C. *Said Samuel, "The sense of the second statement is that we take into account of the possibility that the middle one also has been sanctified, for in any event, compared with the smallest, that dedication would still show a liberal spirit."*

#### **I.2. A. So what should he do?**

- B. *Said Hiyya bar Rab, "He waits until the middle one is blemished and then transfers its sanctity to the largest one" [Cashdan: so that now the largest one is holy beyond doubt, for it was either holy to begin with or now has become so, and the middle one is available for secular use].*
- C. Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, "The ruling applies only to a case in which one has said, 'One of my oxen is sanctified.' But if he had said, 'An ox among my oxen is sanctified,' the largest one among them is sanctified. *For what he meant was, 'an ox among my oxen, [that is, the finest].'*"
- D. *Is that so? But did not R. Hiyya say in the name of Ulla, "He who says to his fellow, 'I sell you a room among my rooms' may show him an upper room." Now does this not mean that the expression means not the best but the worst?*
- E. *No, the meaning of "upper room" really is, "the finest of his rooms."*

- F. *An objection was raised: “An ox among my oxen is sanctified,” and so too, “if an ox belong to the sanctuary was mixed up with unconsecrated ones,” the biggest of them all is sanctified. All the rest are to be sold to those who need burnt offerings, but the proceeds then are unconsecrated.*
- G. *Interpret the statement at the end to refer to the problem, “if an ox belong to the sanctuary was mixed up with unconsecrated ones.”*
- H. *But the exact language is, “and so too”!*
- I. *That speaks only of the detail that concerns the biggest one.*
- J. *An objection was raised: “A house among my houses I sell to you,” and it fell down, — he may present him with the one that fell down. “A slave among my slaves I am selling to you” and one died — he may present him with the one that had died. [109A] But why should this be the case? Why not see which one of the houses fell down or which one of the slaves died [and if it was the best, then the purchases bears the loss, but if not, then the seller]!*
- K. *You are speaking of the buyer, but the buyer is exceptional, for the one who holds a deed is always at a disadvantage [the purchaser who has the deed of sale in hand has to prove that nothing but the best was subject to the sale, otherwise we assume the worst was sold; in the case of offerings for the altar, we always assume that the best was intended (Cashdan)].*
- L. *Now that you have gotten to that point, you may even say that the use of “upper room” means just what it says, and the worst one was intended, on grounds that for the one who holds a deed is always at a disadvantage.*

### 13:10A-J

- A. [He who says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] a burnt offering” offers it in the sanctuary.
- B. And if he offered it in the House of Onias, he has not carried out his obligation.
- C. [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.
- D. But if he offered it in the House of Onias, he has carried out his obligation.
- E. R. Simeon says, “This is no burnt offering.”
- F. [He who says,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite” shaves [Num. 6:13-18] in the sanctuary.
- G. And if he shaved in the House of Onias, he has not carried out his obligation.
- H. [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.
- I. But if he shaved in the House of Onias, he has carried out his obligation.
- J. R. Simeon says, “This is no Nazirite.”
- I.1 A. But if he offered it in the House of Onias, he has carried out his obligation:**
- B. *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]!*

- C. Said R. Hamnuna, "He is treated as though he had said, 'Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering, on the stipulation that I not be liable to take responsibility for the beast's disposition.'"
- D. *Said to him Raba, "Then how about the conclusion of the passage: [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? Do you read the statement in the same way, as though he had said, 'Lo, I am a Nazirite on the stipulation that I shall not be responsible for the disposition of my offerings'? Until he has presented his offerings properly, he remains a Nazirite!"*
- E. Rather, said Raba, "The intent of this man was merely to present a gift to God, with the following musing: 'If it is o.k. in the house of Onias, I'll go to the bother of offering it there, but more than that I'm not planning to bother myself.' And in regard to the Nazirite vow, the man had the same intention, saying, 'If it is o.k. in the house of Onias, I'll go to the bother of offering it there, but more than that I'm not planning to bother myself.'"
- F. *And R. Hamnuna?*
- G. *He will say to you, "As to the Nazirite, matters as are you say. But as to the burnt offering, the intention of the vow was to bear the implication, 'I shall not take responsibility for the offering'" [Cashdan: and consequently in this case he is culpable for slaughtering a consecrated animal outside of the Temple].*
- I.2.** A. *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]." [Cashdan: When he said, "I will offer it in the Temple of Onias," he implied that wherever the animal would be slaughtered would fulfill his obligation.]*
- B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. If someone said, "Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering, which I shall offer in the wilderness," but the man then offered it in Transjordan, 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].

### 13:10K-O

- K. **The priests who served in the House of Onias are not to serve in the sanctuary in Jerusalem.**
- L. **And one need not say [that this applies to those who have served] for another matter [idolatry],**
- M. **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" (11 Kings 23: 9) —**
- O. **lo, they are like blemished priests, taking a share and eating [it] but not offering up [sacrifices].**



**I.1** A. [And one need not say that this applies to those who have served for another matter idolatry:] Said R. Judah, “A priest who slaughtered an animal in the Temple for idolatry — the offering nonetheless is a sweet savor.”

B. *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].”*

**I.2.** A. *It has been stated:*

B. If a priest erred and inadvertently sprinkled the blood in the service of an idol —

C. R. Nahman said, “The offering [made in the Temple] nonetheless is a sweet savor.”

D. R. Sheshet said, “The offering [made in the Temple] is not a sweet savor.”

E. *Said R. Sheshet, “On what basis do I make that statement? It is because it is written, ‘Because they ministered to them before their idols and became a stumbling block of iniquity to the house of Israel’ (Eze. 44:12). That means, either through stumbling or through iniquity,” and ‘stumbling block’ means it was inadvertent, and iniquity, deliberate [Cashdan: thus whether the service in honor of the idol was done inadvertently, through stumbling, or deliberately, through iniquity, the priest is debarred for all time from offering sacrifices in the Temple].”*

F. And R. Nahman?

G. “The sense is, a stumbling block of iniquity” [Cashdan: a deliberate act of service].

H. *Said R. Nahman, “On what basis do I make that statement? It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘And the priest shall make atonement for the soul that errs, when he sins in error’ (Num. 15:28) [Cashdan: a priest who sinned by ministering to idols now offers his own sacrifice and atones for himself] — this teaches that a priest may accomplish atonement in his own behalf. Now how had he ministered to the idol? If we say that it was by an act of slaughter? Then why does the verse refer to sinning in error, for thereby he sinned deliberately. So it can be only that he ministered to the idol by sprinkling the blood before it” [Cashdan: and since he did so in error, he may minister in the Temple, and he therefore presents his own sacrifice, all in accord with Nahman’s view].*

I. *And R. Sheshet?*

J. *He will say to you, “In any event it was through an act of slaughter, but it is still not the same if he did so deliberately, for if he had done so deliberately, he would have become a priest to the idol.”*

**I.3.** A. *The two authorities are consistent with principles expressed elsewhere, for it has been stated:*

B. If one deliberately slaughtered [a beast to idolatry] —

C. R. Nahman said, “The offering [made in the Temple] nonetheless is a sweet savor.”

D. R. Sheshet said, “The offering [made in the Temple] is not a sweet savor.”

- E. R. Nahman said, "The offering [made in the Temple] nonetheless is a sweet savor:" *for he has not performed an act of priestly service.*
- F. R. Sheshet said, "The offering [made in the Temple] is not a sweet savor:" **[109B]** *for he has become a priest to idolatry.*
- G. *Said R. Nahman, "On what basis do I make that statement? It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: a priest who served idolatry and then repented — his later act of making an offering in the Temple is a sweet service. Now how had he ministered to the idol? If we say that it was inadvertently, then why does the verse refer to his repenting? He has never not repented [the action having been done inadvertently]. So the sense must be that he did the act deliberately. And if by sprinkling, then even though he repented, it does him no good, for he performed an act of service before the idol. So the act under discussion can only be an act of slaughter."*
- H. *And R. Sheshet?*
- I. *He will say to you, "In any event it was inadvertent, and the sense is this: 'if he had already repented,' meaning, 'if he ministered only inadvertently, then his offering in the Temple is a sweet savor, if not, it is not a sweet savor.'"*

**I.4.** A. If a priest prostrated himself to idolatry —

- B. R. Nahman said, "The offering [made in the Temple] nonetheless is a sweet savor."
- C. R. Sheshet said, "The offering [made in the Temple] is not a sweet savor."

**I.5.** A. If a priest acknowledged the divinity of idolatry —

- B. R. Nahman said, "The offering [made in the Temple] nonetheless is a sweet savor."
- C. R. Sheshet said, "The offering [made in the Temple] is not a sweet savor."

**I.6.** A. *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 had we been given only the case of the act of slaughter, I might have supposed that only in that case did R. Sheshet take the view that he does, for the man has performed some sort of action, but where he merely prostrated himself before the idol, which is no act of service, he might not have taken the same view. So the latter had to be stated as well.*
- C. *And if the dispute concerning prostration were the only one before us, I might have supposed that only there did R. Sheshet maintain his position, since the man had done something not nothing, but where he had merely acknowledged the divinity of the idol, merely a matter of words, he would not hold the position that he does. So all of them had to be stated.*

**II.1** A. And one need not say [that this applies to those who have served] for another matter [idolatry]:

- B. *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.*
- C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “In the year in which Simeon the Righteous died, he said to them that in that year he would die.
- E. “They said to him, ‘How do you know?’
- F. “He said to them, ‘Every Day of Atonement, appears to me an old man dressed in white and cloaked in white, who enters with me and goes forth with me [to and from the Holy of Holies], while this year an old man appeared to me dressed in black and cloaked in black, who went in with me but did not come out with me.’
- G. “After the Festival of Tabernacles, he fell ill for seven days, and then he died. His brothers the priests refused to pronounce the divine name when bestowing the priestly benediction.
- H. “When he was dying, he said to them, ‘My son Onias will serve in my place.’
- I. “Then his brother Shimei envied him, being older than he by two years and a half. He said to him, ‘Come, and I shall instruct you on the order of the Temple service.’ [Shimei] put on him a light gown and girded him with a girdle and set him up by the altar and then said to his brothers, the other priests, ‘See what this man has promised and carried out for his girl friend: “On the day on which I shall take up the office of high priest, I am going to put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle.”’
- J. “His brothers the priests wanted to kill him [for coming to the altar in a woman’s garments]. He fled from them and they pursued him. So he went off to Alexandria in Egypt and there he built an altar and presented on it burnt offerings for idols.
- K. “Now when sages heard about the matter, they said, ““If this is what happened on account of envy in the case of one who had never taken up the honor, what would happen on account of the envy of one who had actually assumed the honor!,”” the words of R. Meir.
- L. R. Judah says, “That is not the story. Rather, it is this:
- M. “Onias would not accept the office of high priest, because Shimei, his brother, was two and a half years old than he. Nonetheless, Onias envied Shimei.
- N. “He said to him, ‘Come, and I shall instruct you on the order of the Temple service.’ [Shimei] put on him a light gown and girded him with a girdle and set him up by the altar and then said to his brothers, the other priests, ‘See what this man has promised and carried out for his girl friend: “On the day on which I shall take up the office of high priest, I am going to put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle.”’
- O. “His brothers the priests wanted to kill him [for coming to the altar in a woman’s garments]. He reported to them what had happened, so they wanted to kill Onias. He fled from them and they pursued him.
- P. “He fled to the royal palace, but they pursued him there, and whoever saw him yelled, ‘There he is, there he is.’

- Q. “So he went off to Alexandria in Egypt and there he built an altar and presented on it burnt offerings for God. That is in line with this verse: ‘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).
- R. “Now when sages heard about the matter, they said, ‘If this is what happened in the case of someone who had fled from honor, in the case of someone who lusted after honor, what would happen!’”

**II.2.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Joshua b. Perahiah, “To begin with, if somebody said to me, ‘Go up and take office,’ I would tie him up and throw him to a lion. Now, if anybody says to me, ‘Leave office,’ I would pour a pot of boiling water on his head.
- C. “For we see in the case of Saul, at first he avoided the throne, but after he got it, he tried to kill David.”

**II.3.** A. *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)]?”*

- B. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. After the defeat of Sennacherib, Hezekiah went forth and found princes enthroned on golden chariots. He imposed upon them the oath against serving idolatry: “In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, **[110A]** and swear to the Lord of hosts” (Isa. 19:18).
- D. So they went off to Alexandria in Egypt, build an altar, and offered on it offerings for the sake of heaven, as it is said, “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).

**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**

**II.4.** A. “One shall be called the city of Heres”: (Isa. 19:18):

- B. *What is the meaning of “city of Heres”?*
- C. *It is in line with R. Joseph’s rendition in Aramaic, “The city of the sun, which is destined to destruction, will be said to be one of them.”*
- D. *And how do we know that Heres means sun?*
- E. “Who commands the sun [heres] and it does not rise” (Job. 9: 7).

**II.5.** A. “Bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth” (Isa. 43: 6):

- B. “Bring my sons from far:”
- C. Said R. Huna, “This refers to the exiles who dwell in Babylonia, who live in tranquility like sons.”
- D. ““and my daughters from the ends of the earth:”
- E. “This refers to the exiles who dwell in other countries, who, like daughters, do not live in tranquility.”

- II.6.** A. 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.”
- B. *Objected R. Shimi bar Hiyya to Rab, “For from the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof my name is great among the nations, and in every place offerings are burnt and present to my name, even pure obligations’ (Mal. 1:11)!”*
- C. *He said to him, “Are you the one they call Shimi? What they call him is merely, ‘God of Gods.’”*
- II.7.** A. “And in every place offerings are burned and presented to my name” (Mal. 1:11):
- B. *Do you really think that this is in every place!*
- C. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “This refers to the disciples of sages who engaged in Torah-study in every place. I regard them as though they burned up incense and made offerings to my Name.
- D. “‘Even pure obligations.’ this refers to one who in a state of purity studies the Torah, meaning, someone who first gets married and then studies the Torah.”
- II.8.** A. “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):
- B. *What is the meaning of “in the night seasons”?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “This refers to the disciples of sages who engaged in Torah-study by night. Scripture regards them as though they engaged in the Temple service.”
- II.9.** A. “This is an ordinance for ever to Israel” (2Ch. 2: 3):
- B. 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.”
- C. And R. Yohanan said, “This refers to disciples of sages who are engaged in the study of the laws of the Temple service. Scripture regards them as though the Temple were rebuilt in their days.”
- II.10.** A. 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.”
- II.11.** A. *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?”*
- B. Rather, said Raba, “Whoever engages in Torah-study has no need for either burnt offering, meal offering, sin offering, or guilt offering.”

- II.12.** A. *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)?*
- B. “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.”

### 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) —**
- B. **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.**
- I.1** A. *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).”*
- B. R. Adda b. Ahbah said, ““When goods increase, they are increased who eat them, and what advantage is there to the owner thereof, except looking at them’ (Qoh. 5:10).”
- I.2.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. 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.
- C. “Furthermore it is said: **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.**
- D. “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).”
- I.3.** A. Another reading of “...you shall sacrifice at your own volition” (Lev. 19: 5):
- B. “Sacrifice at your own volition! Slaughter at your own volition!”
- C. *That is in line with what Samuel asked R. Huna, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if an act of slaughter was done incidentally, the offering is invalid?”*
- D. He said to him, ““And he shall slaughter the bullock’ (Lev. 19: 5) — the act of slaughter must be carried out with regard to that particular bullock.”



- E. He said to him, “That we have in hand. The issue is, how do we know that correct intentionality is indispensable?”
- F. “Scripture states, ‘you shall sacrifice at your own volition’ (Lev. 19: 5) — perform the act of sacrifice in accord with proper intentionality.”