

IV

BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER FOUR

FOLIOS 38A-52B

4:1A-B

- A. The [absence of] blue [in the fringes, Num. 15:38, M. 3:7] does not impair the validity of the white, and the [absence of] white does not impair the validity of the blue.
- B. (2) 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.
- I.1 A. *May we say that the Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. “‘And you shall see it’ (Num. 15:39) — this teaches that the absence of one of the colors of the show fringes [blue, white] invalidates the other,” the words of Rabbi.
- C. And sages say, “The absence of one or the other of the colors does not invalidate the counterpart.”
- D. *What is the scriptural basis behind the ruling of Rabbi?*
- E. *It is because it is written, “...corner...,” Num. 15:38), meaning that the fringe must be the color as the corner; and it further says, “a blue thread” (Num. 15:39), and when Scripture then states, “And you shall see it” (Num. 15:39), the sense of the “it” is that both colors must be present at one and the same time.*
- F. *And rabbis?*
- G. “‘And you shall see it” (Num. 15:39) — bears the implication, each [color] by itself.
- H. *May we therefore conclude that our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of Rabbi?*
- I. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “You may even maintain that it is in accord with Rabbi. At issue here is only the question of which takes precedence, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- J. The proper conduct of the rite is to insert the white threads into the show fringes before the blue. But if one put the blue in before the white, it is valid, though the fulfillment of the religious duty is yet lacking.
- K. *What is the meaning of though the fulfillment of the religious duty is yet lacking?*

- L. **[38B]** *If we say that the man yet lacks the fulfillment of the religious duty involving the white thread, though he has carried out the religious duty involving the blue, from Rabbi's viewpoint, that would represent the nullification of the action altogether, since each is indispensable to the other.*
- M. Said R. Judah said Rab, "The sense is that, while the fulfillment of the religious duty is yet lacking, the man still has carried out a religious duty. *And what is the meaning of, though the fulfillment of the religious duty is yet lacking? That the person has not carried out the religious duty in the most meritorious manner possible.*"

I.2. A. *There is then no problem with the clause, **The [absence of] blue does not impair the validity of the white.** [Cashdan: even though the blue was inserted first, it is not invalid.]*

B. *But what is the meaning of the clause, **and the [absence of] white does not impair the validity of the blue?** [Cashdan: This ought to mean that even though the white was inserted first, it is not invalid. But that is the proper order of precedence.]*

C. *It has furthermore been stated, said Levi to Samuel Ariokh, "Do not sit down before you explain the following to me: **The [absence of] blue does not impair the validity of the white, and the [absence of] white does not impair the validity of the blue.** What does that statement mean?"*

D. *He said to him, "This rule is required for the case of the fringes of a white linen garment. The correct order is to put the white threads in first, for Scripture speaks of "the corner," meaning, the fringes that are the same color as the corner are to be put in first. But if one put the blue in first, that is inconsequential."*

E. *There is then no problem with the clause, **and the [absence of] white does not impair the validity of the blue.** But what is the meaning of the clause, **The [absence of] blue does not impair the validity of the white?***

F. *Said to him R. Ammi bar Hama, "It is necessary only to deal with the case of the fringes of a garment that is wholly blue, in the case of which it is correct to put the blue threads first, for Scripture speaks of "the corner," meaning, the fringes that are the same color as the corner are to be put in first. But if one put the white in first, that is inconsequential."*

I.3. A. *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 (Cashdan).]*

B. *Rather, said Raba, "The rule was necessary only to deal with the case of cutting off the threads, indicating that if one cut off the blue and left the white, or the white and the blue remained, it is a matter of no consequence."*

C. *For said the sons of R. Hiyya, "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]."*

I.4. A. *And what is the minimum length of the cut back threads?*

B. *Said Bar Hammeduri said Samuel, "Enough must be left to make a loop with it."*

- I.5.** A. *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?*
 B. *The question stands.*
- I.6.** A. *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?”*
 B. *Said to him R. Aha b. Raba, “All the more so are they valid, since the religious duty that is carried out with them is all the more to be discerned!”*
- I.7.** A. *And who is the Tannaite authority who differs from Rabbi?*
 B. *It is the Tannaite authority represented in the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 C. *R. Isaac says in the name of R. Nathan, who made the statement in the name of R. Yosé the Galilean, who spoke in the name of R. Yohanan b. Nuri, “If one has no blue threads, he puts in all white ones.”*
- I.8.** A. *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?”* [Cashdan: 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. **[39A]** *Perhaps the reference is solely to a case in which there were knots after each joint.*
- I.9.** A. *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. [Cashdan: 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. *“So it follows that inference that the upper knot is required by the law of the Torah.”*

Topical Appendix on the Show-Fringes

- I.10.** A. *Said Rabbah b. R. Adda said R. Adda said Rab, “If a thread snapped at the top, it is invalid.” [Cashdan: the entire thread has broken away.]*
 B. *In session, R. Nahman was stating that tradition. Objected Raba to R. Nahman, “Under what circumstances [do the fringes have to be of a minimum length? To begin with [when one is attaching the fringe to the garment (Cashdan)], but afterward, the remnants of the fringes and their stumps may be of any length at all. Now what is the meaning of the remnants of the fringes and their stumps? Is it not*

a remnant, part of the thread of which had broken off and part remained, and stumps means the thread had wholly broken off?”

- C. *Not at all, both make a single statement, along these lines: the remnants of the stumps may be of any length at all.*
- D. *If that were so, then reference should be made only to the stumps! What need is there to refer to remnants at all?*
- E. *Lo, in that way it is further meant to be implied that we require a remnant of the stumps of the thread that is enough to make a loop.*

I.11. A. *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].”*

B. *Said to him R. Joseph, “Samuel made that statement, and not Rab.”*

C. *So too it has been stated:*

D. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, “R. Josiah of Usha remarked to me, ‘The thread that is The thread used for winding the fringe counts in the number of threads.’”*

I.12. A. *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 (Cashdan)], it is nonetheless valid.”*

B. *Said to him R. Joseph, Rab made that statement, and not Samuel.”*

C. *So too it has been stated:*

D. *Said R. Huna bar Judah 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 (Cashdan)], it is nonetheless valid.”*

I.13. A. *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 (Cashdan)], it is nonetheless valid.*

B. *““And even if only a single joint in the fringes was made [Cashdan: a section of the fringe around which a thread has been wound several times and bounded at each end by a knot], it is valid. But the really nice way to do it is to have the thread wound around for a third of its length, with two thirds hanging loose like locks.”*

I.14. A. *What is the minimum measure of a joint?*

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

C. *Rabbi says, “It has to be long enough so that the thread can be wrapped around once, a second, then a third time.”*

I.15. A. *A Tannaite statement:*

B. *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.*

C. *“He who makes fewer joints should make no fewer than seven:” corresponding to the seven firmaments of heaven.*

- D. “and he who wants to make more of them should make no more than thirteen.” seven corresponding to the seven firmaments of heaven, and six corresponding to the air-space between them.

I.16. A. *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. 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.
- C. When one concludes, he should conclude with the white thread, on the principle that one may raise something to a higher level of sanctity but one may not bring it down to a lower level of sanctity.

I.17. A. *One time, in session, Rab and Rabbah bar bar Hannah noticed a man passing by, wearing a garment that was entirely blue, to which were affixed [39B] fringes that were entirely round about [Cashdan: 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!”*

- B. *Rabbah bar bar Hannah said, ““That cloak is nice and so are the fringes !”*
- C. *What’s at stake here?*
- D. *Rabbah bar bar Hannah maintains that since it is written, “Twisted cords” (Deu. 22:12) and “thread” (Num. 15:38), it may be either wholly a twisted cord or wholly loose threads.*
- E. *And Rab takes the view that under all circumstances we require loose threads, and what is the meaning of “Twisted cords” (Deu. 22:12)? That serves to give an indication of the number of threads that are required. Specifically, “Twisted thread” (Deu. 22:12) would involve two, but “Twisted cords” represents four, so one has to twist them into a cord; but from the middle they have to hang down as separate threads [following Cashdan].*

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

- B. *The question was asked: “What is the law as to white linen threads’ carrying out the obligation of a woolen garment to have show fringes? It is in particular the white threads of wool that carry out the obligation of a linen garment to have show fringes, since blue, woolen threads carry out the obligation for show fringes that pertains to any garments; white woolen ones will as well. But white linen threads cannot carry out the obligation for show fringes that pertains to woolen garments. Or perhaps, since it is written, “You shall not wear mingled stuff, wool and linen together, you shall make twisted cords for yourself”(Deu. 22:11, 12), there is no difference whether woolen threads are inserted into a linen cloak, or linen into wool.”*
- C. *Come and take note, for said Rabbah said R. Judah, “White threads of wool carry out the obligation of a linen garment to have show fringes, threads of linen carry out the obligation of a wool garment to have show fringes, and woolen threads along with linen threads carry out the obligation of any garment to have show fringes, even one made out of silk.”*

- I.19.** A. *That differs from what R. Nahman said, for said R. Nahman, “Garments made of silk are exempt from the requirement of having show fringes.”*
- B. *An objection was raised by Raba to this statement of R. Nahman, “Garments made of silk, raw silk, or floss silk are subject to the requirement of having show fringes.”*
- C. *That is only on the authority of rabbis.*
- D. *If so, then note what follows in the same formulation: And in all instances, woolen threads along with linen threads carry out the obligation of a garment to have show fringes. Now if you say that that is on the authority of the law of the Torah, then we can account for the fact that the mixture of diverse kinds, wool and linen, is permitted for them; but if it is merely on the authority of rabbis, how can the use of diverse kinds, wool and linen, which is prohibited by the authority of the Torah except for this one purpose, be permitted for them?*
- E. *Render the formulation: And in all instances, woolen threads or linen threads carry out the obligation of a garment to have show fringes. And that reading stands to reason, for the passage goes on to state: [Threads of silk] serve to fulfill the requirement of show fringes in a garment of the same material, but not in a garment of some other material. Now if you say that that is merely on the authority of rabbis, that explains why they serve to fulfill the requirement of show fringes in a garment of the same material, but not in a garment of some other material. But if you maintain that it is on the authority of the law of the Torah, then in accord with the Torah, only the use of wool and linen are sufficient to carry out the obligation [these alone being mentioned in context, Deu. 22:11, 12].*
- F. *The answer is in accord with Raba, for Raba contrasted these verses: “It is written, ‘The corner’ [Cashdan: which implies that the fringes are to be of] the same kind of material as the corner; but it is also written, ‘wool and linen.’ How so? Woolen threads along with linen threads carry out the obligation of a garment to have show fringes whether these garments are made of the same material or material of some other kind; other kinds of threads serve to fulfill the requirement of show fringes in a garment of the same material, but not in a garment of some other material.”*
- G. *R. Nahman accords with the opinion of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael. For the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “Since ‘garments’ is stated without further explanation, except in one particular case in which Scripture specified ‘wool and linen,’ it is to be inferred that all garments are understood in context as being those that are wool and linen.”*
- H. *Said Abbaye, “This formulation of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael differs from the statement of another Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael, for the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “By ‘garment’ I understand only those that are wool and linen. How do I know that*

I should encompass wool of camels, hares, goats, raw silk, floss silk, or fine silk? Scripture states, 'or a garment' (Lev. 47)."

I.20. A. **[40A]** *Our rabbis have repeated on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **A linen garment, as to fringes —**
- C. **The House of Shammai declare exempt.**
- D. **And the House of Hillel declare liable [M. Eduyyot 4:10G-I].**
- E. And the decided law is in accord with the opinion of the House of Hillel.
- F. Said R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq, "And is it not the fact that, in Jerusalem, anyone who puts in blue threads to a linen garment is solely the cause of wonder?"
- G. Said Rabbi, "If so, why did they prohibit doing so?"
- H. Because people are not expert in the matter [Cashdan: that the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only in connection with the religious duty of wearing show-fringes].

I.21. A. *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!"* [Cashdan: that the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only in connection with the religious duty of wearing show-fringes].

- B. *All the more so will they cause amazement!*
- C. *Then let it be expounded at a major public lecture?*
- D. *Not doing so is a precautionary decree, since people might then use imitation blue [and not the authentic dye, but only using the authentic dye will permit the waiving of the prohibition of diverse kinds].*
- E. *But it is to be classified as nothing more than white!*
- F. *In point of fact, since it is possible to make show fringes out of the same kind of fabric, it is not done any other way. That is in accord with what R. Simeon b. Laqish said.*
- G. *For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "In any context in which you find both an affirmative religious duty and a negative commandment, if you can carry out both of them, it is well and good, but if not, then the affirmative action of commission will come and set aside the negative commandment of prohibition."*
- H. *So examine it anyhow!* [Cashdan: every blue thread can be subjected to a test to ascertain whether the blue dye is genuine or imitation.]
- I. *Rather, the operative consideration is that we make a precautionary decree that this particular thread may have been one used for testing [the quality of the dye, and that thread may not be used in a garment, for the dying of the thread must be done with the particular usage as show fringes in mind (Cashdan)]/*
- J. *But why not issue a written decree on a public notice* [Cashdan: notifying all dyers that the testing thread may not be used in a garment]?
- K. *Are we going to depend on such a flimsy means of securing conformity to the law as public announcements?*
- L. *Said Raba, "Now [40B] with respect to removing leaven prior to Passover and in regard to the Day of Atonement, violation of the prohibitions of*

which the penalty of extirpation is incurred, we do indeed rely on public notices, how much the more so should we rely on them in the present matter, in which the only consideration is the violation of an affirmative action!"

- M. *Rather, 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 — we take account of the possibility that [following Cashdan:] the garment made of linen may have been torn within three fingerbreadths' distance [from the hem] and may then have been sewn together [with linen threads, and the threads were left for hanging for the fringe], while the Torah has said, 'You shall make' (Deu. 22:12) — not using what is already in hand."*

I.22. A. *R. Zira removed [fringes from] his linen garment.*

- B. *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]."*

I.23. A. *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.'*

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

C. *"We are guided by the classification of the principal part of the garment."*

D. *R. Ahai, by contrast, follows the traits of the corner of the garment.*

I.24. A. *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."*

- B. *An objection was raised: the ancient pious ones, once they had woven three corners of a garment, would put the show fringes therein!*

C. *State matters in this language: once they had come to the last three fingerbreadths of the weaving of the garment, would put the show fringes therein.*

I.25. A. *And do invariably we invoke the principle, "'You shall make' (Deu. 22:12) — not using what is already in hand"?*

- B. *And has not R. Zira said, "If someone put show fringes into a garment that already had them, it is valid"?*

C. *Said Raba, "The point is that, since one in doing so violates the law against adding to the religious duties [but doing only what is required (Deu. 13: 1)], the act is treated as null in any event."*

D., *Objected R. Pappa, "Then on what basis do you know that the person here intends to add to the other fringes? Perhaps he wants to nullify the others, in which case he hardly violates the law against adding to the religious duties [but*

doing only what is required (Deu. 13: 1)], the act is treated as entirely valid in any event."

- I.26.** A. 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."
- B. *What is the meaning of the statement, "and that is the fact even though the garment in any event is exempt from the requirement of having show fringes"?*
- C. *If we say that it is a garment that is smaller than the requisite measure of one that is liable to the requirement of having show fringes, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: As to a garment that can be used for a child to cover his head and the greater part of his body, one in which an adult can walk out not regularly but at random, it is liable to the obligation of having show fringes. [41A] If a child cannot cover with it his head and the greater part of his body, even though an adult may in any event can walk out not regularly but at random, it is not liable to the obligation of having show fringes. And so with regard to the consideration of diverse kinds. Now we have reflected on this matter: what is the meaning of the statement, And so with regard to the consideration of diverse kinds? If we say, "and so with regard to the prohibition of mixed species in a garment, lo, we have learned in the Mishnah, **There is no [rule permitting] temporary use in respect to diverse kinds [of garments] [M. Kil. 9:2E]!** But said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "And so is the rule with respect to putting show fringes into a linen garment" [Cashdan: and it is forbidden to insert the fringes in a linen garment that is too small to cover the head and greater part of the body of a child; it is thus evidence that a garment smaller than the prescribed measure, even though provided with fringes, comes within the prohibition of diverse kinds].*
- D. *Then what is the meaning of "and that is the fact even though the garment in any event is exempt from the requirement of having show fringes"? It means, if one inserted another set of show fringes until a garment that already had them [the second set of fringes does not violate the prohibition of mixed species, even though it is not needed to carry out the religious duty at hand].*
- E. *But R. Zira has already made that statement another time ["If someone put show fringes into a garment that already had them, it is valid"]!*
- F. *The one was stated as an inference from the other. [Cashdan: the previous ruling was inferred from this one.]*

I.27. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A garment that is doubled over is required to have show fringes.
- C. And R. Simeon declares it exempt.
- D. But both parties concur that if one doubled it over and then sewed it together, it is obligated to have show fringes.
- E. if one sewed it together— *that is obvious!*
- F. *Not at all. It is necessary to specify the rule to deal with a case in which one only fastened it down with pins.*

- I.28.** A. *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 [Cashdan: 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?"*
- B. *He immediately took off the garment and put on another one.*
- C. *He said to him, "Do you think that the obligation pertains to the person? The obligation pertains to the garment. Go and put in the show fringes properly."*
- D. *May we say that the following supports his position: the ancient pious ones, once they had woven three corners of a garment, would put the show fringes therein?*
- E. *The case involving the pious men is exceptional, because they took upon themselves a more strict rule than commonly prevails.*
- F. *[The view of Rabbah bar R. Huna that the obligation pertains to the garment] differs from the position of the angel.*
- G. *For an angel found R. Qattina wearing a linen wrap [which was a night wrap and so did not have to have show fringes]. He said to him, "Qattina! Qattina! If you wear a linen wrap in summer and a cloak in winter, then what will ever become of the requirement to have show fringes at all [since neither garment is subject to the requirement of having them]?"*
- H. *He said to him, "And do you punish someone for not carrying out an affirmative obligation?"*
- I. *He said to him, "In a time of boiling anger, we do inflict punishment on that account."*
- J. *Now if you take the position that the obligation of show fringes pertains to the person, then that explains why one is liable for not wearing clothing with fringes. But if you hold that the obligation applies to the clothing, then what guilt is incurred for not having fringes on garments that are exempt from the requirement of having them anyhow?*
- K. *Then what is your view? That it is the obligation that pertains to the person. Granting that the All-Merciful has imposed that obligation when one is wearing a garment that is subject to the obligation of fringes, if one is wearing a cloak that is not subject to the liability of show fringes, has the All-Merciful imposed such an obligation? Rather, this is the sense of what he said to him, "You are trying to justify yourself so as not to be obligated to wear show fringes at all!"*
- I.29.** A. *Said R. Tubi bar Qisna said Samuel, "Clothing that are put away in a chest are obligated to have show fringes on them.*
- B. *"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."*
- C. *How come? The All-Merciful has said, "with which you cover yourself" (Deu. 22:12), and this is not an ordinary covering. But at the hour that the shroud comes into use, show fringes should be put in, by reason of the verse, "Whoever mocks the poor blasphemes his maker" (Pro. 17: 5).*

- I.30.** A. 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.” [Cashdan: 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.]
- B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. A garment that was torn more than three fingerbreadths from the corner may be sown up.
- D. If it is within three fingerbreadths of the corner,
- E. R. Meir says, “It may not be sown up.”
- F. And sages say, “It may be sown up.”
- G. And they concur that one may not produce a piece of cloth, even a cubit square, that has fringes from another garment and attach it to this garment [since this would be a ready-made fringe (Cashdan)].
- H. And they concur that one may take fringes out of some other garment and attach them to this garment, **[41B]** so long as they are not cut [but each thread is whole].
- I. *This yields the inference that one may detach fringes from one garment to insert them into another.*
- J. *But perhaps it is permitted only when the first garment had worn out [but one may not remove fringes from a garment in good shape and put them into another].*

I.31. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. 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 [Cashdan: 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].
- C. *The following objection was presented:* Show fringes for a garment carry out the obligation only if they are of the same color as the garment; in one that is wholly blue, one should use blue threads and threads of a different color, except for imitation blue; if threads of imitation blue were inserted, however, the show fringes are nonetheless valid.
- D. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “That really forms no contradiction.* In the one case we speak of a garment in which the show fringes consisted of four threads, in the other, of eight.” [Cashdan: the latter formulation has four threads, two of real blue, two of some other color; one wants then to add four more, of imitation blue. This is not permitted to begin with, since the garment might be sold and the buyer might think all the blue threads were genuine and remove two of the imitation blue and put them into another garment, and in that way, inadvertently, he would violate the law against mixed species.]

- E. *That explanation bears the implication that show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another.*
- F. *Perhaps that is so only after the fact.* [It is not permitted to do so, but this law attends to what is done after the fact.]

I.32. A. *It was stated:*

- B. Rab said, "Show fringes may not be removed from one garment and put into another."
- C. And Samuel said, "Show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another."
- D. Rab said, "In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may not kindle one light from another light."
- E. And Samuel said, "In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light."
- F. Rab said, "The law does not accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another."
- G. And Samuel said, "The law does accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another."
- H. *Said, Abbaye, "At every point, the master [Rabbah] acted in accord with Rab, except for these three items, in which case he acted in accord with Samuel, specifically: show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another; in a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light; and the law does accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another."*
- I. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. R. Simeon says, "On the Sabbath, one may drag a bed, chair, or bench, so long as he does not intend thereby to make a groove in the dirt."

I.33. A. [Reverting to 31.F:] *R. Judah would hand over a garment with show fringes to the fuller [and did not take account of the possibility that he would substitute imitation blue threads for the real thing].*

- B. *R. Hanina would roll up the fringes into a ball [when the garment was being washed, to protect them].*
- C. *Rabina would sew them up.*

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

- B. How many threads does one put into the hole of the corner, to form the fringes?
- C. The House of Shammai say, "Four [fingerbreadths]."
- D. And the House of Hillel say, "Three."
- E. And how far must the threads hang down beyond the hem?
- F. The House of Shammai say, "Four."
- G. And the House of Hillel say, "Three."
- H. And the three fingerbreadths of which the House of Hillel have spoken are measured as one fingerbreadth out of four to a handbreadth of any person.

I. *Said R. Pappa, "The handbreadth of which the Torah speaks is equivalent to four times the width of the thumb, six of the little finger, five of the middle finger."*

I.35. A. 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."

B. R. Judah say, "Three within three, and they must hang down for three."

C. Said R. Pappa, "The decided law is that there must be four threads inserted within three fingerbreadths of the corner, and they must hang down for four fingerbreadths."

D. *Is that to say that there is a fixed length for the show fringes? In contradiction there is the following:*

E. "Show fringes" (Num. 15:38) — The sense of the word means only that something must protrude, and the word implies that any length whatsoever suffices.

F. And in point of fact the elders of the House of Shammai and the elders of the House of Hillel went up to the upper room of Yohanan b. Batera and they said, "There is no fixed measurement attaching to show fringes. Along these same lines, there is no fixed length for the palm branch that is waved on the Feast of Tabernacles."

G. *Does this not mean that there is no fixed measure of any kind whatsoever?*

H. Not at all, **[42A]** what it means is that there is no fixed measure of the maximum, but there is a fixed measure of the minimum. *For if you do not take that position, then the statement, "Along these same lines, there is no fixed length for the palm branch that is waved on the Feast of Tabernacles," would mean that there is no fixed limit of any kind. But we have learned in the Mishnah, A palm branch which is [only] three handbreadths long, sufficient to shake, is valid [M. Suk. 3:1G-I]! But the meaning must be, there is no fixed measure of the maximum, but there is a fixed measure of the minimum. And here too, there is no fixed measure of the maximum, but there is a fixed measure of the minimum.*

I.36. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. "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).

C. And said Abbaye, "And one has to keep the threads distinct from one another, like the forelock of the Romans."

I.37. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. If one put the show fringes at the tip of the corner or at the [Cashdan:] selvedge of the garment [the closely woven binding at the edge of the garment that prevents unravelling], it is valid.

C. R. Eliezer b. Jacob declares invalid in both cases.

D. *In accord with which of the two preceding authorities is the following ruling that R. Giddal said Rab said, "The show fringes have to hang over the corner, in line with the verse, 'on the corners of their garments' (Num. 15:38)?"*

E. *In accord with which authority? It is in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob.*

- I.38.** A. 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.”
- I.39.** A. *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. *For on the basis only of what R. Pappa said, I might have supposed that it must be solely within three fingerbreadths’ distance from the corner, no further off, but the nearer the better. That inaccurate inference necessitates the statement of R. Jacob.*
- C. *And on the basis only of what R. Jacob said, I might have supposed that it must be set off from the corner by a distance equivalent to the first joint of the thumb, no nearer than that, but the farther, the better. That inaccurate inference necessitates the statement of R. Pappa.*
- I.40.** A. *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?”*
- B. *He said to him, “That was stated only to deal with the time when the show fringes are first prepared.”*
- C. *The [Sama] other was embarrassed.*
- D. *Said to him R. Ashi, “Don’t be mortified, one of them [from the land of Israel] is as good as two of us [from Babylonia].”*
- I.41.** A. *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 (Cashdan)]. 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.*
- B. *R. Jeremiah of Difti would insert eight threads, which made sixteen loose threads, but he did not loop them.*
- C. *Mar b. Rabina would do it the way we do it nowadays [Cashdan: four threads that produce eight hanging loose].*
- I.42.** A. *R. Nahman found R. Ada bar Ahbah inserting the threads and saying the blessing, “...to make show fringes.”*
- B. *He said to him, “What is this sound of sh-sh...that I am hearing? This is what Rab said, ‘Inserting show fringes does not have to be accompanied by the recitation of a blessing.’”*
- I.43.** A. *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.”

B. *So what’s the contradiction anyhow?*

C. *Said R. Joseph, “R. Hisda takes the view that any religious duty that may be validly done by a gentile, in the case of an Israelite’s doing the same, no blessing is required; but in the case of any religious duty that may not be validly performed by a gentile, in the case of an Israelite’s doing the same does require a blessing.”*

I.44. A. *But is this really an encompassing principle? And lo, there is the case of circumcision, which may be validly done by a gentile, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: “In a town in which there is no Israelite physician but there are a Samaritan and a gentile physician, the gentile, but not the Samaritan, physician should perform circumcisions,” the words of R. Meir.*

B. R. Judah says, “Let the Samaritan physician perform the rite of circumcision, but not the gentile one.”

C. When it is done by an Israelite, one must recite a blessing, *for a master has said*, “He who performs the rite of circumcision says, ‘Blessed...who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.’”

D. *This question addresses Rab, but Rab has declared it invalid for a gentile to circumcise. For it has been stated:*

E. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that it is invalid for a gentile to perform the rite of circumcision?

F. Daru bar Pappa in the name of Rab said, “‘And as for you, you shall keep my covenant’ (Gen. 17: 9).”

G. And R. Yohanan said, “‘...must be circumcised’ (Gen. 17:13) [the doubling of the verb yields, ‘he who is circumcised shall circumcise’ (Mishcon, Abodah Zarah, to 27A)].”

I.45. A. *As to the matter of the tabernacle for the festival of Tabernacles, that sustains R. Hisda’s position, while the matter involving the boxes containing prayer-parchments refutes it.*

B. *For a tabernacle is valid if a gentile makes it, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: A sukkah built for gentiles, women, cattle, and or Samaritans falls into the category of a sukkah on all accounts [and is] valid, so long as it has sukkah-roofing in accord with the law applying to it.*

C. *And when made by an Israelite, it is not necessary to recite a blessing in that connection, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: **One who makes a sukkah for himself says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...] who has kept us in life and sustained us and brought us to this occasion.” [One who] enters to dwell in it says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...] [who has sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us to dwell in the sukkah.” Once he recites a benediction over it on the first day, he need not recite the benediction again [or remaining days of the festival] [T. Ber. 6:10, 6:9]. But with reference to making the sukkah, no blessing is prescribed.***

I.46. A. *[As to the matter of the tabernacle for the festival of Tabernacles, that sustains R. Hisda's position,] while the matter involving the boxes containing prayer-parchments refutes it: for lo, the boxes containing prayer parchments are invalid if a gentile makes them.*

B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority by R. Hinnena b. Raba [42B] of Pashranayya, "A scroll of the law, boxes containing prayer parchments, and doorpost markers that a Sadducee, a Samaritan, or a gentile, a slave, woman, or minor, or a quisling wrote are invalid, for it is said, 'And you shall bind them...and you shall write them' (Deu. 6:8, 9), meaning, whoever is subject to the requirement of binding is under the law of validly writing them, and whoever is not subject to the requirement of binding them also is not subject to the rules governing writing them.*

C. *And yet, when written by an Israelite, there is no requirement that he say a blessing. For R. Hiyya b. R. Huna in the name of R. Yohanan sent word, "On putting on the prayer-parchment box for the arm, one says, 'Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us to put on boxes containing prayer-parchments.' On putting on the prayer-parchment box for the head, one says, 'Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us concerning the religious duty of prayer-parchments'." But the blessing, "Who...has commanded us to make the boxes containing prayer-parchment" is not said!*

D. *So is this not the operative principle: In the case of any religious duty that is completed in a single action, for instance, circumcision, even though validly performed by a gentile, when done by an Israelite, it is necessary to say a blessing. And in the case of any religious duty that is not completed in a single action, for instance, the making of boxes containing prayer-parchments, even though not validly performed by a gentile, when done by an Israelite, it is not necessary to say a blessing.*

E. *And in regard to making show-fringes, [Nahman and Hisda] differ [on whether or not one has to recite a blessing], for one authority [Hisda] maintains that the obligation pertains to the garment, and the other [Nahman], that the obligation pertains to the person.*

I.47. A. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, "That is how you people repeat the matter as the Tannaite formulation. But as for us, this is how we repeat it as our Tannaite formulation:*

B. *"said R. Judah said Rab, 'How on the basis of Scripture do we know that show fringes of a gentile are valid? As it is said, "Speak to the children of Israel and command them to make show fringes" (Num. 15:38). Others may make show fringes for them.'"*

I.48. A. *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.]*

- B. [Judah continues,] *“Now when I [Judah] repeated this statement before Samuel, he said to me, ‘Also show-fringes made from tufts are invalid.’*
- C. *“‘For we require an act of weaving of the show-fringes that is done for its own sake [and in the present case, there is no such act].’”*
- D. *That is a matter of conflict between Tannaite formulations of the law, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. If one covered phylacteries with gold or attached to them the hide of an unclean beast, the phylacteries are invalid.
- F. If one attached to them the hide of a clean beast, they are valid.
- G. That is the case, even though one did not tan the hide for that purpose.
- H. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, *“Even in the case of the hide of a clean beast, the phylacteries are invalid unless one tanned the hide for the purpose of the use of phylacteries.”* [Cashdan: similarly, the initial authority and Simeon b. Gamaliel would differ on the necessity of weaving the threads specifically for the purpose of show fringes.]

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

- B. *He said to him, [Following Cashdan:] “We bring the blood of the hillazon-mollusc, along with other ingredients, and put them together in a pot and boil them. Then we take a little out in an egg shell and test it on a piece of wool, and throw away what remains in the egg shell and burn the wool.”*
- C. *Three rules are to be inferred from that statement:*
- D. *It is to be inferred that dye that is used for testing is invalid.*
- F. *And it is to be inferred that the dyeing must be for the purpose of carrying out the religious duty.*
- G. *And it is to be inferred that the dye used for testing renders the rest of the dye of that batch unfit.*
- H. *But the rules that dye that is used for testing is invalid and that the dyeing must be for the purpose of carrying out the religious duty are one and the same!*
 - I. *Said R. Ashi, “The formulation means to bear the sense of explaining one rule by reason of the other. Specifically, what is the reason that the dye that is used for testing is invalid? It is because the dyeing must be for the purpose of carrying out the religious duty.”*

I.50. A. *There is a conflict of Tannaite formulations on the same matter:*

- B. *“The dye that is used for testing is invalid, as it is said, ‘all of blue’ (Exo. 28:31) [Cashdan: the dyeing of the blue thread for the show fringes should be the first use of the dye],” the words of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel.*
- C. R. Yohanan b. Dahabai says, *“Even the second dyeing of the batch is valid, for it says, ‘and scarlet’ (Lev. 4) [reading the letters for the word scarlet as though they were sounded to mean ‘second’].”*

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

- B. The blue dye is not subject to testing, and it may be purchased only from an expert.

- C. The boxes containing prayer parchments are subject to examination, but nonetheless may be purchased only from an expert.
- D. Scrolls of the Torah and doorpost markers are subject to testing and may be purchased from an ordinary person.

I.52. A. And is it the fact that the blue dye is not subject to testing? *But R. Isaac b. R. Judah would test it in this way: he would bring liquid alum, juice of fenugreek, and urine [43A] of a forty-day old child, and sock the blue thread in it overnight until morning. If the color faded, it is invalid, if not, it is valid.*

B. *And R. Ada before Raba in the name of R. Avira said, "You bring a piece of hard leavened dough of barley meal and bake it with the blue thread inside. If the color got deeper, it is valid; if it deteriorated, it is invalid. And the mnemonic is, a false change, a true change."*

C. *When one says, The blue dye is not subject to testing, the meaning is the test quantity itself is not subject to testing.*

I.53. A. *In the time of R. Ahai, a master of the town of Moshki got some blue thread. They tested it in accord with the test proposed by R. Isaac b. R. Judah and the color faded. They tested it by the test of R. Adda and the color deepened. He considered declared it invalid.*

B. *Said to them R. Ahai, "But this is neither authentic blue dye nor imitation blue."*

C. *It is then to be inferred that one teaching complements the other: if the test proposed by R. Isaac b. R. Judah was applied and the color did not fade, it is certainly valid; if the color faded, then try the test of R. Adda, baking it in a hard piece of leavened dough. If the color deepens, it is valid, but if it deteriorates, it is not valid.*

D. *So they sent a message from there saying, "The one teaching complements the other."*

I.54. A. *R. Mani was meticulous about buying blue thread, so he followed the stringent requirements of the stated rule [only purchasing it from an expert].*

B. *Said an elder to him, "That is what those who came before you did, and their affairs prospered."*

I.55. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *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."*

B. *What is the operative consideration?*

C. *Here they explained it: because of what a whore might say [if she got it, with fringes, from a gentile in exchange for her services; she might then use it in evidence against a Jew].*

D. *R. Judah said, "It is a precautionary ruling, lest on a journey a Jew join a gentile wearing it, and the latter kill him." [The Jew would assume the other was also a Jew and so would trust him, and the other would kill him unawares.]*

- I.56.** A. *R. Judah would put show fringes onto the aprons of the women of his household.*
- B. *Every morning he would recite the blessing, "...who has commanded us to wrap ourselves around in fringes."*
- C. *But since he put them onto the aprons of the women of his household, it must have regarded it as a religious duty that does not depend upon the advent of a particular point in time to become operative, so why does he say such a blessing every single morning?*
- D. *He is in accord with the view of Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. *"At any time at which one puts on his boxes containing prayer parchments, he says a blessing over them," the words of Rabbi.*
- F. *If that is the case, then whenever during the day he puts on the show fringes, he also should say a blessing.*
- G. *R Judah was a very fastidious person, and he did not take off his cloak for the entire day.*
- H. *Then how come in the morning?*
- I. *Then he changed clothes from night to day garments.*

I.57. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *All are obligated to carry out the religious duty of [affixing to their garments] show-fringes: priests, Levites, Israelites.*
- C. *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.*

- I.58.** A. *The master has said: "All are obligated to carry out the religious duty of [affixing to their garments] show-fringes: priests, Levites, Israelites."*
- B. *[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]?*
- C. *It was necessary to make the specification at hand on account of the priests.*
- D. *[How so?] I might have reasoned as follows: Since it is written, "You will not wear hybrid fabrics [e.g., a garment made from both wool and flax which derive from different categories, vegetable and animal, respectively]... You will make twisted cords [that is, show-fringes] for yourself" (Deu. 22:11, 12).*
- E. *[From the juxtaposition of the previous two verses, the framer reasons as follows:] As to one who in no way enjoys remission of the prohibition against wearing hybrid fabrics in his clothing, he is obligated to observe the religious duty of wearing show-fringes.*
- F. *Thus, since priests [under cultic circumstances] enjoy remission of the prohibition against wearing hybrid fabrics in their garments [Exo. 39:29 is understood as specifying that the priest wears linen and wool cloth, one might reason that] they ought not to be subject to the religious duty of wearing show-fringes [on their garments].*

- G. *Accordingly, [by phrasing the matter to make explicit reference to the priesthood, the author] informs us [that that is not the case].*
- H. *Accordingly, while during the time of their service in the cult, they enjoy a remission [of the stated taboo], at other times they do not.*

- I.59.** A. “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.”
- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon?*
 - C. “And you will look upon it” — excluding pajamas [which, worn by night, are not seen].
 - D. You maintain the reading, “And you will look upon it” — excluding pajamas. But perhaps the sense is only to exclude a garment worn by a blind person!
 - E. When Scripture says, “with which you cover yourself” (Deu. 22:12), that self-evidently encompasses the garment worn by a blind person. So how am I to interpret “And you will look upon it”? It means, excluding pajamas.
 - F. So how come you extend the law to the garment worn by a blind person and exclude from the law of show fringes pajamas?
 - G. I extend the law to the clothing of a blind person, since they are subject to being seen by other people, but I exclude from the requirement pajamas, which are not going to be seen by other people.
 - H. *And rabbis — [43B] how do they interpret the verse, “with which you cover yourself” (Deu. 22:12)?*
 - I. *They require that verse in line with the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - J. “You shall make yourself twisted cords upon the four corners of your garment” (Deu. 22:12) —
 - K. “Four” but not three. [a garment of three corners only, the fourth being rounded, so that it is not a corner, is exempt.]
 - L. Or perhaps the sense is only “four” but not five?
 - M. When Scripture says, “...with which you cover yourself” (Deu. 22:12), lo, it refers to a garment of five corners. So how am I to interpret “four”? The meaning must be, “Four” but not three.
 - N. How come you determine to include a five-cornered garment but exclude a three cornered one?
 - O. I encompass a five-cornered garment because four is covered by five, but I omit a three cornered one, because three does not cover four.
 - P. And R. Simeon?
 - Q. *He derives that rule from “wherewith.”*
 - R. *And Rabbis?*
 - S. *They do not derive that rule from “wherewith.”*
 - T. *And rabbis — how furthermore do they interpret the verse, “And you will look upon it”?*
 - U. *They require it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- V. “That you may look upon it and remember” — look at this religious duty and remember another religious duty that depends upon it, and what is that? It is the recitation of the Shema.
- W. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: From what time do they recite the Shema in the morning? From the hour that one can distinguish between blue and white. R. Eliezer says, “Between blue and green” [M. Ber. 1:2A-C].*
- X. *And a further Tannaite statement:*
- Y. “That you may look upon it and remember” — look at this religious duty and remember another religious duty that depends upon it, and what is that? It is the religious duty concerning mixed species.
- Z. For it is written “You shall not wear mingled stuff, wool and linen together. You shall make yourself twisted cords” (Deu. 22:11,12).
- AA. *And a further Tannaite statement:*
- BB. “That you may look upon it and remember” — look at this religious duty and remember all of the commandments of the Lord” — once one is obligated to carry out this religious duty, he is obligated to carry out all the other religious duties.
- CC. And that represents the view of R. Simeon, who holds that the show fringes are a religious duty the observance of which depends on the advent of a particular time of the day.
- DD. *And a further Tannaite statement:*
- EE. “That you may look upon it and remember all the commandments of the Lord” — this religious duty outweighs all the rest of the religious duties in their entirety.
- FF. *And a further Tannaite statement:*
- GG. “You will look upon it and remember...and do:”
- HH. Seeing brings about remembering, and remembering brings about doing.
- II. And R. Simeon b. Yohai says, “Whoever is devoted to carrying out this religious duties gains the merit to receive the very presence of God.
- JJ. “*Here it is written, ‘That you may look upon it,’ and elsewhere, ‘That you shall fear the Lord your God and him you shall serve’ (Deu. 6:13).’*”

I.60. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **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.**
- C. **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].

I.61. A. 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).”

I.62. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Meir would say, “Why is blue singled out among all the colors for use in the show fringes?
- C. “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).”

I.63. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Meir would say, “Greater is the penalty for neglecting the white thread than the penalty of neglecting the blue.
- C. “The matter yields a comparison: to what is it likened? To a mortal kind who said to two of his staff, to one saying ‘Bring me the seal for mud,’ and to the other, ‘Bring me the seal for gold.’ Both of them proved negligent and did not bring them. Which of the two was subject to the greater punishment? You have to say, the one to whom he said, ‘Bring me the seal for gold,’ who did not bring it.”

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

- B. R. 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).”

I.65. A. *On the Sabbath and on festivals R. Hiyya b. R. Avia would go to the trouble of meeting this goal by using spices and delicacies.*

I.66. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. 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].
- C. R. Aha bar Jacob heard his son reciting the blessing, “Praised are you, O Lord, who did not make me a boor.” He said to him, “Arrogance — to such an extent...!”
- D. He said to him, “Then what blessing should one say?”
- E. “...who has not made me a slave.”

F. *"But that is in the same category as a woman anyhow!"*

G. *A slave is [44A] worse.*

I.67. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. The essence [blood] of the *hillazon*-mollusc is like the sea in color, and the shape is like a fish.

C. It emerges once in seventy years.

D. And with its blood they dye the blue thread of the show fringes.

E. Therefore it is mighty costly.

I.68. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. 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."

C. "There was the case of a man who was meticulous about observing the religious duty of show fringes.

D. "He heard that there was a whore in one of the cities by the sea, who gets a fee of four hundred gold pieces for her services. He sent her four hundred gold pieces and made a date with her.]

E. "When the date came, he came and sat down at the door of her whorehouse. Her slave girl went in and told her, 'That man who sent you the four hundred gold pieces has arrived and is sitting at the door.'

F. "She said, 'Let him come in.'"

G. "He came in. She laid out for him a pile of seven beds, six of silver, one of gold, and between each one was a silver ladder, and the top one was of gold. She went up and took her place on top of the top one, completely nude. He too came up on the ladders to take his place, completely nude, at her side. [But as he was removing his garments], the four show fringes came out and slapped his face.

H. "He slipped off and sat down on the ground, and she too slipped off and sat down on the ground.

I. "She said to him, 'By the Roman capital! I am not letting you go until you tell me what flaw you saw in me!'"

J. "He said to her," "By the Temple service! I never saw a more beautiful woman than you in my whole life. But there is a certain religious duty that the Lord, who is our God, commanded us, and it is called show fringes. And in that connection it is written, 'I am the Lord your God' (Num. 15:41) two times. The meaning is, 'I am the one who is going to exact punishment from you, and I am the one who is going to pay a good reward.'" Now these show fringes appeared to me like four witnesses [to that oath of God]."

K. "She said to him, 'I am not letting you go until you tell me what is your name and the name of your town and the name of your master and the name of the study hall where you have learned the Torah.'"

L. "He wrote it all down and put it in her hand. She went and split up all her property, a third to the government, a third to the poor, and a third she took in hand, along with those beds." She came to the study house of R. Hiyya. She said

to him, "My lord, give orders concerning me so that they will make me a proselyte."

- M. "He said to her, "My daughter, is it possible that you have laid eyes on one of the disciples?"
- N. "She took out the slip of paper in her hand and gave it to him.
- O. "He said to her, "Go and take possession of what you have purchased."
- P. "Those very same beds that she had spread out for him when prohibited did she now spread out for him when permitted.
- Q. "This then is the meaning of giving the reward in this world, but as to the world to come, I do not even know how great it is."

I.69. A. 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."

- B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. He who is living in an inn in the land of Israel, and he who is renting a house outside of the Land of Israel, for the first thirty days is exempt from the requirement of placing a marker on the doorpost. From that time onward, he is liable.
- D. But he who rents a house in the Land of Israel must place a doorpost marker on the doorpost on the spot, on account of the religious duty of dwelling in the Land of Israel.

II.1 A. **The absence of the box containing prayer-parchments [*tfillah*] 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:**

- B. 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."
- C. They said to him, "Do you really say so?"
- D. *He said to them, "No, for it will yield the inference that if someone cannot do two religious duties, then even one religious duty that he can perform he may as well not carry out."*
- E. *So what was his position to begin with?*
- F. It would be a precautionary degree, lest somebody neglect the duty [buying only one box since that would suffice].

II.2. A. Said R. Sheshet, "Whoever does not put on boxes containing prayer parchments violates eight commandments of affirmative action,

- B. "and whoever does not have show fringes on his garment violates five commandments of affirmative action.
- C. "Any priest, moreover, who having the opportunity does not ascend the platform to give the priestly blessing violates three commandments of affirmative action.
- D. "Whoever has not got a doorpost marker on his door violates two commandments of affirmative action: 'And you shall write...and you shall write' (Deu. 6: 9, 11:20)."

II.3. A. And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Whoever does put on boxes containing prayer parchments lengthens his life, as it is said, [44B] ‘The Lord upon them, they shall live, and altogether therein is the life of my spirit; wherefore recover me and make me live’ (Isa. 38:16).”

4:1C-D

- C. (3) 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.
- D. (4) The [omission of any one of] the sprinklings [of blood] which are to be placed on the outer altar [M. Zeb. 5:3-7] does not impair the validity of one another [M. Zeb. 4:1, M. Men. 3:6].

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

- B. “And their meal offerings and their drink offerings” (Num. 29:18) — first present the meal offering, then present the drink offerings.
- C. Rabbi says, “‘A sacrifice and drink offerings’ (Lev. 23:37) — first present the sacrifice, and then present the drink offerings.”
- D. *But from Rabbi’s viewpoint too, is it not written* “And their meal offerings and their drink offerings” (Num. 29:18)?
- E. *He requires that verse to make the point that* “their meal offerings and their drink offerings” may be presented by night, and “their meal offerings and their drink offerings” may be presented even on the next day.
- F. *And from rabbis’ viewpoint, too, is it not written,* “A sacrifice and drink offerings”?
- G. *They require that verse to make the point of Zeiri.*
- H. For 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].
- I. *And does not Rabbi need the same verse to make Zeiri’s point, and do not rabbis require the contrary verse to make the point that* “their meal offerings and their drink offerings” may be presented by night, and “their meal offerings and their drink offerings” may be presented even on the next day?
- J. *But in point of fact, the pertinent scriptural basis for the position of rabbis is that it is written,* “A burnt offering and a meal offering” (Lev. 23:37) [Cashdan: hence the meal offering follows immediately after the animal offering].
- K. *But from Rabbi’s viewpoint too, is it not written,* “A burnt offering and a meal offering” (Lev. 23:37)?
- L. *Well, here is the point: when the drink offerings are presented along with the animal sacrifice, all parties concur that first comes the meal offering, then the drink offering, in line with the verse,* “A burnt offering and a meal offering” (Lev. 23:37). *Where there is a difference of opinion, it is when the drink offerings are presented on their own. Rabbis take the view that,* just as when they accompany the animal sacrifice, the meal offering is presented first and then the drink offering, so when they are offered on their own, the meal offering is offered first and then the drink offering.

- M. *Rabbi holds that the operative consideration when the drink offerings are presented along with an animal offering for the meal offering's being presented first is that, since the offering begins with what is eaten, not drunk, one continues with what is eaten, but when they are offered on their own, the drink offering comes first, since the Psalm is sung by the Levites over the drink offering.*

II.1 A. 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:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. 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?
- D. "And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord your god" (Deu. 12:27).

4:2

- A. **(5) 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, Lev. 23:18, Num. 28:11ff.] do not impair the validity of one another.**
- 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.**
- C. **"But let them not offer up all of them without their [meal and] drink offerings."**

I.1 A. [The absence of bullocks and the rams:] which ones?

- B. *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.]*
- C. *So it must refer to those of the New Moon and of Pentecost.*

I.2. A. [45A] the rams: which ones?

- B. *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 (Cashdan)]!*
- C. *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.

D. *Then as to the bullocks, even though they are set forth in only a single passage, the absence of one does not invalidate the offering of the other; in regard to rams, the absence of what is ordained in one passage does not invalidate the offering that is required in another passage, but of what is ordained in one passage the absence of one does invalidate the other [and that is hardly consistent]!* [Cashdan: the two rams offered with the two loaves on Pentecost, Lev. 23:18, are indispensable to each other, and one cannot be offered without the other.]

E. *The Tannaite framer of the passage has dealt with each case in its own terms.*

I.3. A. “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):

B. What purpose is served by the reference to “a bullock” here?

C. Since the Torah states, “Two bullocks,” then how do I know that if the Temple could not find two, then at least one is presented?

D. Scripture states, “a young bullock.”

E. What purpose is served by the reference to “six lambs”?

F. Since it is written in the Torah, “Seven,” how do I know that if the Temple could not find seven, then at least six are presented?

G. Scripture states, “six lambs.”

H. And how on the basis of Scripture do I know that if six cannot be found, five are presented, or five, four, or four, three, or three, two, and even one?

I. Scripture states, “And lambs according to his means suffice” (Eze. 46: 7).

J. *So if that is what is said, then what is the point of saying, “six lambs”?*

K. *To make the point that, so far as it is possible to embellish the rite, we embellish it.*

L. And how do we know that each one is indispensable, so that its absence invalidates the others?

M. Scripture says, “They shall be...” (Eze. 46: 6).

I.4. A. “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):

B. “A sin offering”? But in point of fact it is a burnt offering [so Num. 28:21]!

C. Said R. Yohanan, “This passage is Elijah destined to interpret.”

D. R. Ashi said, “It speaks of the consecration offering that they presented in the time of Ezra in the manner in which it was presented in the time of Moses” [Cashdan: for on the eighth day of the consecration of the sanctuary in the time of Moses, which coincided with the new moon of Nisan, sin offerings, and not the usual burnt offerings, were brought].

E. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

F. R. Judah says, “This passage is Elijah destined to interpret.”

- G. Said to him R. Yosé, "It speaks of the consecration offering that they presented in the time of Ezra in the manner in which it was presented in the time of Moses."
- H. He said to him, "May your mind rest easy as you have made my mind rest easy."
- I.5.** A. "The priest shall not eat of anything that dies of itself or is torn, whether it be fowl or beast" (Eze. 44:31):
- B. *Is it the fact that priests may not eat that kind of food, but Israelites may eat it? [Obviously not!]*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, "This passage is Elijah destined to interpret."
- D. *Rabina said, "It was necessary to make explicit reference to the priests. It might have entered your mind to say that since a bird slaughtered not in the normal manner but by pinching the neck has been permitted to them, then carrion and terefah-beasts likewise should be permitted to them. So we are informed that that is not the case."*
- I.6.** A. "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):
- B. "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]."
- I.7.** A. ["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:"
- B. if they innovated in the law, e.g., by claiming that the prohibited fat is permitted.
- I.8.** A. ["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:"
- B. this teaches that people are liable [to present the special sin offering of a bullock (Cashdan)] only if the court's ruling was made in ignorance, and the community acted inadvertently.
- I.9.** A. 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.
- B. "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."
- II.1** A. **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:"**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "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):

- D. 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 (Cashdan).] 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 [45B] 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."

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.
- B. Nor does [the absence of] the bread impair their validity.
- C. "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.
- D. 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 [= M. 2:3].
- E. "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].
- F. "Likewise here, let them offer up lambs without bread."
- G. Said R. Simeon, "The law is in accord with the opinion of Ben Nannos.
- H. "But the operative consideration [therefor] is not in accord with his opinion.
- I. "For every [offering, Num. 28:27ff.] stated in the Book of Numbers was offered in the wilderness.
- J. "But every [offering] stated in the Book of Leviticus was not offered in the wilderness [inclusive of that under discussion, Lev. 23:18-19].
- K. "When they came to the Land, both these and those were offered.
- L. "And on what account do I rule, 'Let the lambs be offered without bread'?
- M. "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 (M. 2: 5)]."

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

- B. "And you shall present with the bread seven lambs without blemish" (Lev. 23:18):
- C. "'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].
- D. "'seven lambs without blemish:' even though there is no bread offering.
- E. "If so, why then does Scripture state, 'And you shall present with the bread'?
- F. "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.

- G. Might one suppose that the lambs that are spoken of here are the same as those spoken of in the book of Numbers?
- H. Do you say so? When you come to the bullocks and rams, they cannot be one and the same, for the ones that are mentioned in the Book of Numbers [offered as additional sacrifices, not related to the bread offering (Cashdan)] are presented on their own account, while the others [in Leviticus] are presented by reason of the bread offering. What is the upshot? What is specified in the Book of Numbers was offered in the wilderness, and what is specified in the Book of Leviticus was not offered in the wilderness [vs. **For every offering stated in the Book of Numbers was offered in the wilderness**].
- I. *But perhaps the bullocks and rams noted in each of the two books of the Pentateuch as not the same, but the lambs are the same [since in each case, seven are involved]?*
- J. *Since the one set are different, the others also are different.*
- K. *And how do you know that the bullocks and rams in one book are not the same as the bullocks and rams of the other? Perhaps this is the sense of the All-Merciful's statement: if you want, one bullock and two rams are to be offered, or, if you want, two bullocks and one ram?"*
- L. *Since the order of the beasts differs from one book to the other, that shows that these are not classified as the same.*

II.1 A. "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:

- B. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Aqiba?*
- C. He finds a verbal analogy based on the words "they shall be," so that the meaning of the same phrase in one passage is the same as in the other. ["And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits for a wave offering before the Lord with the two lambs; they shall be holy to the Lord for the priest," (Lev. 23:20), meaning that the offering is essential, but is it the bread offering or the two lambs; Lev. 23:17: "they shall be of fine flour" then speaks of the bread offering Cashdan]. Just as in the latter passage, reference is made to the bread offering, so in the former case the reference is to the bread offering.
- D. And Ben Nannos?
- E. He derives the rule from the use of "they shall be" [at Lev. 23:18, which speaks of the seven lambs and other burnt offerings]. Just as in the latter passage, reference is made to the lambs, so in the former case the reference is to the lambs.
- F. *And why does Ben Nannos also not derive the lesson from the usage "shall be" [to which R. Aqiba calls attention]:* Just as in the latter passage, reference is made to the bread offering, so in the former case the reference is to the bread offering?
- G. The meaning of the plural verb to be, "shall be," derives from the meaning of the same form elsewhere, but one may not infer the meaning of the verb to be in the masculine plural form from the meaning of the verb to be in the feminine plural form.
- H. *So what difference does that make? Has not the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], "'and the priest shall come again' (Lev. 14:39),*

‘and the priest shall come in’ (Lev. 14:44) — each word refers to coming into the house [and the different word choices or formulations are null]”?

- I. *That ruling pertains where there is no identical expression, but in a case such as this one, in which the same root occurs, since the words are in point of fact identical except for the particular form, we do derive such a lesson.*
- J. *Then should not R. Aqiba also follow suit and derive the meaning of one reference to “shall be” from the other as does Ben Nannos?*
- K. We derive the rule governing something that is a gift to the priest from the rule of some other matter that falls into the classification of a gift to the priest, *thus excluding these, which are burnt offerings.*
- L. *And if you prefer, I shall claim that the difference of opinion concerns the interpretation of the actual verse, as follows:*
- M. “They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest” (Lev. 23:20) —
- N. R. Aqiba reasons, “What is the matter that is wholly handed over to the priest? You have to say that it is the bread.”
- O. And Ben Nannos?
- P. *Is it written, “They shall be holy to the priest”? What is written is, “They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest” — and what is that which is partly for the Lord and partly for the priest? You must say, “These are the lambs.”*
- Q. And R. Aqiba?
- R. *Is it written, “They shall be holy to the Lord and to the priest”? What is written is, “They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest” — in line with that which R. Huna said.*
- S. For said R. Huna, “God made acquisition of it and then gave it over to the priest.”

II.2. A. Said R. Yohanan, “All concur [46A] that if they were dependent upon one another, then the absence of the one invalidates the absence of the other.

- B. “And what is it that forms the basis for this interdependence of theirs?
- C. “It is the act of slaughter.”

II.3. A. 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?’*”

- B. *Solve the problem by reference to what R. Yohanan said, for said R. Yohanan, “The act of slaughter forms the basis for interdependence.” Then it must be inferred that the act of waving does not form the basis for interdependence.*
- C. *But the very position of R. Yohanan is at issue, specifically, was it so obvious to R. Yohanan that while the act of slaughter forms the basis for interdependence, the act of waving does not form the basis for interdependence? Or perhaps the rule governing the act of slaughter was clear to him, while the rule governing the act of waving was simply a matter of doubt to him?*
- D. *The question stands.*

II.4. A. 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

[Cashdan: 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].”

- B. *And according to your reasoning, the verse is written after the rite of waving, not after the slaughtering!* [Cashdan: The verse relates to the time after the slaughtering, for only then can they be considered for the priest, and yet they differ as to which is indispensable; hence the argument could be adduced to prove that even slaughtering does not create interdependency.] *Rather, what can you say here? You must say that the rule in the verse applies to the early stage of the offering [before the beasts are slaughtered], and the verse, “They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest” pertains to later on, at which point they will be for the priest; then here too, only later on will they be for the priest* [the rule that one may be offered without the other relates only to the early stage of the offering, before the waving; the waving then creates interdependency (Cashdan)].

II.5. A. *But does the act of slaughtering create interdependency?*

- B. *An objection was raised: If before the thank offering was slaughtered, the bread was broken, let him bring other bread and slaughter the animal to which it belongs, and it is valid. If after he slaughtered the animal, the bread accompanying it was broken, the blood nonetheless is to be tossed, and the man has fulfilled the conditions of his vow. The thank-offering may be eaten, but the bread is forbidden. If this happened after the blood was tossed, they take the heave offering owing to the priest, one in ten loaves, from the whole loaves in behalf also of the broken ones. If after the animal was slaughtered, the bread accompanying it was made unclean, the blood is tossed, but the owner has not yet fulfilled the conditions of his vow. The thank offering may be eaten, but the bread is prohibited. If this happened after the blood was tossed, they take the heave offering owing to the priest from what is clean in behalf of what is unclean, and the owner has fulfilled his vow, for the priest’s frontplate expiates the offering that had become unclean; but the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled and then the cake became unclean, he must give as the priestly offering a clean cake in behalf of what had become unclean* [following the verse of T. **Men. 8:27A-H**]. *Now if it were the fact that the act of slaughtering does create interdependency, since through the act of slaughter the one became dependent upon the other, if the cakes had become invalid, the thank offering also should be invalid [and the blood should not be sprinkled]!*
- C. The case of the thank offering is exceptional, for the All-Merciful has classified it as peace offerings. Just as peace offerings then are presented without a bread offering, so the thank offering may be presented without a bread offering.”
- II.6.** A. Said R. Jeremiah, “If you maintain that waving creates interdependency, then if the bread offering was lost after waving, **[46B]** 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?

- B. *"It goes without saying, of course, that if the lambs were lost and replaced, there is no question that the second set of lambs has to be waved. The question arises only when the bread was lost."*
- C. *"And in respect to the position of Ben Nannos there is no question, for he has said, 'The lambs are the principal part of the offering.' The question arises in regard to the position of R. Aqiba, who has said, 'The bread is the principal part of the offering.' Then what is the rule? Since the bread is the principal part of the offering, the replacement bread has to be waved? Or perhaps since the component of the rite that permits the priests to eat their share of the offering that affects the bread is the proper performance of the rite concerning the lambs, there is no need to wave the bread again?"*
- D. *The question stands.*

- II.7.** A. *Said Abbayye 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?"*
- B. He said to him, "It is because the one has been made interdependent with the other through being waved in common."
 - C. *"But what about the thank offering, where the animal offering and the bread are not made interdependent through an act of waving, and yet the one effects the sanctification of the other, and the absence of the one invalidates the other?"*
 - D. *"So let us effect the comparison with the thank offering: just as the thank offering is classified as a peace offering [Cashdan: and that alone effects the sanctification of the bread], so here too it is the peace offering that sanctifies the bread [Cashdan: whereas the seven lambs, bullock, and rams are burnt offerings]."*
 - E. *"Can such a comparison really be made? In the case of the thank offering, there are no other offerings that are presented with it, while in the offerings of Pentecost, there are other classifications of offering that are presented with it. Since there is another classification of offering that is presented with it, both kinds should effect the sanctification of the bread."*
 - F. *"Rather, it is like the ram that is presented by the Nazirite. Just as in the case of the ram that is presented by the Nazirite, even though there are other offerings that accompany the ram {ram for a peace offering, male lamb for a burnt offering, ewe lamb for a sin offering}, it is the peace offering alone that sanctifies the bread, and nothing else sanctifies the bread, so here too the rule is the same."*
 - G. *And how do we know it in that case? As it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - H. *"And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace offerings to the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread" (Num. 6:17) —*
 - I. *this teaches that the basket of bread is obligatory for the ram, and slaughtering the ram sanctifies the basket of bread.*
 - J. *Therefore if the beast was slaughtered for any classification of offering other than that for which it was originally consecrated, the bread is not thereby sanctified.*

II.8. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **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].**
- C. *What's your choice? If the two loaves presented without the lambs are presented to be eaten, let them be eaten. If they are presented to be burned, let them be burned right away. Why wait till they rot?*
- D. *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."*

II.9. A. *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?' [Cashdan: 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. *Said to him Abbaye, "Not at all. In point of fact they are presented with an animal offering, And as to your question deriving from the case of the thank offering and its loaves, the loaves of the thank offering are not classified as a meal offering, but the two loaves are classified as a meal offering: 'when you bring a new meal offering to the Lord' (Num. 28:26)."*

II.10. A. *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."*

- B. *Said to him Abbaye, "Are the cases really parallel? In the case of not burning holy things on a festival day, the reason is that it is not part of the correct fulfillment of the commandment pertaining to them to do so [since the holy thing was supposed to be eaten, not burned, and that cannot be done on the festival]. But in this case, the proper fulfillment of the religious duty concerning them is that they be burned on the festival, as is the case of the bullock and the he goat offered on the Day of Atonement."*

- C. Rather said R. Joseph, "It is a precautionary decree, lest later on in the day lambs might become available [and it may become possible to carry out the rite in the proper way; so burning the loaves is delayed as long as possible (Cashdan)]."
- D. *Said to him Abbaye, "Granting that one may delay burning the loaves so long as the time for offering them remains in effect, but after that time they should be burned right away!"*
- E. *What is the meaning of **they then are left to spoil**? It is, they are to be kept as the time for offering them remains in effect.*

II.11. A. Raba said, "*They are presented for eating. But it is a precautionary decree on account of the considerations raised by Rabbah.*

- B. "*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.*"

II.12. A. **[47A]** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The lambs that are presented at Pentecost sanctify the bread only when they are slaughtered.
- C. How so?
- D. "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.
- E. "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.
- F. "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.
- G. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "Under no circumstances is the bread sanctified unless 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."
- H. *What is the operative consideration for the position of Rabbi?*
- I. Because it is written, "And the ram he shall offer by slaughtering it as a peace offering to the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread" (Num. 6:17) — *thus bearing the implication that the act of slaughtering the pace is what sanctifies the bread.*
- J. And R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon?
- K. "...he shall offer..." means, he must perform all the required actions [Cashdan: including sprinkling the blood].
- L. And Rabbi? *After all, it is indeed written, ...he shall offer...!*

- M. *Were it written, “slaughtering,” and then, “he shall offer,” I should concede that matters are as you say [sprinkling the blood is required in addition to the act of slaughter]. But now that it is written, “he shall offer by slaughtering,” the meaning is, “he shall offer it by an act of slaughtering.”*
- N. *And as to R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon — do we not find the language “[And the ram he shall offer] by slaughtering [it as a peace offering to the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread]” (Num. 6:17)?*
- O. *That is required in line with what R. Yohanan stated, for said R. Yohanan, “All concede that it is necessary that the bread be present at the time that the beast is slaughtered.”*

II.13. A. *What is the meaning of the bread is sanctified but not sanctified?*

- B. Said Abbaye, “It is holy but not wholly so.”
- C. And Raba said, “It is holy but not permitted for eating.”
- D. *So what’s at stake here?* [Cashdan: Abbaye will concur that it is not wholly holy so it cannot be eaten.]
- E. *At issue is whether or not redemption takes effect. In the view of Abbaye, redemption takes effect, in the view of Raba, redemption does not take effect.* [Cashdan: the underlying principle is that whatever is consecrated only for its value can be redeemed; its sanctity then is transferred to the money, and the thing itself is now secular. What is sanctified as to itself, not merely its value, cannot be redeemed in that way. Abbaye holds that the bread is not completely holy, so it may be redeemed. Raba has it wholly sanctified, so redemption is null.]
- F. *Now from the perspective of Raba, there is then a difference of opinion between Rabbi and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon [the latter holds that redemption takes effect, the former not]. But from the perspective of Abbaye, what can possibly separate the positions of Rabbi and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon [since both would maintain that redemption takes effect]?*
- G. *At issue between them is whether or not it would become invalidated if it is taken out of the sanctuary* [Cashdan: according to Rabbi, it would be invalid, according to Eleazar b. R. Simeon, not].

II.14. A. *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?*

- B. *In accord with which authority is this question formulated? If the question is formulated vis à vis R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, has he not stated that it is the act of sprinkling that sanctifies the bread [so the bread has not been sanctified, and it obviously cannot be eaten]. If it is formulated vis à vis Rabbi, whether from the perspective of Abbaye or of Raba, the bread while sanctified is not permitted for eaten.*
- C. *Rather, it is in vis à vis the Tannaite authority of the following:*

- D. *For Abbuha b. R. Jeremiah bar Abba repeated as a Tannaite statement, “The two loaves of bread that were taken out of the Temple precinct between the act of slaughtering the lambs and the act of tossing of the blood, and when the priest did sprinkle the blood of the lambs, at the moment of doing so he expressed the intention of eating the meat outside of the proper time,*
- E. *“R. Eliezer says, “No aspect of refuse pertains to the bread.”*
- F. *“R. Aqiba says, ‘An aspect of refuse pertains to the bread.’”*
- G. *Said R. Sheshet, “These Tannaite authorities accord with the position of Rabbi, that slaughtering sanctifies the bread [so the bread becomes invalid when it is taken out of the Temple precinct], but R. Eliezer is consistent with his position, which is that the act of tossing the blood does not subject to the laws of sacrilege what is taken out of the Temple precincts [so the bread is invalid but is not subject to the intention that the priest expressed during the act of tossing the blood], and R. Aqiba is consistent with his position, which is that the act of tossing the blood does subject to the laws of sacrilege what is taken out of the Temple precincts [so the bread is valid but is subject to the intention that the priest expressed during the act of tossing the blood].*
- H. **[47B] For we have learned in the Mishnah: The meat of Most Holy Things which went forth [beyond the veils] before the tossing of the blood — R. Eliezer says, “The laws of sacrilege apply to it. And they are not liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.” R. Aqiba says, “The laws of sacrilege do not apply to it. Truly are they liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness” [M. Me. 1:2A-C].**
- I. *[Reverting to the question with which we commenced, 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?] what is the upshot [so far as Aqiba is concerned]? Just as the sprinkling of the blood that has been subjected to the intentionality that makes the offering refuse classifies the bread as refuse just like the meat of the offering, so here too, the sprinkling performed not within the classification for which the beast was originally designated likewise renders the bread permissible [just as the meat is permissible in such conditions, since only the sin offering would be spoiled by such an intentionality]? Or do we take the position that that is the case only when the result is a strict ruling but not when it is a lenient ruling? [The strict result would be classification as refuse, the lenient, the bread may be eaten.]*
- J. *To this proposal objected R. Pappa, “On what basis do you assume that the issue is when they are located outside of the Temple precincts? Perhaps all concur that, when the bread is still outside, the sprinkling is null, having no affect upon what is located outside of the Temple [Cashdan: even Aqiba would concur that the sprinkling can have no effect on bread that is still outside, for it cannot be regarded in the same category as sacrificial portions of the offering, since these are part of*

the offering, while the bread is distinct from it]. *Where they differ is in the case in which the loaves were brought back in. R. Eliezer concurs with Rabbi that the act of slaughter sanctifies them, so they have become invalid by being taken outside. R. Aqiba concurs with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon that the act of slaughter does not sanctify the bread, so they have not become invalid by having been taken outside.*”

- K. *What sort of a comparison is that! True enough, if you say that R. Aqiba concurs with Rabbi, that slaughtering sanctifies the loaves, then the act of slaughter has sanctified them, and once having been sanctified by the act of slaughter, they are made refuse by what has happened when the blood was slaughtered. But if you maintain that he stands within the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon that the act of slaughter does not sanctify the loaves, then we may ask the following question: Can the act of sprinkling which is subjected to the intentionality leading to the classification of refuse sanctify them at all? [How can they be both sanctified and made refuse at the same instant?] Has not R. Giddal said Rab said, ‘The act of sprinkling that has been affected by an intentionality that yields the classification of refuse does not impose upon what is slaughtered the law of sacrilege and does not remove from the law of sacrilege what has been slaughtered. The law of sacrilege pertains to the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things, so the act of sprinkling marred by the refuse-making intention does not bring the thing under the law of sacrilege. And it also does not remove it from coverage by the law of sacrilege speak of Most Holy Things?’ [Cashdan: the law of sacrilege applies only until the sprinkling of the blood; then the meat is permitted for the priests to eat; whatever is permitted to the priests is no longer subject to the law of sacrilege. If the sprinkling was not properly done, the meat is not permitted to the priests and is subject to the law of sacrilege.]*
- L. *But wasn’t what R. Giddal said Rab said refuted? [Of course it was.] [Cashdan: Pappa’s objection is then valid, so we do not know in accord with whose position Samuel b. Isaac raised his question.]*

- II.15.** A. *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]?”*
- B. *He said to him, “‘But is there anything that if slaughtered under its original designation is unfit but if slaughtered under some other than the original designation is fit?’”*
- C. *But is there no such thing? Lo, there is the case of animal designated as a Passover offering, which, if slaughtered under its original designation is unfit but if slaughtered under some other than the original designation is fit!*
- D. *This is what I meant to say: “Is there anything that was suitable to be offered under the classification for which the beast was originally designated, but then was rejected as an offering for that original designation and if offered for the original designation is invalid, but if it is offered for some other designation is valid?”*

- E. But is there no such thing? Lo, there is the Passover offering after midday? [It was available at the proper time; if held over until after the festival and offered as a Passover offering, it is invalid; if offered as a peace offering, it is valid (Cashdan).]
- F. *This is what I meant to say:* “Is there anything that at one time was fit to be offered within the classification for which it was originally designated, and which was in fact slaughtered for the classification for which it was originally designated, but which then was rejected from being offered under its originally designation, and now, if offered under its own designation would be invalid but if offered under some other designation is valid?”
- G. But what about the thank offering? [Cashdan: if one of the cakes of the thank offering was broken after the slaughtering of the animal, the blood is sprinkled as though it were a peace offering and not a thank offering, and the meat may be eaten; here then the thank offering was slaughtered under its own name, rejected from being offered under its own name, and yet is valid if offered under another name.]
- H. *The thank offering is exceptional, for the All-Merciful classified it as a peace offering.*

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

- B. If one slaughtered two lambs that were accompanied by four loaves [instead of two], one chooses two of them and waves them, [48A] and as to the rest, when they have been redeemed, they may be eaten.
- C. *Rabbis stated this formulation in the presence of R. Hisda, [commenting,] “This does not accord with the view of Rabbi, for if it were in accord with the position of Rabbi, since he has said that the act of slaughter sanctifies the bread, where will the act of redemption take place anyhow? If they are all taken outside of the sanctuary and redeemed there, the sanctified loaves are forthwith made unfit by having been taken outside, since it is written, ‘Before the Lord’ (Lev. 23:20). But if it is done inside the sanctuary [so all four loaves are to be eaten inside, since we do not know which are the sanctified ones, and which are the redeemed ones (Cashdan)], then one will be in the position of bringing unconsecrated things into the sanctuary.”*
- D. *Said R. Hisda to them, “In point of fact, it does accord with the view of Rabbi. [And as to your question,] the redemption takes place outside of the Temple, and the loaves become unconsecrated willy-nilly [Cashdan: there is no transgression committed here, for the loaves only become unconsecrated when already in the sanctuary].”*

II.17. A. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘When they are redeemed, it must be done outside of the sanctuary alone?’”*

- B. *“That clearly accords with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, for within the premise of Rabbi, as soon as they are taken outside of the sanctuary, they become invalid forthwith.”*

II.18. A. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, “May we say that what we have here is a refutation of the position of R. Yohanan in any event. For it has been stated:*

- B. “A thank offering that one slaughtered in connection with eighty loaves of bread —
- C. “Hezekiah said, ‘Forty of the loaves among the eighty have been sanctified.’
- D. “R. Yohanan said, ‘Forty of the loaves among the eighty have not been sanctified.’” [Yohanan could not concur with 16.B.]
- E. *But was it not stated in that connection, said Zira, “All concur that if the officiating priest said, ‘Let forty out of the eighty be sanctified,’ they are sanctified”? Here too, we say that he declared, “Let two out of the four be sanctified.”*

II.19. A. 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. [Cashdan: 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 designation 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].”

- B. Said to him R. Yohanan, “So do we say to someone, ‘Go, commit a sin so that you will gain a benefit’? [Cashdan: in order to save two lambs for eating, a sin is deliberately committed by offering a sacrifice for some purpose other than that for which the beast was originally designated.] *And have we not learned in the Mishnah: The limbs of a sin offering which were mixed up with the limbs of a burnt offering — R. Eliezer says, “Let him place [them all] above [the altar fires]. And I regard the meat of the sin offering [which is] on top [of the fires] as if it were wood.” And sages say, “Let their appearance be spoiled, and let them go out to the place of burning [as remnant]” [M. Zeb. 8:4A-D]. Now why should it all be burned? Why not say, ‘Go, commit a sin so that you will gain a benefit’?”* [Cashdan: One should commit the sin of burning the limbs of a sin offering upon the altar for the sake of the limbs of the burnt offering, so that the latter be rendered acceptable.]
- C. *In the case of a sin offering, we do say, “Go, commit a sin so that you will gain a benefit”! But in the case of a burnt offering, we make no such statement.*
- D. *But do we make such a statement when it is a single matter at hand [in which the sin that is committed and the advantage that is gained pertain to one and the same thing (Cashdan)]? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: As to the lambs of Pentecost that one slaughtered in a classification other than that for which the animals were originally designated, or that one slaughtered whether before or after the correct time [the festival itself], the blood is to be tossed, and the meat is to be eaten. If the Festival coincides with the Sabbath, the blood is not to be tossed [since the offering is no longer a communal one, so the laws of the Sabbath now are in force, as they would not be if it were a communal offering]. But if the blood was tossed, the sacrifice is accepted, even though the sacrificial portions of the beast may be burned only after sunset.” Now why should this be*

the case? Why not invoke the conception, Go, commit a sin so that you will gain a benefit?

- E. *While we would say, “Go, commit a sin on the Sabbath so that you will gain a benefit on the Sabbath,” we would never say, “Go, commit a sin on the Sabbath so that you will gain a benefit on a weekday”!*

II.20. A. *But do we not make such a statement when there are two matters at hand [in which the sin that is committed and the advantage that is gained pertain to two different things? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: [As to] a jug [of wine in the status of heave offering] which broke in the upper vat, and the lower [vat] is unclean — R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that if he can save from it a fourth in a state of cleanness, he should save [it]. But if not: [48B] R. Eliezer says, “Let it go down [into the lower vat] and be made unclean. But let him not make it unclean with his hand [through his own actions].” And R. Joshua says, “He may even make it unclean through his own action” [M. Ter. 8:9A-E]. [Cashdan: hence according to Joshua we tell the man to sin in respect to the wine that is in the status of heave offering in order to benefit from the wine that is not in the status of heave offering.]*

- B. *That case is exceptional, since the wine that is in the status of heave offering will become unclean willy nilly.*

II.21. A. *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.”*

- B. *Said to him R. Nahman, “You, who treat them as analogous to a sin offering, repeat as the Tannaite formulation, ‘they are invalid.’ A Tannaite authority of the household of Levi, who derives the rule governing obligatory peace offerings from that covering votive peace offerings, holds that they are valid. For Levi repeated as a Tannaite formulation, ‘And as to all of the other peace offerings of the Nazirite [which are obligatory], which one slaughtered not in accord with the religious duty that pertains to them, may be eaten within the same day and evening; they do not have to be accompanied by a bread offering, nor does the shoulder go to the priest’ [T. Naz. 4:9].” [Cashdan: although the peace offering of the Nazirite is mentioned alongside with his sin offering, so one could conclude that if the former is not offered according to its prescribed rite, it is invalid, Levi prefers to draw an analogy between identical kinds of offerings, free will and obligatory peace offerings; accordingly, any obligatory peace offerings, e.g., the Nazirite’s peace offering or the lambs of Pentecost, are valid even though offered not according to the prescribed rite, as is the case with free will peace offerings].*

- C. *An objection was raised: If an animal designated as a guilt offering, which should be a year old, is offered at the age of two, or an animal designated as a guilt offering, which should be two years old, is offered at the age of a year, the offering is invalid; it is left to rot and is taken away to the burning place. If for a burnt offering of a Nazirite or for a woman after childbirth or for a person healed of the skin ailment a sheep two years old was designated and slaughtered, it is valid. This is the operative principle: whatever is valid for a freewill burnt offering is valid for an obligatory burnt offering, and*

whatsoever is invalid for a sin offering is invalid for a guilt offering, except when the offering was slaughtered under some other classification from which the beast was originally designated [T. Zeb. 1:2-3]. [If the offering was a sin offering, it would be invalid, a guilt offering, valid. The obligatory burnt offerings are placed on the same footing as free will burnt offerings, not compared with sin offerings, so too obligatory peace offerings are treated as analogous with free will peace offerings but not with sin offerings, against the position of Isaac, so Cashdan.]

- D. *The Tannaite authority before us is a member of the household of Levi.*
- E. *Come and take note of that which has been taught as a Tannaite statement by Levi: in the case of a guilt offering presented for a Nazirite or a guilt offering presented for a person cleansed of the skin ailment which one slaughtered under a designation other than the one for which the beasts were originally consecrated, they are valid, though they have not fulfilled the obligation of their owners. If one slaughtered them prematurely, either by reason of the condition of their owner or by reason of the fact that they were two years old when slaughtered, they are unfit.” [Freedman, Zebahim: and if they were slaughtered outside the Temple under such conditions, they do not entail liability, in accord with the general rule that what is unfit inside does not entail liability without; thus contradicts the earlier teaching.] Now if it were the fact that the Tannaite authority of Levi’s household treats as analogous the free will offering and the obligatory offering,] then there should be an analogy drawn from the peace offering [Cashdan: thus as the free will peace offering is valid even though a sheep of the second year was offered in place of the lamb of the first year that was vowed, so it should be with the obligatory guilt offering]!*
- F. *Well, he would draw an analogy between peace offerings and peace offerings, but he would not draw an analogy between a guilt offering and peace offerings.*
- G. *So if it is the fact that he would draw an analogy between peace offerings and peace offerings, then let him draw an analogy between one guilt offering and another, e.g., the guilt offering of the Nazirite and the guilt offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment from the rule governing the guilt offering presented on account of thievery and the guilt offering on account of sacrilege, or the guilt offering on account of thievery and the guilt offering on account of sacrilege from the guilt offering of the Nazirite and the guilt offering of the person afflicted with the sin ailment! [The result would be that all guilt offerings are valid, whether the lamb is in the first or the second year (Cashdan).]*
- H. Said R. Shimi bar Ashi, “We compare what is offered not in line with the rite that renders it valid from what is offered no in line with the rule that renders it valid, but we do not derive the rule for what is offered not in accord with the validating rite from what is offered according to the validating rite” [that the guilt offering of the Nazirite or the person afflicted with the skin ailment should be valid when offered not according to its prescribed rite, e.g., if a sheep of the second year was offered, by inference from the guilt offering for thievery or for sacrilege, which must be a sheep of the second year (Cashdan)].”
- I. *And do we not? And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: How do we know that that which has been taken out of the Temple courtyard, if it has then*

been put up on the altar, is not to be taken down? It is from the fact that at a high place what had been taken out of the veils still could be validly offered.

- J. **[49A]** *The Tannaite formulation in any event relies upon the verse, “This is the law of the burnt offering” (Lev. 6: 2). That serves as inclusive.*

II.22. A. *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.”*

- B. Rab said to him, “They most certainly do go to their owner’s credit and carry out his obligation.”

C. *Said R. Hisda, “What Rab said certainly stands to reason in a case in which the officiating priest thought that they were rams and slaughtered them as lambs, for in point of fact, lambs were slaughtered for what they were, which is lambs; but if the officiating priest thought they were rams and slaughtered them as rams, Rab’s position is not plausible, for a change in the accepted procedure done in error still represents a change in the accepted procedure, [so the act is null].”*

- D. And Raba said, “A change in the accepted procedure done in error in no way represents a change in the accepted procedure, [so the act is valid].”

E. Said Raba, “I proposed as an objection to my own ruling the following: priests whose improper intentionality imposed the status of refuse on Holy Things in the sanctuary, if they did so deliberately, are liable to pay compensation.’ Lo, if they did so inadvertently, they are not liable. *And in this connection it was formulated as a Tannaite statement, ‘What their improper intentionality has classified as refuse indeed is refuse.’ Now what circumstances can be in mind here? If we say that the officiating priest knew that it was a sin offering but expressed the intentionality of making the offering as peace offerings, lo, are these folk acting inadvertently? They are acting with all due deliberation. Rather, is it not a case in which the officiating priest thought the offering was peace offerings, and expressed the intentionality of making the offering as peace offerings, and nonetheless, it is taught as a Tannaite formulation, ‘What their improper intentionality has classified as refuse indeed is refuse’! It must therefore follow that a change in the accepted procedure done in error still represents a change in the accepted procedure, [so the act is null].”*

- F. *Said to him Abbaye, “In point of fact the officiating priest did know that it was a sin offering, and he did express the intentionality of making the offerings as peace offerings, but we deal with a case in which he thought that was permitted to do just that [when in fact it is not].”*

G. *Objected R. Zira, “**R. Simeon says, ‘All meal offerings from which the handful was taken for some purpose other than the originally designated one are valid, and they do go to their owner’s credit in fulfillment of an obligation [M. Men. 1:1A-B]. For meal offerings are not comparable to animal sacrifices. If the priest takes a handful from a meal offering prepared on a griddle and refers to it as one prepared in a pan, the rites pertaining to it in any case indicate that he is dealing with one prepared on a griddle. If he is dealing with a dry meal offering and refers to it as one mixed with oil, this is of no consequence, because the rites pertaining to it indicate that he is***

dealing with a dry one. But in the case of animal sacrifices, there is only one rite that covers all of them, only one mode of slaughter that pertains to all of them, one mode of tossing the blood that pertains to all of them, one mode of receiving the blood that pertains to all of them” [T. Zeb. 1:1A-E]. Now how can this issue be envisaged in concrete terms? If we say that the officiating priest knew that it was a meal offering prepared on a griddle and took the handful with the intentionality of doing so for a meal offering prepared in a pan, then what difference does it make to me that the preparation of the offering clearly shows the actual classification of the offering? Lo, he has in any event changed the rite from the established procedure! So we must say that the officiating priest believes he is dealing with a meal offering prepared in a pan, and when he takes the handful, he classifies it as such, but he has made an error; in this case his intention is null, since the rites of preparing the offering on their own dictate the classification of the offering. But then, in all other cases, we must conclude that a change in the accepted procedure done in error represents a change in the accepted procedure, [so the act is invalid].”

- H. Said to him Abbaye, “Not at all. The officiating priest did know that it was a meal offering prepared on a griddle; when taking the handful, nonetheless, he has classified it as one prepared in a pan. And as to your question, ‘what difference does it make to me that the preparation of the offering clearly shows the actual classification of the offering?’ the answer is in line with Raba, who is consistent in the position that he has pronounced: ‘An expressed intention that is obviously wrong is treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offering and simply null. An expressed intention that is not obviously wrong is not treated by the All-Merciful as incapable of invalidating an offering and does take effect.’” [Cashdan: where the priest’s actions belie his expressed intention, obviously his words cannot be taken seriously, and they therefore cannot render the offering invalid.]

4:4

- A. (1) The [absence of] continual offerings [daily whole offerings] does not impair the validity of the additional offerings, and (2) the [absence of] the additional offerings does not impair the validity of the continual offerings, and (3) the additional offerings do not impair the validity of one another.
- B. [If] they did not offer a lamb in the morning, let them offer it at twilight.
- C. Said R. Simeon, “Under what circumstances? When they were subject to constraint or in error.
- D. “But if they deliberately did not offer a lamb in the morning, they should not offer it at twilight.”
- E. [If] they did not burn the incense in the morning, they should burn it at twilight.
- F. Said R. Simeon, “But all of it [the incense offering] is offered at twilight.
- G. “For they dedicate[d] (1) the golden altar only with incense of sweet spices that are offered in the afternoon,
- H. “and (2) the altar of the burnt offering only by the continual offering in the morning,

I. and (3) the table only by the showbread that was laid on the table on the Sabbath,

J. and (4) the candlestick only by the seven lamps kindled in the afternoon.”

I.1 A. 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?*”

B. He said to him, “You have learned the Tannaite statement that follows: **The [absence of] continual offerings [daily whole offerings] does not impair the validity of the additional offerings, and (2) the [absence of] the additional offerings does not impair the validity of the continual offerings, and (3) the additional offerings do not impair the validity of one another.** *Now to what case does this rule refer? If we say that both classifications of offering are in hand, and the question is only one of which takes precedence [Cashdan: and by stating that one does not invalidate the other, the Mishnah teaches that any one may be offered first], then has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that nothing whatsoever should take precedence over the daily whole offering that is presented at dawn? Scripture says, ‘And he shall lay the burnt offering in order upon it’ (Lev. 6: 5). And said Raba, “‘The burnt offering’ means the first burnt offering of the day.’ [49B] So we must be dealing with a case in which both classifications of offering are not in hand. But if both of them are meant to serve for today, then how can it be said that [either of the two may be offered, since is it not the fact that] as between the more regular and the more holy, the more regular takes precedence? It must follow that one is for the next day. And yet the Mishnah states, the absence of the one does invalidate the other. So it must follow that they are at the same level.”*

C. Said to him Abbaye, “In point of fact, we deal with a case in which both classifications of offering are in hand. It is a question of which comes first. And as to the question that you have raised, nothing whatsoever should take precedence over the daily whole offering that is presented at dawn, *that represents an account of how ideally the religious duty is to be carried out [but not what must in fact be done to validate the offering].*”

D. Come and take note: **They do not count less than six inspected lambs in the chamber of the lambs, sufficient for the Sabbath and for two festival days of the New Year [M. Ar. 2:5A-B].** [The six lambs would serve for the Daily Whole Offerings for the Sabbath, Sunday, and Monday. But another lamb still has to be kept ready for the morning Daily Whole Offering for Tuesday, since there will be no chance to get one during the prior three days (Cashdan).] *Now how shall we*

imagine such a situation [to cover the case in which the New Year coincides with a Sunday and Monday]? If I should say that there are lambs available, then many more will be needed for daily whole offerings and additional offerings [twenty-two lambs for the three days, six for the daily whole offerings, morning and night, and sixteen for the additional offerings (Cashdan)]. So we must be dealing with a case in which there are not enough lambs, and, it must follow, the daily whole offering does take precedence [all six lambs being kept for the daily whole offering, none for the additional offerings].

- E. *Not at all! In point of fact, they really do have enough lambs in hand for all the required offerings. But this is the sense of the passage: **They do not count less than six inspected lambs in the chamber of the lambs** four days prior to the point at which they are to be slaughtered. And who is the authority behind this statement? It is Ben Bag Bag. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Ben Bag Bag says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the lamb for the daily whole offering has to be inspected four days prior to the one on which it is to be slaughtered? Because it is written here, ‘You shall observe to offer to me in its due season’ (Num. 2: 2), and elsewhere, ‘And they shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month’ (Exo. 12: 6). As in the latter case, the lamb has to be examined four days prior to its being slaughtered, so in the former case the lamb has to be examined four days prior to its being slaughtered.”*

I.2. A. *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!”*

- B. *[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].”*

- C. *“That’s no problem. The formulation of the rule refers to the time after that one was offered anyhow.”*

- D. **[50A]** *In any event there must be seven.*

- E. *It must follow that the Tannaite formulation is made in general terms, and the language, **sufficient for the Sabbath and for two festival days of the New Year**, serves only as a mnemonic in general. [It refers to all times of the year, when the lamb store must have six lambs that have been checked out four days earlier, so whatever happens, there must be enough for three days (Cashdan).] You may derive that conclusion even from the very wording of the passage, for it is formulated in this manner: **sufficient for the Sabbath, and not, and for two festival days of the New Year.***

- F. *That is decisive.*

II.1 A. **[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.** Said R. Simeon, “But all of it [the incense offering] is offered at twilight. For they dedicate[d] (1) the golden altar only with incense of sweet spices that are offered in the afternoon:”

- B. *Who in the world brought up the subject of the dedication of the golden altar!*
- C. *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.**

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

- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught as a Tannaite rule:*
- C. **“And the second lamb you shall offer towards evening”** (Exo. 29:39) — the second “towards evening,” but not the lamb designated for use first “towards the evening.” Under what circumstances? In a case in which the altar had not been consecrated. But if the altar had been consecrated, then then even the lamb designated for use first “towards the evening.”
- D. **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.”**

III.1 A. **[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?

- B. *Said Raba, “This is the sense of the statement: But if they deliberately did not offer a lamb in the morning, these priests in particular should not offer it at twilight, but others should make the offering.”*
- C. **“[If] they did not burn the incense in the morning, they should burn it at twilight, for since it is uncommon for incense offerings to be made, since it was only twice daily, while burnt offerings were presented all day long, and it enriches the priest who makes the offering, it is an act that the priests prize, and they are not likely to neglect it.”**

IV.1 A. **Said R. Simeon, “But all of 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:”**

- B. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “by the incense of sweet spices that are offered in the morning”?*
- C. *What we have is a conflict of Tannaite formulations.*
- D. *Said Abbaye, “It is more reasonable that the rule accords with the formulation, For they dedicated the golden altar only with incense of sweet spices that are offered in the afternoon, for it is written, ‘Every morning when he dresses the lamps he shall burn it’ (Exo. 30: 7), and how can the lamps be dressed in the morning if they were not lit the prior evening?”*

- E. *But in accord with him who says, 'by the incense of sweet spices that are offered in the morning,' the rule derives from the verbal analogy established by the rule governing the altar for burnt offerings. Just as it was dedicated by the daily whole offering of the morning, so the golden altar was dedicated by the incense of spices that were offered in the morning.*

V.1 A. 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]:

- B. *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!]*
- C. *In formulating the matter in this way, we are informed that the dedication of the table and the sanctification of the bread took place only on the Sabbath, and so it is in line with the further formulation: **and the candlestick only by the seven lamps kindled in the afternoon.** [Cashdan: as the entire service of the candlestick was to be at its dedication in the evening, so the entire service in connection with the table must take place at its dedication on the Sabbath.]*

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

- B. 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.
- C. *How so?*
- D. Said R. Pappa, "This speaks of the incense offering presented by the heads of the tribes."

V.3. A. 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?

- B. *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:*
- C. Might one suppose that an individual may voluntarily present a free will offering of incense along these same lines [as did the heads of the tribes when they dedicated the altar]? I cite this scripture: "That which has emerged from your lips shall you observe and do" (Deu. 23:24). Scripture therefore says, "You shall not offer exotic incense on it" (Exo. 30: 9).
- D. Might one suppose that an individual may not present it, since he may not present such a thing as an obligatory offering, [50B] but the community may present incense as a freewill offering, since the community does present incense as an obligatory offering?
- E. Scripture states, "You [plural, meaning, the community as a whole, also] shall not offer" (Exo. 30: 9).
- F. Might one think that while the community may not present incense on the inner altar, it may do so on the outer altar?
- G. Scripture states, "And the anointing oil and incense of sweet spices for the holy place according to all that I have commanded you shall they do" (Exo. 31:11).

H. Only that which is stated in context may be offered.

V.4. A. 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.”

4:5

- A. The griddle cakes of the high priest were not offered in half [tenths of an ephah at a time].
- B. But one brings a whole tenth and divides it,
- C. and offers half in the morning and half at twilight.
- D. And a priest who offered half in the morning and died,
- E. and in whose place [on that same day] they appointed another priest —
- F. [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.
- G. But he brings a whole tenth and divides it and offers half. And the other half is left to perish.
- H. It turns out that two halves are offered, and two halves are left to perish.

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

- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. 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?
- E. Scripture states, “And half of it in the evening,” meaning he must offer half of a whole tenth.
- F. 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.
- G. If the high priest offered half in the morning and then died, and on the same day they appointed another high priest in his place, might I claim that he may then present a half tenth from his own resources or may utilize the remaining half tenth of the meal produced by the first high priest?
- H. Scripture states, “And half thereof in the evening,” meaning that it must be half of a whole tenth.
- I. so he has to bring another whole tenth and divide it, offering up half of the tenth, leaving the other half to perish.
- J. It turns out that two halves are offered, two left to perish.

- I.2.** A. *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.”*
- B. *Said to him R. Nahman, “Now I can understand why that is the rule for the half left over by the first high priest, for it can have been itself made as an offering, but as to the second, why should it be left to rot? To begin with, it was supposed to perish. It must follow that the one who stated this rule to you must be the Tannaite authority of the household of Rabbah bar Abbuha, who has said, ‘Even what has been rendered refuse has to be left to rot.’”*
- C. *R. Ashi said, “You may even maintain that this represents the position of rabbis in general, Each of the two halves, after all, had been valid for an offering, since, at the moment it was divided, one half or the other was equally a candidate for offering.”*

I.3. A. *It was stated:*

- B. *As to the griddle cakes of the high priest, how were they prepared?*
- C. *R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan [said], “One bakes them first of all in an oven and then fries them [Cashdan: on a griddle after smearing them with oil].”*
- D. *R. Assi said R. Hanina said, “One fries them and afterward bakes them in an oven.”*
- E. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “In accord with my view matters are more reasonable, for the word that is used in Scripture at Lev. 6:14 bears letters that can be read to yield the sense, bake while still attractive.”*
- F. *R. Assi said, “In accord with my view matters are more reasonable, for the word that is used in Scripture at Lev. 6:14 bears letters that can be read to yield the sense, bake when already half done.”*
- G. *We have a conflict of Tannaite formulations on the same matter, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *The word that is used in Scripture at Lev. 6:14 bears letters that can be read to yield the sense, bake while still attractive.*
- I. *R. Dosa says, “The word that is used in Scripture at Lev. 6:14 bears letters that can be read to yield the sense, bake several times.”*
- J. *Rabbah accepts the interpretation “half done” and also “attractive.”*

I.4. A. *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].***

- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that kneading may be done on the Sabbath?*
- C. *Said R. Huna, “Since the word that is used in Scripture at Lev. 6:14 bears letters that can be read to yield the sense, bake while still attractive, if the cakes were baked the day before the Sabbath, they would lose their freshness.”*
- D. *Objected R. Joseph, “But they could be preserved in herbs.”*
- E. *A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael stated, “‘It shall be prepared’ (Lev. 6:24) — even on the Sabbath.*

- F. “‘It shall be prepared’ (Lev. 6:24) — even in uncleanness.”
- G. Abbayye said, “Scripture has said, ‘of fine flour for a meal offering daily’ (Lev. 6:13) — **[51A]** lo, it is in the same classification as the meal offering that accompanies the daily whole offering.”
- H. Raba said, “‘on a griddle’ (Lev. 6:14) teaches that it has to be done in a utensil of service, *and if they were baked on the day before the Sabbath, they would then be invalidated, having been sanctified in such a utensil, for they will have been kept over night.*”

I.5. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority along the lines of what Raba has said:*

- B. “...on a griddle’ (Lev. 6:14) teaches that it has to be done in a utensil of service.
- C. “...with oil” — with an addition of oil.
- D. But I do not know how much is to be added.
- E. 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.
- F. Or take this route:
- G. here we find a reference to “oil” and in the context of the meal offering given as an act of free will, we also find a reference to “oil.” Just as in that context, only a single log of oil is required with the ephah of fine flour, so here too, only a single log of oil is required with the ephah of fine flour.
- H. Let us see which of the two analogies is the more appropriate: we should infer the rule for a meal offering that is offered daily, is obligatory, and overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness, from the case of a meal offering that is offered daily, is obligatory, and overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness, but let us not infer the rule governing a meal offering that is a meal offering that is offered daily, is obligatory, and overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness from the case of one that is not a meal offering that is offered daily, is obligatory, and overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness.
- I. Or take this route: let us infer the rule governing a meal offering that is presented by an individual, that is brought on its own and not with some other offering, and that requires frankincense, from the case of a meal offering that is presented by an individual, that is brought on its own and not with some other offering, and that requires frankincense, but let us not infer the rule governing a meal offering that is presented by an individual, that is brought on its own and not with some other offering, and that requires frankincense, from the case of one that is not a meal offering that is presented by an individual, that is brought on its own and not with some other offering, and that requires frankincense.
- J. R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “‘Of fine flour for a meal offering daily’ (Lev. 6:13) — lo, it is to be characterized by the indicative traits of the meal offering that is presented along with the daily whole offering, namely, 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.”

- K. R. Simeon says, “Here an abundant addition of oil is required, and in connection with the meal offering that goes with the lambs of the daily whole offering, abundant oil is required. Just as there, three logs of oil per tenth of fine flour is required, so too here, three logs of oil are required for a tenth of fine flour.
- L. “Or perhaps one should take this route: here Scripture has required an abundance of oil, and in connection with the meal offering that accompanies bullocks and rams, oil is required. Just as in that case, only two logs of oil per tenth of fine flour is required, so here, only two logs of oil per tenth of fine flour are required.
- M. “But let us then see which is the appropriate analogy: let us draw an analogy for a meal offering that is made up of a tenth of fine flour from another meal offering that is made up of a tenth of fine flour, but we should not infer the rule for a meal offering that is brought of a tenth of fine flour from a meal offering that is made up of two or three tenths of fine flour.”

- I.6. A. *Now there is an internal contradiction at hand. You have said, “‘...with oil’ — with an addition of oil.” And then you have gone and said, “here we find a reference to “oil” and in the context of the meal offering given as an act of free will, we also find a reference to ‘oil.’ Just as in that context, only a single log of oil is required with the ephah of fine flour, so here too, only a single log of oil is required with the ephah of fine flour.”*
- B. Said Abbayye, “Who is responsible for the formulation, “‘...with oil’ — with an addition of oil”? It is R. Simeon. And the one who has gone and formulated the other matter, involving the free will meal offering, is R. Ishmael.”
- C. *R. Huna b. R. Joshua said, “The whole of the formulation is in the words of R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, and this is the sense of the statement that he has made:*
- D. *““‘...with oil’ — with an addition of oil.’ For to make the point that oil is needed, no verse would have been required to make that point; the expression ‘on a griddle’ would bear the sense, prepared like any other meal offering prepared on a griddle. Or perhaps the real intention is only to make the point that oil is needed? For if Scripture had not made reference to oil, I might have thought that it should be in the same classification as the meal offering presented by a sinner [which has no oil]. So then, further, he said, ‘Even so, it may mean only that it requires oil. But it can further be argued by the comparison of the meal offering to the one that accompanied the daily whole offering that three logs are required. But that would not prove the case, so he had to invoke the verse, ‘of fine four for a meal offering daily,’ as was made explicit by R. Ishmael in his concluding remarks.”*
- E. Rabbah said, “The whole of it represents the position of R. Simeon, *and this is the sense of his statement:*
- F. *““‘...with oil’ — with an addition of oil.’ For to make the point that oil is needed, no verse would have been required to make that point; the expression ‘on a griddle’ would bear the sense, prepared like any other meal offering prepared on a griddle. Or perhaps the real intention is only to make the point that oil is needed? For if Scripture had not made*

reference to oil, I might have thought that it should be in the same classification as the meal offering presented by a sinner [which has no oil]. So then, further, he said, 'Even so, it may mean only that it requires oil. But it can further be argued by the comparison of the meal offering to the one that accompanied the daily whole offering that three logs are required. But that would not prove the case, so he had to invoke the argument, [52B]...like the meal offering that accompanies bullocks and rams, oil is required. Just as in that case, only two logs of oil per tenth of fine flour is required, so here, only two logs of oil per tenth of fine flour are required.'

4:5I-L

- I. [If] they did not appoint another priest [in place of the one who died], of whose [property] was it offered?**
- J. R. Simeon says, "Of the community."**
- K. R. Judah says, "Of the heirs [of the deceased]."**
- L. And the whole [tenth] was offered.**

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

- B.** "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?"
- C.** "Scripture says, 'The anointed priest that will be in his place from among his sons shall offer it' (Lev. 6:15)."
- D.** "Might one suppose that they then offer it a half tenth at a time?"
- E.** "Scripture says, 'it,' meaning, the whole of it, and not half of it," the words of R. Judah.
- F.** R. Simeon says, "'It is a statute for the world at large' (Lev. 6:15) — it derives from communal funds."
- G.** "'It shall be wholly burned' — the whole of it shall be burned [none being left over to be eaten]."

I.2. A. *But is it for the stated purpose that the cited verse, "The anointed priest that will be in his place from among his sons shall offer it" (Lev. 6:15), is set forth? It is in point of fact required in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "This is the offering which Aaron and his sons shall offer:"**
- C. Might one suppose that Aaron [that is, the high priest] and his sons will present the offering all together?**
- D. Scripture says, "...his sons, which they shall offer...."**
- E. How so?**
- F. Aaron will present an offering in his own behalf, and his sons will present their offering in their behalf.**
- G. "...his sons:"**
- H. this refers to ordinary priests.**
- I. But could "his sons" refer to high priests?**

- J. **When Scripture says, “The priest from among Aaron’s sons, who is anointed to succeed him,” lo, we find reference to the high priest.**
- K. **Accordingly, how shall I interpret “his sons”?**
- L. **this must refer to ordinary priests [Sifra 74:1.1-2].**
- M. *If it were for that purpose that the cited verse is presented, then Scripture can as well have written, “And if the anointed priest died, his sons in his stead shall offer....” Why does the verse say, “from among his sons”? It is to infer both teachings.*

I.3. A. *And how does R. Simeon interpret the word, “it”?*

- B. *He requires it to make the following point:*
- C. *If the high priest died after offering the morning half-tenth, and another was appointed in his place, the latter does not present the half tenth from his own resources nor use the remaining half tenth of the predecessor [but must present the entire tenth from his own resources].*
- D. *But is this fact not derived from the language, “and half thereof” (Lev. 6:13)?*
- E. *He derives no lesson from the use of “and” in that verse.*

I.4. A. *How then does R. Judah interpret the language, “It is a statute for the world at large” (Lev. 6:15)?*

- B. *It means, a statute for ever.*
- C. *And what about his treatment of the verse, “It shall be wholly burned” — the whole of it shall be burned [none being left over to be eaten?]*
- D. *He requires that clause in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. *I know only that the high priest’s meal offering, which is mentioned above, must be wholly burned, and that the ordinary priest’s meal offering, which is mentioned below, must not be eaten. But how do I know that the rules that are stated in regard to the former pertain also to the latter, and the rules that apply to the latter pertain also to the former?*
- F. *Scripture states, “...wholly burned...” in both instances and that serves to establish a verbal analogy between them. Here we find reference to “wholly burned” and elsewhere we find the same language, Just as the former must be wholly burned, so the latter must be wholly burned, and just as the latter may not be eaten, so the former may not be eaten.*

I.5. A. *But does R. Simeon take the position that by the law of the Torah the meal offering of the high priest derives from public funds? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: Said R. Simeon, “Seven rules did the court ordain, and this (1) [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 [Lev. 6:13] should derive from public funds” [M. Sheq. 7:6]. It was a stipulation of the court, furthermore, that if the high priest*

died and another was not appointed in his place, the meal offering that he owes [for the rest of the day] is offered at public expense”?

- B. *Said R. Abbahu, “There were two distinct ordinances. On the strength of the law of the Torah the offerings should derive from public funds. But when they saw that the funds in the chamber were diminishing, they made the ordinances that the heirs would have to provide the flour. When they saw that the heirs neglected to provide what was owing from them, they reverted to the law of the Torah.”*

I.6. A. They ordained] concerning the red cow, that the laws of sacrilege should not apply to its ashes [M. Sheq. 7:7A-B]:

- B. *Is this not the law of the Torah? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “It is a sin offering” (Num. 19: 9) — this teaches that the law of sacrilege applies to it, [52A] and “it” implies the law of sacrilege does not apply to its ashes.
- D. *Said R. Ashi, “There were two distinct ordinances. On the strength of the law of the Torah the law of sacrilege applies to it, but the law of sacrilege does not apply to its ashes. When they saw that people treated the matter with contempt and applied the ashes to wounds, they ordained that the law of sacrilege should apply to the ashes. When they saw that when it came to doubt, people would then avoid using the water for sprinkling, they reverted to the law of the Torah.”*

I.7. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. **“The funds to purchase the bullock that is offered when the entire community has sinned in error and for the he goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry must be contributed for that purpose in particular,” the words of R. Judah.**
- C. **R. Simeon says, “They derive from funds of the heave offering of the sheqel-chamber” [T. Sheq. 2:L-M].**
- D. *But has not the opposite been taught on Tannaite authority?*
- E. *Which of them was taught last [the later version being the more reliable]?*
- F. *Rabbis stated before R. Ashi, “May we say that the former version was set forth last, for we already know that R. Simeon takes account of the possibility of neglect [the high priest’s meal offering is offered out of public funds and not left to the heirs, since they might neglect their duty, so the more reliable view of Simeon’s opinion would be that these offerings are also taken out of the funds of the community, which agrees with the former version (Cashdan)].”*
- G. *Said to them R. Ashi, “But you may even say that the latter of the two versions is the later, for when R. Simeon takes account of the possibility of neglect, that concerns something where the involved persons themselves do not gain atonement, but where they themselves gain atonement thereby, there is no reason, so R. Simeon maintained, to be concerned about the possibility of neglect.”*

I.8. A. So what’s the upshot of the matter?

- B. *Said Rabbah the Lesser to R. Ashi, "Come and take note of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *""My food which is presented to me for offerings made by fire, of a sweet savor to me, shall you observe to offer to me in its due season" (Num. 28: 2) — that serves to encompass even the bullock that is offered when the entire community has sinned in error and for the he goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry, funds for which derive from the heave offering of the sheqel-chamber,' the words of R. Simeon."*

II.1 A. And the whole [tenth] was offered:

- B. *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?'"*
- C. *Said Raba, "Come and take note: [How many priests were engaged in the service and the functions of each under normal circumstances are now set forth: **All of them turned out to be standing in a row, and the limbs in their hands: (1) the first, with the head and a hindleg, the head in his right hand, with its muzzle along his arm, and its horns in his fingers, and the place at which it was slaughtered turned upwards, and the fat set on top of it [that place], and the right hind leg in his left hand, and the flayed end outermost; (2) the second, with the two forelegs, that of the right hand in his right hand, and that of the left in his left, with the flayed end outermost; (3) the third, with the rump and the [other] hind leg, the rump in his right hand, and the fat tail hanging down between his fingers, and the lobe of the liver and the two kidneys with it, the left hind leg in his left hand, with the flayed end outermost; (4) the fourth, with the breast and the neck, the breast in his right hand, and the neck in his left, and with its ribs between his fingers; (5) the fifth with the two flanks, that of the right in his right hand, that of the left in his left, with the flayed ends outwards; [(6) the sixth, with the innards put in a dish, and the shanks on top of them, above; [(7) the seventh, with the fine flour;] (8) the eighth, with the baked cakes [=the meal offering of the high priest]; [(9) the ninth, with the wine] [M. Tam. 4:9:1Q].. Now if it were the fact that it was annulled for the evening offering, then it would sometimes turn out that the eighth on that list did not bear the meal offering of the high priest, in a case, for instance, in which the high priest had died and another had not been appointed in his place!'"***
- D. *Rabbis reported this statement before R. Jeremiah. He said, "Idiot-Babylonians! Because they live in a dark country, they say dark traditions. But since it is taught, (7) the seventh, with the fine flour;...(9) the ninth, with the wine, is it the fact that these two were never omitted? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: "'Their meal offering and their drink offerings" (Num. 29:18) — even at night; "Their meal offering and their drink offerings" (Num. 29:18) — even even on the next day.' But the Tannaite framer of the passage was not concerned with the exceptional case [when part of the service was omitted (Cashdan)]."*

- E. *This then was sent back to Raba, who said, "When we say something contemptible, they report that before them, but when we say something remarkable, they do not report it before them."*
- F. *But then Raba retracted, saying, "This too is something remarkable of ours, for Scripture has said, 'Of fine flour for a meal offering daily' (Lev. 6:13), meaning, it is comparable to the meal offering that accompanies the daily holy offering" [which is invariably presented, so too the high priest's meal offering is invariably presented].*

II.2. A. *So what's the upshot of the matter?*

- B. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Come and take note of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: A whole tenth was offered in the morning, and a whole tenth was offered in the evening."*

II.3. A. Said R. Yohanan, "There is a dispute in this matter between Abba Yosé b. Dosetai and rabbis.

- B. "Abba Yosé b. Dosetai says, 'The high priest [presenting his meal offering each day, a tenth of fine flour, divided and offered half in the morning and half at night] sets aside two handfuls of frankincense, one for the morning, the other for the evening.'
- C. "And rabbis say, 'He sets aside one handful, half offered in the morning and the other half in the evening.'
- D. "What is at stake in this dispute?
- E. *"Abba Yosé b. Dosetai takes the view that we have no case in which a half handful was offered. Rabbis take the view that there is no case in which a tenth requires two handfuls [with one meal offering, even though the handfuls are offered one at a time (Cashdan)]."*

II.4. A. R. Yohanan presented this question: "A high priest who died and in place of whom another was not appointed — **[52B]** *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?*

- B. *"And as to the matter of oil, from the perspective of both rabbis and Abba Yosé b. Dosetai, the same question is to be raised."* [Cashdan: the high priest brought from his own resources a tenth of fine flour and three logs of oil, which he divided and offered, half in the morning and half by night. Now since the quantity of flour is doubted, is the amount of oil also to be doubled?]
- C. *Said Raba, "Come and take note: They are five sorts of [rules pertinent to] handfuls: [(1) He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] frankincense" should not [bring] less than a handful. (2) He who volunteers a freewill offering of a meal offering brings with it a handful of frankincense (3) He who offers up a handful outside is liable (4-5) And two dishes require two handfuls of frankincense] [M. Men. 13:3C].* [Cashdan: and the handful of frankincense along with the

high priest's meal offering is not one of them, since it was offered a half handful at a time]. *But if it were the case [that rabbis would hold a whole handful was to be offered morning and evening], then there would on occasion be seven, not just five.*"

- D. *As before, the framer of the passage is not interested in counting up the exception too.*
- E. *In session R. Pappa was citing this tradition. Said R. Joseph bar Shemaia to R. Pappa, "But lo, he who offers up a handful outside of the temple is exceptional, but the framer of the passage has included it!"*
- F. *So what is the upshot?*
- G. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Come and take note of what has been taught on Tannaite authority: A high priest who died and who was not replaced by another in his place — an entire tenth must be offered in the morning, and an entire tenth in the evening; two handfuls of frankincense must be set aside, one for the morning, one for the evening; three logs of oil must be designated, one and a half for the morning, one and a half for the evening. And who is the authority behind this formulation? If you say it is rabbis, then one must ask, why double the quantity of frankincense but not the oil? So it must be Abba Yosé b. Dosethai, who takes the position that under all circumstances the meal offering of the high priest requires two handfuls of frankincense, so neither the quantity of frankincense nor that of oil has been doubled. And, since in the view of Abba Yosé b. Dosetai the quantity of oil is not doubled, so too according to rabbis, the quantities of frankincense and oil are not doubled [for the same reason, and that solves Yohanan's problem (Cashdan)]."*
- H. *Said R. Yohanan, "The decided law is in accord with the position of Abba Yosé b. Dosetai."*
- I. *But could R. Yohanan have made any such statement? And lo, said R. Yohanan, "The decided law is in accord with the unattributed formulation of the Mishnah," and we have learned in the Mishnah: **They are five sorts of [rules pertinent to] handfuls: [(1) He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself [to bring] frankincense" should not [bring] less than a handful. (2) He who volunteers a freewill offering of a meal offering brings with it a handful of frankincense (3) He who offers up a handful outside is liable (4-5) And two dishes require two handfuls of frankincense] [M. Men. 13:3C]!** [But according to Abba Yosé the number should be seven to include the two handfuls of the high priest's meal offering (Cashdan)].*
- J. *There is a conflict of Amoraic formulations vis à vis the view of R. Yohanan.*