

X

BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER TEN

FOLIOS 87A-94A

10:1

- A. Two dry measures were in the sanctuary: (1) a tenth [ephah measure], and (2) a half-tenth [ephah measure].
- B. R. Meir says, “A tenth measure, [another] tenth measure, and a half-tenth measure” [M. 10:5].
- C. A tenth measure: how did it serve?
- D. In it did one measure [flour for] all meal offerings.
- E. One did not measure either with a three-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a bullock, or with a two-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a ram [Num. 15:6, 9, 28:12], but they measured them with tenth measures.
- F. A half-tenth measure: how did it serve?
- G. In it did one measure the baked cakes of a high priest [M. 4:5], half [a tenth-ephah measure] for the morning, half [a tenth-ephah measure] for twilight [M. 10:5].

I.1 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Meir says, “What is the meaning of the statement of Scripture, ‘a tenth, a tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 28:29)? It is to teach you that there were two tenth-ephah measures in the Temple, one that is heaped up, one that is not heaped up. With this one that was heaped up did one measure the flour for all meal offerings. [87B] With this one that was not heaped up did one measure the flour for the cakes of an anointed priest” [T. Men. 10:1A-D].
- C. And sages say, “There was there only a single tenth-ephah measure, as it is said, ‘And one tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 29: 4). If so, why does Scripture state, ‘a tenth, a tenth for every lamb’ (Num. 28:29)? It serves to encompass the use of a half-tenth measure.”
- D. *Then how on the basis of Scripture does R. Meir derive the rule that a half-tenth-ephah measure is used as well?*
- E. *He derives it from the language, “And one tenth” [the use of the ‘and’ being augmentative].*

- F. *And rabbis?*
- G. *They impute to the “and” no special meaning.*
- H. *And how does R. Meir interpret the verse, “And one tenth for every lamb” (Num. 29: 4)?*
- I. *He derives from that verse the lesson that **one did not measure either with a three-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a bullock, or with a two-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a ram [Num. 15:6, 9, 28:12], but they measured them with tenth measures.***
- J. *And rabbis?*
- K. *They derive that lesson from the appearance of a dot [written above the second W in the word for tenth-ephah measure in Num. 29:15]. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. *Said R. Yosé, “How come there is a dot written above the second W in the word for tenth-ephah measure [in Num. 29:15] with reference to the offerings for the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles? It is to teach the lesson that **one did not measure either with a three-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a bullock, or with a two-tenths measure for [the meal offering of] a ram [Num. 15: 6, 9, 28:12], but they measured them with tenth measures.**”*
- M. *And R. Meir?*
- N. *He imputes to the dot no special meaning.*

II.1 A. **A half-tenth measure: how did it serve? In it did one measure the baked cakes of a high priest [M. 4:5], half for the morning, half for twilight [M. 10:5]:**

- B. *...did one measure! But to the contrary: The griddle cakes of the high priest were not offered in half [tenths of an ephah at a time]. But one brings a whole tenth and divides it, and offers half in the morning and half at twilight.*
- C. *Said R. Sheshet, “What is the sense of ...did one measure? It is, did divide.”*

II.2. A. *Rami bar Hama addressed this question to R. Hisda: “In R. Meir’s view, was the half-tenth measure to be heaped up or level?”*

- B. *[He said to him,] “But why not raise the question in regard to the position of rabbis?”*
- C. *“But in rabbis’ view, was the tenth measure itself to be heaped up or level?”*
- D. *He said to him, “On the basis of what R. Meir has said, we may infer the position of R. Meir on the question you have raised, and on the basis of what R. Meir has said, we may also derive the position of rabbis. Since R. Meir has said that the tenth measure used for measuring the meal offering of the high priest was level, you may draw the conclusion that the half tenth measure also was to be level, and since from R. Meir’s position both were to be level, according to rabbis as well, both were to be level.”*

II.3. A. *Rami bar Hama further addressed this question to R. Hisda: “As to the griddle cakes of the high priest, how were they divided into cakes? Was it by hand or by some instrument?”*

- B. *“Obviously, by hand, for if it were by some sort of utensil, would one have to bring scales into the Temple?”*

- C. *"But why not bring scales into the Temple?"*
- D. *"That would not be right, since that bread should be divided by weight is regarded as a curse [a mark of famine]."*

- II.4.** A. Rami bar Hama further addressed this question to R. Hisda: "As to the table, what is the law on its sanctifying the handfuls of frankincense that are heaped up on it and not put into dishes? *Since the table has that effect of sanctifying the show bread, should it also sanctify the handfuls set on the table? or perhaps the table sanctifies what is appropriate to it but not what is not appropriate to it?*"
- B. He said to him, "It does not have the power of sanctification in that connection."
 - C. *"Can this be so? And has not R. Yohanan said, 'In the opinion of him who says that two and a half handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will be seen that the table sanctified everything that was placed on it, up to a height of fifteen handbreadths, and according to the position of him who maintains that the two handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will emerge that the table sanctified everything that was placed on it to a height of twelve'?"*
 - D. He said to him, "It does not effect sanctification so that they may be presented on the altar, but it does sanctify them so that they may become invalid [if taken out of the sanctuary and the like]."

10:2

- A. **Seven liquid measures were in the sanctuary: (1) a hin [= twelve logs], and (2) a half-hin, and (3) a third-hin, and (4) a fourth-hin, (5) a log, and (6) half-log, and (7) a quarter-log.**
- B. **R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, "Notches were in the hin: 'Up to here for a bullock [a half-hin of oil and wine],' 'up to here for a ram [a third-hin],' 'up to here for a lamb [a fourth hin, Num. 28:14].'"**
- C. **R. Simeon says, "There was no hin there, and for what purpose would a hin serve? [There was no need for a hin-measure. It was used only for Moses' anointing oil, Exo. 30:24.]**
- D. **"But there was a further measure of a log and a half [= an eighth-hin], in which one did measure out [oil for] the high priest's meal offering.**
- E. **"A log and a half in the morning, and a log and a half at twilight."**

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

- B. **"There were seven liquid measures in the sanctuary, a quarter log, a half log, a log, a quarter hin, a third hin, a half hin, and a hin," the words of R. Judah.**
- C. **R. Meir says, "A hin, a half hin, a third hin, a quarter hin, a log, a half log, and a quarter log" [T. Men. 10:2A-C, with variations].**
- D. **R. Simeon says, "There was no hin there, and for what purpose would a hin serve? [88A] And what then can I put in its place? [There was no need for a hin-measure. It was used only for Moses' anointing oil, Exo. 30:24.] But there was a further measure of a log and a half [= an eighth-hin], in which**

one did measure out [oil for] the high priest's meal offering. A log and a half in the morning, and a log and a half at twilight."

- E. They said to him, "There was a half log measure at hand, and one could therefore measure the log and a half of oil with the half log measure."
- F. He said to them, "Even within your position, there was no need even for a half log measure, since at hand was the quarter log measure, and it was possible to measure what was needed by the quarter log. But as a matter of fact, this is the encompassing rule that prevailed in the Temple: a utensil that served for a given standard of measure may not be used for another standard of measure" [cf. T. [Men. E-G](#)].
- G. R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, "Notches were in the hin: 'Up to here for a bullock [a half-hin of oil and wine],' 'up to here for a ram [a third-hin],' 'up to here for a lamb [a fourth hin, Num. 28:14].'"

I.2. A. *What is at issue between R. Meir and R. Judah?*

- B. *Said R. Yohanan, "At issue between them is the status of the overflow of the measures. He who lists the measures from the smaller to the larger takes the view that what overflows from the measures also was sanctified, for the All-Merciful gave to Moses a quarter log measure and told him to calculate the larger measures by including the overflow of the smaller ones. He who takes the view that the measures are to be listed from the larger to the smaller holds that the overflow of the measures was not sanctified. The All-Merciful gave Moses a hin measure and told him to calculate the smaller ones by excluding the overflow of the larger one."*
- C. *Abbayye said, "All parties concur that the overflow of the measures may be either sanctified or not, but what is at issue here is another question entirely, namely, the meaning of the word 'full' (at Num. 7:13). He who takes the view that the measures are to be listed from the larger to the smaller holds that the word full means that the volume may be neither less than the requisite measure nor more, and the one who lists the measures from smaller to larger takes the position that while the word full means that the volume may not be less than the prescribed measure, if it is more, it still qualifies as full."*

I.3. A. The master has said: "**R. Simeon says, 'There was no hin there:'**"

- B. *Now R. Simeon gave the rabbis a solid reply, and what can they reply?*
- C. *There was indeed a hin measure there, which was used by Moses in preparing the anointing oil: "And of olive oil a hin" (Exo. 30:24).*
- D. *One authority then takes the place that, since that measure would never again be required by the later generations, it was made for the occasion and then hidden away, and the other party takes the position that once it was used, it remained a valid measure.*

I.4. A. The master has said: "And what then can I put in its place?"

- B. *But does something else have to be substituted?*
- C. *The answer accords with that which Rabina said, "We have learned that there are two layings on of hands that are done in connection with offerings of the community" [the bullock offered when the whole community has sinned in error,*

and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement].” *Here too, we have a tradition that there were seven liquid measures in the sanctuary.*

II.1 A. R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, “Notches were in the hin: Up to here for a bullock [a half-hin of oil and wine], up to here for a ram [a third-hin], up to here for a lamb [a fourth hin, Num. 28:14]:”

- B. *Does he not then hold the tradition that there were seven liquid measures in the sanctuary?*
- C. *Nope.*
- D. *If you prefer, I shall say, “What is the meaning of seven liquid measures? Seven acts of measurement.”*

10:3

- A. **A quarter-log: how did it serve?**
- B. **It served to measure out the quarter-log of water for the person afflicted with the skin ailment [Lev. 14:5], and a quarter-log of oil for the Nazirite [M. 7:2].**
- C. **A half-log: how did it serve? It served to measure out the half-log of water for the woman accused of adultery [Num. 5:17], and a half-log of oil for the thank offering [M. 7:1].**
- D. **And with a log did one measure out [oil] for all meal offerings.**
- E. **Even [for] the meal offering containing sixty tenths did one measure out sixty [individual] logs.**
- F. **R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “Even a meal offering of sixty tenths gets only its [one] log,**
- G. **“as it is said, ‘For a meal offering, and a log of oil’ (Lev. 14:21).”**
- H. **Six [logs = a half-hin] [the drink offerings of] a bullock, four [logs = a third-hin] for a ram, three [logs = a quarter-hin] for a lamb, and three and a half for the lamp, a half-log for each light.**

I.1 A. *In session Rabbi raised this question: “Why was the quarter log measure anointed at all [in that anointing served so that the utensil would sanctify whatever was poured into it]? If it was to sanctify the quarter log of oil for the person afflicted with the skin ailment, in point of fact that took place [88B] outside of the camp [so it did not have to be sanctified], and if it was to sanctify the quarter log of oil for the Nazirite, in point of fact, the bread offering of the Nazirite was sanctified solely by the act of slaughtering the ram [and not by the oil]!”*

- B. *Said to him R. Hiyya, “With it one would measure out the flour for the griddle cakes of the high priest, a quarter log of oil for each cake.”*
- C. *He recited in his connection the verse, “The man of my counsel is from a far country” (Isa. 46:11) [=Babylonia].*

II.1 A. A half-log: how did it serve? It served to measure out the half-log of water for the woman accused of adultery:

- B. *In session Rabbi raised this question: “Why was the quarter log measure anointed at all [in that anointing served so that the utensil would sanctify whatever was poured into it]? If it was it was for the water to be used for the woman accused of adultery, was it unconsecrated to begin with? Is it not written,*

‘holy water’ (Num. 5:17) [which had already been consecrated]? *And if it is to sanctify the half log of oil used for the thank offering, as a matter of fact, the bread of the thank offering was sanctified only when the thank offering itself was slaughtered.*”

C. Said to him R. Simeon b. Rabbi, “With it the priest divided the oil for the candlestick, a half log for each one.”

D. He said to him, “You light of Israel! That is precisely the fact.”

II.2. A. Said R. Yohanan said Rabbi, “In the case of a lamp that during the night accidentally went out, both the oil and the wick are then classified as unfit. What does the priest have to do? First he has to clean it out, then put in fresh oil and wick, then relight it.”

II.3. A. *In session R. Zeriqa raised this question:* “When he puts in the oil, is it the same volume as he put in to begin with, or is it only enough to keep the lamp lit through the rest of the night?”

B. *Said R. Jeremiah, “Obviously, it is the same volume as he put in to begin with, for if it is only the amount that is needed for the rest of the night, then how are we going to know how much it is now lacking? And if you say that it can be estimated, then there will have to have been not only seven specified measures, but a great many others!”*

C. *He recited in his connection the verse, “And in your majesty prosper, ride on, on behalf of truth and meekness and righteousness” (Psa. 45: 5).*

D. *So too it has been stated:*

E. Said R. Abbahu said R. Yohanan, and some say, said R. Abba said R. Hanina said Rabbi, ““In the case of a lamp that during the night accidentally went out, both the oil and the wick are then classified as unfit. What does the priest have to do? First he has to clean it out, then put in fresh oil in the same volume as he put in to begin with, and wick, then relight it.”

II.4. A. Said R. Huna b. R. Judah said R. Sheshet, “The lamp at the top of each branch of the candlestick in the Temple was flexible. [Cashdan: although the whole candlestick, including the lamps, was beaten out of one piece of gold, the ends of the branches that supported the lamps were made thin and flexible so that the whole lamp could be turned in any direction and cleaned out well.]”

B. *He takes the opinion that the words “a talent” (Exo. 25:39) and “beaten work” (Exo. 25:31, 36) pertain to the candlestick and to the lamps as well, and, since the latter had to be cleaned out, if they were not flexible they could not be cleaned out properly.*

C. *An objection was raised:* How did [the priest clean out the lamps]? He would remove them from the candlestick and put them in a cleansing mixture. He dried them with a sponge, put oil in them, and lit them [so they could be removed after all].

D. *[R. Sheshet] made his statement along the lines of the Tannaite authority of the following statement that has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. Sages say, “They did not remove it from its place.”

- F. *Does this mean, then, that if he wanted to remove it, he could have done so? Rather, formulate the matter in this way: “They did not remove it from its place at all.”*
- G. *Now who are “sages” here? It is R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq says, “There was a kind of golden plating over the lamps, and when cleaning the lamp, the priest would press it down toward the mouth of the lamp [getting out the burnt out matter (Cashdan)], and when putting in oil, he would press it down towards the back of the lamp.”

II.5. *A. There is a dispute among the following Tannaite authorities on this matter, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The candlestick and the lamps were made out of the talent of gold [Exo. 25:39], but the tongs and snuff dishes were not made out of the talent of gold.
- C. R. Nehemiah said, “The candlestick was made out of the talent of gold, but the lamps, tongs, and snuff dishes were not made out of the talent of gold.”
- D. *What is at stake in this dispute?*
- E. *At issue is the exposition of a verse of Scripture, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. “‘Of a talent of pure gold shall it be made’ (Exo. 25:39) — thereby we learn that the candlestick derives from a talent. How do we know that the same is the case for the lamps? Scripture says, ‘with all these vessels.’ Then might I suppose that the same is so for the tongs and snuff dishes? Scripture states, ‘it’ (Exo. 25:39),” the words of R. Nehemiah.
- G. *But then there is a contradiction between statements made by R. Nehemiah!*
- H. *What we have are two Tannaite versions of R. Nehemiah’s views.*
- I. R. Joshua b. Qorha says, “The candlestick was made out of the talent of gold, but the lamps, tongs, and snuff dishes were not made out of the talent of gold. Then how do I make sense of the language, ‘with all these vessels’? The utensils were made of gold.”
- J. *But that they were to be made of gold is explicit: “And you shall make the lamps thereof seven, and they shall light the lamps thereof, to give light over against it; and the tongs thereof, and the snuff dishes thereof, shall be of pure gold” (Exo. 25:37)!*
- K. *The initial statement refers only to the mouth of the lamp [where the flame is located (Cashdan)]. For I might have supposed that, since the mouth of the lamp turns black, the Torah has shown consideration for the capital of Israel. [89A] So they may be made of any kind of gold. The cited verse then indicates that it too must be of gold.*

III.1 *A. and a half-log of oil for the thank offering:*

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. [Supply:] “...then he shall offer with the thank offering unleavened cakes mixed with oil, unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes of fine flour well mixed with oil” (Lev. 7:12):
- D. R. Aqiba says, “Why does Scripture twice refer to ‘oil’?”

- E. “Had Scripture referred to ‘oil’ only one time, I might have maintained that lo, this is in the same category as all other meal offerings as to the requirement of a *log* of oil. When Scripture refers to ‘oil’ repeatedly, we know that the use of one inclusionary statement after another serves only to diminish the matter at hand.
- F. “Consequently, the purpose is to diminish the requirement of oil to only a *half-log*.”
- G. *But is there really an amplification in succession to another? There is only a single one before us. Rather, argue as follows:*
- H. “If the verse had not stated ‘with oil’ at all, I might have supposed that it was in the same classification as all other meal offerings in regard to the *log* of oil [and therefore requires oil]. But since ‘with oil’ occurs twice, I have an amplification following another such usage, and whenever there is such, then the upshot is a limitation. So the verse reduces the required quantity of oil to a *half-log*.
- I. “Might one then imagine that one should present only a third *log* for the three varieties that are specified, that is, unleavened cakes, unleavened wafers, and cakes of fine flour well mixed with oil?
- J. “Scripture says, ‘unleavened wafers spread with oil and cakes of fine flour well mixed with oil,’ and that formulation yields an inclusionary phrase after an exclusionary phrase, which has the effect of increasing the requirement at hand.”
- K. What does one do?
- L. One puts a quarter-*log* into the cakes of fine flour that are to be well mixed in oil, and a quarter-*log* into the other two species, half for the loaves and half for the wafers.
- M. Said R. Eleazar b. Azariah to R. Aqiba, “Aqiba, even if you maintain the entire day that one ‘with oil’ serves to limit and one to augment the required measure, I shall not listen to you. [It is not the formulation of Scripture which is at issue; these are revealed measurements.]
- N. “Rather, we know as laws revealed by God to Moses at Mount Sinai that what is required is a *half-log* of oil for the thanksgiving offering, a quarter-*log* of oil for the Nazirite, and the standard eleven days between one menstrual period and another” [Sifra LXXXV:I.4-6].

IV.1 A. And with a *log* did one measure out [oil] for all meal offerings:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “‘And a tenth [of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil for a cereal offering mixed with oil for a meal offering and a *log* of oil’ (Lev. 14:21)] —
- D. “This teaches that every tenth requires a *log* of oil,” the words of sages.
- E. R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob say, “Even a cereal offering of sixty tenths requires only its single *log* of oil,
- F. “as it is said, ‘for its cereal offering, and a *log* of oil’ (Lev. 14:21)” [Sifra CLIV:I.6].

- G. *Then how do R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer deal with the statement, “And a tenth [of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil for a cereal offering mixed with oil for a meal offering and a log of oil] (Lev. 14:21)?*
- H. *They maintain that that statement has been set forth for its own purpose, for the All-Merciful has said that he has to bring a tenth of flour for a meal offering.*
- I. *And the other side?*
- J. *It is not required to make its own point, for the All-Merciful in any event has made it clear that a wealth person afflicted with the skin ailment has to present three animal offerings with three tenths of flour for a meal offering, so here, in the case of a poor one, since he brings only one animal offering, he has to bring only a single tenth.*
- K. *And the other side?*
- L. *It is so needed, for what might I otherwise have thought? I might have said that since the All-Merciful has shown concern for the man by permitting him to bring a paltry offering, he may not have to bring any meal offering at all. So we are informed that that is not the case.*
- M. *And the other side?*
- N. *We find no case whatever in which no such offering is demanded.*
- O. *And how do rabbis interpret the verse, “And a tenth [of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil for a cereal offering mixed with oil for a meal offering and a log of oil] (Lev. 14:21)?*
- P. *They require that verse to deal with the case of one who makes a freewill offering out of a meal offering, indicating that he may not present less than the quantity for which one log of oil is prescribed, namely, a tenth.*
- Q. *And the other side?*
- R. *They derive from that same verse not one but two rules.*

V.1 A. Six [logs = a half-hin] [the drink offerings of] a bullock, four [logs = a third-hin] for a ram:

- B. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*
- C. *“And their drink offerings shall be half a hin of wine for a bullock:” (Num. 28:14).*
- D. *Now a hin has twelve logs: “And of olive oil a hin” (Exo. 30:24), and “This shall be a holy anointing oil to me throughout your generations” (Exo. 30:31) [and the value of the letters in the word for this is twelve, so the hin is twelve logs].*

VI.1 A. three [logs = a quarter-hin] for a lamb, and three and a half for the lamp, a half-log for each light:

- B. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*
- C. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *“To burn from evening to morning” (Exo. 27:21):*
- E. *Give it enough oil so that it may burn from evening to morning.*
- F. *Another interpretation of the verse, “To burn from evening to morning” (Exo. 27:21):*
- G. *You have no act of service that is validly done from evening to morning except this one alone.*

- H. Sages calculated that a half log of oil will burn from evening to morning.
- I. *There are those who say, "They made the calculating through reducing the original quantity of oil," and some say, "They made the calculation by increasing it."*
- J. *Those who say, "They made the calculation by increasing it" explain that the Torah has shown consideration for Israel's capital, and those who say that they made the calculation by reducing it take the view that there is no consideration of poverty where people have enough money.*

10:4

- A. **They stir together (1) [the meal offering which accompanies] drink offerings of rams along with [that for] drink offerings of bullocks, (2) [the meal offering which accompanies] drink offerings of lambs along with [that for] drink offerings of lambs, (3) those of an individual along with those of the community, [89B] (4) those of one day along with those of the preceding day [for drink offerings may be offered up to ten days after the sacrifice which they accompany].**
- B. **But they do not stir the drink offerings of lambs [A2] along with the drink offerings of bullocks or rams [A1].**
- C. **And if one stirred them = [BI, these by themselves and those by themselves, and they [then] become confused, they are valid.**
- D. **If before one stirred them [they became confused], it is invalid.**
- E. **The lamb which is brought with the sheaf of first barley that is waved — even though its meal offering was doubled [two tenths instead of one, Lev. 23:13], its drink offerings were not doubled [but each lamb gets three logs of wine and oil].**
- I.1 A. They stir (1) [the meal offering which accompanies] drink offerings of rams along with [that for] drink offerings of bullocks, (2) [the meal offering which accompanies] drink offerings of lambs along with [that for] drink offerings of lambs, (3) those of an individual along with those of the community, [89B] (4) those of one day along with those of the preceding day [for drink offerings may be offered up to ten days after the sacrifice which they accompany]:**
 - B. *An objection was raised to the foregoing:*
 - C. *"And he shall burn it" (Lev. 3:11) — he may not mix the fat portions of one offering with those of another.*
 - D. *Said R. Yohanan, "The Mishnah speaks of a case in which the mixing had already taken place [but not to begin with]."*
 - E. **But they do not stir the drink offerings of lambs [A2] along with the drink offerings of bullocks or rams — even after the fact!**
 - F. *But lo, since in the next clause it states, And if one stirred them = [B], these by themselves and those by themselves, and they [then] become confused, they are valid, it must follow that the opening clause speaks of a case in which they may be mixed together even to begin with!*
 - G. *Said Abbaye, "This is the sense of the statement: if the flour and oil had already been mixed together, then one may mix the wine offerings together as well. But to begin with one may not mix the wine offerings together at all."*

- H. *But lo, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “Under what circumstances does [the rule that one may not mix the drink offering of a bullock together with that of a lamb] apply? It pertains to the flour and oil, but as to the wine offerings, one may indeed mix them together”?*
- I. *Rather, said Abbaye, “This is the sense of the statement: in a case in which the flour and oil of the first two offerings already have been burned on the altar, one may mix the wine offerings to begin with. If they had not yet been burned up but they had been mixed together, one may mix the wine offerings. If they have not been mixed together, one may not mix the wine offerings, for this might lead to mixing the flour and oil to begin with.”*

II.1 A. The lamb which is brought with the sheaf of first barley that is waved — even though its meal offering was doubled [two tenths instead of one, Lev. 23:13], its drink offerings were not doubled [but each lamb gets three logs of wine and oil]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **“And the cereal offering with it shall be two tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, to be offered by fire to the Lord, a pleasing odor” (Lev. 23:13):**
- D. **This teaches that the requirement for the lamb that was offered with the sheaf of first barley is doubled [a cereal offering of two tenths of an ephah].**
- E. **Might one suppose that, just as the usual requirement for the cereal offering is doubled to two tenths, so the requirement of the wine offering should be doubled as well?**
- F. **Scripture says, “wine, a fourth of a hin.”**
- G. **Might one suppose that one will not double the volume of the wine libation, because wine is not mixed in with the fine flour, but one should double the oil requirement, since the oil is mixed in with the fine flour?**
- H. **Scripture says, “and the drink offering with it shall be of wine, a fourth of a hin” —**
- I. **all the libations are to be fourth-hins [Sifra CCXXXI:II.4].**
- J. *What is the exegesis that yields that result?*
- K. *Said R. Eleazar, “It is written, ‘and its libation’ in the feminine, referring to the oil, but we read it, ‘its libation’ in the masculine, referring to the lamb’s wine. How is this so? The drink offering of the meal offering, that is, the oil, shall be equal to the drink offering of the lamb, the wine, and as the wine was a fourth part of a hin, so the oil was to be a fourth part of a hin.”*

II.2. A. Said R. Yohanan, “The guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment that one slaughtered under some other than the designation that originally applied to the beast requires drink offerings, for if you do not say so, you invalidate the offering” [Cashdan: and it could not be offered at all; it is not permissible to offer it as another offering, since it was originally designated as a guilt offering, and it is not a free will offering, since a guilt offering is obligatory, so it can only be offered as the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment and therefore has to have drink offerings].

- B. *To that proposition objected R. Menasya bar Gadda, "But how about the following: the lamb that is presented with the first sheaf of barley that was slaughtered under some designation other than the original one should have a meal offering double in volume than the ordinary one, for if you do not say so, you invalidate the offering [Cashdan: for it cannot be offered for some other classification, and as the lamb in the present case it has to have a double meal offering]."*
- C. *"The daily whole offering presented at dawn that one slaughtered for some other than the original designation should require the presentation of two logs of wood by a priest, for if you do not say so, you invalidate the offering."*
- D. *"The daily whole offering presented at dusk that was slaughtered for some other than its original designation should require the presentation of two logs of wood by two priests, for if you do not say so, you invalidate the offering."*
- E. *That is entirely correct, so rather, said Abbaye, "[Yohanan] seized upon one of these cases [in particular, but in point of fact, all of them are the same]."*
- F. *Raba said, "Not so. The latter cases are burnt offerings. [90A] If they are not suitable as the obligatory burnt offerings as originally designated, they may serve quite well as free will burnt offerings. But in the case of the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment, if it is not classified as the offering for which the beast was originally designated, it cannot be offered at all, there being no such thing as a guilt offering presented as a matter of free will."*
- G. *There is a teaching on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Yohanan:*
- H. *The guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment that one slaughtered under some other than the designation that originally applied to the beast, or the blood of which one put on the thumb and big toe of the afflicted party, nonetheless is offered on the altar and requires drink offerings, but the person must present another guilt offering to render him permitted [to reenter the Israelite camp].*

10:5

- A. **All measures which were in the sanctuary were heaped up,**
 - B. **except for that of the high priest, which he did heap up into its own midst.**
 - C. **Liquid measures: their overflow was consecrated.**
 - D. **And dry measures: their overflow was unconsecrated.**
 - E. **R. Aqiba says, "The liquid measures are consecrated, therefore, their overflow is consecrated. And dry measures are unconsecrated, therefore, their overflow is unconsecrated."**
 - F. **R. Yosé says, "Not on this account, but [the reason is] that [by adding a surplus, what is in] the liquid measure is stirred up, but [by adding a surplus] what is in the dry measure is not stirred up."**
- I.1** A. *Who is the authority behind our rule? If you say that it is R. Meir [at M. 10:1], in his opinion, only one measure was heaped up; and if you say it is rabbis in that same context, in their view there was only one tenth measure, and that was levelled!*
- B. *Said R. Hisda, "In point of fact it is R. Meir, and what is the meaning of the statement, **All measures which were in the sanctuary were heaped up?** It*

means all the acts of measuring with this measure [involved filling it up to a heap].”

II.1 A. Liquid measures: their overflow was consecrated:

- B. *What is at issue here?*
- C. *The first of the two authorities holds that the liquid measures were anointed inside and out, dry measures were anointed inside but not out; R. Aqiba takes the view that liquid measures were anointed inside and out but dry measures were not anointed at all; R. Yosé maintains that both liquid and dry measures were anointed on the inside, not on the outside. But this is the operative consideration: [by adding a surplus, what is in] the liquid measure is stirred up, but [by adding a surplus] what is in the dry measure is not stirred up.*

II.2. A. So even if the liquids are stirred up, what difference does that make? The person has the intention of sanctifying only what he requires in any event!

- B. *Said R. Dimi bar Shishena in the name of Rab, “That is to say: utensils of service can effect sanctification even if the owner of the offering has no such intention.”*
- C. *Rabina said, “In point of fact, I shall tell you that the utensils of service sanctify their contents only with the owner’s intention. But we deal here with a precautionary decree, lest people say, people may empty the contents of a utensil of service into an unconsecrated utensil.”*
- D. *Objected R. Zira, “[If] one set out the bread on the Sabbath but [set out] the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath and burned the dishes [of frankincense] on the [next] Sabbath, it is invalid...How should one do it? Let him leave it for the coming Sabbath [thirteen days in all], for even if it is on the table for many days, that is of no account [M. Men. 11:8]. But why should it be left on the table? Would it not be necessary to make a precautionary decree, so that people should not say that one may allow holy things to remain for a long time in a utensil of service [and is not invalidated by being kept overnight, even though that is not the case]?”*
- E. *Are you raising an objection between what is done inside the Temple [the presentation of the show bread] and what is performed outside [measuring the meal offering, done in the courtyard]? In the case of what is done inside, not everybody is informed, but everybody knows about what is done outside [so such a decree has to be made].*

II.3. A. We have learned in the Mishnah: R. Ishmael says, “The surplus of the drink offerings goes for [purchase of animals for sacrifice] for ‘dessert’ [the unused time of the altar] [M. Sheq. 4:4C].

- B. *What is the meaning of “the surplus of the drink offerings”?*
- C. *R. Hiyya bar Joseph said, “It is the overflow of the measures.”*
- D. *R. Yohanan said, “That is in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: Whoever undertakes to provide flour at four [seahs a sela] — [if] the price stood at [deflated to] three [selas for a seah] — still must provide it at four. [If he undertook to provide it at] three to a seah, and the price stood at [inflated to] four, [90B] let him provide it at four. For the claim of the sanctuary is always paramount [M. Sheq. 4:9B-F].”*

- E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Yohanan, and it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Hiyya bar Joseph.*
- F. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Yohanan:* What did they do with the overflow of the measures? If there was another animal offering at hand, they would present it with it, and if it were kept overnight, it is invalidated on that account. But otherwise, it is offered as a dessert for the altar.
- G. What is the dessert of the altar? Burnt offerings: the meat is burned for the Lord, and the hides go to the priests.
- H. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Hiyya bar Joseph:*
- I. If someone promised to provide fine flour at four seahs a sela and the price went down to three, he still has to supply it at four; if the undertaking was to supply it at three and the price went up to four, he has to supply it at four, for the claim of the sanctuary is always paramount.
- J. This illustrates what we have learned: the excess of the drink offerings is used for the altar's dessert.

10:6

- A. **All offerings of the community and the individual require drink offerings,**
- B. **except for (1) the firstling, (2) tithe of cattle, (3) the Passover, (4) the sin offering, and (5) the guilt offering.**
- C. **But (4) the sin offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment and (5) his guilt offering require drink offerings.**
- I.1 A. **[All offerings of the community and the individual require drink offerings:]**
Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:
- B. **"...and you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire [or a burnt offering or a sacrifice, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, or at your appointed feasts] (Num. 15: 3):"**
- C. **May I infer that whatever is offered as an offering by fire requires a drink offering, even a meal offering?**
- D. **Scripture refers specifically to a burnt-offering.**
- E. **I know only that that is the case of a burnt offering.**
- F. **How do I know that the same rule applies to peace-offerings?**
- G. **Scripture alludes to a "sacrifice."**
- H. **How about a thank offering?**
- I. **Scripture refers to "or a sacrifice."**
- J. **Should I then infer that the law extends to bringing drink-offerings with a firstling, tithe of the crop, a Passover offering, and likewise with a sin-offering or a guilt offering?**
- K. **Scripture states, "...to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering:" I have therefore encompassed within the rule [that drink offerings are required] only Holy Things that are brought on account of a vow or a freewill offering [that is,**

votive but not obligatory]. What is presenting as votive requires a drink offering, what is present by reason of an obligation does not.

- L. Then the inference is that I exclude these [a sin-offering or a guilt offering, which do not require drink offerings], but then I should further exclude a burnt-offering brought in fulfillment of an obligation on the pilgrim festivals [since that would be excluded by the rule that what is brought on one's own option requires the drink-offerings].
- M. *And what might these be? Burnt offerings brought on account of making an appearance and peace offerings that are presented on the festival?*
- N. When Scripture makes explicit reference to "at your appointed feasts," Scripture encompasses all the obligatory burnt-offering brought on festivals. [That sort of offerings requires drink-offerings as well.]
- O. Then the inference is that one encompasses in the requirement of bringing drink offerings a burnt offering brought as a matter of obligation on pilgrim festivals and likewise a sin-offering that also is brought as a matter of obligation on festivals.
- P. Scripture says, "... you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock." An animal "from the herd" was encompassed by the general rule but singled out from the general rule to teach you a trait of the encompassing rule itself.
- Q. That is, specifically, just as an animal of the herd is brought on account of a vow or as a freewill offering and requires drink offerings, so whatever is brought on account of a vow or as a freewill offering requires drink-offerings.
- R. Then a sin-offering and a guilt offering are excluded, for these do not come on account of keeping a vow or as a thank-thank-offering [but only when the obligation is imposed on account of an inadvertent violation of the law], and so these do not require drink-offerings [Sifré to Numbers CVII:II.1].
- S. "...from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire *or* a burnt offering *or* a sacrifice, to fulfil a vow *or* as a freewill offering, *or* at your appointed feasts, to make a pleasing odor to the Lord:'
- T. "Why is this stated?
- U. "Since it is said, '... and you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire or a burnt offering or a sacrifice,' I might infer that the same rule applies to a burnt-offering brought of fowl, namely, that drink-offerings should be required.
- V. "Scripture specifies, '...from the herd or from the flock,' to indicate that burnt-offerings of fowl do not require drink offerings," the words of R. Josiah.
- W. R. Jonathan says, "Such an argument is not required. For in any case it is said, '...or a sacrifice.' Just as a sacrifice always derives from a beast, so a burnt offering under discussion here involves a beast [and not fowl, so drink offerings are not required for fowl].
- X. "Why then does Scripture say, "...from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire or a burnt offering or a sacrifice, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, or at your appointed feasts, to make a pleasing odor to the Lord'?

- Y. “Because Scripture says, ‘and you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire.’
- Z. “The point is, if someone has said, ‘Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering and peace offerings,’ should I infer that he should bring the two of them simultaneously [of the same species]?
- AA. “Scripture says, ‘...from the herd or from the flock,’ to indicate that if he wants, one brings a beast of this species by itself and one of that species by itself, and if he wants, he presents two from one species” [Sifré to Numbers CVII:III.1].

- I.2.** A. *Why does R. Jonathan find a verse necessary to make the point that he wants to make? Has he not said, “Unless the verse explicitly states ‘together’”? [Cashdan: wherever in any law Scripture states two items, the two may be taken either together or separately unless Scripture expressly states “together” as at Deu. 22:10. That expression does not occur at Lev. 1:2, so an offering of one kind alone obviously is permissible.]*
- B. *It is necessary to present such a proof. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that since [91A] Scripture states, “and of the flock,” it is as though the language “together” had been used.*
 - C. *And from the perspective of R. Josiah, who has said, “Even though the word ‘together’ is not written, it is as though it were written,” a verse is required to indicate that it is not necessary to present one of each kind [but he uses the available verse for another purpose, excluding bird offerings]!*
 - D. *It is written in context, “If his offering be a burnt offering of the herd” (Lev. 1:3) and further, “And if his offering be of the flock” (Lev. 1:10).*
 - E. *And the other party?*
 - F. *It is nonetheless required. For otherwise it might have entered my mind to suppose that that is the case only when the one who took the vow articulated his intention in that wise, but where he did not so express his intent, I might suppose that he has to bring a beast from each of the two kinds, and so we are taught that that is not the case.*

- I.3.** A. The master has said: “**How about a thank offering? Scripture refers to ‘or a sacrifice:’**”
- B. *Is a thank offering not a sacrifice [and, since it is, the reference is superfluous]!*
 - C. *It was necessary to make such an explicit reference to the matter. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that since a bread offering is presented along with the thank offering, there should be no requirement of drink offerings in addition. [The explicit proof forestalls that false conclusion.]*
 - D. *But what then would have differentiated the ram of the Nazirite, which is accompanied by a bread offering, but which in any event requires drink offerings?*
 - E. *It might have entered your mind to suppose that where the bread offering is made up of only two species of bread, unleavened cakes, unleavened wafers, there a drink offering is required, but here, where four distinct species of bread are required, that would not be the case. So we are informed that that conclusion is false.*

- I.4.** A. *But let Scripture state only, “In fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill offering” and not specify “a burnt offering” [which would have been covered, as it is ordinarily votive]?*
- B. *Had Scripture not made explicit reference to “a burnt offering,” I might have supposed that the language, “and you will make an offering by fire to the Lord” formed an encompassing proposition, “in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill offering” a particularization of the foregoing, and then “to make a sweet savor” would be yet another encompassing proposition. In that case we should have an encompassing proposition, a particularization of the foregoing, and then another encompassing proposition. Where there is an encompassing proposition, a particularization of the foregoing, and then another encompassing proposition, you draw an analogy only in accord with the indicative traits of the particularization. Just as in the case of the particularization it is made explicit that at issue is something that is not presented by reason of sin, so in the case of anything that is not presented by reason of sin the rule at hand pertains. Then I exclude from the requirement a sin offering and a guilt offering, which are presented by reason of sin. So I should therefore subject to the same rule the firstling, the tithe of the corral, and the Passover offering, all of which are presented not by reason of sin. Then Scripture states, “burnt offering,” to exclude that possible conclusion.*
- C. *Now that it is written, “burnt offering,” I have an encompassing proposition, then a particularization of the foregoing, so what remains for augmentation of the application of the rule under the general proposition and the particularization?*
- D. *Just as what is covered by the particularization in explicit terms is any offering that one is not already liable to present, so any offering that one is not already liable to present is covered by the law, which extends under the law offerings of the offspring of Holy Things and animals declared to be substitutes therefor, the burnt offering that is purchased by surplus funds set aside for the purchase of such an offering, a guilt offering that is set out to pasture [not being required for the purpose for which it was designated, the owner having died, in which case the beast is pastured until blemished, redeemed, and the proceeds purchase another burnt offering], and all animal offerings that are presented in a classification other than that for which the beast was originally designated.*
- I.5.** A. *But now that you have determined that the term “or” was set forth for an exposition such as has been spelled out [making the point that a burnt offering of any one animal or the herd or flock has to be accompanied by drink offerings], what need do I have for “or” in the verse, “in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a free will offering” to indicate a disjunction [this or that]?*
- B. *It was necessary to include such a clause. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that if one did not present an offering to carry out a vow and also a free will offering, one would not have to present drink offerings. So we are informed that if one presents an offering that is only a fulfillment of a vow, one must present drink offerings; and so too, if one presents a free will offering on its own, one must present drink offerings.*
- C. *Now that poses no problems to R. Josiah [“...from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire or a burnt offering or a sacrifice, to fulfil a vow or as a freewill offering, or at your appointed feasts, to make a*

pleasing odor to the Lord: ‘Why is this stated? Since it is said, ‘... and you offer to the Lord from the herd or from the flock an offering by fire or a burnt offering or a sacrifice,’ I might infer that the same rule applies to a burnt-offering brought of fowl, namely, that drink-offerings should be required. Scripture specifies, ‘...from the herd or from the flock,’ to indicate that burnt-offerings of fowl do not require drink offerings,” the words of R. Josiah] [so he requires the disjunctive term, or otherwise would take the items together as one]. *But from the perspective of R. Jonathan, [Such an argument is not required], what purpose is thereby served?*

- D. *It might have entered your mind to suppose that if one brought an offering to carry out a vow alone, drink offerings are required; if one brought a free will offering alone, one must do the same; if he brought an offering that fulfilled a vow and service also as a free will offering, it is necessary to bring only a single drink offering. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

I.6. A. *What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “or in your appointed seasons”?*

- B. *It was necessary. For I might have thought that that rule applies only where one presented a burnt offering in fulfillment of a vow and a free will peace offering, or vice versa. But where one presented both a burnt offering and a peace offering in fulfillment of a vow, or both of them as free will offerings, since there is only a single class of offering at hand, either in fulfillment of a vow or free will offerings, it suffices to present only drink offerings for one. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

I.7. A. *What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “and when you prepare a bullock for a burnt offering or for a sacrifice” (Num. 15:12)?*

- B. *It was necessary. For I might have thought that that rule pertains to a case in which one presented a burnt offerings and peace offerings by reason of having taken a vow, or a burnt offerings and peace offerings as freewill offerings. But in a case in which one presented the two as burnt offerings, one by reason of a vow and the other by reason of a free will offering, or the two of them as peace offerings, one by reason of a vow, the other as a free will offerings, I might have supposed that both of them fall into the category of peace offerings, both of burnt offerings, and these form a single classification, so it should suffice to present drink offerings on only one count. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

I.8. A. *What need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or for peace offerings” (Num. 15: 8)?*

- B. *It was necessary. For I might have thought that that rule applies to a case in which one presented two animals both as burnt offerings, one by reason of a vow, the other as a free will offerings; or two as peace offerings, one by reason of a vow, the other as free will offerings. But in a case in which one presented two animals as burnt offerings by reason of free will or two animals as burnt offerings by reason of a vow, since there is at hand only a single classification of offering, peace offering or burnt offering, it would suffice to present drink offerings on only one count. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

- I.9.** A. *And from the perspective of R. Josiah, what need to I have for the “or” in the phrase, “of the herd or of the flock”?*
- B. *It was necessary. For I might have thought that that rule applies when we deal with two different species of animal, but when we deal with a single species of animal, it would suffice to present drink offerings on one count only. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

- I.10.** A. *And what need was there for the verse, “So you shall do for every one according to their number” (Num. 15:12)?*
- B. *It was necessary. For I might have thought that that rule applies when the offerings are presented in sequence, once following the other. But if they were presented simultaneously, then the offering should suffice only with drink offerings on one count only. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

II.1 A. **But (4) the sin offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment and (5) his guilt offering require drink offerings:**

- B. *What are the scriptural foundations of the Mishnah’s rule?*
- C. *It is in accord with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **“And three-tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed in oil” (Lev. 14:10)**
- E. **Scripture speaks of the meal offering that is presented with the animal offering [each animal offering is accompanied by a meal offering of a tenth of an ephah of flour as a drink offering].**
- F. **You maintain that Scripture speaks of the meal offering that is presented with the animal offering [each animal offering is accompanied by a meal offering of a tenth of an ephah of flour as a drink offering]. But perhaps it speaks only of a meal offering that is presented by itself?**
- G. **When Scripture says, “And the priest shall offer up the burnt offering [and the cereal offering] on the altar” (Lev. 14:20), it teaches that this refers only to the meal offering of the beast.**
- H. **Still I do not know whether or not drink offerings are required [so the matter is necessary further evidence being required, now concerning drink-offerings.**
- I. **When it says, “You will prepare for the burnt offering” (Num. 15:5: “And wine for the drink-offering... You shall prepare for the burnt-offering or for the sacrifice for each lamb” — this refers to the burnt-offering of the leper**
- J. **“for the burnt-offering” — to include the purification-offering of the leper.**
- K. **“Or for the sacrifice” — to include his guilt-offering [Sifra CLI:I.11].**

- II.2.** A. *But the rule governing both the sin offering and the guilt offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment surely can be derived from “the sacrifice:” [so why are two distinct words demanded]? [91B] For a master has said [at B. Zeb. 36A], “How do we know the rule governing the sin offering and the guilt offering? Scripture says, ‘and the meat of the sacrifice’”!*

- B. *That single exegesis covering both the guilt offering and the sin offering applies where both offerings fall into a single category [and serve the same purpose (Cashdan)], but where the guilt offering serves to render a person acceptable for reentry into the Temple, and the sin offering serves to atone, we require two distinct verses of Scripture to make the same point.*

- II.3.** A. “The sacrifice” refers to the sin offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment.
- B. *But might I say that this refers to the sin offering and guilt offering of a Nazirite?*
- C. *Don’t let it enter your mind, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “[...and a basket of unleavened bread, [cakes of fine flour mixed with oil, and unleavened wafers spread with oil,] and their cereal offering and their drink offerings” (Num. 6:15):
- E. Scripture speaks of [Sifré to Numbers: These are for] the burnt-offering and the peace-offering.
- F. You say that Scripture speaks of the burnt-offering and the peace-offering. Or is it possible that they cover also the sin-offering [Sifré to Numbers: and the guilt-offering]?
- G. [Sifré to Numbers:] Logic would lead to this argument:
- H. [Sifré to Numbers:] Since a leper cuts off the hair and brings an offering, and a Nazirite cuts off the hair and brings an offering, if I draw an analogy from the rule governing the leper, whose sin-offering and guilt-offering require drink-offerings, so in the case of the Nazir, his sin-offering and guilt-offering should require drink-offerings.
- I. Scripture then states, “...and he shall offer the ram as a sacrifice of peace offering to the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread; the priest shall offer also its cereal offering and its drink offering:”
- J. The ram was part of the encompassing rule, but has been singled out from the encompassing rule [as indicated in the cited verse], serving to clarify the encompassing rule itself.
- K. What distinguishes the ram is that it is brought on account of a vow or a thanksgiving offering and requires drink-offerings, so whatever is brought on account of a vow or a thanksgiving offering requires drink-offerings.
- L. Excluded then are the sin-offering and the guilt offering, which are not brought on account of a vow or a thanksgiving offering and which do not require drink-offerings [Sifré to Numbers XXXIV:II.1].
- II.4.** A. “for the burnt-offering” — this refers to the purification-offering of the leper:
- B. *But might one not say, “This refers to the burnt offering presented by a woman after childbirth”?*
- C. *Said Abbayye, “The rule governing the the burnt offering presented by a woman after childbirth derives from the last part of the clause, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- D. R. Nathan says, “‘...for each lamb,’ encompasses the burnt offering brought by a woman after childbirth, who has to bring drink offerings, a rule which we have not derived anywhere else in the entire Torah. [Sifré to Numbers adds: Or perhaps it speaks only of the ram? When Scripture says, ‘... for a ram you shall prepare for a cereal offering two tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with a third of a hin of oil; and for the drink offering you shall offer a third of a hin of wine,’ lo, reference is made to the ram. So how shall I interpret the statement, “‘...for each lamb’? It is to encompass the burnt

offering brought by a woman after childbirth, who has to bring drink offerings, a rule which we have not derived anywhere else in the entire Torah.”]

- E. “...for each lamb’ encompasses the eleventh lamb produced in the tithing of the flock” [Sifré to Numbers CVII: V.2B-E, in the name of Jonathan].
- G. [Since the actual tithe of the herd does not have to have drink offerings when it is sacrificed, but an animal designated as tenth though it is eleventh, hence a subsidiary beast, does require drink offerings, we notice that] we do not find in the entire Torah a case in which what is subsidiary is subjected to a more weighty requirement than what is principal!
- H. Raba said, “And what case do we know in which it is required to find three distinct terms to encompass its required offerings? It must be the case of the person afflicted with the sin offering.” [Cashdan: thus the verse in question, which contains three inclusive terms, can only refer to the case of the person afflicted with the sin offering, who requires three offerings: a burnt offering, a sin offering, and a guilt offering].

II.5. A. [At Num. 15:6,] what need is there for a reference to “for a ram”? [Cashdan: The drink offerings for a ram are prescribed at Num. 28:12, 14.]

- B. Said R. Sheshet, “This serves to encompass under the rule of drink offerings the ram presented by Aaron [on the day of atonement, Lev. 16: 3].”
- C. *The ram presented by Aaron [on the day of atonement, Lev. 16: 3] is covered by the reference to “in your appointed seasons” [at Num. 15: 3].*
- D. *But it might have entered your mind that the reference to “in your appointed seasons” pertains in particular to offerings that derive from the resources of the community, but not to offerings that derive from the resources of an individual.*
- E. *But what then would differentiate that offering from the burnt offering of a woman following childbirth [an individual’s offering, which requires drink offerings]?*
- F. *You might have supposed that the rule pertains to an offering that is not subject to a fixed time [since the offering of the woman after child birth is not assigned to a fixed point in the year], but here, where the offering is subject to a fixed time [the day of atonement], it might then be subject to a different requirement. So we are informed that Aaron’s ram does require drink offerings as well.*

II.6. A. [At Num. 15: 6,] what need is there for a reference to “or for a ram”?

- B. It encompasses a sheep in its thirteenth month [between the age of a lamb and the age of a ram; it too is classified as a ram and has to have drink offerings].
- C. *That poses no problem to the position of R. Yohanan, who has said that it forms a distinct species [so a scriptural reference would be required], as we have learned in the Mishnah: Lambs — one year old. And rams — two years old. And in all cases, [the year is reckoned] from [birth]day to [birth]day. One thirteen months old is not suitable either for a lamb or for a ram. R. Tarfon calls it Palges. Ben Azzai calls it Noqed. R. Ishmael calls it Parkharigma [M. Par. 1:3A-G]. [If] one did offer it up, one brings on its account the drink offerings of a ram. But his sacrifice does not go to his credit. One which is*

thirteen months and one day old — lo, this is a ram [M. Par. 1:3U-V]. And said R. Yohanan, “‘*or* for a ram’ serves to encompass a sheep in its thirteenth month [between the age of a lamb and the age of a ram; it too is classified as a ram and has to have drink offerings].”

- D. *But from the perspective of Bar Padda, who maintains that the person must present drink offerings as for a ram and stipulate appropriately [if this is a ram, these drink offerings are in order, if it is for a lamb, then let the quantity required for the lamb be taken from the drink offerings and the remainder be regarded as a free will offering (Cashdan)], this being a case of doubt, one must then raise this question: is a verse of Scripture required to cover what is merely a matter of doubt? [Not very likely.]*
- E. *Well, for Bar Padda, this really is a problem.*

II.7. A. “Thus it shall be done for *each* bull or ram or for *each* of the male lambs or the kids, according to the number that you prepare, so shall you do with every one according to their number:”

- B. **Why does Scripture state, “For each bull?” [Sifra to Numbers: Scripture thus stresses that there is no difference between the drink offerings brought for a calf and the drink offerings brought for an ox.]**
- C. **For one might have reasoned wrongly, as follows: the animal drawn from the flock requires drink offerings, and so does one drawn from the herd. If I draw an analogy, in that the Torah has made a distinction between the drink offerings required of a lamb and those required of a ram, so I should draw a distinction between the drink offerings required for a calf and those required for an ox.**
- D. **So the Torah specifies to the contrary: “Thus it shall be done for each bull [or ram or for each of the male lambs or the kids],” indicating that the Torah has made no distinction between the drink offerings brought for a calf and those brought for an ox [Sifré to Numbers CVII:X.1].**
- E. **“[Thus it shall be done for] each bull or ram [or for each of the male lambs or the kids, according to the number that you prepare, so shall you do with every one according to their number. All who are native shall do these things in this way, in offering an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the Lord]:”**
- F. **Why is this point stressed?**
- G. **It is because logic would have suggested otherwise: since we find that the Torah has made a distinction between the drink offerings required of a one year old beast and those to be brought for a two year old beast, so the Torah should distinguish the drink offerings brought for a two year old beast from those brought for a three year old.**
- H. **Scripture says, “...or for each ram,” indicating that even though the Torah has distinguished the drink offerings brought for a one year old beast from those for a two year old, the Torah does not distinguish those brought for a two year old from those brought for a three year old.**
- I. **“...or for each of the male lambs or the kids:”**
- J. **Why is this stated?**

- K. It is because logic would have suggested otherwise: since we find that the Torah has made a distinction between the drink offerings required of lamb from those required of a ram, so the Torah should distinguish between the drink offerings brought for a female lamb from those brought for a sheep.
- L. So Scripture states, "...or for each of the male lambs or the kids" [Sifré to Numbers CVII:XI.1-2]

II.8. A. Said R. Pappa, "*Raba examined us with the following question: [92A] 'How much should be the drink offerings presented with a ewe in its second year?' And we answered him on the basis of the following Mishnah-teaching: 'Calf' signifies drink offerings for [offerings from] the herd, large or small, male or female, [M. Sheq. 5:3D], except for rams*" [so a ewe in its second year requires the drink offerings of a lamb (Cashdan)].

10:7

- A. All offerings of the community do not receive laying on of hands,
- B. except for the bullock which is brought on account of [the community's transgression of] any of the commandments [Lev. 4:15] and the goat which is sent forth [Lev. 16:21].
- C. R. Simeon says, "Also: the goats which are brought on account of idolatry [Num. 15: 2]."
- D. All offerings of the individual require laying on of hands,
- E. except for (1) the firstling, (2) tithe of cattle, and (3) the Passover.
- F. And the heir [of a man who died before bringing a vowed sacrifice] lays on hands and brings drink offerings and has the power to effect substitution (Lev. 27:10).

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

- B. All offerings of the community do not receive laying on of hands, except for the bullock which is brought on account of [the community's transgression of] any of the commandments [Lev. 4:15] and the goat which is sent forth [Lev. 16:21], "and goats which are brought on account of idolatry [Num. 15: 2]," the words of R. Simeon.
- C. R. Judah says, "Goats that are presented on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands. And what does one bring in their stead? The goat which is sent forth."
- D. *But is it absolutely required to present something in their stead?*
- E. *[Well, yes there is, for] said Rabina, "We have learned as a tradition that two acts of laying on of hands on the offering of the community are going to be required" [so there has to be substitute for an item removed from the list]. "*
- F. Said to him R. Simeon, "And does not the laying on of hands apply only to the owners? [Who else can do it?] The goat that is sent forth — Aaron and his son lay hands on it simultaneously."
- G. Said to him R. Judah, "They also gain atonement through it" [T. Men. 10:9A-C].

- I.2.** A. *Said R. Jeremiah, “Each party is consistent with views expressed elsewhere. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- B. **“he shall make atonement for the sanctuary:”**
 - C. **this refers to the inner sanctum.**
 - D. **“and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting:”**
 - E. **this refers to the sanctuary.**
 - F. **“and for the altar:” this means what it says.**
 - G. **“and he shall make atonement:”**
 - H. **this refers to the courtyards.**
 - I. **“for the priests:””this means what it says.**
 - J. **“and for all the people of the assembly:”**
 - K. **this refers to the Israelites.**
 - L. **“and he shall make atonement:”**
 - M. **this refers also to the Levites.**
 - N. **The law has treated them all the same as subject to a single act of atonement.**
 - O. **“This teaches that all of them find atonement through the goat that is sent away,” the words of R. Judah.**
 - P. **R. Simeon says, “Just as the blood of the goat that is prepared within the temple effects atonement for the Israelites, so the blood of the young bull atones for the priests. Just as the confession said over the goat that is sent away atones for other sins for the Israelites, so the confession that is said over the young bull atones for other sins for the priests” [Sifra CLXXXVI:II.2]**
- I.3.** A. *But surely R. Simeon must concede that all of the sections of the people are covered by the final phrases of the verse at hand!*
- B. *True enough, all are treated within the same rule in that all are atoned for, but each is atoned for through its own offering.*
 - C. *R. Judah then maintains that, for sins involving the laws of uncleanness as these affect the Temple and its Holy Things, Israelites are atoned for through the blood of the he goat sprinkled within the Holy of Holies, and priests through Aaron’s bullock, and for other sins, all obtain atonement through the confession over the scape goat. According to R. Simeon, even for other since, priests are atoned for through the confession pronounced over the bullock. And so it is stated explicitly in tractate Shebuot: All the same are the Israelites and the priests and the anointed priest. Then what differentiates the Israelites from the priests and the anointed priest? The blood of the bullock atones for priests for violations of the laws of uncleanness affecting the ‘Temple and its Holy Things. R. Simeon says, “Just as the blood of the he goat that is sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies atones for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock atone for the priests; just as the confession of sin pronounced over the scape goat atones for the Israelites, so the confession of sin stated over the bullock atones for the priests.”*
- I.4.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **“...The elders of the community shall lay their hands [upon the head of the bull before the Lord, and the bull shall be slaughtered before the Lord:]”**

- C. **“The bullock requires the laying on of hands, but goats that are brought on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands,” the words of R. Judah.**
- D. **R. Simeon says, “The ox requires the laying on of hands by the elders. The goats brought on account of idolatry do not require laying on of hands by the elders. But only Aaron does it.”**
- E. **For R. Simeon says, “Every sin offering brought by the community, the blood of which is brought within, requires the laying on of hands” [T. Men. 10:9A-B, with somewhat different wording].[Sifra XLIII:I.4].**
- F. *In contradiction to the foregoing, we have the following:*
- G. **“‘...the live goat’ (Lev. 16:21) — only the live goat requires the laying on of hands, but the he goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands,” the words of R. Judah.**
- H. **R. Simeon says, “It means only the live goat requires the laying on of hands by Aaron, [92B] but the he goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands at all by Aaron, but only by the elders.” [Simeon now has contradictory opinions.]**
- I. *Said R. Sheshet, “But do you imagine that the first of the two formulations is sound? Has not R. Simeon taken the view that we require the laying on of hands by the owners in particular? Rather, this is how to lay out matters: “‘...the bullock:’ this means that only the bullock requires laying on of hands, but he goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands,” the words of R. Judah. R. Simeon says, “‘the live goat:’ only the live goat requires the laying on of hands by Aaron, but the he goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron but by the elders.’ And this is the sense of what R. Simeon meant to say to R. Judah: ‘The he goats offered for the sin of idolatry have to have laying on of hands, for if you have heard the opinion that they do not require the laying on of hands, you must have heard it only with respect to Aaron, for they were excluded by the language, “the live goat.”’” [Cashdan: only on the scape goat shall Aaron lay his hands, but not on these; one may not infer the rule for the he goats from ‘the bullock’ for they are of different kinds.]*
- J. *But from R. Judah’s perspective, why was a verse required to exclude [the he goats offered for the sin of idolatry]? Has not Rabina stated,” “We have learned that there are two layings on of hands that are done in connection with offerings of the community” [the bullock offered when the whole community has sinned in error, and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement]”?*
- K. *That is merely a rather general version of matters [and Judah wanted a specific proof for the proposition at hand].*
- I.5. A. And as to R. Simeon, how on the basis of Scripture does he prove that the goats that are presented on account of idolatry require the laying on of hands?**
- B. *It is in line with that which we have learned on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **““And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat’ (Lev. 4:24 [the goat brought by the ruler] — this encompasses the goat brought by Nahshon under the rule of the laying on of hands,” the words of R. Judah.**

- D. R. Simeon says, "It serves to encompass under the rule of laying on of hands the goats brought on account of inadvertent idolatry."
- E. For R. Simeon would say, "Any sin offering the blood of which is brought to the inner altar requires the laying on of hands."
- F. *What need do I have for the inclusion of the statement, For R. Simeon would say, "Any sin offering the blood of which is brought to the inner altar requires the laying on of hands"?*
- G. *It is merely a general explication of his views.*
- H. *But might one say that the verse that requires laying hands on the he goat presented by a ruler includes the he goat that is presented on the Day of Atonement on the inside altar [in line with what Simeon has just said]?*
- I. *What is covered by the matter must be comparable to the he goat of a rule that makes atonement for the person who knows that he has transgressed the requirement [but the he goat of the Day of Atonement concerns violating laws of uncleanness in the Temple that one does not know has happened].*

I.6. A. *And from the perspective of Rabina, who has said, "We have learned that there are two layings on of hands that are done in connection with offerings of the community" [the bullock offered when the whole community has sinned in error, and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement], what need does he have for a verse of Scripture to make this point? [Cashdan: Simeon holds that laying on of hands must be performed by the owners, so Aaron's laying on hands on the scape goat is improper, for he does not own the goat or atone through it; so in line with the tradition that only two possible offerings of the congregation that require laying on of hands are the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation and he goats offered for the sin of idolatry, no further verse of Scripture is needed].*

B. *It was necessary to appeal to both the verse at hand and also the tradition. For if the law derived only from the verse alone [concerning laying on of hands on an offering of the congregation], I might have concluded that the peace offering of the congregation also requires the laying on of hands. That question in fact was raised in the chapter entitled "All meal offerings are brought unleavened" [Mishnah-tractate Menahot 5:1A]. It is contrary to that statement that R. Simeon said, "Three kinds [of offering] require three rites, two [apply] to each of them, but [all] three apply to none of them. And these are they: the sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual, and the sacrifices of peace offerings of the community, and the guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment. The sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual [M. 5:6G4-5] require (1) laying on of hands while the animal is yet alive [Lev. 3: 2], and (2) waving of the slaughtered animals, but (3) waving does not apply to them while they are alive [Lev. 10:15]. The sacrifices of peace offerings of the community [the lambs of Pentecost/Shabuot, M. 5:6 require (1) waving while they are alive and (2) when they are slaughtered, but (3) the laying on of hands does not apply to them [Lev. 23:20]. The guilt offering of the person healed of the skin ailment requires (1) laying on of hands and (2) waving while it is alive [Lev. 14:12-13], but (3) waving does not apply to it when it has been slaughtered" [M. Men. 5:7A-F]. [And the following argument then was presented:] If the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community, which*

do not require the laying on of hands while yet alive, do require waving while yet alive, the peace offering of the individual, which requires the laying on of hands while it is yet alive, surely should require waving while it is yet alive! *The All-merciful excluded the sacrifices of peace offerings in behalf of the community by using the word "them,"* thus excluding the peace offering of the individual. And should not the peace offerings of the community require laying on of hands by an argument *a fortiori*: if the sacrifices of peace offerings of an individual, which do not require waving while alive, do require the laying on of hands, the sacrifices of peace offerings of the community, which do require waving while yet alive, surely should require the laying on of hands! So the tradition was made necessary, expressed as follows: said Rabina, "We have learned that there are two layings on of hands that are done in connection with offerings of the community" [the bullock offered when the whole community has sinned in error, and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement].

- C. *And if we had in hand only the tradition alone, I should not have know the other case* [one offering of the congregation, the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation, is made explicit in Scripture, but what other offering required it, he goats offered for the sin of idolatry, he goat of the Day of Atonement, or peace offerings of the congregation (Cashdan)]. *So we are informed by the verse that it includes what is comparable to the he goat of the rule, which makes atonement for the person who has knowledge that he has violated a commandment.*

II.1 A. All offerings of the individual require laying on of hands, except for (1) the firstling, (2) tithe of cattle, and (3) the Passover:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **"his offering" (Lev. 3: 1):**
- D. **and not a firstling.**
- E. **But is the opposite not a matter of logic?**
- F. **If peace offerings, which are not consecrated from the womb, require laying on of hands, the firstling, which is consecrated from the womb, surely should require the laying on of hands.**
- G. **That is why it is necessary for Scripture to make matters explicit:] "his offering:"**
- H. **and not a firstling.**
- I. **"his offering" (Lev. 3: 1):**
- J. **and not a beast designated as tithe.**
- K. **But is the opposite not a matter of logic:**
- L. **If peace offerings, which are not in the classification of sacrifices that one is obligated to go and bring, require laying on of hands, a beast designated as tithe, which is in the classification of a sacrifice that one is obligated to go and bring, surely should require the laying on of hands.**
- M. **That is why it is necessary for Scripture to make matters explicit:] "his offering:"**
- N. **and not a beast designated as tithe.**
- O. **"his offering" (Lev. 3: 1):**

- P. and not a beast designated as a passover.
- Q. But is the opposite not a matter of logic:
- R. If peace offerings, concerning which Scripture did not specify a sizable number of instructions, require laying on of hands, the animal killed as a passover, which is subject to numerous additional rules [e.g., about how it is to be cooked and eaten], surely should require the laying on of hands.
- S. That is why it is necessary for Scripture to make matters explicit:] “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1):
- T. and not a beast designated as a passover [Sifra XXIX:II.2-5]
- U. *One might object:* that is the rule governing peace offerings, since these require drink offerings and the waving of the breast and thigh [but that is not the case with those classifications of offering that do not require these same rites, including the firstling, tithe, and Passover offering. So why require proof on the basis of Scripture?]
- V. *True enough, the proof-texts provide ancillary support.*
- W. **[93A]** *Then for what purpose are the verses of Scripture?*
- X. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1):
- Y. [“His offering” requires the laying on of hands,] but not the offering presented by his fellow.
- Z. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1):
- AA. [“His offering” requires the laying on of hands,] but not the offering of a gentile.
- BB. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1):
- CC. This serves to encompass every owner of an offering, who is to be included in the rite of laying on of hands [all partners being required to do so].

III.1 A. And the heir [of a man who died before bringing a vowed sacrifice] lays on hands and brings drink offerings and has the power to effect substitution (Lev. 27:10):

- B. *R. Hananiah repeated as a Tannaite formulation before Raba, “The heir does not lay hands on his father’s offering, and the heir does not have the power to effect an act of substitution with an animal designated for an offering by his father.”*
- C. *“But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: And the heir [of a man who died before bringing a vowed sacrifice] lays on hands and brings drink offerings and has the power to effect substitution (Lev. 27:10)!”*
- D. *He said to him, “Shall I reverse what I have said?”*
- E. *He said to him, “No, for what you have stated represents the position of R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. **“‘his offering:’ not the offering of his deceased father [who designated a beast for an offering and then died].**
- G. **“‘his offering:’ not an offering belonging to someone else [e.g., a gentile].**
- H. **“‘his offering:’ not an offering designated by a proselyte [who designated a beast and then died].”**
- I. **“R. Judah says, ‘An heir does not lay hands on a beast consecrated by the deceased and brought for slaughter or effect an act of substitution’ [Sifra XXIX:I.2].”**

III.2. A. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Judah?*

- B. “His offering,” not the offering designated by his deceased father — *then we derive* the rule governing the beginning of the process of sanctification from the rule governing the end of the process of sanctification [the laying on of hands, followed immediately by the act of slaughter]. Just as at the end of the process of consecration, the heir may not lay on hands, so at the beginning of the process of sanctification the heir may not effect an act of substitution.
- C. *And rabbis?*
- D. “And if he shall at all change” (Lev. 27:10) — this serves to encompass under the rule of substitution the heir [of the person who can perform an act of substitution]. *Then we derive* the rule governing the end of the process of sanctification from the rule governing the beginning of the process of sanctification [the laying on of hands, followed immediately by the act of slaughter]. Just as at the beginning of the process of consecration, the heir may effect an act of substitution, so at the end of the process of sanctification the heir may effect an act of substitution.
- E. *And how do rabbis interpret the language* “his offering”?
- F. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1): [“His offering” requires the laying on of hands,] but not the offering of a gentile.
- G. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1): [“His offering” requires the laying on of hands,] but not the offering presented by his fellow.
- H. “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1): This serves to encompass every owner of an offering, who is to be included in the rite of laying on of hands [all partners being required to do so].
- I. And R. Judah?
- J. *He does not accept the reading:* “his offering” (Lev. 3: 1): This serves to encompass every owner of an offering, who is to be included in the rite of laying on of hands [all partners being required to do so].
- K. *Alternatively, he takes the position that the exclusion of the gentile and the fellow is contained within a single verse of Scripture, leaving two verses over for his use, and one teaches:* “his offering,” not the offering of his father; “his offering” encompassing every other owner of the offering within the rite of laying on of hands.
- L. *And how does R. Judah interpret the language,* “And if he shall at all change” (Lev. 27:10)?
- M. *He requires it to encompass a woman under the law of substitution [so that if she makes a statement substituting a beast for one already consecrated, the substituted beast is deemed sanctified]. That is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- N. Since the entire passage on the law of substitution is stated in the masculine, how on the basis of Scripture do we know that women are subject to the law?
- O. Scripture states, “And if he shall at all change” (Lev. 27:10).
- P. *And rabbis?*
- Q. *They derive that lesson from the phrase,* “And if.”
- R. And R. Judah?

S. *He derives no lesson from the phrase, "And if."*

10:8

- A. **All lay on hands,**
 - B. **except for (1) the deaf-mute, (2) the idiot, and (3) the minor, (4) the blind person, and (5) the gentile, and (6) the slave, and (7) the agent, and (8) the woman.**
 - C. **And laying on of hands constitutes the residue of the requirement [which may, in fact, be omitted without affecting the efficacy of atonement].**
 - D. **[It is done] on the head [of the animal] with both hands.**
 - E. **And in the place in which they lay on hands [there do] they slaughter [the animal].**
 - F. **And forthwith after laying on of hands is the act of slaughter.**
 - E. **which is not the rule for laying on of hands.**
- I.1** A. *Now there is no problem in understanding the exclusion of the (1) the deaf-mute, (2) the idiot, and (3) the minor, for they are held not to possess the power of intentionality.*
- B. *And there is no problem in understanding the exclusion of the gentile, since it is written "the children of Israel" (Lev. 1: 2), so that only Israelites may lay on hands, but gentiles may not do so.*
- C. *But on what basis is the blind person excluded?*
- D. R. Hisda and R. Isaac —
- E. *One of them said, "We draw an analogy for the laying on of hands on offerings from the laying on of hands done by the elders of the congregation [and the elders had to be without blemish, so the blind person, suffering a blemish, may not lay on hands]."*
- F. *And the other said, "We draw an analogy for the laying on of hands on offerings from the laying on of hands of the burnt offering that is presented on the occasion of making an appearance at a pilgrim festival" [and just as the blind person is exempt from presenting such an offering, so he is not able to lay on hands].*
- G. *Now from the perspective of him who has said, "We draw an analogy for the laying on of hands on offerings from the laying on of hands of the burnt offering that is presented on the occasion of making an appearance at a pilgrim festival," how come we draw no analogy from the case of the elders of the congregation?*
- H. **[93B]** *We draw an analogy from a case involving an individual from another case involving an individual, but we do not drawn an analogy for a case involving an individual from a case involving the community at large.*
- I. *And from the perspective of him who has said, "We draw an analogy for the laying on of hands on offerings from the laying on of hands done by the elders of the congregation," how come we draw no analogy from the case of the laying on of hands of the burnt offering that is presented on the occasion of making an appearance at a pilgrim festival?*
- J. *We draw an analogy from a matter concerning which the laying on of hands is expressly prescribed for another matter concerning which the rite of laying on of hands is expressly prescribed, but that is not the rule for the offering presented as*

a burnt offering when making an appearance at a pilgrim festival. For the requirement to do so itself derives from the rule governing a free will burnt offering.

- K. For a Tannaite authority repeated before R. Isaac bar Abba: “‘And he presented the burnt offering and offered it according to the ordinance’ (Lev. 9:16) — that is, according to the ordinance applying to a free will burnt offering. This teaches that the obligatory burnt offering requires the laying on of hands.”

II.1 A. (6) the slave, and (7) the agent, and (8) the woman:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
C. **“And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering:”**
D. **It must be his hand, not that of his son**
E. **“...his hand:”**
F. **and not that of his slave.**
G. **“...and he shall lay his hand:”**
H. **and not the hand of his agent [Sifra XXIX:I.1]**
I. **“...his hand:”**
J. **And not the hand of his wife.**

II.2. A. *What need is there for all of these distinct proofs?*

- B. *If Scripture had stated the rule governing only a single instance [using “his hand” one time only], I might have supposed that the purpose was to eliminate from the rite one’s slave, who is not subject to the obligation of carrying out the commandments.*
C. *But someone’s agent, who is subject to the obligation of carrying out the commandments, a man’s agent being no different from himself, I might have supposed should lay on hands.*
D. *And had we been taught these two items, which are not equivalent to the man’s own self, I might have supposed that the reason they do not lay on hands is that they are not deemed equivalent to his own body, but a man’s wife, who is deemed equivalent to his own body, I might have said may lay hands on her husband’s offering.*
E. *So all three are required.*

III.1 A. And laying on of hands constitutes the residue of the requirement [which may, in fact, be omitted without affecting the efficacy of atonement]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
C. **Since we have found that the atonement takes place only through the tossing of the blood of the sacrifice on the altar, why does Scripture say, “and he shall lay his hand ...and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1: 2)? Is it the fact that the laying on of hands effects atonement? And is it not the fact that atonement is only through the blood, as it is said, “For the blood is what makes atonement by reason of the life” (Lev. 17:11)?**
D. **It is to teach the rule that if one has treated as a mere minor detail the laying on of hands, Scripture regards it as though he has not achieved atonement [Sifra VI.V.4]**

E. But in point of fact, he has made atonement.

III.2. A. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority along these same lines with respect to the rite of waving the offering:*

B. “To be waved, to make atonement for him” (Lev. 14:21):

C. Is it the fact that the waving effects atonement? And is it not the fact that atonement is only through the blood, as it is said, “For the blood is what makes atonement by reason of the life” (Lev. 17:11)?

D. It is to teach the rule that if one has treated the waving as a mere minor detail of the religious duty, Scripture regards it as though he has not achieved atonement.

E. But in point of fact, he has made atonement.

IV.1 A. **[It is done] on the head [of the animal]:**

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

C. **“...his hand upon the head:”**

D. **but not his hand upon the neck.**

E. **“...his hand upon the head:”**

F. **and not on the back.**

G. **“...his hand upon the head:”**

H. **and not on the breast [The laying on of hands is at the horns of the beast, not at the shoulders.] [Sifra VI.II.5-6]**

IV.2. A. *So what need do I have for all these distinct details?*

B. *Each was required. For if Scripture had stated only one time “his hand,” I might have thought that excluded was the hand on the neck, since that is not at the same plane as the head, but as to putting the hand on the back, which is at the same plane as the head, I might have thought was quite acceptable.*

C. *And if only those two had been specified, I might have supposed that the operative consideration is that they are not included in the rite of the waving.*

D. *But the breast, which itself is encompassed in the rite of the waving, I might have thought was not excluded. So all three cases are required.*

IV.3. A. *The question was raised: if one put the hands on the sides of the head, what is the law?*

B. *Come and hear that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. Abba Biraah b. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “‘his hand upon the head’ — but not his hand on the sides of the head.”

IV.4. A. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: “Would a cloth placed between the hands and the beast’s head constitute an interposition, or is that not the case?”*

B. *Come and take note: but that is on condition that nothing whatsoever may interpose between him and the offering.*

V.1 A. **...with both hands:**

B. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*

C. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “For said Scripture, ‘And Aaron shall lay both his hands’ (Lev. 16:21). What is written could be read as ‘his hand,’ but it is written to be read, ‘both of his hands.’ This serves as the generative analogy for every

place in which 'his hand' is written. Lo, in all such passages, we deal with both hands, unless Scripture will make it explicit for you that only one is required."

- V.2.** A. *R. Eleazar went and stated this tradition in the house of study, but he did not state it in the name of R. Simeon b. Laqish.*
- B. *R. Simeon b. Laqish heard and blew up. He said, "If you maintain that in every place in which 'his hand' is written, we deal with both hands, unless Scripture will make it explicit for you that only one is required, why did Scripture ever say 'his hands' at all?" Then he interrogated him in regard to twenty-four passages in which the language "his hands" occurs: "his hands shall bring" (Lev. 7:30); "his hands shall contend for him" (Deu. 33: 7); "he guided his hands wittingly" (Gen. 48:14).*
- C. *The other shut up.*
- D. *When R. Simeon b. Laqish calmed down, he said to him, "So why did you not answer me that you meant the expression 'his hand' used in the context of the rite of laying on of hands? But there it is written even with regard to laying on of hands, 'and he laid his hands upon him and gave him a charge' (Num. 27:23)."*
- E. *"I referred to the laying on of hands in the context of an animal offering only."*

- VI.1** A. **And in the place in which they lay on hands [there do] they slaughter [the animal]. And forthwith after laying on of hands is the act of slaughter, which is not the rule for laying on of hands:**
- B. *What does this mean [since obviously if the slaughter of the beast is done right after the laying on of hands, it surely will take place in the same location]?*
- C. *This is the sense of the statement: in the place in which they lay on hands [there do] they slaughter [the animal], because forthwith after laying on of hands is the act of slaughter, which is not the rule for laying on of hands.*

10:9

- A. **A more strict rule applies to laying on of hands than to waving, and to waving than to laying on of hands.**
- B. **For: one person waves for all associated [with the sacrifice], but one person does not lay on hands for all associated [with the sacrifice].**
- C. **A more strict rule applies to waving.**
- D. **For: Waving applies to offerings of an individual and to offerings of the community, [92A] to living animals and to slaughtered animals, to something animate and to something inanimate,**
- E. **which is not the rule for laying on of hands.**

- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **The word "his offering" recurs, to encompass all the partners in a given offering [each of whom lays on hands].**
- C. **But does the opposite of that proposition not derive from an argument from logic?**
- D. **If waving, which applies to animals both living and already slaughtered, is excluded in the case of offerings of partnerships, laying on of hands, which**

applies only to living beasts, surely should be omitted in the case of partnerships.

- E. That is why Scripture is required to make the point that the word “his offering” recurs, to encompass all the partners in a given offering [each of whom lays on hands] [Sifra XXIX:II.1].
- F. But should not the rite of waving be extended to a beast owned by a partnership [so that all partners should join in the waving] through the following argument a fortiori? If the laying on of hands, which has not been extended to animals that have been slaughtered, has been extended to a partnership, the rite of waving, which has been extended to slaughtered animals, surely should be extended to an offering in behalf of partners!
- G. *The reason that it is not is simply because it is not possible. For how could it ever be done? Should all of them wave it at once? Then there would of necessity be interposition [between one partner's hands and the beast's body] And if you say, then let one owner wave it first, then another, the All-Merciful has spoken of one, not many, wavings..*
- H. *But if there never an act of laying on of hands in the case of a beast that has already been slaughtered? Lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: When the high priest wants to burn the offerings, he would go up on the ramp, with the prefect at his right. [When] he reached the half way point of the ramp, the prefect took him by the right hand and led him up. The first [of the nine priests, [M. 4:3] handed him the head and the hind leg, and he laid his hands on them and tossed them [into the altar fire]. The second handed over to the first the two forelegs. He gives them to the high priest. And he laid his hands on them and tossed them [into the altar fire]. The second departed, going on his way. And so did they hand over to him all the rest of the limbs, and he lays his hands on them, and tosses them [into the altar fires]. And when he wants, he lays on his hands, but others throw [the pieces into the fire] [M. Tamid 7:3].*
- I. *Said Abbaye, “In that case the rite is done in this way because of the honor owing to a high priest.” [Cashdan: but the rite of laying on of hands ordained in the Torah applied only to living offerings.]*