

**The Soncino Babylonian Talmud**

**Book IV**

**Folios 86b-110a**



**MENOCHOS**

**TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES**

*Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771*

*[www.613etc.com](http://www.613etc.com)*

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

## Menachoth 86b

**GEMARA.** ARE EQUAL! [But is this possible?] Have you not said, ‘The first kind is fit for the candlestick and the others for meal-offerings’?<sup>1</sup> — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, The statement ARE EQUAL means that they are equal in respect of meal-offerings.<sup>2</sup>

**BY RIGHT IT COULD BE INFERRED BY THE FOLLOWING ARGUMENT THAT MEAL-OFFERINGS,** etc. Our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] ‘Pure’; [and the expression] ‘pure’ means nothing else but clear.<sup>3</sup> R. Judah says. [It is written.] Beaten; [and the expression] ‘beaten’ means nothing else but pounded.<sup>4</sup> I might then think that this pounded oil is not valid for meal-offerings.<sup>5</sup> therefore the text states, And a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of beaten oil.<sup>6</sup> Why then did the text state, For the light?<sup>7</sup> — Out of regard to the sparing [of expense]. What is meant by ‘out of regard to the sparing’? —

Said R. Eleazar, The Torah wished to spare Israel unnecessary expense.<sup>8</sup> Command the children of Israel that they bring unto thee pure olive oil beaten for the light.<sup>9</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani said, ‘Unto thee’, but not unto Me, for I am not in need of light. The table was on the north side and the candlestick on the south side.<sup>10</sup> R. Zerika said in the name of R. Eleazar, I am not in need of food and I am not in need of light.<sup>11</sup> And for the house he made windows broad and narrow;<sup>12</sup> ‘broad’ without and ‘narrow’ within, for I am not in need of light.<sup>13</sup> Without the veil of the testimony in the tent of meeting.<sup>14</sup> It is a testimony to mankind that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. For how can you say He<sup>15</sup> is in need of light, when the whole of the forty years that the Israelites travelled in the wilderness they travelled only by His<sup>16</sup> light! But it is a testimony to mankind that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. What is the

testimony? Rab said, It was the western lamp<sup>17</sup> [of the candlestick] into which the same quantity of oil was poured as into the others,<sup>18</sup> yet he kindled the others from it and ended with it.<sup>19</sup>

**MISHNAH.** FROM WHENCE DID THEY BRING THE WINE?<sup>20</sup> KERUHIM<sup>21</sup> AND ‘ATTULIM RANK FIRST FOR THE QUALITY OF THEIR WINE. SECOND TO THEM ARE BETH RIMMAH, BETH LABAN ON THE HILL. AND KEFAR SIGNA IN THE VALLEY. [WINE OF THE] WHOLE LAND WAS VALID BUT THEY USED TO BRING IT ONLY FROM THESE PLACES. ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM A MANURED FIELD OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD OR FROM VINES PLANTED IN A FIELD SOWN WITH SEEDS;<sup>22</sup> BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT [FROM THESE] IT WAS VALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM SUN-DRIED GRAPES,<sup>23</sup> BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT, IT WAS VALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING OLD WINE.<sup>24</sup> SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT. ONE MAY NOT BRING SWEET WINE<sup>25</sup> OR SMOKED WINE OR COOKED WINE, AND IF ONE DID BRING IT, IT WAS INVALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM THE GRAPES OF THE ESPALIER, BUT ONLY FROM THE VINES GROWING FROM THE GROUND AND FROM WELL-CULTIVATED VINEYARDS. ONE DID NOT PUT [THE WINE] IN LARGE CASKS BUT IN SMALL BARRELS; AND ONE DID NOT FILL THE BARRELS TO THE BRIM SO THAT ITS SCENT MIGHT SPREAD.<sup>26</sup> ONE MAY NOT TAKE THE WINE AT THE MOUTH OF THE BARREL BECAUSE OF

(1) Thus the second kind of oil of the first crop is not fit for the candlestick but only for meal-offerings, whereas the first kind of oil of the second crop is fit even for the candlestick!

(2) I.e., they are of equal quality. and if a man has to bring a meal-offering he may bring with it either kind of oil.

(3) I.e., the oil which oozes by itself from the olives without any pressure being applied.

(4) Sc. in a mortar, but not ground in a mill.

(5) For Scripture expressly says. Beaten (i.e. pounded) for the light. but for no other purpose.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

- (6) Ex. XXIX, 40.  
(7) Seeing that beaten oil is valid also for meal-offerings.  
(8) V. Sifra on Lev. XIV, 36. And since the meal-offering required a considerable amount of oil the Torah therefore ordained pure beaten oil only for the light.  
(9) Lev. XXIV, 2.  
(10) In the Sanctuary.  
(11) This is demonstrated by the fact that God ordained the placing of the candlestick far away from the table; with human beings it is usual to place the lamp close to the table.  
(12) I Kings VI, 4.  
(13) The windows were thus constructed in a manner contrary to the usual practice to prove that God has no need of light.  
(14) Lev. XXIV,3 with reference to the preparation and kindling of the candlestick.  
(15) According to R. Tam the reference is to Aaron the priest; v. Tosaf s.v. מזוּיָךְ and Shab. 22b.  
(16) V. p. 523, n. 13.  
(17) I.e., the central lamp (for its wick was turned towards the west), according to the view that the candlestick was so placed that its branches extended to the north and to the south; or the second lamp counting from the east, assuming that the candlestick was so placed that its branches extended to the east and to the west. V. infra 98b.  
(18) Sc. half a log, the quantity estimated to burn through the longest night.  
(19) By the morning the oil in the lamps had burnt out and the priest came in and cleaned out the lamps, removing the old wicks and putting in new wicks, and pouring oil into them ready for kindling in the evening. The western lamp (v. supra n. 2). however, although it had no more oil than any of the other lamps, miraculously continued to burn the whole day long, so that when the lamps were to be kindled in the evening they were kindled from this one. The western lamp itself was then extinguished and cleaned out, a fresh wick put in, oil poured in, and then relit. Thus this lamp provided the fire for lighting the other lamps, and yet was the last to be cleaned out. This miracle testified to the Divine Presence in Israel.  
(20) For the drink-offerings.  
(21) The place names enumerated in this Mishnah admit of many variants and the suggested identifications are doubtful. According to Neubauer, Geographie p. 82ff, Keruhim = Coreae (in north of Judah), 'Attulim = Kefer Hatla (north of Gilgal). Beth Rimmah and Laban = the present Beit Rima and Lubban (north-west of Jerusalem), and Kefar Signa = Sukneh (near Jaffa).  
(22) As to the question of kil'ayim'. v. Com. of Rashba, a.l.

(23) הליסטון or אליסטון = \*\*, a sweet wine made from grapes dried in the sun.

(24) i.e., which is more than a year old and its redness is not so sparkling.

(25) Made from a kind of sweet grapes. in contradistinction from grapes sweetened in the sun. Aliter: new wine, must.

(26) The scent would fill the space in the barrel above the wine and settle there, thus the wine would retain its scent. Were the barrel to be filled to the brim its scent would be lost as soon as it was opened.

## Menachoth 87a

THE SCUM, NOR THAT AT THE BOTTOM BECAUSE OF THE LEES; BUT ONE SHOULD TAKE IT ONLY FROM THE MIDDLE THIRD OF THE BARREL.<sup>1</sup> HOW WAS IT TESTED?<sup>2</sup> THE TEMPLE-TREASURER USED TO SIT NEARBY WITH HIS STICK<sup>3</sup> IN HIS HAND; WHEN THE FROTH BURST FORTH HE WOULD KNOCK WITH HIS STICK.<sup>4</sup> R. JOSE SON OF R. JUDAH SAYS, WINE ON WHICH THERE IS A SCUM IS INVALID, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, THEY SHALL BE UNTO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, AND THEIR MEAL-OFFERING;<sup>5</sup> AND THEY SHALL BE UNTO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, AND THEIR DRINK-OFFERINGS.<sup>6</sup>

**GEMARA.** ONE MAY NOT BRING SWEET WINE OR SMOKED WINE OR COOKED WINE. AND IF ONE DID BRING IT, IT WAS INVALID. but does not [the Mishnah] state in an earlier clause, ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM SUN-DRIED GRAPES.<sup>7</sup> BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT, IT WAS VALID? —

Rabina answered, Combine them and learn them together.<sup>8</sup> R. Ashi answered, If the sweetness is by reason of the sun it is not nauseous, but if the sweetness is in the fruit itself it is nauseous.<sup>9</sup>

**ONE MAY NOT BRING OLD WINE. SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT.** Hezekiah said, What is the reason for Rabbi's view? Because the verse reads, For a lamb

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

wine;<sup>10</sup> as a lamb [for an offering] may be only one year old, so wine may be only one year old. Then it should follow, should it not, that as a lamb that is two years old is invalid, so wine that is two years old is invalid? And should you say that it is indeed so, but it has been taught: One may not bring wine that is two years old, but if one did bring it, it was valid. Now who is it that rules that one may not bring [old wine]? Obviously Rabbi; yet it says 'But if one did bring it, it was valid'! — Rather said Raba, this is the reason for Rabbi's view; it is written, Look not thou upon the wine when it is red.<sup>11</sup>

**ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM THE GRAPES OF THE ESPALIER, etc.** A Tanna taught: [It must come from] vineyards that are cultivated twice in the year. R. Joseph once had a garden-plot which he used to give an extra hoeing and it produced wine that could take twice the usual amount of water.<sup>12</sup>

**ONE DID NOT PUT [THE WINE] IN LARGE CASKS.** A Tanna taught: [By BARRELS are meant] the medium-sized pitcher-shaped Lydian vessels.<sup>13</sup> They should not be put away in twos but singly.<sup>14</sup>

**HOW WAS IT TESTED? THE TEMPLE-TREASURER USED TO SIT NEARBY WITH HIS STICK IN HIS HAND; WHEN THE FROTH BURST FORTH HE WOULD KNOCK WITH HIS STICK.** A Tanna taught: When the froth of the lees burst forth the Temple-treasurer would knock with his stick. And why did he not say so?<sup>15</sup> — This supports R. Johanan. for R. Johanan said', In the same way as speech is beneficial to the spices<sup>16</sup> so is speech injurious to wine.

**R. JOSE SON OF R. JUDAH SAYS, etc., R. Johanan<sup>17</sup>** raised the question. If a man consecrated it<sup>18</sup> does he incur stripes for consecrating a blemished thing or not? Since it is unfit it is like a blemished animal; or [shall we say that the prohibition of] a

blemished thing applies only to animals? — This question remains undecided.

**Our Rabbis taught: Rams [were brought] from Moab, lambs from Hebron, calves from Sharon, and doves from the Royal Mountain.<sup>19</sup>** R. Judah said, One should bring lambs whose height was equal to their breadth.<sup>20</sup> Raba son of R. Shila said, What is the reason for R. Judah's view? — For it is written, In that day shall thy cattle feed, the broad lambs.<sup>21</sup> It is written, I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem; they shall never hold their peace day nor night; ye that are the Lord's remembrancers, take ye no rest.<sup>22</sup> What do they say? — Raba son of R. Shila said. [They say,] Thou wilt arise and have compassion upon Zion.<sup>23</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, [They say,] The Lord doth build up Jerusalem.<sup>24</sup> And what did they say before this?<sup>25</sup> — Raba son of R. Shila said, [They used to say.] For the Lord hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His habitation.<sup>26</sup>

## CHAPTER X

**MISHNAH.** THERE WERE TWO DRY-MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE: THE TENTH<sup>27</sup> AND THE HALF-TENTH.<sup>28</sup> R. MEIR SAYS, A TENTH, [ANOTHER] TENTH, AND A HALF-TENTH. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE MEAL-OFFERINGS. ONE DID NOT MEASURE WITH A THREE-TENTHS MEASURE [THE MEAL-OFFERING] FOR A BULLOCK<sup>29</sup> OR WITH A TWO-TENTHS MEASURE [THE MEAL-OFFERING] FOR A RAM,<sup>30</sup> BUT ONE MEASURED THEM BY SO MANY TENTHS. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE GRIDDLECAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST<sup>31</sup> [WHICH WAS OFFERED] THE HALF IN THE MORNING AND THE HALF TOWARDS EVENING.

**GEMARA.** It was taught: R. Meir used to say. Wherefore does the text state, A tenth, a

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

tenth for every lamb?<sup>32</sup> To teach you that there were two tenth measures in the Temple, one heaped<sup>33</sup> and the other level. With the heaped measure they used to measure all meal-offerings.

- (1) I.e., the barrel is pierced in its side in the middle and the tap inserted there; in this manner the wine drawn off is from the middle of the barrel.
- (2) To ascertain whether the wine was of a good quality.
- (3) A measuring stick (Rashi). A staff, the symbol of his authority (Tif. Yis.).
- (4) As a sign that no more wine shall be drawn off, for the wine that follows is not so pure but is mixed with the lees (Maim.).
- (5) Num. XXVIII, 19, 20. The meal-offering must also be free from blemishes, hence if the meal was maggoty it is invalid.
- (6) Ibid, 31. The drink-offering shall also be free from blemish, hence if there is a scum on the wine it is invalid.
- (7) Which is a sweet wine.
- (8) Thus: one may not bring wine from sun-dried grapes or sweet wine, etc., and if one did bring it, it was invalid. According to Tosaf s.v. כרך it was valid.
- (9) And therefore invalid.
- (10) Num. XXVIII, 14.
- (11) Prov. XXIII, 31. Hence red wine is the choicest; but after one year the wine loses its redness and brightness.
- (12) Usually wine was adulterated with water in the proportion of three parts of water to one of wine (cf. Shab. 77a); this wine could stand an admixture of water in the proportion of six parts of water to one of wine.
- (13) Or 'the medium-sized Lydian pitchers'. Cf. however Tosef. Men. IX, where it reads: The wine was not put in large casks or in small barrels but in medium-sized pitcher-shaped vessels.
- (14) So that if one barrel turned bad none of the others would be affected.
- (15) That the froth is now coming out and no more wine should be drawn from the barrel.
- (16) During the preparation of the spices for the incense much talking was going on as this was considered beneficial for it. Cf. Ker. 6b.
- (17) Sh. Mek. 'Raba'; cf. supra p. 516.
- (18) Sc. wine with scum.
- (19) Lit., 'the mountain of the King'. I.e., the hill-country of Judea. V. Git. (Sonc. ed.) p. 254. n. 4.
- (20) According to another reading: שגביהן רחבים 'whose backs are broad'.
- (21) Isa. XXX, 23. So according to Talmudic exposition; in the E.V. in large pastures.

- (22) Ibid. LXII, 6.
- (23) Ps. CII, 14.
- (24) Ps. CXLVII, 2.
- (25) Sc. before the destruction of Jerusalem.
- (26) Ibid. CXXXII, 13.
- (27) Sc. of an ephah. And so throughout.
- (28) These were the two measuring standards used in the Temple for dry-stuffs; but of course there were many vessels of each size.
- (29) Which consisted of three tenths of flour.
- (30) Which consisted of two tenths.
- (31) Cf. Lev. VI, 13ff.
- (32) Num. XXVIII, 29.
- (33) I.e., the vessel was actually less than a tenth and only when heaped did it amount to a tenth.

## Menachoth 87b

With the level measure they used to measure the griddle-cakes of the High Priest.<sup>1</sup> But the Sages said, There was but one tenth measure there, as it is said, And one tenth for every lamb.<sup>2</sup> Wherefore then does the text state, 'A tenth, a tenth'? In order to include the half-tenth. Whence does R. Meir derive the half-tenth [measure]? — He derives it from [the expression], And one tenth.<sup>3</sup> And the Rabbis? — They base no exposition upon the letter waw ['and']. And for what purpose does R. Meir apply the verse, And one tenth for every lamb? — To teach that one should not measure with a three-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a bullock or with a two-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a ram. And the Rabbis?<sup>4</sup> They derive it from the dots [above the word]. For it has been taught: R. Jose said, Wherefore is there a dot above the waw in the middle of the first 'issaron<sup>6</sup> stated in connection with the offerings for the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles]? [To teach] that one may not measure with a three-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a bullock or with a two-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a ram. And R. Meir? — He bases no exposition upon the dot [above the word].

**FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE GRIDDLE-CAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST. 'ONE**

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

USED TO MEASURE’!<sup>7</sup> But I can point out a contradiction, for we have learnt: The griddle-cakes of the High Priest must not be brought in [two separate] halves, but he must bring a whole tenth and then divide it!<sup>8</sup> — R. Shesheth answered, The expression ‘MEASURE’ that is used is to be understood in the sense of divide.

Rami b. Hama enquired of R. Hisda, Was the half-tenth according to R. Meir a heaped measure or a level measure? (Mnemonic: Half; Griddle-cakes of the High Priest; Table).<sup>9</sup> But you might ask the same question according to the Rabbis? — [Indeed so, and] according to the Rabbis the question is as regards the tenth as well, Was it heaped or level? — He replied, From R. Meir's statement [in one case] we can understand the view of R. Meir [in the other]; and also from R. Meir's statement we can understand the view of the Rabbis. Thus since R. Meir stated that the tenth measure [used for measuring the meal-offering of the High Priest] was level, we know that the half-tenth measure<sup>10</sup> was also level; and since according to R. Meir [both measures were] level, according to the Rabbis too [they were both] level.

Rami b. Hama further enquired of R. Hisda, How were the griddle-cakes of the High Priest divided into cakes?<sup>11</sup> By hand or by a utensil? — Surely it is obvious that it was divided by hand, for should you say by a utensil, would one bring in scales [into the Temple]? But why not bring it in? — It is not proper to do so since it is stated in connection with the curses.<sup>12</sup>

Rami b. Hama further enquired of R. Hisda, Would the table hallow the handfuls<sup>13</sup> placed as a pile upon it or not? [Shall we say] since it hallows the Showbread it would hallow the handfuls too; or it only hallows what is prescribed for it<sup>14</sup> but not what is not prescribed for it? — He replied, It would not hallow them. But this cannot be right, for did

not R. Johanan say that according to the one who holds that two and a half handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either end], it will be seen that the table hallowed everything that was on it to a height of fifteen handbreadths;<sup>15</sup> and according to the one who holds that two handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either end], it will be seen that the table hallowed everything that was on it to a height to twelve handbreadths?<sup>16</sup> — He replied, It would not hallow them so far as being offered upon the altar is concerned,<sup>17</sup> but it would hallow them to the extent that they can become invalid.<sup>18</sup>

*MISHNAH.* THERE WERE SEVEN LIQUID-MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE: THE HIN,<sup>19</sup> THE HALF-HIN, THE THIRD-HIN, THE QUARTER-HIN, THE LOG, THE HALF-LOG, AND THE QUARTER-LOG. R. ELIEZER SON OF R. ZADOK SAYS, THERE WERE MARKINGS IN THE HIN MEASURE [INDICATING] THUS FAR FOR A BULLOCK, THUS FAR FOR A RAM, AND THUS FAR FOR A LAMB.<sup>20</sup> R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE WAS NO HIN MEASURE THERE AT ALL; FOR WHAT PURPOSE COULD THE HIN SERVE?<sup>21</sup> BUT THERE WAS AN ADDITIONAL MEASURE<sup>22</sup> OF ONE LOG AND A HALF BY WHICH ONE USED TO MEASURE [THE OIL]<sup>23</sup> FOR THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE HIGH PRIEST, A LOG AND A HALF IN THE MORNING AND A LOG AND A HALF TOWARDS EVENING.

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis taught: There were seven liquid-measures in the Temple: the quarter-log, the half-log, the log, the quarter-hin, the third-hin, the half-hin, and the hin. So R. Judah. But R. Meir says. [They were:] the hin, the half-hin, the third-hin, the quarter-kin, the log, the half-log, and the quarter-log. R. Simeon says, There was no hin measure there at all; for what purpose could the kin serve?

(1) This meal-offering of the High Priest was not measured by the heaped measure, for when dividing it into halves the flour would certainly pour out on to the ground.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

- (2) Num. XXIX, 4.
- (3) The additional waw, 'and', intimates another vessel, namely the half-tenth.
- (4) Whence do they derive this last teaching.
- (5) In the Masoretic text there is seen a dot above the second waw of the word ועשרון in Num. XXIX, 15. The dot points to an exposition connected with this word, namely that only the tenth shall be used as a measure even though it is necessary to measure three tenths as for the meal-offering for a bullock.
- (6) Num. XXIX, 15. The word עשרון (tenth) is stated twice at the beginning of the verse, but the dot is placed over the waw in the first word.
- (7) It is understood from this expression that the High Priest measured out a half-tenth in the morning and brought it to the Temple, and did likewise in the evening.
- (8) Supra 50b.
- (9) These are the subjects of the three questions put by Rami b. Hama to R. Hisda in the passage which follows.
- (10) Also used in connection with the meal-offering of the High Priest, namely for dividing it into two.
- (11) For it was baked into twelve cakes, six being offered in the morning and six in the evening. The question therefore is, Was the dough (according to Tosaf., the flour) divided into twelve equal parts by scales, or only by guesswork?
- (12) That bread will be divided by weight; cf. Lev. XXVI, 26.
- (13) Of frankincense, heaped up on the table and not put in the dishes. According to Tosaf. s.v. מדי (so, too, Maim.) the reference is to the handful of a meal-offering that was not put into a vessel of ministry but was placed in a heap on the table.
- (14) Sc. the Showbread which is to be placed directly on the table, whereas the frankincense is to be put in dishes which are to be set on the table.
- (15) V. infra 96a. The cakes of the Showbread were each ten handbreadths long, and the table, according to R. Judah, was five handbreadths wide. Now as the cakes were set lengthwise across the breadth of the table, two and a half handbreadths of the cake would overlap the table at each end. Accordingly this amount was turned up; then the second cake was placed upon it and likewise turned up at its ends and so on, so that the six cakes rose to a height of fifteen cubits (6 X 2 1/2) above the surface of the table.
- (16) The table, according to R. Meir, was six handbreadths wide, thus only two handbreadths at each end of the cake, the amount that would be overlapping on either side, was turned up. The six cakes thus rose to a height of twelve handbreadths (6 X 2) above the table.

- (17) The table would not hallow the frankincense put upon its bare surface to that extent that it is permitted to be burnt upon the altar.
- (18) If taken out of the Sanctuary or if touched by a Tebul Yom (v. Glos.).
- (19) A liquid-measure equal to twelve logs.
- (20) So that it was not necessary to have a separate measure for a half or a third or a quarter of a hin.
- (21) The measure of a hin was prescribed for use only once at the preparation of the anointing oil by Moses, cf. Ex. XXX, 24.
- (22) To make up the seven measures.
- (23) Sc. three logs of oil; cf. supra 51a.

## Menachoth 88a

What then can I put in its place?<sup>1</sup> But there was an additional measure there of a log and a half, by which one used to measure [the oil] for the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, a log and a half in the morning and a log and a half towards evening. They said to him, But there was there the half-log measure, and one could therefore measure it<sup>2</sup> with the half-log measure! He replied, In that case, even according to your view, there was no need for the half-log measure, for since there was there the quarter-log measure it was possible to measure it with the quarter-log! But the following rule was established in the Temple: The vessel that served for one measure did not serve for another measure.<sup>3</sup>

R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok says, There were markings in the hin measure [indicating] thus far for a bullock, thus far for a ram, and thus far for a lamb.<sup>4</sup> What is the difference between R. Meir and R. Judah? — R. Johanan said, There is a difference between them as regards the overflow of the measures. He who counts the measures from below upwards<sup>5</sup> is of the opinion that the overflow of the measures was also holy; for the All-Merciful gave unto Moses a quarter-log measure and instructed him to calculate [the larger measures] by including the overflow [of the smaller measure].<sup>6</sup> But he who counts the measures from the top downwards<sup>7</sup> is of the opinion that the overflow of the measures was not holy; for

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

the All-Merciful gave unto Moses a hin measure and instructed him to calculate [the smaller measures] by excluding the overflow [of the larger measure].<sup>8</sup>

Abaye said, All [may be of the opinion] that the overflow of the measures was either holy or not holy, but they differ as to the meaning of the word ‘full’.<sup>9</sup> He who counts the measures from the top downwards maintains that the word ‘full’ implies that it may be neither less [than the prescribed measure] nor more.<sup>10</sup> But he who counts the measures from below upwards maintains that the word ‘full’ implies that it may not be less [than the prescribed measure], but if it is more it is still regarded as ‘full’.<sup>11</sup>

The Master said, ‘R. Simeon says, There was no hin measure there at all’. R. Simeon is surely quite right in his argument with the Rabbis. What can the Rabbis reply? — There was the hin measure used by Moses in the preparation of the anointing oil, as it is written, And of olive oil a hin.<sup>12</sup> Now one is of the opinion that since it was not necessary for later generations, it was only made for that occasion and thereafter hidden away, but the other is of the opinion that once it was put to a use it remained as a measure.

The Master said, ‘What then can I put in its place?’ But is it absolutely essential to substitute another? As Rabina said elsewhere: There is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation only two require the laying on of hands;<sup>13</sup> similarly here there is a tradition that there were seven liquid-measures in the Temple.

**R. ELIEZER SON OF R. ZADOK SAYS, THERE WERE MARKINGS IN THE HIN MEASURE.** Does he not then accept the tradition of seven liquid-measures? — He does not. Alternatively I can say, By seven measures he understood seven measurings.<sup>14</sup>

**MISHNAH.** FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE QUARTER-LOG SERVE? [TO MEASURE] A QUARTER-LOG OF WATER FOR THE LEPER<sup>15</sup> AND A QUARTER-LOG OF OIL FOR THE NAZIRITE.<sup>16</sup> FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-LOG SERVE? [TO MEASURE] A HALF-LOG OF WATER FOR THE SUSPECTED WOMAN<sup>17</sup> AND A HALF-LOG OF OIL FOR THE THANK-OFFERING. WITH THE LOG ONE MEASURED [THE OIL] FOR ALL THE MEAL-OFFERINGS. EVEN A MEAL-OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS<sup>18</sup> REQUIRED SIXTY LOGS [OF OIL]. R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAYS, EVEN A MEAL-OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS REQUIRED ONLY ONE LOG [OF OIL], FOR IT IS WRITTEN, FOR A MEAL-OFFERING, AND A LOG OF OIL.<sup>19</sup> SIX [LOGS]<sup>20</sup> WERE REQUIRED FOR A BULLOCK. FOUR<sup>21</sup> FOR A RAM, AND THREE<sup>22</sup> FOR A LAMB; THREE LOGS AND A HALF FOR THE CANDLESTICK, A HALF-LOG FOR EACH LAMP.

**GEMARA.** Rabbi was sitting and raised this difficulty: Wherefore was the quarter-log measure anointed?<sup>23</sup> If [it was in order to hallow the quarter-log of water] of the leper,

- (1) To make up the seven liquid-measures.
- (2) The log and a half of oil.
- (3) It was thus not permissible to measure a half-log by filling twice the quarter-log measure, similarly to measure a log and a half by filling the half-log measure three times.
- (4) This is the continuation of the Baraitha, and not the quotation from our Mishnah, v. Rashi.
- (5) Sc. R. Judah, who enumerates the measures beginning from the smallest, the quarter-log.
- (6) For when the smaller measuring vessel is filled to overflowing and is quickly poured out into ‘the larger vessel the latter vessel will take in also the overflow of the former. Accordingly the half-log measure was a little more than two full quarter-logs since it held the two quarter-logs plus the overflow of each. And so also with the larger measures.
- (7) Sc. R. Meir, who enumerates the measures beginning with the largest, the hin.
- (8) For when pouring from a larger vessel which is filled to overflowing into two smaller vessels, by the time the smaller vessels are filled the overflow of the larger will have run off. Hence the several

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

measures were exact measures without the overflow.

(9) Stated in Num. VII, 13 in regard to the measures.

(10) Accordingly all the measures had to be determined with accuracy, and this could only be done by filling the largest measure, the hin, to the brim and carefully dividing it into halves and into quarters, etc. Conversely, to fill the smaller vessel several times and pour it into the larger vessel would not give an accurate measure, for two full half-measures when poured into a larger vessel are more than one whole measure (Rashi MS.).

(11) Since the measures were calculated from the smallest they were a little more than the measure they represented; thus the half-log was a little more than two exact quarter-logs, for when pouring two quarter-logs into a large vessel there would be therein more than a half-log by reason of the froth that is formed (Rashi MS.). Tosaf. s.v. **תמא** suggest the following interesting interpretation: It is agreed that the term 'full' precludes what is less than the prescribed measure, but as to what is more, he who maintains that the largest measure was given to Moses and was divided up into smaller measures, takes this as a symbol to exclude anything that is more than the measure, but he who maintains that the smallest measure was given to Moses and by increasing it the other measures were arrived at, takes it as a symbol that even what is more than the measure is still regarded as the full measure.

(12) Ex. XXX, 24.

(13) Supra 62b.

(14) I.e., seven markings in the hin measure.

(15) Cf. Lev. XIV, 5. One of the birds used in the purification rites of the leper was to be killed over running water in an earthen vessel. The quantity of water was determined by the Rabbis at one quarter-log, for in this quantity the blood of the bird would still be recognizable. V. Sot. 16b.

(16) For his cakes and wafers; v. Num. VI, 15.

(17) In the preparation of the bitter waters; cf. *ibid.* V, 17 and Sot. 15b.

(18) This was the maximum quantity of flour that might be brought as a meal-offering in a single vessel. *Infra* 103b.

(19) Lev. XIV, 21. Thus no matter how large the meal-offering was only one log of oil was necessary.

(20) Of oil and of wine, measured by the half-hin measure. The hin comprised twelve logs.

(21) Measured by the third-hin measure.

(22) Measured by the quarter-hin measure.

(23) All the Temple measures were anointed with the anointing oil and thereby consecrated, so that they could hallow whatever was put in them.

## Menachoth 88b

but that was outside [the camp];<sup>1</sup> and if [to hallow the quarter-log of oil] of the Nazirite,<sup>2</sup> but the bread-offering of the Nazirite was hallowed only by the slaughtering of the ram!<sup>3</sup> — Said to him R. Hiyya. By it one measured the oil for the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, a quarter-log of oil for each cake.<sup>4</sup> Rabbi then applied to him the verse, The man of my counsel from a far country.<sup>5</sup>

**FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-LOG SERVE?** Rabbi was sitting and raised this difficulty: Wherefore was the half-log measure anointed? If [it was in order to hallow the water used] in the case of a suspected woman, but was it unconsecrated [water that was used]? Is it not written, Holy water?<sup>6</sup> And if [to hallow the half-log of oil] of the thank-offering, but the bread of the thank-offering was hallowed only by the slaughtering of the thank-offering!<sup>3</sup> Said to him R. Simeon, Rabbi's son, By it [the priest] divided the oil for the Candlestick, a half-log for each lamp. Rabbi then exclaimed, O Lamp of Israel, it was so indeed. R. Johanan said in the name of Rabbi, If a lamp had gone out,<sup>7</sup> both the oil and the wick have become unfit.<sup>8</sup> What must he do? He must clean it out, put in it fresh oil [and a fresh wick], and relight it.

R. Zerika was sitting and asked the following question, When he puts in fresh oil does he put in the same quantity of oil as at first, or only the quantity needed [for the remainder of the night]?<sup>9</sup> — It is obvious, said R. Jeremiah. that he puts in as much oil as at first, for should you say only the quantity needed [for the remainder of the night, the question will be asked]. How do we know how much is needed? But should you say that it<sup>9</sup> can be measured,<sup>10</sup> then there must have been not only seven measures but numerous measures? [R. Zerika] thereupon applied [to R. Jeremiah] the verse, And in thy majesty prosper, ride on, on behalf of truth and

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

meekness and righteousness.<sup>11</sup> And so it has been stated: R. Abbahu said in the name of R. Johanan-others say, R. Abba said it in the name of R. Hanina who said it in the name of Rabbi — If a lamp had gone out, both the oil and the wick have become unfit. What must he do? He must clean it out, put in fresh oil as much as at first, [put in a fresh wick] and relight it.

R. Huna the son of Rab Judah said in the name of R. Shesheth: The lamp [at the top of each branch of the Candlestick] in the Temple was flexible.<sup>12</sup> He is of the opinion that the expressions ‘a talent’<sup>13</sup> and ‘beaten work’<sup>14</sup> apply to the Candlestick and also to the lamps; and since the latter had to be cleaned out, were they not flexible, they could not very well be cleaned out. An objection was raised: How did he do it?<sup>15</sup> He removed [the lamps from the Candlestick] and put them in a cleansing mixture.<sup>16</sup> He then dried them with a sponge, put oil in them, and lit them!<sup>17</sup> — He<sup>18</sup> agrees with the following Tanna, for it was taught: The Sages say, They did not move it [the lamp] from its place at all. Does this mean to imply that it could be moved if one wanted to do so? — Say rather, They could not move it from its place at all. Who are ‘The Sages’? — R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok is meant. For it was taught: R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok says, There was a kind of thin plate of gold over [each lamp]; when cleaning out [the lamp the priest] used to press it down towards the mouth of the lamp,<sup>19</sup> and when putting oil in it he used to press it down towards the back of the lamp.<sup>20</sup>

And this matter is the subject of dispute between the following Tannaim. For it was taught: The Candlestick and the lamps were made out of the talent,<sup>21</sup> but the tongs and the snuff dishes were not made out of the talent. R. Nehemiah said, The Candlestick [only] was made out of the talent, but neither the lamps nor the tongs nor the snuff dishes were made out of the talent. Wherein do they differ? — In the exposition of the following

verse. For it was taught: Of a talent of pure gold shall it be made;<sup>22</sup> we thus learn that the Candlestick was made out of the talent, but whence do I know that it included the lamps too? Because Scripture says, With all these vessels.<sup>22</sup> Then I might think that it included even the tongs and the snuff dishes; the text therefore states, It.<sup>22</sup> This is the opinion of R. Nehemiah. (But is there not here a contradiction between the two statements of R. Nehemiah?<sup>23</sup> —

Two Tannaim differ as to R. Nehemiah's view.) R. Joshua b. Korha says, The Candlestick was made out of the talent, but neither the lamps nor the tongs nor the snuff dishes were made out of the talent. How then do I interpret the words ‘with all these vessels’? That the vessels were of gold. But that they were of gold is expressly stated in the verses, And thou shalt 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!<sup>24</sup> — [The former verse] was stated only for the sake of the mouth of the lamp.<sup>25</sup> For I might have thought that since the mouth of the lamp becomes black the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel,

- (1) The water did not need to be hallowed for that purpose.
- (2) I.e., the measuring vessel should hallow the oil and the oil when mixed with the bread should hallow the bread.
- (3) But not before by the oil.
- (4) For the six cakes that were offered in the morning one log and a half of oil was used, that is, a quarter-log for each cake. Similarly for the six cakes offered in the evening.
- (5) Isa. XLVI, 11. R. Hiyya had come from Babylon to Palestine.
- (6) Num. V, 17. As the water used was already consecrated, being taken from the laver, there was no need for a consecrated measuring vessel to hallow the water (Rashi MS. and Tosaf.).
- (7) Each lamp was filled every evening with a half-log of oil which was estimated to burn through the night until the morning. In this case the lamp had accidentally gone out in the night.
- (8) Lit., ‘have become ashes’.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(9) That is the amount of oil left unburnt which was thrown out.

(10) The oil is placed in a measure before it is thrown out.

(11) Ps. XLV, 5. Cf. Shab. 63a where ויהדרך ‘thy majesty’ is interpreted as ויהדרך ‘thy sharpness, thy acumen’.

(12) Lit., separate parts’. The meaning is that although the whole Candlestick, including the lamps, was beaten (מקשה) out of one piece of gold, the ends of the branches which supported the lamps were made quite thin and flexible so that the whole lamp could be turned in any direction and thus be cleaned out well.

(13) Ex. XXV, 39. This word is omitted in MS.M.

(14) Ibid, 31, 36.

(15) I.e., how did the priest clean the lamps?

(16) Heb. אהל, a mineral substance used for cleansing (Jast.). ‘Among aloes’ (Goldschmidt). According to Rashi: ‘in the tent’, i.e., in the Temple.

(17) It is evident from this Baraita that the lamps could be removed from the Candlestick, which is contrary to R. Shesheth.

(18) R. Shesheth.

(19) Thus ejecting all burnt-out matter.

(20) Thus making a wide opening to receive the oil.

(21) The talent of pure gold used in the making of the Candlestick; cf. Ex. XXV, 39

(22) Ex. ibid.

(23) For above it was taught that according to R. Nehemiah the lamps were not made out of the talent.

(24) Ex. XXV, 37, 38.

(25) Where the flame is.

quantity of oil] to a half-log. But is there here an amplification following another amplification? There is only one amplification here!<sup>3</sup> —

Rather the argument is this: Had not the verse stated ‘with oil’ at all, I should have said that it was like all other meal-offerings in respect of the log of oil;<sup>4</sup> but now that ‘with oil’ is stated twice, there is here an amplification following an amplification. and whenever an amplification follows another amplification it implies limitation. Thus the verse has reduced [the quantity of oil] to a half-log. I might think that this half-log of oil was to be divided equally among the three kinds of cakes,<sup>5</sup> namely the cakes, the wafers, and the soaked cakes; but since the verse stated ‘with oil’ with the soaked cakes, which was quite unnecessary,<sup>6</sup> it thereby increased the quantity of oil for the soaked cakes. How then [was it divided]? A half-log of oil was to be brought and divided into halves, one half to be used for the cakes and wafers and the other half for the soaked cakes. Thereupon R. Eleazar b. Azariah rejoined. Akiba, even though you repeat the word ‘with oil’ the whole day long I shall not listen to you; but [the fact is that] the half-log of oil of the thank-offering, the quarter-log of oil of the Nazirite, and the eleven days between two periods of menstruation,<sup>7</sup> are laws delivered to Moses on Sinai.

WITH THE LOG ONE MEASURED [THE OIL FOR ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS]. Our Rabbis taught: It is written,<sup>8</sup> And one tenth [part of an ephah of fine flour] mingled [with oil for a meal-offering,] and a log [of oil].<sup>9</sup> This teaches that every tenth requires a log of oil. So the Sages. But R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer [b. Jacob] say, Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths requires but one log, for it is said, For a meal-offering and a log of oil.<sup>10</sup> For what exposition do R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob require the words ‘And one tenth... mingled... and a log of oil’? — They require them for their own purpose; the

## Menachoth 89a

and therefore it may be made of any kind of gold; the verse therefore teaches us [that it, too, must be of pure gold].

**A HALF-LOG OF OIL FOR THE THANK-OFFERING.** It was taught: R. Akiba says, Why is the expression ‘with oil’ stated twice?<sup>1</sup> Had the verse stated ‘with oil’ once only, I should have said that it<sup>2</sup> was like all other meal-offerings in respect of the log of oil; but now that ‘with oil’ is stated twice, there is here an amplification following an amplification, and whenever an amplification follows an amplification it implies limitation. Thus the verse has [implied] reduced [the

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

Divine Law ordaining thereby that he must bring one tenth [for a meal-offering]. And the others?<sup>11</sup> — They say that for that purpose no verse is required. for since the Divine Law ordained in the case of a leper of affluent means that he must bring three animal-offerings and three tenths [of flour for a meal-offering], here [in the case of a leper of poor means], since he brings but one animal-offering, only one tenth [is required for a meal-offering]. And the others?<sup>12</sup> — The verse is indeed necessary; for otherwise I might have said that, since the All Merciful has spared him expense by allowing him to bring a poor [man's] sacrifice, no meal-offering at all is to be brought! And the others?<sup>13</sup> — We do not find [they say] that he should be [exempt] entirely [from the offering].<sup>14</sup>

And for what exposition do the Rabbis require the words 'For a meal-offering and a log of oil'? — They need them to teach that whosoever makes a freewill-offering of a meal-offering shall bring nothing less than the quantity for which one log of oil is prescribed, and that is, one tenth. And the others?<sup>15</sup> — Both teachings [they say] can be derived [from these words].

**SIX [LOGS] WERE REQUIRED FOR A BULLOCK, FOUR FOR A RAM, AND THREE FOR A LAMB.** How do we know this? Because it is written, And their drink-offerings shall be half a hin of wine for a bullock.<sup>16</sup> And a hin has twelve logs, for it is written, And of olive oil a hin;<sup>17</sup> and it is also written, This [Zeh] shall be a holy anointing oil unto Me throughout your generations.<sup>18</sup> the numerical value of Zeh being twelve.<sup>19</sup>

**THREE LOGS AND A HALF FOR THE CANDLESTICK, A HALF-LOG FOR EACH LAMP.** Whence is this derived? — Our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] To burn from evening to morning;<sup>20</sup> provide it with its requisite measure so that it may burn from evening to morning. Another interpretation:

'From evening to morning': you have no other service that is valid from evening to morning save this<sup>21</sup> alone. And the Sages have calculated that a half-log of oil [will burn] from evening to morning. Some say that they calculated it by reducing [the original quantity of oil];<sup>22</sup> while others say that they calculated it by increasing it.<sup>23</sup> Those who say that they calculated it by increasing [the quantity of oil adopt the principle that] the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel;<sup>24</sup> and those who say that they calculated it by reducing it [adopt the principle that] there is no poverty in the place of wealth.

**MISHNAH. ONE MAY MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS<sup>25</sup> OF BULLOCKS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF RAMS,<sup>26</sup> OR THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF OTHER LAMBS, OR THOSE OF AN INDIVIDUAL OFFERING WITH THOSE OF A COMMUNAL OFFERING,**

(1) Lev. VII, 12 with reference to the various cakes offered with the thank-offering.

(2) Sc. the thank-offering.

(3) For the words 'with oil' stated the first time are essential to teach that oil is required.

(4) Since we know of no meal-offering consisting of cakes and wafers that is brought without oil.

(5) The leavened cakes of the thank-offering required no oil.

(6) For from Lev. VI, 14 we already learn that soaked cakes required oil.

(7) Any discharge of blood during these intervening eleven days is deemed a flux (זֵיבָה), and under no circumstances can it be accounted as menstrual blood (טָהוֹרֵת). For full details v. Nid. 71b ff. V. Pes., Sonc. ed., p 422, n. 5.

(8) Cur. edd. insert. here: 'with reference to the offering of a leper of poor means. This is clearly an explanatory gloss and is omitted in all MSS.

(9) Lev. XIV, 21.

(10) Ibid. No matter how large the meal-offering is only one log of oil is required.

(11) The Sages. Do they not agree that these words of the verse are necessary for their own purpose; how then can they interpret the verse otherwise so as to derive their teaching that for every tenth one log of oil is required?

(12) R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(13) The Sages.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(14) The Divine Law has reduced the number and cost of the offerings for a man of poor means, but by no means has it exempted him entirely therefrom.

(15) Do not R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob agree that the verse is required for this last teaching; how then can they interpret the verse otherwise so as to derive therefrom their ruling that only one log is required for the meal-offering, no matter how large it is?

(16) Num. XXVIII, 14.

(17) Ex. XXX. 24.

(18) Ibid. 31. Heb.  $\pi\tau$ .

(19)  $\tau = 7$  and  $\pi = 5$ . Thus it is established that the hin consists of twelve logs, for the log is the smallest unit of liquid measure mentioned in the Torah (Rashi).

(20) Ex. XXVII, 21.

(21) Sc. the kindling of the lights.

(22) Lit., 'from above downwards'. They first filled each lamp with a large quantity of oil and on finding in the morning that the lamp was still alight and that there was still oil in the lamp, they gradually reduced the quantity until they arrived at a half-log. This measure was found to be sufficient for the longest night of the winter; in the summer a thicker wick was used so that the oil was consumed more quickly.

(23) Lit., 'from below upwards'. They first filled the lamp with a small quantity of oil and on finding in the morning that it had burnt out, the next evening they increased the quantity of oil and so on until they arrived at the standard of the half-log.

(24) And to calculate by using the larger quantity of oil in the first instance entailed the waste of the oil that was still in the lamp by the morning.

(25) This term includes the meal-offering, i.e., the quantities of flour and oil, as well as the wine-offering. It is assumed for the present that the Mishnah is dealing with the meal-offerings.

(26) For the mixture of each meal-offering was of equal consistency, the meal-offering of the bullock consisting of three tenths flour and a half-hin (six logs) of oil, and that of a ram of two tenths flour and a third-hin (four logs) of oil, thus in each case there were two logs of oil to every tenth of flour. The meal-offering of a lamb, however, was of a thinner consistency, consisting of one tenth of flour and a quarter-hin (three logs) of oil.

LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS OR OF RAMS.<sup>2</sup> IF AFTER EACH WAS MINGLED<sup>3</sup> BY ITSELF THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER, THEY ARE VALID; BUT IF BEFORE EACH WAS MINGLED BY ITSELF [THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER], THEY ARE INVALID. ALTHOUGH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE LAMB THAT WAS OFFERED WITH THE 'OMER WAS DOUBLED,<sup>4</sup> ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS WERE NOT DOUBLED.<sup>5</sup>

*GEMARA.* [ONE MAY MIX, etc.]. I can point out a contradiction to this, [for it has been taught]: And he shall burn it:<sup>6</sup> [this intimates] that he shall not mix the fat portions [of one sacrifice] with the fat portions [of another]!<sup>7</sup> -R. Johanan answered, [The Mishnah only] speaks of the case where they had been mixed.<sup>8</sup>

BUT ONE MAY NOT MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS OR OF RAMS; that is, even though they had been mixed they are not [valid].<sup>9</sup> But surely since it states in the next clause, IF AFTER EACH WAS MINGLED BY ITSELF THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER, THEY ARE VALID, it follows that the first clause teaches [that they may be mixed together] in the first instance! — Abaye therefore answered, [The Mishnah] means to say this: One may mix the wine-offerings<sup>10</sup> together if the flour and oil<sup>10</sup> had already been mixed together.<sup>11</sup> But may not one mix the wine-offerings in the first instance?<sup>12</sup> But it has been taught: This rule<sup>13</sup> applies only to the flour and oil, but one may mix the wine-offerings!<sup>14</sup> — Rather, said Abaye, If the flour and oil [of the two offerings] have already been burnt [upon the altar],<sup>15</sup> one may then mix the wine-offerings in the first instance.<sup>16</sup> If they have not yet been burnt, but they<sup>17</sup> have been mixed together, one may mix the wine-offerings;<sup>18</sup> but if they have not [been mixed together], one may not mix [the wine-offerings], for this

## Menachoth 89b

OR THOSE OF [AN OFFERING OFFERED] TO-DAY WITH THOSE OF [AN OFFERING OFFERED] YESTERDAY;<sup>1</sup> BUT ONE MAY NOT MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

might lead to the mixing of the flour and oil in the first instance.<sup>19</sup>

[ALTHOUGH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF] THE LAMB THAT WAS OFFERED WITH THE ‘OMER, etc. Our Rabbis taught: And the meal-offering thereof shall be two tenth parts:<sup>20</sup> this teaches us that the meal-offering of the lamb that was offered with the ‘Omer was doubled. I might then think that as its meal-offering was doubled so its wine was also doubled; the text therefore stated, And the drink-offering thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of a hin.<sup>20</sup> I might further think that its wine was not doubled since it was not mingled with the meal-offering, but its oil [I say] was doubled, seeing that it was mingled with the meal-offering; the text therefore stated, ‘And the drink-offering thereof’, thus intimating that all the drink-offerings thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin. How is this intimated in the verse? — R. Eleazar said, Because it is written we-niskah<sup>21</sup> and we read it we-nisko.<sup>22</sup> Now what is the explanation thereof? — The drink-offering of the meal-offering, [namely the oil,] shall be equal to the drink-offering of [the lamb, namely] the wine, and as of wine there was the fourth part of a hin so of oil there was the fourth part of a hin. R. Johanan said, If the guilt-offering of a leper was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it still requires the drink-offerings; for should you not say so, you would render it invalid.<sup>23</sup>

R. Menashia b. Gadda demurred, In that case, if the lamb that is offered with the ‘Omer was slaughtered under any name other than its own, its meal-offering should nevertheless be doubled; for should you not say so, you would render it invalid.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, if the daily morning-offering was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it should nevertheless require the offering of two logs of wood by a priest;<sup>25</sup> for should you not say so, you would render it invalid. And furthermore, if the daily

evening-offering was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it should nevertheless require the offering of two logs of wood by two priests;<sup>25</sup> for should you not say so, you would render it invalid! — It is indeed so,<sup>26</sup> for<sup>27</sup> Abaye has said, He<sup>28</sup> stated but one of several cases. Raba<sup>29</sup> said, [It is not so.] for in the latter cases the offerings are burnt-offerings,

- (1) The drink-offerings may be offered many days after the offering of the animal. V. supra 15b.
- (2) For the meal-offerings are of unequal consistencies and it is inevitable that the thicker mixture (sc. the meal-offering of the bullock or of the ram) should not absorb some of the thinner mixture (sc. the meal-offering of the lamb), accordingly both meal-offerings would be invalid, the former because it is too much and the latter because it is too little.
- (3) Sc. the flour with the oil.
- (4) Two tenths of flour instead of the usual one tenth. V. Lev. XXIII, 13.
- (5) And it required only a quarter-hin (three logs) of oil and of wine.
- (6) Lev. III, 11.
- (7) Pes. 64b. Likewise one shall not mix the meal-offering which accompanies one sacrifice with the meal-offering which accompanies another sacrifice, even though the same kind of animal was offered in each case.
- (8) But one may not mix them in the first instance.
- (9) The text followed here is that of MS.M. (omitting אֵי הָיָה and taking the sentence as the continuation of R. Johanan's argument). So Sh. Mek. and also in the text quoted by Kesef Mishneh on Maim. Yad, Temidin u-Musafin X, 14.
- (10) Of bullocks and rams.
- (11) But not where the flour and oil of the two offerings had not been mixed together. And so, too, where the flour and oil of two dissimilar meal-offerings had been mixed together (e.g., the meal-offering of a bullock with that of a lamb), one may not mix the wine-offerings.
- (12) In the case where the flour and oil of the two meal-offerings had not been mixed together.
- (13) That one may not mix the drink-offering of a bullock with that of a lamb.
- (14) Of bullocks and lambs in all circumstances, whether the flour and oil of the two offerings had already been mixed together or not.
- (15) Even if they had never been mixed together.
- (16) Even the wine-offering of a bullock or a ram with that of a lamb. This is the ruling embodied in the last quoted Baraitha.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(17) Sc. the meal-offerings of bullocks and rams, but not the meal-offerings of bullocks or rams and lambs. V. Glosses of R. Samuel Strashoun a.l., and Com. ‘Olath Shelomoh.

(18) In accordance with the ruling of the first clause of our Mishnah.

(19) And this would be a transgression of the verse And he shall burn it; v. supra p. 543.

(20) Lev. XXIII, 13.

(21) Lev. XXIII. 13. וְיִסְכּוּ ‘her drink-offering’, i.e., that of the meal-offering (מִנְחָה being feminine in Heb.), namely the oil.

(22) וְיִסְכּוּ ‘his drink-offering’, i.e., that of the lamb (being masculine), namely the wine.

(23) And it could not be offered at all; for it is not permissible to offer it as another offering since it was originally set apart as a guilt-offering, and to regard it as a freewill-offering is out of the question for a guilt-offering is only brought as an obligation; accordingly it can only be offered as the guilt-offering of a leper, and as such it requires drink-offerings (v. infra 90b).

(24) For it cannot be offered as another offering, and as the lamb of the ‘Omer it requires a double meal-offering.

(25) V. Yoma 26b.

(26) That in the other cases mentioned, besides that mentioned by R. Johanan, the offering must be offered according to all the prescribed rites, as though it had been slaughtered under its own name.

(27) So most MSS., reading וְהָאֵמֶר instead of אֵלָא אֵמֶר

(28) R. Johanan.

(29) So all MSS., and also according to Rashi and Tosaf. Cur. edd. ‘R. Abba’.

leper] must bring another guilt-offering to render him permitted.<sup>2</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ALL THE MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE WERE HEAPED EXCEPTING [THAT USED FOR] THE HIGH PRIEST'S [MEAL-OFFERING] WHICH INCLUDED IN ITSELF THE HEAPED MEASURE.<sup>3</sup> THE OVERFLOW OF THE LIQUID-MEASURES WAS HOLY, BUT THE OVERFLOW OF THE DRY-MEASURES WAS NOT HOLY. R. AKIBA SAID, THE LIQUID-MEASURES WERE HOLY, THEREFORE THEIR OVERFLOW WAS HOLY TOO; THE DRY-MEASURES WERE NOT HOLY, THEREFORE THEIR OVERFLOW WAS NOT HOLY. R. JOSE SAID. IT IS NOT ON THAT ACCOUNT BUT BECAUSE LIQUIDS ARE STIRRED UP<sup>4</sup> AND DRY-STUFFS ARE NOT.

**GEMARA.** Who is [the author of our Mishnah]? Should you say R. Meir,<sup>5</sup> but according to him only one measure was heaped up. And should you say the Rabbis,<sup>5</sup> but according to them there was only one [tenth-measure] and that was leveled! — R. Hisda answered, Indeed it is R. Meir, but the expression ALL THE MEASURES’ means all the measurings.<sup>6</sup>

**THE OVERFLOW OF THE LIQUID-MEASURES WAS HOLY.** What is the point at issue between them? — The first Tanna is of the opinion that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside,<sup>7</sup> but the dry-measures were anointed inside only but not outside. R. Akiba is of the opinion that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside but the dry-measures were not anointed at all.<sup>8</sup> R. Jose is of the opinion that both [the liquid-measures and the dry-measures] were anointed inside only and not outside, but this is the reason [for the ruling of our Mishnah]: liquids are stirred up, and therefore the overflow comes from the inside of the vessel’, but dry-stuffs are not stirred up at all. But even if [liquids are] stirred up,

## Menachoth 90a

and if they are not admissible as the original obligatory burnt-offerings, they are nevertheless admissible as freewill burnt-offerings;<sup>1</sup> but here [in the case of the guilt-offering of a leper] if you do not regard it as the originally named [offering, it cannot be offered at all, for] there is no such thing as a freewill guilt-offering. There has been taught [a Baraitha] that is in accord with R. Johanan: If the guilt-offering of a leper was slaughtered under any name other than its own, or if [the priest] did not apply some of the blood upon the thumb and great toe [of the leper], it is nevertheless offered upon the altar and it requires drink-offerings; but [the

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

what does it matter? The man surely intends to hallow only that which he requires?<sup>9</sup> —

Said R. Dimi b. Shishna in the name of Rab, This proves that vessels of ministry can hallow even without the [owner's] intention.<sup>10</sup> Rabina, however, said, I can still hold that vessels of ministry hallow only with the [owner's] intention, [nevertheless the overflow is deemed to be holy, for otherwise] it is to be feared that people will say that one may take out what has already been in a vessel of ministry for secular use.<sup>11</sup>

R. Zera raised the following objection: [We have learnt:]<sup>12</sup> If he set the Showbread and the dishes [of frankincense] on the day after the Sabbath and burnt the dishes of frankincense on the next Sabbath,<sup>13</sup> it is not valid.<sup>14</sup> What should he do? He should leave it until the following Sabbath,<sup>15</sup> for even if it remains many days on the table there is no harm. But why [is it allowed to be left for a longer period]? Might not people say, that one may allow holy things to remain in a vessel of ministry?<sup>16</sup> — You surely cannot point out a contradiction between [what is performed] inside<sup>17</sup> and [what is performed] outside;<sup>18</sup> [what is performed] inside not everybody is aware of, but [what is performed] outside everybody is aware of.<sup>19</sup> We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>20</sup> The surplus of the drink-offerings was used for the altar's 'dessert'.<sup>21</sup> What is meant by 'the surplus of the drink-offerings'? —

R. Hiyya b. Joseph said, It is the overflow of the measures. R. Johanan said, It is as we have learnt:<sup>22</sup> If a man had undertaken to supply fine flour at four [se'ahs a sela']<sup>23</sup> and the price subsequently stood at three [se'ahs a sela'], he must still supply it at four;<sup>24</sup>

(1) Accordingly in the circumstances stated, neither the lamb of the 'Omer would require a double meal-offering, nor the daily offerings the special offering of wood, since they could be offered as freewill burnt-offerings.

(2) To enter the camp of Israel, for he has not fulfilled his obligation with the first guilt-offering.

(3) This measure when filled level held as much as the others when heaped.

(4) When a liquid is being poured into a vessel what comes into the vessel last does not merely lie on the surface of what was poured in before it, but the entire liquid in the vessel is stirred up. Accordingly when the vessel is filled to overflowing, the overflow is not only of that liquid which was poured on the vessel after the vessel had been filled, but is also of the liquid displaced from the inside of the vessel; and as the latter has been hallowed in the vessel the overflow must of necessity be holy.

(5) V. supra 87a.

(6) I.e., whenever this one measure was used it was filled to a heap.

(7) Sc. the outer rim of the vessel. Hence the overflow as it passes over this rim becomes hallowed.

(8) But what was placed in them was hallowed by word of mouth. Accordingly only what was required for the man's purpose was thus hallowed, but not the overflow.

(9) And not the overflow. This question lies against all three Tannaim. V. Mishneh le-melek on Maim. Yad, Ma'ase Hakorb., II, 9.

(10) The overflow is automatically hallowed by the vessel even though the owner does not desire it.

(11) Because of this apprehension it was decreed that the overflow of liquids which comes from the inside of the vessel is holy.

(12) V. infra 100a; Yoma 29b.

(13) As is normally required.

(14) For the Showbread must remain on the table for seven days, whereas here it remained there only for six days.

(15) I.e., for thirteen days.

(16) And so long as it is in a vessel of ministry it does not become invalid by being kept overnight or for any longer period.

(17) Sc. the arrangement of the Showbread, which is performed inside the Temple where only priests entered.

(18) Sc. the measuring of the meal-offering, which is performed outside the Temple in the Temple court where all Israelites were permitted to enter.

(19) And there is ground for the apprehension.

(20) Shek. IV, 4; Keth. 106b.

(21) קיץ 'summer fruit'; cf. II. Sam. XVI, 1, 2. These were the burnt-offerings offered after all the public and private offerings of that day had been offered so that the altar should not remain idle. V. Shebu., Sonc. ed., p. 50 n. 3.

(22) Shek. IV, 9; B.M. 57b.

(23) And he was paid by the Temple-treasurer a certain sum of money.

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

(24) For in regard to Temple matters the payment of money binds the contract even though the goods have not yet passed either actually or symbolically into the possession of the Temple.

## Menachoth 90b

if [he had undertaken to supply it] at three and the price subsequently stood at four, he must supply it at four,<sup>1</sup> for the Temple has always the upper hand. There has been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Hiyya b. Joseph and there has also been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Johanan.

There has been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Hiyya b. Joseph, viz., What did they do with the overflow of the measures? If there was another animal-offering, it may be offered with it; and if it had been kept overnight, it is thereby<sup>3</sup> rendered invalid. Otherwise<sup>4</sup> it is offered as ‘dessert’ for the altar. What is this ‘dessert’? Burnt-offerings; the flesh [is burnt] unto God, and the skins fall to the priests. There has also been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Johanan, viz., If a man had undertaken to supply fine flour at four [se'ahs a sela'] and the price subsequently stood at three [se'ahs a sela'], he must still supply it at four; if [he had undertaken to supply it] at three and the price subsequently stood at four, he must supply it at four, for the Temple has the upper hand. This [illustrates] what we have learnt: The surplus of the drink-offerings was used for the altar's ‘dessert’.

**MISHNAH.** ALL THE OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION AND OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS<sup>5</sup> EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE TITHE OF CATTLE, THE PASSOVER-OFFERING, THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING; BUT THE SIN-OFFERING AND GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS.

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: [Since it is written,] And ye will make an offering by fire unto the Lord,<sup>6</sup> I might think that every offering that is offered upon the fire [of the altar] requires drink-offerings, hence even the meal-offering requires the drink-offerings; the text therefore added, A burnt-offering.<sup>7</sup> Whence do I know that peace-offerings [require drink-offerings]? Because the text added, A sacrifice.<sup>8</sup> And whence the thank-offering? Because the text added, Or a sacrifice.<sup>9</sup> I would then include also the firstling, the tithe of cattle, the Passover-offering, the sin-offering, and the guilt-offering; but the text stated, In fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering:<sup>8</sup> that which is offered in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering requires drink-offerings, but that which is not offered in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering does not require drink-offerings; the implication being to exclude the above.<sup>10</sup> I would then exclude also the obligatory offerings that are offered on account of the festival on the festival, namely the ‘appearance burnt-offerings<sup>11</sup> and the festival peace-offerings; but the text stated, Or in your appointed seasons:<sup>8</sup> whatever is offered on your appointed seasons requires drink-offerings; the implication being to include the above. I would then include the he-goats for sin-offerings.<sup>12</sup> since they are offered as an obligation on the festival; but the text stated, And when thou preparest a bullock for a burnt-offering.<sup>13</sup>

Now the bullock was included in the general law,<sup>14</sup> why then was it singled out? To teach you that everything be compared with it: as the bullock is distinguished in that it may be offered either in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering, so everything that is offered either in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering [requires drink-offerings].<sup>15</sup> Wherefore did the text state, To make a sweet savor unto the Lord, of the herd or of the flock?<sup>16</sup> It is because it says ‘A burnt-offering’, and that, I would have said,

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

included the burnt-offering of a bird; the text therefore stated, 'Of the herd or of the flock', [thereby excluding the burnt-offering of a bird]. So R. Josiah. R. Jonathan says, This is quite unnecessary, for the text stated, 'A sacrifice', and a bird-offering is no sacrifice.<sup>17</sup> Wherefore then did the text state, 'Of the herd or of the flock'? It is because it is said previously, When any man of you bringeth an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock.<sup>18</sup>

Now I might have thought that if a man said, 'I take upon myself [to offer] a burnt-offering', he must bring [one animal] from each of the two kinds; the text therefore stated here, 'Of the herd or of the flock': if he so desires he brings one [animal] or if he so desires two. But why, according to R. Jonathan, is any verse necessary to teach this? Has he not said, 'Unless the verse expressly states "together"?'<sup>19</sup> — It is necessary, for I might have said that

(1) For in this case Temple matters are on a par with ordinary lay transactions, and therefore so long as the goods have not yet passed into the hands of the purchaser the contract is not binding. Now the extra se'ah of flour that is supplied to the Temple is deemed to be 'the surplus of the drink-offerings', for the flour was intended to be used for the drink-offerings, and is used for the altar's 'dessert'.

(2) Sc. the overflow of the measures.

(3) Lit., 'by being kept overnight'.

(4) If there is no other animal-offering available.

(5) These are the meal-offering of flour and oil and the wine-offering that accompanied the animal-offering.

(6) Num. XV, 3, with reference to the drink-offerings.

(7) Num. XV, 3. Only an animal-offering requires drink-offerings.

(8) Ibid., with reference to the drink-offerings.

(9) Ibid. The expression 'or' extends the scope of the law.

(10) For the firstling and the tithe of cattle, etc. are obligatory offerings.

(11) The offerings to be offered by every Israelite on appearing at the Temple on the three great festivals. Cf. Deut. XVI, 16.

(12) I.e., that the Musaf or additional sacrifices of the festivals should require drink-offerings.

(13) Num. XV, 8.

(14) Laid down in v. 3: And ye will make an offering by fire, which includes everything that is offered by fire (Rashi MS.). Or expressly stated in the end of that verse: Of the herd or of the flock (R. Gershom, Tosaf.).

(15) This excludes the he-goats for the sin-offerings, since the sin-offering is an obligatory offering.

(16) Num. XV, 3.

(17) For the Heb. זבחה is strictly an animal-offering to which the law of slaughtering זביחה applies; it therefore excludes a bird-offering which does not require slaughtering but nipping off the head.

(18) Lev. I, 2.

(19) Wherever in any law Scripture states two items, the two may be taken either together or separately, according to the other rules governing that law, unless Scripture expressly states 'together', as, e.g., in Deut. XXII, 10. The dispute between R. Josiah and R. Jonathan is stated primarily regarding the cursing of parents in Lev. XX, 9. V. Sanh. 85b and Hul. 78b. As the expression 'together' is not found in Lev. I, 2, one would have assumed at the outset that an offering of one kind alone was permissible.

## Menachoth 91a

since it is written there, And of the flock, it is as though the expression 'together' had been used.<sup>1</sup> Then according to R. Josiah who says that even though the expression 'together' is not expressly used it is interpreted as though 'together' had been used, a verse is surely necessary [to teach that both need not be brought!]<sup>2</sup> — There is written, If his offering be a burnt-offering of the herd,<sup>3</sup> and there is also written, And if his offering be of the flock.<sup>4</sup> And the other?<sup>5</sup> — I might have thought that that was so only when a man expressly said so,<sup>6</sup> but when he did not say so expressly<sup>7</sup> [I would say that] he must bring from [each of] the two kinds; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

The Master stated: 'And whence the thank-offering? Because the text added. Or a sacrifice'. But is not the thank-offering also a sacrifice?<sup>8</sup> — I might have thought that since it is accompanied by a bread-offering it does

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

not require the drink-offerings.<sup>9</sup> But wherein does it differ from the Nazirite ram, which is accompanied by a bread-offering and yet requires the drink-offerings? — I might have thought that only there [where the bread-offering consists only] of two kinds<sup>10</sup> [are drink-offerings required] but [not] here [where] it consists of four kinds; we are therefore taught otherwise. But the Divine Law should only have stated, In fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering, and it need not have stated, A burnt-offering!<sup>11</sup> —

Had not the Divine Law stated, ‘A burnt-offering’. I should have said that the expression ‘and ye will make an offering by fire unto the Lord’<sup>12</sup> was a general proposition, ‘in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering’<sup>13</sup> a specification, and ‘to make a sweet savour’<sup>13</sup> another general proposition; we would thus have two general propositions separated by a specification, in which case everything that is similar to the matter specified would be included; and as the matter specified is distinguished in that it is an offering not brought [in atonement] for any sin, so every offering that is not brought [in atonement] for any sin [would require drink-offerings]. I would thus exclude [from drink-offerings] the sin-offering and the guilt-offering as they are brought [in atonement] for a sin, but I would include the firstling, the tithe of cattle, and the Passover-offering, as they are not brought [in atonement] for any sin;<sup>14</sup> the text therefore stated, A burnt-offering.<sup>15</sup> But now that [Scripture] has stated, A burnt-offering, what then is [there left] to be included by the general propositions and the specification? —

[The inference from the specification is made thus:] As the matter specified is an offering which one is under no obligation to offer,<sup>16</sup> so every offering which one is under no obligation to offer [requires drink-offerings]; this includes [for drink-offerings] the young of consecrated animals<sup>17</sup> and their

substitutes, the burnt-offering brought out of the surplus,<sup>18</sup> the guilt-offering condemned to pasture,<sup>19</sup> and all offerings that were slaughtered under any name other than their own. Now that you have established that the term ‘or’ was inserted for an exposition,<sup>20</sup> was there any need for [the term ‘or’ in the expression] ‘in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or as a free will-offering’ to indicate disjunction? —

It was necessary, for [without ‘or’] I might have thought that unless one brought an offering in fulfillment of a vow and also a freewill-offering one would not have to bring drink-offerings; we are therefore taught that if one brings an offering in fulfillment of a vow alone one must bring drink-offerings, and so, too, if one brings a freewill-offering alone one must bring drink-offerings. This is quite in order according to R. Josiah.<sup>21</sup> but what need was there for that term according to R. Jonathan?<sup>22</sup> —

It was necessary, for [without ‘or’] I might have thought that if one brought an offering in fulfillment of a vow alone one must bring drink-offerings, and if one brought a freewill-offering alone one must bring drink-offerings, but if one brought an offering in fulfillment of a vow and also a freewill-offering it is sufficient if the drink-offerings are brought for one only; we are therefore taught [otherwise]. And what need was there for the term ‘or’ in the expression or in your appointed seasons’? —

It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that<sup>23</sup> was so only where one brought a burnt-offering in fulfillment of a vow and a freewill peace-offering or vice versa, but where one brought a burnt-offering and a peace-offering both in fulfillment of a vow or both as freewill-offerings, since there is only one class of offering here, viz., in fulfillment of a vow or freewill-offerings, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

therefore taught [otherwise]. And what need was there for [the ‘or’ in] the verse, And when thou preparest a bullock for a burnt-offering or for a sacrifice?<sup>24</sup> —

It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that<sup>23</sup> was so only where one brought a burnt-offering and a peace-offering both in fulfillment of a vow or both as freewill-offerings, but where one brought two burnt-offerings one in fulfillment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings one in fulfillment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, since there is only one type of offering here, viz., the peace-offering or the burnt-offering, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise]. And what need was there for [the ‘or’ in] the expression ‘in fulfillment of a vow clearly uttered or for peace-offerings’?<sup>25</sup> —

It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that<sup>26</sup> was so only where one brought two burnt-offerings one in fulfillment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings one in fulfillment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, but where one brought two burnt-offerings each in fulfillment of a vow, or each as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings each in fulfillment of a vow or each as a freewill-offering, since there is only one type of offering here, viz., the burnt-offering or the peace-offering, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise]. And according to R. Josiah what need was there for [the ‘or’ in] the expression ‘of the herd or of the flock’?<sup>27</sup> —

It was necessary. for [without it] I might have thought that that<sup>26</sup> was so only [where the two animals were] of two kinds,<sup>28</sup> but where they were both of one kind it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise]. And what need was there for the verse, So shall ye

do for every one according to their number?<sup>29</sup> — [Without it] I might have thought that that<sup>26</sup> was so only [where the two animals were consecrated] one after the other, but where they were [consecrated] simultaneously<sup>30</sup> it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

**BUT THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS.** How do we know this? — Our Rabbis taught: And three tenth parts of an ephah of fine flour for a meal-offering;<sup>31</sup> this verse refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering.<sup>32</sup> You say it refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering, but perhaps it is not so but rather it refers to the meal-offering that is offered by itself! Since it says, And the priest shall offer the burnt-offering and the meal-offering,<sup>33</sup> you may be sure that the other verse [also] refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering. But I still do not know whether it<sup>34</sup> requires a drink-offering [of wine] or not; the text therefore states, And wine for the drink-offering, the fourth part of a hin, shalt thou prepare with the burnt-offering or for the sacrifice, for each lamb.<sup>35</sup> The expression ‘the burnt-offering’ refers to the burnt-offering of the leper, ‘the sacrifice’ to the sin-offering of the leper, and ‘or for the sacrifice’ to the guilt-offering of the leper. But surely both [the sin-offering and the guilt-offering of the leper] can be derived from ‘the sacrifice’!<sup>36</sup>

(1) For according to the construction of that verse the interpretation might well be that the words ‘and of the flock’ must be taken in addition to ‘cattle’, thus indicating that two animals must be brought for the offering, and that the intervening expression ‘of the herd’ is merely in apposition to ‘cattle’. According to Tosaf. the suggestion that the expressions in this verse must be taken conjunctively is made by reason of the repetition of the particle **וְ** ‘of’, in the verse.

(2) But R. Josiah actually utilizes the verse, which according to R. Jonathan signifies disjunction, for

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

another purpose, namely to exclude bird-offerings.

(3) Lev. I, 3.

(4) Ibid. 10. Since each is dealt with separately it is obvious that each may be brought by itself.

(5) How can R. Jonathan suggest that both kinds were to be brought together seeing that each is dealt with alone in separate passages?

(6) E.g., 'I take upon myself to offer a lamb (or a bullock) for a burnt-offering'. In this case he expressly mentioned one animal.

(7) But simply said, 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering'.

(8) The thank-offering is surely included under the term 'sacrifice', consequently the expression 'or' is rendered superfluous.

(9) For the bread-offering (cf. Lev. VII, 12, 13) would take the place of the drink-offerings.

(10) The bread-offering which accompanied the Nazirite's ram consisted of two kinds only, viz., unleavened cakes and unleavened wafers (cf. Num. VI, 15), whereas the thank-offering had two additional kinds of cakes, viz., soaked cakes and leavened cakes.

(11) For the burnt-offering would have been included since it is usually brought in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering. Moreover it was not necessary to state the burnt-offering in order to exclude the meal-offering for that is excluded by the expression 'sacrifice'.

(12) Num. XV, 3.

(13) Num. XV, 3.

(14) Accordingly by the application of the principle of two general propositions separated by a specification we would have to include those offerings which were not quite similar to the specification, and therefore even what is not offered in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering (e.g. the firstling) would still require drink-offerings provided it was like the specification in this one respect, viz., that it was not offered in atonement for any sin.

(15) Ibid. The expression 'a burnt-offering' is also taken as a specification inserted between two general propositions, and it serves to exclude the firstling and the tithe.

(16) For the burnt-offering mentioned in the verse is clearly a freewill-offering.

(17) E.g., the young of a peace-offering.

(18) I.e., from the overflow of measures, v. supra 90a. According to another reading given in Rashi MS. and also found in R. Gershom: 'the substitute of the burnt-offering' (reading *התמורת*, for *המותר*).

(19) I.e., when the guilt-offering was no longer required for its purpose as when the owner thereof had died. The animal was condemned to pasture until it became blemished when it was

redeemed and the proceeds used for burnt-offerings. V. supra 4a.

(20) To indicate disjunction, namely that a burnt-offering of any one animal of the herd or of the flock requires drink-offerings.

(21) Who holds that in the absence of any disjunctive term the particular items would be taken together as one; accordingly the term 'or' is essential here.

(22) Since he holds that without any disjunctive term the items can be taken individually.

(23) That for each offering drink-offerings are required.

(24) Num. XV, 8.

(25) Num. XV, 8.

(26) That for each offering drink-offerings are required.

(27) Ibid. 3. The expression in general has been utilized by him to exclude bird-offerings, but what is the point of the disjunctive term 'or'?

(28) E.g., a bullock and a sheep.

(29) Ibid. 12. This verse also implies that for each offering there must be the drink-offerings.

(30) And brought into the Temple at the same time.

(31) Lev. XIV, 10, in reference to the sacrifices brought by a leper of substantial means on the day of his purification. These animal-offerings consisted of three lambs, one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering, and the third for a guilt-offering.

(32) I.e., each of the three animal-offerings (v. prec. n.) was accompanied by a meal-offering of one tenth of an ephah of flour as a drink-offering.

(33) Ibid. 20. In this verse the meal-offering is clearly that which accompanies the burnt-offering as a drink-offering.

(34) Sc. each of the leper's animal-offerings.

(35) Num. XV, 5.

(36) Why are two separate expressions required?

## Menachoth 91b

For a Master has said, Whence do I know it of the sin-offering and of the guilt-offering?<sup>1</sup> Because the text states, The sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> — That is so<sup>3</sup> only where both offerings serve the same purpose.<sup>4</sup> but where the guilt-offering serves to qualify [the person] and the sin-offering to make atonement [for him]<sup>5</sup> we require two separate expressions [to include both]. "'The sacrifice" refers to the sin-offering of the leper'. Perhaps it refers to the sin-offering and guilt-offering of the Nazirite!<sup>6</sup> —

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

You cannot think of it, for it has been taught: It is written, And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings;<sup>7</sup> this verse refers to his burnt-offering and his peace-offerings. You say it refers to his burnt-offering and his peace-offerings, but perhaps it is not so but rather it refers to his sin-offering;<sup>9</sup> the text therefore states, And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace-offerings.<sup>10</sup> Now the ram was included in the general statement of the law,<sup>11</sup> why then was it singled out here? That everything be compared with it: as the ram<sup>12</sup> is distinguished in that it may be offered either in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering, so everything that is offered either in fulfillment of a vow or as a freewill-offering [requires drink-offerings].<sup>13</sup> 'The expression "the burnt-offering" refers to the burnt-offering of the leper'. Perhaps it refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth!<sup>14</sup> —

Abaye answered, The burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth<sup>14</sup> is derived from the latter part of the verse. For it was taught: R. Nathan says. 'Lamb'<sup>15</sup> refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth, and 'each'<sup>15</sup> to the eleventh of the cattle tithe.<sup>16</sup> And this, that the accessory should be more weighty than the principal,<sup>17</sup> we do not find elsewhere in the whole of the Torah. Raba said,<sup>18</sup> What case is there that requires three separate terms to include [its offerings]? You must say it is the case of the leper.<sup>19</sup> What need was there for the expression 'for a ram'?<sup>20</sup> —

R. Shesheth said, It includes Aaron's ram.<sup>21</sup> But is not Aaron's ram derived from the expression 'in your appointed seasons'?<sup>22</sup> — [No, for] I might have thought that that applied only to the offerings of the community but not to the offering of an individual. But wherein does it differ from the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth?<sup>23</sup> — I might have thought that only [an individual offering] which has no fixed time<sup>24</sup> was included but not that which

has a fixed time; the verse is therefore stated [to include Aaron's ram]. What need is there for the expression 'or for a ram'?<sup>25</sup> — It includes the pallax.<sup>26</sup> This is quite in order according to R. Johanan who holds that it is a distinct species.<sup>27</sup> For we have learnt:<sup>28</sup> If a man [under an obligation to bring a lamb or a ram for his sacrifice] offered it [a pallax], he must bring for it the drink-offerings as for a ram, but he does not thereby discharge the obligation of his sacrifice. And R. Johanan said that the expression 'or for in ram' included the pallax. But according to Bar Padda who holds that he must bring [for it the drink-offerings as for a ram] and account for the possibilities,<sup>29</sup> for it is only a case of doubt, it will be asked, is a verse ever stated in order to include what is in a condition of doubt?<sup>30</sup> — This is obviously a difficulty according to Bar Padda. Thus shall it be done for each bullock, or for each ram, or for each of the lambs or of the kids.<sup>31</sup> Wherefore did the text state, 'For each bullock'?<sup>32</sup> —

It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a ram and the drink-offerings of a lamb; and I might have thought that there should also be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a bullock and the drink-offerings of a calf; the text therefore stated, For each bullock.<sup>33</sup> Wherefore did the text state, 'Or for each ram'?<sup>32</sup> —

It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a sheep in its first year and those of one in its second year; and I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a sheep in its second year and those of one in its third year; Scripture therefore stated, 'Or for each ram'.<sup>34</sup> Wherefore did the text state, 'Or for each of the lambs'?<sup>35</sup> —

It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a lamb and the drink-offerings of a ram; and

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a ewe in its first year and those of a ewe in its second year; the text therefore stated, 'Or for each of the lambs'.<sup>36</sup> Wherefore did the text state, 'Or of the kids'?<sup>37</sup> —

It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a lamb and the drink-offerings of a ram; and I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a kid and those of an older goat; the text therefore stated, 'Or of the kids'. R. Papa said, Raba once tested us [with the following question]:

(1) That if the Nazirite placed the hair of his head under the cauldron containing his sin-offering or his guilt-offering, instead of under the cauldron containing his peace-offering as is expressly stated in Scripture (Num. VI, 18), he has thereby fulfilled his obligation (Rashi). V. Nazir 45b. According to Tosaf. Whence do we know that the sin-offering and the guilt-offering are eaten the same day and the night until midnight? V. Zeb. 36a.

(2) Ibid. VI, 18. According to Tosaf. (v. prec. n.) the reference is to Lev. VII, 15. We thus see that the term 'sacrifice' includes both the sin-offering and the guilt-offering.

(3) That from the one expression 'the sacrifice' both the guilt-offering and the sin-offering can be derived.

(4) As in the case of the Nazirite; the guilt-offering brought by the Nazirite who had suffered uncleanness unwittingly serves to qualify him to resume his Nazirite vow, and the sin-offering brought at the completion of the Nazirite's vow serves to qualify him to resume a normal living, to drink wine and to cut his hair.

(5) As in the case of the leper; for the guilt-offering serves to qualify him that he may now join the congregation, and the sin-offering makes atonement for him, for the affliction of leprosy was regarded as a punishment for the seven sins enumerated in 'Ar. 16a.

(6) Teaching us that these offerings require drink-offerings.

(7) Num. VI, 15.

(8) The Nazirite's.

(9) And the verse teaches that the sin-offering brought by the Nazirite at the completion of his vow requires drink-offerings; and so, too, the

guilt-offering brought by the Nazirite after his involuntary defilement.

(10) Ibid. 17. The verse concludes: And the priest shall offer the meal-offering thereof and the drink-offering thereof.

(11) Cf. *ibid.* XV, 6, where drink-offerings are prescribed for a ram.

(12) Which is a peace-offering.

(13) Thus excluding the sin-offering and the guilt-offering which are obligatory offerings.

(14) I.e., that the lamb for a burnt-offering which she has to bring (v. Lev. XII, 6) requires drink-offerings.

(15) Num. XV, 5.

(16) V. Bek. 60a. Where a man who was counting his cattle one by one for the purpose of the tithe erred in his counting and called the ninth tenth, the tenth ninth, and the eleventh tenth, all three become holy: the ninth may only be consumed when it has suffered a blemish, the tenth becomes the tithe, and the eleventh must be offered as a peace-offering and with it also drink-offerings.

(17) For actual cattle tithe does not require the drink-offerings whereas the eleventh animal, which is only an 'accessory' or subsidiary to the cattle tithe does.

(18) In reply to the question that perhaps it refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth.

(19) Thus the verse in question which contains three inclusive terms can only refer to the case of the leper who requires three offerings: a burnt-offering, a sin-offering and a guilt-offering.

(20) Ibid. 6. The drink-offerings for a ram are already prescribed in Num. XXVIII, 12, 14.

(21) I.e., the ram offered by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement; cf. Lev. XVI, 3. This offering, the verse informs us, also requires drink-offerings.

(22) Num. XV, 3.

(23) Which is an individual offering, nevertheless it is included in this passage for drink-offerings. In the same way the expression 'in your appointed seasons' includes Aaron's ram, accordingly the expression 'for a ram' is superfluous.

(24) As the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth.

(25) Num. XV, 6.

(26) Heb. פֶּלֶא from Greek \*\* (spec. a youth not yet arrived at adolescence), a sheep in its thirteenth month; in its first twelve months it is termed a 'lamb' and after thirteen months it is termed a 'ram'. Thus the pallax is included that it shall have the same drink-offerings as for a ram.

(27) Hence it was necessary for Scripture to include it.

(28) Par. I, 3; Hul. 23a.

(29) Lit., 'and stipulate', by declaring: if the pallax is a ram then these drink-offerings are just right, but if it is a lamb then let that quantity which is

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

required for a lamb be taken from these drink-offerings and let the remainder be regarded as a freewill-offering.

(30) Of course not, for the Divine Law could not have had any doubts about it.

(31) Ibid. 11.

(32) For its prescribed drink-offerings have already been stated previously in this passage.

(33) Signifying that whatever its age there is but one quantity of drink-offerings for an offering of the herd.

(34) I.e., whatever goes by the name 'ram' requires the drink-offerings as prescribed in this passage for a ram.

(35) V. p. 559. n. 8.

(36) I.e., there is but one quantity of drink-offerings for any animal among the lambs.

(37) Since we find kids included under the term 'lambs'.

## Menachoth 92a

What is the quantity of drink-offerings for a ewe in its second year? And we answered him that this was clearly stated in a Mishnah:1 [The seal inscribed with] 'Kid' signified drink-offerings for [offerings from] the flock, whether large or small, male or female, excepting rams.2

**MISHNAH.** NONE OF THE OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE BULLOCK THAT IS OFFERED FOR THE TRANSGRESSION [BY THE CONGREGATION]3 OF ANY OF THE COMMANDMENTS, AND THE SCAPEGOAT.4 R. SIMEON SAYS, ALSO THE HE-GOAT OFFERED FOR THE SIN OF IDOLATRY.5 ALL THE OFFERINGS OF AN INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE CATTLE TITHE, AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERING. THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS [ON HIS FATHER'S OFFERING].6 MAY BRING THE DRINK-OFFERINGS FOR IT, AND CAN SUBSTITUTE [ANOTHER ANIMAL FOR IT].7

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: None of the offerings of the congregation require the laying on of hands except the bullock that is

offered for the transgression [by the congregation] of any of the commandments, and the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry. So R. Simeon. But R. Judah says, The he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. What then must I include in their place? The scapegoat. (But is it absolutely necessary to include [another in their place]? —

Rabina answered, There is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are two that require the laying on of hands.) R. Simeon said to him, Is it not the law that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners [of the offering]? But on that Aaron and his sons lay the hands!9 He replied, Even in that case [the laying on of the hands is performed by the owners] since Aaron and his sons obtain atonement through it.

R. Jeremiah said, They are indeed consistent in their views, for it has been taught:10 And he shall make atonement for the most holy place.11 this means the Holy of Holies;12 and the tent of meeting.11 this means the Holy place; and the altar,11 this is to be taken in its usual sense; he shall make atonement,11 this means the various Temple courts; and for the priests,11 this is to be taken in its usual sense; and for all the people of the assembly,11 this means the Israelites; he shall make atonement,11 this means the Levites. They are all13 declared alike in respect of one atonement, in that they obtain atonement through the scapegoat for other sins.14 So R. Judah.15

But R. Simeon says, Just as the blood of the he-goat that is offered within [the Holy of Holies] makes atonement for Israelites for all matters of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests for all matters of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof; and just as the confession of sin pronounced over the

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

scapegoat<sup>16</sup> makes atonement for Israelites for other sins, so does the confession of sin pronounced over the bullock<sup>17</sup> make atonement for priests for other sins.<sup>18</sup> But according to R. Simeon [it will be asked]: Surely they are declared alike!<sup>19</sup> —

Yes. they are all declared alike in that they all obtain atonement, but each obtains atonement through its own [offering].<sup>20</sup> This means,<sup>21</sup> therefore, that, according to R. Judah, for transgressions of the laws of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof Israelites obtain atonement through the blood of the he-goat that is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies], and priests through Aaron's bullock,<sup>22</sup> and for other sins all obtain atonement through the confession over the scapegoat; according to R. Simeon, even for other sins priests obtain atonement through the confession pronounced over the bullock. And so it is stated in [the Tractate] Shebu'oth:<sup>23</sup> [For all other sins the scapegoat makes atonement] alike for Israelites, priests and the anointed High Priest. Wherein do Israelites differ from priests and the anointed High Priest? Only in that the blood of the bullock makes atonement for priests for the transgressions of the laws of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof.<sup>24</sup> R. Simeon says, As the blood of the he-goat that is sprinkled within the Holy of Holies makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin pronounced over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin pronounced over the bullock make atonement for the priests.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock:<sup>25</sup> this signifies that only the bullock requires the laying on of hands, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R.

Simeon says, [It signifies that] only the bullock requires the laying on of hands by the elders, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by the elders but by Aaron.<sup>26</sup> There is, however, [a Baraita] which conflicts with the above, for it was taught: It is written, The live [goat]:<sup>27</sup> this signifies that 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. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says, [It signifies that] only the live [goat] requires the laying on of hands by Aaron

(1) Shek. V, 3.

(2) A man who required drink-offerings for his offering did not bring them from his own home but came to the Temple to the officer in charge of the seals, paid him money, and received from him a seal. On handing the seal to another officer who was in charge of the drink-offerings he would receive the necessary quantities of drink-offerings as indicated by the inscription on the seal. The seal inscribed with 'Kid' signified the drink-offerings for an offering from the flock. V. Shek. V, 4. Thus a ewe in its second year required the drink-offerings of a lamb.

(3) Who sinned in error by reason of an erroneous ruling of the Beth din; v. Lev. IV, 13-21.

(4) Ibid. XVI, 21.

(5) Where the congregation sinned in error by reason of an erroneous ruling of the Beth din in regard to idolatry; v. Num. XV, 24. Cf. Hor. 5b.

(6) Where the father died having already set aside a beast for his burnt-offering or peace-offering, and the heir is offering it on behalf of his father.

(7) I.e., if he substituted another animal for his father's offering, both animals are holy; v. Lev. XXVII, 10.

(8) Sc. the scapegoat.

(9) And not the owners, for the owners are the entire congregation.

(10) Yoma 61a, Shebu. 13b. Hul. 131b.

(11) Lev. XVI, 33. From this verse it is deduced that the High Priest effected atonement for the transgression of the laws of uncleanness in the Holy of Holies, in the Holy place, etc. with the bullock and the he-goat, the former making atonement for priests who erred in this way and the latter for Israelites.

(12) I.e., if a person became unclean whilst in the Holy of Holies or in the Holy place and tarried there for the prescribed period (v. Shebu. 16b), or if he offered incense on the golden altar whilst

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

unclean, or if he unwittingly entered the Temple courts whilst unclean.

(13) Priests, Levites and Israelites.

(14) I.e., for all sins except the transgression of the laws of uncleanness connected with the Temple.

(15) Thus according to R. Judah priests also obtained atonement through the scapegoat, consequently when they lay the hands on it they do so in the capacity of owners.

(16) Lev. XVI, 21; cf. Yoma 66a.

(17) Cf. Yoma 35b.

(18) According to R. Simeon, therefore, priests do not obtain any atonement through the scapegoat.

(19) For the last phrases of the quoted verse imply that all sections of the people, Israelites as well as priests, obtain atonement alike for other sins.

(20) For other sins, Israelites through the scapegoat and priests through the bullock.

(21) Heb. פִּירוּשׁ, so MS.M., and Sh. Mek. An unusual expression. The entire passage is an addition by the Saboraim (Sh. Mek.).

(22) I.e., the High Priest's bullock; v. Lev. XVI, 6.

(23) Shebu. 2b. So in MS.M. and Sh. Mek.; cur. edd. omit 'in Shebu'oth'.

(24) Cur. edd. insert here: 'This is the opinion of R. Judah'.

(25) Lev. IV, 15 with reference to the bullock offered when the congregation sinned in error by reason of an erroneous ruling of the Beth din.

(26) I.e., a priest.

(27) Ibid. XVI, 21 with reference to the scapegoat.

## Menachoth 92b

but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron but by the elders!<sup>1</sup> — Thereupon R. Shesheth said, And do you think that the first [Baraitha] is correct? Has not R. Simeon laid down the rule that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners?<sup>2</sup> But you must correct [the Baraitha] as follows: The bullock; this signifies that only the bullock requires the laying on of hands, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. So R. Judah.

R. Simeon says. The live [goat]: this signifies that 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 really what R. Simeon said

to R. Judah: The he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry [most certainly] require the laying on of hands, for if you have heard anything to the effect that they do not require the laying on of hands, you must have heard it only in regard to Aaron;<sup>3</sup> for they<sup>4</sup> were excluded by 'the live [goat]'.<sup>5</sup> But according to R. Judah what need was there to exclude them<sup>6</sup> by a verse? Has not Rabina stated that there is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are two that require the laying on of hands?<sup>7</sup> — It was merely an exercise in interpretation.<sup>8</sup> Whence does R. Simeon derive the law that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry require the laying on of hands [by the elders]?<sup>9</sup> —

He derives it from the following [Baraitha] which was taught:<sup>10</sup> And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat:<sup>11</sup> this includes Nahshon's goat<sup>12</sup> in respect of the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says. It includes the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry in respect of the laying on of hands; for R. Simeon ruled that every sin-offering whose blood was brought within<sup>13</sup> required the laying on of hands.<sup>14</sup> Why is it stated [in this Baraitha], 'for [R. Simeon ruled, etc.]'?<sup>15</sup> — It is merely an indication [of his view]. But perhaps it<sup>16</sup> includes the he-goat that is offered within [on the Day of Atonement]!<sup>17</sup> — [What is included] must be like the he-goat of a ruler which makes atonement for the person who has knowledge of the transgression of the precept.<sup>18</sup> But according to Rabina who said that there is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are [only] two that require the laying on of hands, wherefore is a verse required [to include the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry]?<sup>19</sup> —

Both the verse and the tradition are necessary. For if [the law<sup>20</sup> were derived] from the verse alone I should have said that the peace-offerings of the congregation also [require the laying on of hands] — as indeed this question was raised in the chapter

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

entitled ‘All meal-offerings were offered unleavened’,<sup>21</sup> against that Mishnah where R. Simeon stated, There are three kinds of offering which [between them] require three rites,<sup>22</sup> in the following terms: ‘Surely the peace-offerings of the congregation should require the ceremony of the laying on of hands by the following a fortiori argument: if the peace-offerings of the individual which do not require waving for the living animals require the laying on of hands, etc.’<sup>23</sup> — the tradition is therefore necessary.<sup>24</sup> And if it were derived from the tradition alone I should not have known which was [the other case],<sup>25</sup> the verse therefore informs us that it includes what is like the he-goat of a ruler which makes atonement for the person who has knowledge of the transgression of the precept.<sup>26</sup>

**ALL THE OFFERINGS OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE CATTLE TITHE, AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERING.** Our Rabbis taught: His offering,<sup>27</sup> [requires the laying on of hands], but not the firstling. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which is not holy from the womb requires the laying on of hands, the firstling which is holy from the womb surely requires the laying on of hands! The text therefore stated, ‘His offering’, but not the firstling. ‘His offering’, but not the tithes. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which does not sanctify what comes before it or what comes after it requires the laying on of hands, the tithes which sanctify what comes before it and what comes after it surely requires the laying on of hands!

The text therefore stated, ‘His offering’, but not the tithes. ‘His offering’, but not the Passover-offering. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which one is not bound to bring<sup>29</sup> requires the laying on of hands, the Passover-

offering which one is bound to bring surely requires the laying on of hands! The text therefore stated, ‘His offering’, but not the Passover-offering. But surely all these arguments can be refuted: It is so with the peace-offering since it requires drink-offerings and also the waving of the breast and the thigh!<sup>30</sup> — Indeed the verses are merely a support. But

- (1) This contradicts the view of R. Simeon as stated in the former Baraitha.
- (2) Supra p. 561. And the owners of the he-goats offered by the congregation for the sin of idolatry are the elders of the congregation, yet R. Simeon states in the first Baraitha that the laying on of hands was to be performed by Aaron and not by the elders!
- (3) I.e., that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron, but they certainly require the laying on of hands by the elders.
- (4) I.e., that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron.
- (5) Thus only on the scapegoat shall Aaron lay his hands but not on these goats. This is the proper inference. viz., the he-goats from the scapegoat; but one may not infer the he-goats from ‘the bullock’ (as was originally stated in the first Baraitha), for they are of different kinds.
- (6) Sc. the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry.
- (7) I.e., two and no more. And the two, according to R. Judah, are: the scapegoat, and the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation. V. our Mishnah.
- (8) To interpret the verses in order to arrive at the traditional view as reported by Rabina. Aliter: R. Judah does not accept this tradition but arrives at that view by the exposition of verses.
- (9) All that R. Simeon established above was that these goats do not require the laying on of hands by the priest, but whence does he derive it that it must be performed by the elders? Perhaps they do not require it at all?
- (10) Supra 55b; Zeb. 48b.
- (11) Lev. IV, 24. with reference to the he-goat offered by a ruler, i.e., a prince of a tribe, for a sin committed by him in error.
- (12) Sc. the he-goat offered by each of the princes of the tribes at the dedication of the altar, called ‘Nahshon's goat’ because he, Nahshon b. Aminadab, the prince of Judah, was the first to bring his offering. Cf. Num. VII, 12.
- (13) To be sprinkled upon the golden altar or upon the veil.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(14) And the blood of the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry was sprinkled within, whereas the blood of Nahshon's goat was not.

(15) For the only two cases to which this rule applies are the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry and the sin-offering of the anointed High Priest. How the former is here included for the rite of laying on of hands, and as for the latter, Scripture has expressly stated that it requires the laying on of hands (v. Lev. IV, 4); obviously then R. Simeon's rule is superfluous!

(16) Sc. the verse that prescribes the laying on of hands in the case of the he-goat brought by a ruler.

(17) Since its blood is sprinkled within the Holy of Holies it should require the laying on of hands, in accordance with R. Simeon's ruling.

(18) Whereas the he-goat of the Day of Atonement makes atonement for the transgression of the laws of uncleanness relating to the Temple and the holy things where the transgressor has no knowledge thereof. V. Shebu. 2a.

(19) Since R. Simeon is of the opinion that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners, and therefore the laying of the hands by Aaron on the scapegoat is not a proper laying on of hands, inasmuch as Aaron is not the owner since he does not even obtain any atonement through it, then by virtue of the tradition the only two possible offerings of the congregation that require the laying on of hands are the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation and the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry. Hence the verse is superfluous!

(20) Sc. of laying on the hands in offerings of the congregation.

(21) Chap. V.

(22) Supra 61a.

(23) V. supra p. 369.

(24) That there are only two cases of laying on of hands among the offerings of the congregation.

(25) One offering of the congregation, namely the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation, is expressly stated in Scripture as requiring the laying on of hands, but we should not know which was the other offering that required it, whether it was the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry, or the he-goat of the Day of Atonement, or the peace-offerings of the congregation.

(26) Hence the he-goat of the Day of Atonement cannot be included, v. supra p. 566, n. 1; neither can the peace-offerings of the congregations be included as they do not make atonement at all.

(27) Lev. III, 1. The expression 'his offering' occurs seven times in the passage dealing with the peace-offering (Lev. 111, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14) and each is interpreted for some purpose in connection

with the law of the laying on of hands. V. Sifra a.l. The basis for the interpretations in this passage is the definition of the word 'offering', which is defined as that which is made holy by a person of his own free will and which he offers as a gift to God to win His favor. Accordingly the firstling is excluded since it is holy from the moment it is born and not made holy by any person, moreover it is an obligatory offering and is not brought to win God's favor. The tithe and the Passover-offering are also excluded for the reason last stated.

(28) For if in the course of counting the animals for the purpose of the tithe the ninth was by error called the tenth, the tenth the ninth, and the eleventh the tenth, all three become holy. V. supra p. 558, n. 4 and Bek. 60a.

(29) Lit., 'which is not (subject to the command of) arise and bring it'.

(30) And therefore it also requires the laying on of hands, but neither the firstling nor the tithe nor the Passover-offering require drink-offerings or the waving of the breast and thigh. Accordingly no verses are required to exclude these offerings as there are no valid reasons for including them.

## Menachoth 93a

what is the real purpose of these verses? — [To teach the following:] 'His offering' [requires the laying on of hands], but not the offering of another.<sup>1</sup> 'His offering', but not the offering of a gentile, His offering, this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands.<sup>2</sup>

**THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS.** R. Hananiah recited the following teaching in the presence of Raba: The heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir cannot substitute [another animal for his father's offering].<sup>3</sup> [Raba said to him.] But we have learnt: **THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS [ON HIS FATHER'S OFFERING]. MAY BRING THE DRINK-OFFERINGS FOR IT, AND CAN SUBSTITUTE [ANOTHER ANIMAL FOR IT]!** Shall I then reverse it?<sup>4</sup> he asked. No, replied the other, for the teaching [quoted by you] is the view of R. Judah. For it was taught: The heir may lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir can also substitute [another animal

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

for it]. R. Judah says. The heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir cannot substitute [another animal for it]. What is the reason for R. Judah's view? —

It is written, His offering.<sup>5</sup> but not the offering of his father;<sup>6</sup> and he compares the inception of the consecration<sup>7</sup> with the termination of the consecration:<sup>8</sup> just as at the termination of the consecration the heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], so at the inception of the consecration the heir cannot substitute [another animal for his father's offering]. And what is the reason for the view of the Rabbis?<sup>9</sup> —

It is written, And if he shall at all change,<sup>10</sup> this includes the heir;<sup>11</sup> and they compare the termination of the consecration with the inception of the consecration: just as at the inception of the consecration the heir can substitute [another animal for his father's offering], so at the termination of the consecration the heir may lay his hands [on his father's offering]. For what purpose do the Rabbis utilize the expression 'his offering'?<sup>12</sup> — For the following: 'His offering' [requires the laying on of hands], but not the offering of a gentile. 'His offering', but not the offering of another. 'His offering', this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands. And R. Judah?<sup>13</sup> — He does not hold the view that every owner of the offering is included for the rite of the laying on of hands. Alternatively, he may even hold [that view] but the offering of another and the offering of a gentile are excluded from one verse, hence two verses are at his disposal, one for the teaching that only 'his offering' [requires the laying on of hands] but not the offering of his father, and the other to include every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands. And for what purpose does R. Judah utilize the expression 'and if he shall at all change'? — He requires it in order to include a woman.<sup>14</sup> For it was taught: Since the

whole passage<sup>15</sup> is stated in the masculine form, whence do we know<sup>16</sup> to include a woman? Because the text states, And if he shall at all change. And the Rabbis?<sup>17</sup> — They derive it by expounding the expression 'and if'.<sup>18</sup> And R. Judah? — He bases no exposition on the expression 'and if'.

*MISHNAH.* ALL MAY LAY THE HANDS ON THE OFFERING EXCEPT A DEAF-MUTE, AN IMBECILE, A MINOR, A BLIND MAN, A GENTILE, A SLAVE, AN AGENT, OR A WOMAN. THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS OUTSIDE THE COMMANDMENT.<sup>19</sup> [ONE MUST LAY] BOTH HANDS ON THE HEAD OF THE ANIMAL; AND IN THE PLACE WHERE ONE LAYS ON THE HANDS THERE THE ANIMAL MUST BE SLAUGHTERED; AND THE SLAUGHTERING MUST IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.

*GEMARA.* We understand a deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a minor being disqualified, because they do not know what they are doing; also a gentile, because it is written, The children of Israel:<sup>20</sup> [only they] may lay on the hands but gentiles may not lay on the hands. But why should a blind man be disqualified? R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [suggest different reasons]. One Says, It is because we deduce the laying on of hands [for all offerings] from the laying on of hands performed by the elders of the congregation.<sup>21</sup> And the other says, It is because we deduce the laying on of hands [for all offerings] from the laying on of hands performed on the 'appearance' burnt-offering.<sup>22</sup> Why does not he that deduces the law from the 'appearance' burnt-offering rather deduce it from the elders of the congregation? —

(1) A man may not lay his hands on his neighbor's offering even though he was instructed to do so on his behalf.

(2) I.e., every person that has a share in the offering must lay his hands on it.

(3) I.e., if he did so it is of no effect.

(4) And substitute 'may' for 'may not' and 'can' for 'cannot'. —

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(5) Lev. III, 2: And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering.

(6) Thus the heir may not lay his hands on his father's offering.

(7) Viz., the substitution of another animal for the offering. This is an original act of consecration whereby a profane animal becomes holy.

(8) Viz., the laying on of hands. This is almost the last act with the consecrated animal, since the slaughtering must immediately follow the laying on of his hands.

(9) I.e., the first view in the above-mentioned Baraita, quoted anonymously. In the parallel passage, Tem. 2a this is R. Meir's view.

(10) Lev. XXVII, 10.

(11) Thus the heir can effectively substitute another animal for his father's offering, and both animals become holy.

(12) This was interpreted by R. Judah to exclude the heir from the laying on of hands.

(13) Since he uses the expression 'his offering' to exclude the heir, he is then short of one of these expressions for the three foregoing teachings.

(14) I.e., that the law of substitution also applies to a woman.

(15) Concerning the law of substitution.

(16) Lit., 'what is our end'.

(17) How do they know that a woman can effectively substitute another animal for the offering?

(18) For the waw, 'and', is superfluous.

(19) Lit., 'the remnant of the commandment'. I.e., the laying on of hands may be omitted and yet the offering is valid, for the atonement is not dependent upon this act.

(20) Lev. I, 2.

(21) In connection with the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation; cf. Lev. IV, 15. And as the elders of the congregation had to be free from every physical blemish, v. Sanh. 17a, hence the blind may not lay on the hands.

(22) I.e., the burnt-offering offered by every Israelite on appearing at the Temple on the three great Festivals; cf. Deut. XVI, 16. And as a blind man was exempt from the 'appearance' burnt-offering, v. Hag. 2a, the inference may therefore be made that a blind man may not lay on the hands.

## Menachoth 93b

It is more proper to deduce the offering of an individual from another offering of the individual<sup>1</sup> rather than to deduce the offering of the individual from the offering of the congregation. And why does not he that

deduces the law from the elders of the congregation rather deduce it from the 'appearance' burnt-offering? — It is only proper to deduce the offering for which the rite of laying on the hands is expressly prescribed<sup>2</sup> from that offering for which the rite of laying on the hands is also expressly prescribed;<sup>3</sup> but this is not the case with the 'appearance' burnt-offering, for that<sup>4</sup> is itself derived from the freewill burnt-offering. For a Tanna recited before R. Isaac b. Abba: And he presented the burnt-offering; and offered it according to the ordinance,<sup>5</sup> that is, according to the ordinance of a freewill burnt-offering; this teaches that the obligatory burnt-offerings<sup>6</sup> requires the laying on of hands.

A SLAVE, AN AGENT, OR A WOMAN. Our Rabbis taught: His hand,<sup>7</sup> but not the hand of his slave; his hand,<sup>8</sup> but not the hand of his agent; his hand,<sup>9</sup> but not the hand of his wife. Why are all these required? — They are all necessary, for if the Divine Law had only stated once [the expression 'his hand']. I should have said that it only excluded the slave, since he is not subject to the commandments, but an agent, since he is subject to the commandments, and moreover a man's agent is like himself,<sup>10</sup> [I would say] may lay the hands [on his principal's offering]. And if only these two<sup>11</sup> had been stated [I should have said that the reason they are disqualified is that] they<sup>11</sup> are not as part of himself, but a man's wife, since she is as part of himself,<sup>12</sup> [I would say] may lay the hands [on her husband's offering]. Therefore [all three verses] are necessary.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS OUTSIDE THE COMMANDMENT. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall lay his hand... and it shall be accepted for him [to make atonement for him].<sup>13</sup> Does the laying on of hands make the atonement? Does not the atonement come through the blood, as it is said, For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life?<sup>14</sup> This, however, informs you that if

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

a man treated the laying on of the hands as outside the commandment<sup>15</sup> Scripture accounts it to him as though he has not obtained [the highest form of] atonement, but he has obtained atonement.<sup>16</sup> The same was also taught with regard to the rite of waving. To be waved, to make atonement for him.<sup>17</sup> Does the waving make the atonement? Does not the atonement come through the blood, as it is said, For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life? This, however, informs you that if a man treated the waving as outside the commandment Scripture accounts it to him as though he has not obtained [the highest form of] atonement, but he has obtained atonement.

**ON THE HEAD.** Our Rabbis taught: [And he shall lay] his hand upon the head [of his offering],<sup>18</sup> but not his hand upon the neck;<sup>19</sup> his hand upon the head, but not his hand upon the back; ‘his hand upon the head’, but not his hand upon the breast. Why are all [the three verses] required? — They are all necessary, for if the Divine Law had only stated once [the expression ‘his hand upon the head,] I should have said that it only excluded the hand upon the neck, since it is not on the same plane as the head, but the [laying of the] hand upon the back, which is on the same plane as the head, I would say was not [excluded].<sup>20</sup> And if only these two<sup>21</sup> had been stated, [I should have said that] the reason [they are excluded] is that they are not included in the rite of waving, but the breast, since it is included in the rite of waving, I would say was not [excluded]. Therefore all [three verses] are necessary. The question was asked: What if the hands were laid upon the sides [of the head]? —

Come and hear, for it was taught: Abba Bira'ah taught in the School of R. Eleazar b. Jacob: The expression ‘his hand upon the head’ excludes the hand upon the sides of the head. R. Jeremiah enquired, Would a cloth<sup>22</sup> be regarded as an interposition or not?<sup>23</sup> —

Come and hear: But nothing shall interpose between him and the offering.<sup>24</sup>

**BOTH HANDS.** Whence do we derive it? — Resh Lakish said, Because the verse says, And Aaron shall lay both his hands.<sup>25</sup> Now actually there is written in the verse ‘his hand’,<sup>26</sup> and yet it says ‘both’, this establishes the rule that wherever ‘his hand’ is stated both [hands] are meant unless Holy Writ clearly specifies one. R. Eleazar went and reported this statement in the Beth-Hamidrash,<sup>27</sup> but did not report it in the name of Resh Lakish. When Resh Lakish heard of it he was annoyed. Resh Lakish then said to him,<sup>28</sup> If it is as you say that wherever ‘his hand’ is stated both [hands] are meant, why did [Scripture] state at all ‘his hands’? He thus questioned him from twenty-four passages where ‘his hands’ occurs; e.g.. His hands shall bring,<sup>29</sup> his hands shall contend for him,<sup>30</sup> he guided his hands wittingly.<sup>31</sup> The other remained silent. When Resh Lakish's mind had been appeased he said to the other, Why do you not answer me that you mean the expression ‘his hand’<sup>32</sup> stated in connection with the rite of the laying on of hands. But is there not written, even with regard to the laying on of hands, And he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge?<sup>33</sup> — I refer to the laying on of hands in connection with an animal-offering.

**AND IN THE PLACE WHERE ONE LAYS ON THE HANDS THERE THE ANIMAL MUST BE SLAUGHTERED; AND THE SLAUGHTERING MUST IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.** What does he mean by this?<sup>34</sup> — He means to say, In the place where one lays on the hands there the animal must be slaughtered because the slaughtering must immediately follow the laying on of hands.<sup>35</sup>

**MISHNAH.** THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS [IN CERTAIN RESPECTS] MORE STRINGENT THAN THE RITE OF WAVING. AND THE RITE OF WAVING IS [IN

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

**OTHER RESPECTS] MORE STRINGENT THAN THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. [THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS MORE STRINGENT,] FOR ONE MAY PERFORM THE WAVING ON BEHALF OF ALL THE OTHER FELLOW-OWNERS BUT ONE MAY NOT PERFORM THE LAYING ON OF HANDS ON BEHALF OF ALL THE OTHER FELLOW-OWNERS. THE RITE OF WAVING IS MORE STRINGENT, FOR THE RITE OF WAVING TAKES PLACE IN OFFERINGS OF THE INDIVIDUAL<sup>36</sup> AND IN OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION,<sup>37</sup>**

- (1) Sc. the 'appearance' burnt-offering.
- (2) Sc. the freewill-offering of the individual; v. Lev. I, 4.
- (3) Sc. the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation; *ibid.* IV, 15.
- (4) I.e., that the 'appearance' burnt-offering requires the laying on of hands.
- (5) Lev. IX, 16. The verse is dealing, according to Rashi, with the obligatory burnt-offering offered by Aaron on the eighth day of his consecration (*ibid.* 2), but according to Tosaf. with the people's burnt-offering (*ibid.* 15). V. Bez. 20a.
- (6) Which includes the 'appearance' burnt-offering.
- (7) Lev. III, 2.
- (8) *Ibid.* 8.
- (9) *Ibid.* 13.
- (10) V. Kid. 41b.
- (11) The slave and the agent.
- (12) V. Ber. 24a.
- (13) Lev. I, 4.
- (14) *Ibid.* XVII, 11.
- (15) Lit., 'remnants of the precept'. I.e., he omitted to perform this rite.
- (16) By the sprinkling of the blood.
- (17) *Ibid.* XIV, 21.
- (18) This expression is stated three times in the chapter dealing with the peace-offering. viz., Lev. III, 2, 8, 13.
- (19) I.e., the front of the neck.
- (20) Hence a verse was necessary to exclude the laying of hands on the back of the offering.
- (21) I.e., verses excluding the neck and the back.
- (22) I.e., if a man wrapped a cloth round his hands and thus laid them on the head of the animal; or a cloth was covering the head of the animal and he laid his hands thereon.
- (23) Is it regarded as a proper laying on of hands or not?
- (24) When laying the hands upon the head of the offering. V. Yoma 36a and Tosef. Men. X.

- (25) Lev. XVI, 21.
- (26) The Heb. for 'his hands' is written defectively thus וְיָ and it might be read as וְיָ his hand.
- (27) V. Glos.
- (28) R. Eleazar.
- (29) Lev. VII, 30.
- (30) Deut. XXXIII, 7.
- (31) Gen. XLVIII, 14.
- (32) So MS.M., and so apparently in the text before Rashi; in cur. edd. 'his hands'.
- (33) Num. XXVII, 23, with reference to the appointment of Joshua as leader. Why did Scripture state here 'his hands' and not 'his hand'?
- (34) Since the slaughtering must follow the laying on of hands obviously then the animal would be slaughtered in the same place where the laying on of hands was performed in order to avoid any delay; hence the first statement is superfluous.
- (35) For in Scripture 'And he shall lay his hand' (Lev. I, 4) is immediately followed by And he shall slaughter (*ibid.* 5).
- (36) The waving of the breast and thigh of the peace-offering.
- (37) The waving of the two lambs of Pentecost. V. supra 61a.

## Menachoth 94a

**FOR LIVING ANIMALS AND FOR SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS, AND FOR THINGS THAT HAVE LIFE AND FOR THINGS THAT HAVE NOT LIFE;<sup>1</sup> BUT IT IS NOT SO WITH THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.**

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] 'His offering', this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands.<sup>2</sup> For [without this exposition] I should have argued as follows: if the rite of waving which has been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is restricted in the case of fellow-owners,<sup>3</sup> the rite of the laying on of hands which has not been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is surely restricted in the case of fellow-owners!<sup>4</sup> The text therefore stated, 'His offering', to include every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands. But should not the rite of waving be extended even in the case of fellow-owners<sup>5</sup> [by the following] a fortiori [argument]: if the rite of the laying on of hands which has not

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is extended in the case of fellow-owners, is it then not logical that the rite of waving which has been extended to apply to slaughtered animals should be extended also in the case of fellow-owners? —

[No,] because it is not possible to do so; for how should it be done? If you say. Let all wave it together.<sup>6</sup> there would then be an interposition.<sup>7</sup> And if you say, Let one first wave it and then the other, but the Divine Law speaks of one waving and not of many wavings. But is the rite of the laying on of hands never applied to a slaughtered animal? Behold we have learnt:<sup>8</sup> Whenever the High Priest wished to burn the offering,<sup>9</sup> he used to go up the ascent, having the deputy [High Priest] at his right hand. When he had reached half way up the ascent, the deputy took him by the right hand and led him up. The first priest<sup>10</sup> handed to him the head and the hind-leg, and he laid his hands on them and threw them [upon the altar fire]. The second priest handed to the first priest the two fore-legs, and he gave them to the High Priest who laid his hands on them and threw them. The second priest then slipped away and departed. In this way<sup>11</sup> they used to hand to him the rest of the limbs of the offering, and he laid his hands on them and threw them. If he so desired he would only lay his hands on them while others threw them! — Abaye said, That was done there only out of respect for the High Priest's dignity.<sup>12</sup>

## CHAPTER XI

**MISHNAH.** THE TWO LOAVES [OF PENTECOST] WERE KNEADED SEPARATELY AND BAKED SEPARATELY. THE [CAKES OF THE] SHEWBREAD WERE KNEADED SEPARATELY AND BAKED IN PAIRS. THEY<sup>13</sup> WERE PREPARED IN A MOULD; AND WHEN THEY WERE TAKEN OUT FROM THE OVEN THEY WERE AGAIN PUT IN A MOULD LEST THEY BECOME DAMAGED.

**GEMARA.** Whence do we derive it? — Our Rabbis taught: Two tenth parts of an ephah shall be in one cake,<sup>14</sup> this teaches that they were kneaded separately. And whence do we know that the Two Loaves were also [kneaded] in like manner? Because Scripture says. Shall be. And whence do we know that [the cakes of the Showbread] were baked in pairs? Because the text states, And thou shalt set them.<sup>15</sup> Perhaps then the Two Loaves were also [baked] in like manner! Scripture therefore says. Them.<sup>16</sup> 'But have you not already drawn a deduction from the word 'them'?<sup>17</sup> — If for that purpose alone Scripture would have used the expression 'and thou shalt set them';<sup>18</sup> why 'and thou shalt set them'? Two deductions may therefore be made.

Our Rabbis taught: 'And thou shalt set them', that is, in a mould. There were three moulds: [the Showbread] was first put into a mould<sup>19</sup> while still dough; in the oven there was also a kind of mould; and when it was taken out from the oven it was put into a [third] mould lest it become damaged. But why was it not put back again in the first mould? — Because after the baking it would have swollen.<sup>20</sup> It was stated: How did they fashion the Showbread?

(1) E.g., the waving of the cakes of the thank-offering.

(2) V. supra p. 568.

(3) I.e., only one performs the waving on behalf of the others.

(4) I.e., that one only should lay on the hands on behalf of the others.

(5) I.e., that every fellow-owner should wave the offering.

(6) By one fellow-owner placing his hands under the offering, another placing his under the hands of the first, a third placing his under the hands of the second and so on, thus all would wave the offering together.

(7) Since none but the hands of the first actually touch the offering.

(8) Tam. VII, 3 (33b).

(9) Cf. Yoma 14a.

(10) Of the nine priests to whose lot fell the service of the daily offering; v. Tam. III, 1 (30a) and IV, 3 (31b).

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(11) I.e., each priest in turn handing the parts of the offering to the first priest who gave them to the High Priest.

(12) The laying on of the hands by the High Priest was introduced in order to distinguish his act of service from the usual service of the ordinary priest. The rite of the laying on of hands as ordained in the Torah, however, applied only to the living offerings.

(13) The cakes of the Showbread.

(14) Lev. XXIV, 5.

(15) Ibid. 6. Heb. וְשִׂמַת אֹתָם. The word 'them' stated in connection with the setting of the cakes, i.e., the placing of the cakes in the oven for baking, signifies that the cakes were baked in pairs and not singly.

(16) Thereby excluding the Two Loaves.

(17) Viz., that the baking of the Showbread shall be in pairs.

(18) Heb. וְשִׂמַתָּם: the pronoun 'them' might have been added as a suffix to the verb.

(19) So as to obtain the required shape for the cakes, v. infra.

(20) And would not fit in the first mould.

## Menachoth 94b

R. Hanina said, Like a broken box.<sup>1</sup> R. Johanan said, Like a ship's keel.<sup>2</sup> According to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand where the dishes [of frankincense] were placed,<sup>3</sup> but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', where were the dishes placed?<sup>4</sup> — A special place was made for them.<sup>5</sup> Again according to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand how the rods lay [on the sides of the cakes],<sup>6</sup> but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', how could the rods lie [on the side of the cakes]?<sup>7</sup> — Projections were attached to them [on top].<sup>8</sup> Again according to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand how the props supported the cakes,<sup>9</sup> but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', how could the props support the cakes?<sup>10</sup> — They were made obliquely.<sup>11</sup> Now according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', we clearly understand the need for props,<sup>12</sup> but according to him who says 'like a broken box', what need was there for props? — [For otherwise] they might break by reason of the pressure of the

[upper] cakes.<sup>13</sup> Again according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', it is clear that the props rested on the table,<sup>14</sup> but according to him who says 'like a broken box', where were the props placed?<sup>15</sup> Were they perhaps placed on the ground? — Yes. for R. Abba b. Memel said, According to him who says 'like a ship's keel', the props stood on the table, and according to him who says 'like a broken box', they stood on the ground.<sup>16</sup> With which view agrees the statement of R. Judah that the cakes held up the props and the props held up the cakes? With the view [that the cakes were] like a ship's keel.<sup>17</sup>

(1) I.e., in the shape of an open box with two of its sides, the front and the back, removed; in other words, each cake consisted of a base and two sides which rose perpendicularly, thus (Fig. 1).

(2) Lit., 'a rocking ship'; i.e., like the sides of a ship which narrow downwards until the keel is reached. In like manner the side of each cake narrowed downwards until there was but a fingerbreadth between Fig. 1 them at the bottom; v-shaped. It also appears (v. Rashi) that each side of the cake tapered upwards almost to a point, thus (Fig. 2). The sides (s) rose upwards at an angle from the dotted lines.

(3) Viz., on the base of the topmost cake. Cf. infra 96a.

(4) As the two sides came almost to a point there was no base upon which the dishes of frankincense might be placed.

(5) In the topmost cake there was made a projection or ledge of dough upon which the dishes were placed.

(6) V: infra 96a. There were twenty-eight rods each shaped like the half of a hollow reed, fourteen being used for one row of the Showbread and fourteen for the other. And the cakes were arranged as follows: the nethermost cake stood on the table; three rods were placed above it, their ends resting on the perpendicular or rising sides of the cake and also in the grooves of the two upright props (v. infra p. 579, n. 1), and the second cake was placed on the rods. Three rods were similarly placed above the second, third and fourth cakes, but only two above the fifth, since it only had to bear the pressure of one single cake.

(7) For since the sides of each cake tapered upwards almost to a point (v. supra n. 3) there was certainly no place on the top for three rods; there might at most have been sufficient space for one rod, but no more.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(8) At the top of each side of the cakes projections, made of dough, were attached horizontally like arms, and upon these projections the rods lay.

(9) V. infra 96a. For each row of the Showbread there were two props which stood upright on opposite sides of the table. Now if it is assumed that the sides of each cake rose up perpendicularly at the edge of the table, then the props which stood close to the table gave abundant support to the sides of the cakes so that they could bear the pressure of the upper cakes.

(10) For the props came into contact only with the top point of each side of the cakes, since only the top reached the edge of the table, and that contact obviously afforded very little support.

(11) From the props there jutted forth curved brackets to fit in the outer curve of the sides of the cakes. The sides of the cakes thus rested on these brackets.

(12) And brackets, since the cakes had no base.

(13) The props thus strengthened the sides of each cake to withstand the pressure of the cakes above it.

(14) Since the cakes were v-shaped there were obviously spaces underneath the sides of each cake; accordingly the bracket under the lowest cake rested on the Fig. 1 table, v. Fig. 1.

(15) As the sides of the cakes a=props: b=cakes: c=rods. were flush with the edge of the table there was no room on the table for the props.

(16) Fig. 2 illustrates the arrangement of a row of the Showbread according to the view that the cakes were fashioned in the shape of a box broken at two sides; Fig. 1 illustrates the arrangement according to the view that they were in the shape of a ship's keel, v-shaped.

(17) For the curved sides of the cakes lay on the brackets and held them firm, whilst the brackets and props supported the cakes.

## Menachoth 95a

An objection was raised: There was in the oven [a mould] in the form of a bee-hive,<sup>1</sup> and it resembled a square plate!<sup>2</sup> — Render: the top of it resembled a square plate.<sup>3</sup> There is [a Baraitha] taught which agrees with the view that they were like a ship's keel. For it was taught: There were four golden props there which put forth branches on top like brackets, and these supported the cakes which resembled a ship's keel.

The question was raised: Was the Showbread rendered invalid on the journeys,<sup>4</sup> or not? —

R. Johanan and R. Joshua b. Levi [hold different views]. One said, it was rendered invalid. The other said, It was not rendered invalid. One said, It was rendered invalid, because it is written, As they encamp so they shall journey;<sup>5</sup> therefore as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by being taken outside [the curtains of the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was rendered invalid, since it was taken outside [the Tabernacle].<sup>6</sup> The other says, It was not rendered invalid, because it is written, And the continual bread shall remain thereon.<sup>7</sup> And the other? Is there not written, As they encamp so they shall journey? —

This means quite the reverse: just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside.<sup>8</sup> And the other? Is there not written, And the continual bread shall remain thereon? —

The fact is that when R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported as follows: As regards [the bread] that was still set [on the table] they do not differ,<sup>9</sup> they differ only regarding the bread that had been removed.<sup>10</sup> He who said, It was rendered invalid, [argued thus:] It is written, 'As they encamp so they shall journey': therefore just as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by being taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was rendered invalid, since it was taken outside. But he who said, It was not rendered invalid, [argued thus:] It is written, Then the tent of meeting shall set forward;<sup>5</sup> thus even though they had set forth it was still the tent of meeting.<sup>11</sup> And the other? Is there not written, 'As they encamp so they shall journey'? —

It means quite the reverse; just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was not rendered

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

invalid if it had not been taken outside. And the other? Is there not written, ‘And the tent of meeting shall set forward’? — That only comes to teach us the [order of the] standards.<sup>12</sup> And the other? — He derives [the order of the standards] from the verse, The camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps.<sup>13</sup> An objection was raised: When [the Tabernacle] was dismantled for journeying consecrated things became invalid since they were outside [the Tabernacle]; none the less persons suffering from an issue and lepers were to be put outside their respective bounds.<sup>14</sup> Now this applies, does it not, also to the Showbread? —

No, [it applies to everything] except the Showbread. But what is your view? If you hold that it is still the tent of meeting<sup>15</sup> then the consecrated things should also [not become invalid], and if you hold that it is no more the tent of meeting then even the Showbread should [become invalid]! — Rather [the true position is] as reported by Rabin when he came [from Palestine]: One stated his view<sup>16</sup> in respect of [the Showbread] that was still set [on the table], while the other stated his view<sup>17</sup> in respect of [the Showbread] that had been removed, and so they do not differ at all.

Abaye said, This<sup>18</sup> proves that the Tabernacle could be dismantled for journeying at night,<sup>19</sup> for should you hold that the Tabernacle could not be dismantled for journeying at night, but it was taken to parts only in the morning, then why [did the consecrated things become invalid] on the ground of being taken outside the Tabernacle? Surely they became invalid by being kept overnight! Is not this obvious? Holy Writ expressly says, That they might go by day and by night!<sup>20</sup> — I might have thought that that was so<sup>21</sup> only when they had already set out by day, but if they had not set out by day they would not set out at night; we are therefore taught [that it was not so]. I can point out a contradiction [to the above

teaching].<sup>22</sup> [It was taught:]<sup>23</sup> As soon as the curtains [of the Tabernacle] were folded up those that had an issue and lepers were permitted to enter [into the camp]! —

R. Ashi said, This is no difficulty, for one [Baraita]<sup>24</sup> represents the view of R. Eliezer, the other the view of the Rabbis. For it was taught:<sup>25</sup>

- (1) I.e., perforated like a bee-hive (Tosaf.).
- (2) in this mould the cake was baked (v. supra p. 577). It is evident, however, that the cake was not v-shaped, but had a square base, like the bottom of a box.
- (3) But the sides narrowed downwards until they joined together; i.e., v-shaped.
- (4) When the camp was about to break up and Israel was ordered to set forth on their journeys, the Tabernacle was dismantled Fig. 2 and its parts carried by the Levites. Now the only offering that was continually in progress a=props; b=cakes; c=rods. in the Tabernacle was the Showbread, for every Sabbath fresh bread was set upon the table and the old bread which had stood for seven days on the table was removed and consumed by the priests. The question here is, whether the Showbread was immediately rendered invalid on the dismantling of the Tabernacle or not.
- (5) Num. II, 17.
- (6) For the Tabernacle has now been dismantled.
- (7) Ibid. IV, 7. I.e., even though the Tabernacle has been dismantled the bread is still holy.
- (8) I.e., so long as it had not been removed from the table it was valid.
- (9) That bread was certainly valid, for the last mentioned verse states that so long as the bread was on the table it remained in its sanctity.
- (10) But which had not yet been consumed by the priests (Rashi). According to R. Gershom the reference is to the bread that was set before the Lord but which had for some reason or other been taken off the table at the time of the dismantling of the Tabernacle.
- (11) And the bread remained in its sanctity.
- (12) Sc. the arrangement of the camp and the order of the march.
- (13) Num. II, 17.
- (14) The leper was excluded from the whole camp, while those afflicted with issues were permitted to remain in the camp of Israel but were excluded from the Sanctuary proper and from the Levite encampment.
- (15) Even though the Tabernacle has been dismantled.
- (16) That it was not invalid.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(17) That it became invalid.

(18) The statement in the foregoing Baraitha that all consecrated things at the dismantling of the Tabernacle became invalid on the ground of being 'outside'.

(19) I.e., if the cloud was lifted (which was the signal for the people to march onward, cf. Num. IX, 17ff) at night, the Tabernacle was immediately dismantled and the people straightway set forth on their journey and did not wait till the morning.

(20) Ex. XIII, 21.

(21) That they journeyed by night.

(22) Which stated that those afflicted with an issue and lepers were still excluded from the camp even when the Tabernacle was dismantled.

(23) Ta'an. 21b.

(24) The latter Baraitha.

(25) Pes. 67b.

## Menachoth 95b

R. Eliezer says, You might think that if those that had an issue and lepers had forced their way through and entered the Temple court at a time when the Passover-offering was being offered in uncleanness<sup>1</sup> — you might think that they are culpable, the text therefore stated, They shall put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead:<sup>2</sup> when those that are unclean by the dead are put out [of the Sanctuary], those that have an issue and lepers are put out [of their respective camps];<sup>3</sup> when those that are unclean by the dead are not put out, those that have an issue and lepers are not put out.<sup>4</sup>

**MISHNAH.** THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE ALIKE IN THAT THE KNEADING AND THE SHAPING WERE PERFORMED OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT], BUT THE BAKING INSIDE; AND IT<sup>5</sup> DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. R. JUDAH SAYS, ALL THESE WORKS WERE PERFORMED INSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT]. R. SIMEON SAYS, ACCUSTOM THYSELF TO SAY, THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE VALID WHETHER MADE IN THE TEMPLE COURT OR IN BETH PAGE.<sup>6</sup>

**GEMARA.** Is not this self-contradictory? You say, THE KNEADING AND THE SHAPING WERE PERFORMED OUTSIDE, which proves that the dry-measures were not hallowed,<sup>7</sup> and then you say, BUT THE BAKING INSIDE, which proves that the dry-measures were hallowed! — Said Raba: This question was raised by a hard man, who is as hard as iron,<sup>8</sup> namely R. Shesheth. But what is the difficulty? Perhaps the tenth [measure] does not hallow [whatsoever is put therein] whereas the oven does! Rather if a difficulty is to be pointed out it is the following: [You say,] BUT THE BAKING INSIDE, which proves that the oven hallows [whatsoever was baked in it], and then you say, IT DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. The cakes would then become invalid by being kept overnight!<sup>9</sup> Said Raba: This question was raised by a hard man, who is as hard as iron, namely R. Shesheth. R. Ashi said, But what is the difficulty? Perhaps 'INSIDE' means under the supervision of careful men.<sup>10</sup> This view of R. Ashi, however, is beside the mark. For take whichever view you will, if the baking required the supervision of careful men then the kneading and the shaping also required the supervision of careful men; and if the kneading and the shaping did not require the supervision of careful men, then the baking also did not require the supervision of careful men.<sup>11</sup> We must therefore say that R. Ashi's view is beside the mark.<sup>12</sup>

R. JUDAH SAYS, ALL THESE WORKS WERE PERFORMED INSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT], etc. R. Abbahu b. Kahana said, Both<sup>13</sup> derived their views from the same verse: And it is in a manner common, yea, though it were sanctified this day in the vessel.<sup>14</sup> R. Judah maintains that he<sup>15</sup> found [the priests] baking [the Showbread] on a weekday and said to them, You are baking it on a weekday? But since it has been sanctified this day in the vessel<sup>16</sup> it will become invalid by being kept overnight!<sup>17</sup> R. Simeon maintains that he

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

found them baking it on the Sabbath and said to them, Should you not have baked it on a weekday? After all it is not the oven that hallows the bread but the table.<sup>18</sup> But how can it be said that he found them baking [the Showbread]? Is it not written, So the priest gave him hallowed bread; for there was no bread there but the Showbread that was taken from before the Lord?<sup>19</sup> — Rather it is this that he meant by ‘in a manner common’. They said to him, There is no bread here but the Showbread that has been taken from before the Lord. And he<sup>15</sup> replied, As to that bread there is no doubt at all,<sup>20</sup> for since it is no more subject to the law of sacrilege<sup>21</sup> it is in a manner common. But even that which has been sanctified this day in the vessel you may give him<sup>22</sup> to eat

(1) I.e., if the greater part of the community were unclean by contact with a dead body.

(2) Num. V, 2.

(3) V. supra p. 582, n. 3.

(4) Likewise with regard to the entering into the camp by unclean persons during the time that the Tabernacle was dismantled: since those that are unclean by the dead are not put out at all (for they were only excluded from the Sanctuary and now there is no Sanctuary), lepers and those afflicted with issues are likewise not put out of the camp.

(5) Sc. the baking. Accordingly the loaves were baked before the Sabbath.

(6) V. supra p. 468, n. 6. R. Simeon holds that they may even be baked outside the Temple court.

(7) I.e., the tenth measure by which the flour was measured was not hallowed, hence it could not hallow the flour and therefore it was permitted to knead it outside the Temple court. Had it been hallowed by the measuring vessel, the flour would have become invalid as soon as it was taken outside.

(8) Cf. Ta'an. 4a: a scholar who is not as hard as iron is no real scholar.

(9) Since they were baked, and thereby hallowed, on the day before the Sabbath.

(10) Lit., ‘in the place of careful men’, i.e., priests; but not in the Temple court.

(11) But there is no valid reason for distinguishing between the baking and the other works.

(12) The position therefore is that the two clauses of our Mishnah cannot be reconciled but they are the conflicting opinions of different Tannaim (Tosaf.).

(13) R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(14) I Sam. XXI, 6. The Heb. ליל usually meaning profane, common, non-holy, is taken in the sense of non-holy day, weekday.

(15) David.

(16) Sc. in the oven.

(17) It is therefore wrong to bake the Showbread on a weekday.

(18) It could have been baked before the Sabbath and kept for the Sabbath, for it is not hallowed until it is set on the table.

(19) Ibid. 7.

(20) That it may be given to a non-priest to eat.

(21) In accordance with the rule laid down (Me'il. I, 1): The law of sacrilege does not apply to whatsoever is permitted to the priests.

(22) Sc. David.

## Menachoth 96a

for he is in danger of his life.<sup>1</sup> R. Judah and R. Simeon, however, differ as to the tradition.<sup>2</sup> And there is in fact evidence for this, for it reads: R. SIMEON SAYS, ACCUSTOM THYSELF TO SAY, THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE VALID WHETHER MADE IN THE TEMPLE COURT OR IN BETH PAGE. This proves it.<sup>3</sup>

*MISHNAH.* THE KNEADING, THE SHAPING, AND THE BAKING OF THE HIGH PRIEST'S GRIDDLE-CAKES<sup>4</sup> WERE PERFORMED WITHIN<sup>5</sup> [THE TEMPLE COURT], AND THEY OVERRODE THE SABBATH; THE GRINDING [OF THE CORN FOR IT] AND THE SIFTING DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH.

R. AKIBA LAID DOWN THIS GENERAL RULE: ANY WORK THAT CAN BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH, BUT THAT WHICH CANNOT BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH OVERRIDES THE SABBATH.<sup>6</sup>

ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] WITHIN,<sup>7</sup> BUT DO NOT REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] OUTSIDE. THE TWO LOAVES WERE SEVEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FOUR WIDE

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

AND THEIR HORNS<sup>8</sup> WERE FOUR FINGERBREADTHS. THE [CAKES OF THE] SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE AND THEIR HORNS<sup>8</sup> WERE SEVEN FINGERBREADTHS.

R. JUDAH SAYS, LEST YOU ERR [REMEMBER BUT THE WORDS] ZADAD YAHAZ.<sup>9</sup> BEN ZOMA SAYS, AND THOU SHALT SET UPON THE TABLE SHEW BREAD BEFORE ME CONTINUALLY:<sup>10</sup> 'SHEWBREAD' SIGNIFIES THAT IT SHALL HAVE ALL ITS SURFACES VISIBLE.<sup>11</sup> THE TABLE WAS TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE;<sup>12</sup> THE CAKES OF THE SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE. EACH CAKE WAS PLACED LENGTHWISE ACROSS THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO AND A HALF HANDBREADTHS WERE TURNED UP<sup>13</sup> AT EITHER SIDE SO THAT ITS LENGTH FILLED THE ENTIRE BREADTH OF THE TABLE. THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. JUDAH.

R. MEIR SAYS, THE TABLE WAS TWELVE HANDBREADTHS LONG AND SIX WIDE;<sup>14</sup> THE CAKES OF THE SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE. EACH CAKE WAS PLACED LENGTHWISE ACROSS THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO HANDBREADTHS WERE TURNED UP AT EITHER SIDE; AND THERE WAS A SPACE OF TWO HANDBREADTHS BETWEEN [THE TWO SETS] SO THAT THE WIND COULD BLOW BETWEEN THEM.<sup>15</sup>

ABBA SAUL SAYS, THERE THEY USED TO PUT THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE PERTAINING TO THE SHEWBREAD. THEY SAID TO HIM, IS IT NOT WRITTEN, AND THOU SHALT PUT PURE FRANKINCENSE UPON ['AL] EACH ROW?<sup>16</sup> HE REPLIED, BUT IS IT NOT WRITTEN, AND NEXT UNTO ['AL] HIM SHALL BE THE TRIBE OF MANASSEH?<sup>17</sup> THERE WERE THERE FOUR GOLDEN PROPS,<sup>18</sup> BRANCHED AT THE TOP, WHICH SUPPORTED THE CAKES, TWO FOR

THE ONE ROW AND TWO FOR THE OTHER ROW. AND THERE WERE TWENTY-EIGHT RODS,<sup>18</sup> EACH [SHAPED] LIKE THE HALF OF A HOLLOW REED, FOURTEEN FOR THE ONE ROW AND FOURTEEN FOR THE OTHER ROW.

NEITHER THE PLACING OF THE RODS NOR THEIR REMOVAL OVERRODE THE SABBATH, BUT [A PRIEST] USED TO ENTER ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH, DRAW OUT THE RODS, AND PLACE THEM<sup>19</sup> PARALLEL WITH THE LENGTH OF THE TABLE.<sup>20</sup> EVERY ARTICLE THAT STOOD IN THE TEMPLE WAS PLACED WITH ITS LENGTH PARALLEL WITH THE LENGTH OF THE HOUSE.<sup>21</sup>

*GEMARA.* ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] WITHIN. Rabbi was asked, How do you know it? And he replied, Behold it is written, And he said unto me, This is the place where the priests shall boil the guilt-offering and the sin-offering, where they shall bake the meal-offering; that they bring them not forth in the outer court.<sup>22</sup> The meal-offering is placed alongside with the guilt-offering and the sin-offering; as the guilt-offering and the sin-offering require a vessel of ministry,<sup>23</sup> so the meal-offering also requires a vessel of ministry.

THE TABLE WAS TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG. R. Johanan said, According to him who says that two and a half handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either side], it will be seen that the table could hallow [whatsoever was put upon it] to the height of fifteen handbreadths;<sup>24</sup> and according to him who says that two handbreadths were turned up [at either side] it will be seen that the table could hallow to the height of twelve handbreadths. But there were the rods!<sup>25</sup> — The rods were sunken in.<sup>26</sup> But what was the purpose [of the rods]? To prevent the bread from becoming moldy, was it not? But as now suggested the bread would still become

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

mouldy!<sup>27</sup> — It was raised a little.<sup>28</sup> Then that little [should also be taken into account]!<sup>29</sup> — Since in all it did not amount to a handbreadth it was of no significance. But there were the dishes [of frankincense]!<sup>29</sup> — They were placed in the bread<sup>30</sup> and rose to the same height as the bread. Then there were the corners!<sup>31</sup> — The corners were bent inward and the bread rested upon them.

(1) For David had been overcome by faintness by reason of his hunger, and in order to save life all laws may be superseded.

(2) As to whether or not the oven hallows whatsoever is baked in it.

(3) R. Simeon's expression clearly shows that he is referring to a tradition that he had received from his teachers.

(4) The meal-offering prepared on a griddle which was offered daily by the High priest, half of the tenth being offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. V. Lev. VI, 12-15.

(5) For the half-tenth measure by which the tenth was divided was, according to all views, a hallowed vessel, so that the flour became hallowed therein; hence it was necessary to knead it inside the Temple court.

(6) As the grinding and sifting can be done before the Sabbath they do not override the Sabbath, but the kneading, the shaping and the baking cannot be done before the Sabbath, for since the flour has already been hallowed in the half tenth measure the offering would become invalid if kept overnight; accordingly they override the Sabbath.

(7) Or: Every (work in connection with the) meal-offering that is prepared in a vessel of ministry must be performed within (the Temple court), but every work that is not prepared in a vessel of ministry may be performed outside.

(8) There is considerable doubt among the commentators as to what these horns were. According to Rashi and Bertinoro they were lumps of dough, four fingerbreadths long (in the Showbread, seven), put on the four upper corners of the cake after the manner of the horns of the altar. For further suggestions v. Cohn J. Menachot (Mischnayot) Berlin, 1925 a.l.

(9) The consonants of these two words have the numerical values of 7, 4, 4 and 10, 5, 7, which correspond to the dimensions of the Two Loaves and the Showbread respectively. The mnemonical words are meaningless.

(10) Ex. XXV, 30.

(11) Lit., 'it shall have faces (on all sides)'. Another interpretation, based on the reading פנינים

is: it shall have corners, i.e., the horns mentioned above; v. supra p. 586, n. 5.

(12) For according to R. Judah the cubit consisted of five handbreadths, and the dimensions of the table are given in the Torah as two cubits long and one wide. Cf. Ex. XXV, 23.

(13) And stood perpendicularly; these were the sides of the cakes.

(14) For the cubit according to R. Meir consisted of six handbreadths.

(15) This free circulation of air between the two rows would prevent the cakes from becoming moldy.

(16) Lev. XXIV, 7. The Heb. על generally means upon; thus the frankincense was to be put upon the bread.

(17) Num. II, 20. In this verse על clearly denotes 'next to', 'by the side of'. Likewise, argues Abba Saul, in the case of the Showbread על denotes by the side of and not upon.

(18) V. supra p. 579 and notes thereon.

(19) I.e., the rods were placed on the ground to lie parallel with the length of the table (Tosaf.).

(20) The rods were removed on the Friday, on the Saturday fresh cakes were set on the table without, however, putting the rods in their place, and in the evening after the Sabbath the rods were inserted between the cakes.

(21) I.e., east to west; e.g., the table.

(22) Ezek. XLVI, 20.

(23) For those services which are performed inside the Temple court, e.g., the cooking of the offering, which is expressly spoken of in this verse.

(24) As each cake was two and a half handbreadths high each row of six cakes rose to a height of fifteen handbreadths above the surface of the table.

(25) That were placed between the cakes; accordingly the six cakes rose to a greater height than fifteen handbreadths, for there must be added thereto five times the thickness of the rods.

(26) There were notches at the top of each cake and the rods were laid therein so that there was no intervening space between one cake and that above it.

(27) In spite of the rods, since there is no space between the cakes.

(28) The rod did not lie actually, as was assumed supra, upon the sides of the cake (v. diagram p. 580), but was raised above it, and the ends of the rod rested in the grooves of the upright props; accordingly the upper cake did not come into contact with the one below it, and the air could circulate freely between the cakes.

(29) It would make each row rise to a greater height than fifteen handbreadths.

(30) I.e., in the air-space of the top cake between the two perpendicular sides.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(31) Or 'horns', v. supra p. 586, n. 5.

## Menachoth 96b

But there was also the border of the table!<sup>1</sup> — It is in accordance with the view of him who says that the border was underneath [the table].<sup>2</sup> But [what can be said] according to him who says that the border was above [the table]? — It slanted outwards so that the bread actually rested on the table. As was taught: R. Jose says, There were no props there at all but the border of the table supported the bread. But they said to him, The border was beneath [the table].

R. Johanan said, According to him who says that the border was beneath the table, it follows that a board which can be used on either side<sup>3</sup> is susceptible to uncleanness;<sup>4</sup> but according to him who says that the border was above the table,<sup>5</sup> there is still a doubt as to whether a board which can be used on either side [is susceptible to uncleanness or not]. It is evident [from the above] that the table was susceptible to uncleanness, but surely it is a wooden vessel made to rest, and a wooden vessel made to rest is not susceptible to uncleanness! For what reason? We require it to be like a sack:<sup>6</sup> just as a sack is movable both full and empty so everything that is movable both full and empty is susceptible to uncleanness!<sup>7</sup> — The table, too, was movable both full and empty, in accordance with Resh Lakish's statement.

For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the verse, upon the clean table?<sup>8</sup> The inference is that it is susceptible to uncleanness. But why? It is a wooden vessel made to rest and cannot therefore contract uncleanness!<sup>9</sup> It teaches that they used to lift it up and exhibit the Showbread thereon to those who came up for the Festivals, saying to them, Behold the love in which you are held by God! This is in accordance with R. Joshua b. Levi; for R. Joshua b. Levi said, A great miracle was wrought in regard to the

Showbread: it was taken away as [fresh as] when it was set down, as it is written, To put hot bread in the day when it was taken away.<sup>10</sup> But surely you can arrive at this<sup>11</sup> from the fact that it was overlaid [with gold]!<sup>12</sup> For we have learnt:<sup>13</sup> If a table or a side-table<sup>14</sup> was damaged,<sup>15</sup> or was overlaid with marble,<sup>16</sup> yet room enough was left to set cups thereon,<sup>17</sup> it is still susceptible to uncleanness.

R. Judah says, There must be room enough left to set portions [of food thereon]. Now if there was room enough left it is [susceptible] but if there was not room enough left it is not [susceptible].<sup>18</sup> And should you say that in the one case<sup>19</sup> the overlaying was fixed, whereas in the other it was not fixed;<sup>20</sup> but [it has been reported] that Resh Lakish enquired of R. Johanan, [Does it<sup>21</sup> apply only] to a fixed overlaying or also to an overlaying that is not fixed? And furthermore does it apply only to the case where the rims were also overlaid

(1) It is assumed that the border was a rim or a ledge which rose above the table; accordingly the bread would have to be placed above this ledge, and as the border was one handbreadth wide each row of bread would then reach to a height of sixteen handbreadths above the table.

(2) The border was a frame which joined together the four legs of the table. The top of the table, however, was a flat board and not attached to the frame, so that either side of the board could have been used as the table top.

(3) Lit., 'which can be turned over'. i.e., a flat board without rim or ledge on either side.

(4) For such was the top of the Sanctuary table, and that was susceptible to uncleanness, v. infra.

(5) Accordingly the table top could not have been reversed, but with its proper side up it formed a receptacle, and so it was susceptible to uncleanness.

(6) A wooden vessel in order to be susceptible to uncleanness must in the manner of its use be like a sack, for the two are mentioned together in one verse in respect of uncleanness (Lev. XI, 32).

(7) This would exclude wooden vessels not intended to be moved at all.

(8) Lev. XXIV, 6. V. supra 29a.

(9) So in MS.M., and in all the parallel passages; omitted in cur. edd.

(10) I Sam. XXI, 7. V. supra p. 287, n. 6.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(11) That the Sanctuary table was susceptible to uncleanness even though it was intended to rest in one place.

(12) This establishes it as a metal vessel, and metal vessels are susceptible to uncleanness even though made to rest, for they are not likened to a sack. (v. p. 590, n. 4).

(13) Kel. XXII, 1; Hag. 26b.

(14) דולבקי. V. Jast. s.v. דלפקי '(delphica, sub. mensa) a three-legged table used as a toilet table or a waiter, contrad. From שלחן (eating table)'.

(15) Damaged tables which can no longer be used for their original purpose are not susceptible to uncleanness.

(16) Stone vessels are not susceptible to uncleanness.

(17) I.e., part of the table was left undamaged or was not overlaid with marble, and that part could still be used for its original purpose.

(18) Thus if the entire table was damaged, or if it was entirely overlaid with marble, it is not susceptible to uncleanness; hence it is evident that we consider a vessel in regard to uncleanness according to the material of its overlaying.

(19) In the Mishnah quoted.

(20) The golden overlaying of the Sanctuary table was not fastened to it permanently but was removable, hence the table could not be regarded as a metal vessel.

(21) Sc. the teaching of the above-quoted Mishnah viz., that the material of the overlaying of a vessel is regarded for the purposes of uncleanness as the material of the vessel.

## Menachoth 97a

or also to the case where the rims were not overlaid? And he replied, It makes no difference whether the overlaying was fixed or the overlaying was not fixed; whether the rims were overlaid or the rims were not overlaid.<sup>1</sup> And should you further say that acacia wood,<sup>2</sup> being valuable, is not nullified [by the overlaying],<sup>3</sup> this would be quite in order according to Resh Lakish who said that they taught this<sup>4</sup> only of vessels of common woods<sup>5</sup> which come from overseas, but vessels of fine woods<sup>6</sup> are valuable and are not nullified [by the overlaying]. But what can one say according to R. Johanan who said that even vessels of fine wood are nullified [by the overlaying]? —

One must therefore say that the table [of the Sanctuary] was different, for the Divine Law called it wood. For it is written, The altar was of wood, three cubits high, and the length thereof two cubits; and the corners thereof, and the length thereof, and the walls thereof were of wood; and he said unto me, This is the table that is before the Lord.<sup>7</sup> [The verse] begins with the altar and ends with the table! R. Johanan and R. Eleazar both said, While the Temple still stood the altar used to make atonement for a man, but now that the Temple no longer stands a man's table makes atonement for him.<sup>8</sup>

**THERE WERE THERE FOUR GOLDEN PROPS, etc.** How do we know this? — R. Kattina said, For the verse says, And thou shalt make ke'arothaw, and kappothaw, and kesothaw, and menakiothaw, to cover withal.<sup>9</sup> Ke'arothaw are the moulds,<sup>10</sup> kappothaw the dishes,<sup>11</sup> kesothaw the props,<sup>12</sup> and menakiothaw the rods;<sup>13</sup> to cover withal: wherewith the bread was covered.<sup>14</sup>

Raba raised an objection. [We have learnt:] **NEITHER THE PLACING OF THE RODS NOR THEIR REMOVAL OVERRODE THE SABBATH.** Now if we were to hold [that the rods are enjoined] in the Torah, wherefore do they not override the Sabbath? Later, however, Raba said, What I said was not correct, for we have learnt: **R. AKIBA LAID DOWN THIS GENERAL RULE: ANY WORK THAT CAN BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH.** This,<sup>15</sup> therefore, in all probability did not override the Sabbath. For why [were the rods required at all]? So that the bread become not moldy. But in this short time<sup>16</sup> it would not become moldy. And so it has been taught: What was the procedure? He used to enter on the eve of the Sabbath, draw out the rods, and place them [on the ground] parallel with the length of the table. At the outgoing of the Sabbath he used to enter again, lift up the

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

ends of one cake and insert the rods underneath it, and then lift up the ends of another cake and insert the rods underneath it. The four [middle] cakes each required three rods underneath them, the topmost cake required but two rods underneath it for there was no burden upon it, while the bottom cake required no rods at all for it stood upon the surface of the table.

We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>17</sup> R. Meir says, All cubit measurements in the Temple were [according to a cubit of] medium size,<sup>18</sup> excepting those of the golden altar, the horns, the sobeb,<sup>19</sup> and the base [of the outer altar]<sup>20</sup> R. Judah says, The cubit used for the [Temple] building was of six handbreadths and that for the vessels was of five handbreadths.

R. Johanan said, Both derived their views from the same text: And these are the measures of the altar<sup>21</sup> by cubits — the cubit is a cubit and a handbreadth;<sup>22</sup>

(1) In all the circumstances stated the vessel is determined by the material of its overlaying.

(2) Of which the table was made; Ex. XXV, 23.

(3) And despite the overlaying of gold it is still regarded as a wooden vessel.

(4) Sc. that the overlaying is all-important and that it determines the character of the vessel.

(5) אכסלגוס Meaning and etymology doubtful; according to Jast.: \*\*, wood-carrier, common wooden vessels’.

According to Tosaf. it is the name of a place.

(6) גמסמס. According to Jast.: ‘polished wood, prob. coral-wood’.

(7) Ezek. XLI, 22.

(8) When the poor are at his table.

(9) Ex. XXV, 29. The translation of these words: תקשותיו, and מנקיתיו in the E.VV. does not correspond with the Rabbinical interpretation which follows, hence they are left untranslated.

(10) Wherein the cakes were shaped; v. supra 94a.

(11) Wherein the frankincense was put; cf. Lev. XXIV, 7.

(12) V. supra 96a. קשותיו is thus derived from קשה, hard; for the props kept the cakes hard and firm so that they should not break.

(13) V. supra ibid. מנקיתיו is derived from נקי, clean; the rods, shaped like the half of a hollowed reed, allowed the free circulation of air between

the cakes, and thus the cakes were kept clean and free from moldiness.

(14) I.e., the rods lay over the cakes like a cover.

(15) Sc. the placing of the rods and the removal thereof.

(16) When the cakes stood without the intervening rods, i.e., between the removal of the rods on the eve of the Sabbath and the removal of the bread on the Sabbath at midday, or between the setting down of the fresh bread on the Sabbath and the insertion of the rods at the conclusion of the Sabbath.

(17) Kel. XVII, 10; ‘Er. 4b; Suk. 5b.

(18) I.e., of six handbreadths.

(19) Heb. סובב: the second terrace or ledge which ran round the altar upon which the officiating priests walked.

(20) For these the standard of the cubit was five handbreadths.

(21) Sc. the outer altar, i.e., the altar of the burnt-offering.

(22) I.e., the ordinary cubit, which measured six handbreadths, was one cubit and one handbreadth by the standard of the cubit spoken of in this verse, for the latter cubit measured only five handbreadths. And all the parts of the altar mentioned in this verse were measured by a cubit of five handbreadths.

## Menachoth 97b

the bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span;<sup>1</sup> and this shall be the base of the altar.<sup>2</sup> ‘The bottom shall be a cubit’ refers to the base [of the altar]; ‘and a cubit the breadth’ refers to the sobeb; ‘and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span refers to the horns;<sup>3</sup> ‘and this shall be the base of the altar’ refers to the golden altar.<sup>4</sup> Now R. Meir maintained that [only] this<sup>5</sup> was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths but all the other vessels [in the Temple] were measured by a cubit of six handbreadths; whereas R. Judah maintained that like this [cubit] shall be all the cubits for the vessels.

It was assumed that it was the height from the base to the sobeb that was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths;<sup>6</sup> and the verse, ‘The bottom shall be a cubit and a cubit the breadth,’ meant to say that [the height]<sup>7</sup> from

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

the base [which rose up] one cubit to [the sobeb which was] one cubit wide was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths. [Let us now consider:] The height of the altar was in all ten cubits, six [cubits] being of five handbreadths each and four of six handbreadths each. Thus the height of the altar was fifty-four handbreadths, and the half thereof was twenty-seven handbreadths. [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-four handbreadths, that is, three handbreadths less than half the height of the altar.<sup>8</sup> And we have learnt:<sup>9</sup> A red line went around the altar in the middle<sup>10</sup> to separate between blood that must be sprinkled above and blood that must be sprinkled below. How then could it have taught in connection with the burnt-offering of a bird that [the priest] went up the ascent, passed on to the sobeb and came to the south-eastern horn, nipped off the head close by its neck and divided it asunder, and drained out the blood on the altar wall, and that if he did it even one cubit's distance below his feet,<sup>11</sup> it was valid? He has then applied below, to the extent of two handbreadths, blood that must be applied above!<sup>12</sup> —

It must be said, therefore, that ‘the bottom shall be a cubit’ refers to the rebatement<sup>13</sup> [of the base], ‘a cubit the breadth’ to the rebatement [of the sobeb], and ‘the border thereof by the edge thereof round about’ to the rebatement [of the horns].<sup>14</sup> Accordingly the height of the altar was sixty handbreadths,<sup>15</sup> and the half thereof was thirty handbreadths.<sup>16</sup> [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-four handbreadths, that is, six handbreadths<sup>17</sup> less than half the height of the altar. And therefore we have learnt: If he did it even one cubit's distance below his feet, it was valid.<sup>18</sup> How have you explained it?

As referring to the rebatements. But how can you explain it as referring to the rebatements? Behold we have learnt: The

altar was [at its base] thirty-two cubits long and thirty-two cubits wide. It rose up one cubit and receded one cubit:<sup>19</sup> this formed the base; thus there were left thirty cubits by thirty.<sup>20</sup> According to you, however, it should be thirty cubits and two handbreadths by thirty cubits and two handbreadths!<sup>21</sup> And further we have learnt: It rose up five cubits and receded one cubit: this formed the sobeb; thus there were left twenty-eight cubits by twenty-eight.<sup>20</sup> According to you, however, it should be twenty-eight cubits and four handbreadths by twenty-eight cubits and four handbreadths! And should you say that since they<sup>22</sup> were less than one cubit [the Tanna] purposely omitted them, but we have learnt further: The place of the horns was one cubit on every side; thus there were left twenty-six cubits by twenty-six;<sup>20</sup> and according to you it should be twenty-seven by twenty-seven!<sup>23</sup> —

He was not exact [in his reckoning]. But we have learnt further: The place<sup>24</sup> on which the feet of the priests trod was one cubit on every side; thus there were left twenty-four cubits by twenty-four, the place for the altar fire.<sup>20</sup> According to you, however, it should be twenty-five by twenty-five! Should you say also here that he was not exact, but it is written, And the altar hearth shall be twelve cubits long by twelve broad, square.<sup>25</sup> Now you might say that it was only twelve cubits by twelve; but when it also says, In the four quarters thereof,<sup>25</sup> it teaches that one must measure from the middle twelve cubits in every direction!<sup>26</sup> And should you say that originally<sup>27</sup> six [of the thirty-two cubits] were cubits of five handbreadths,<sup>28</sup> then the Temple court must have had more space, and we have learnt: The Temple court was in all a hundred and eighty-seven cubits long and a hundred and thirty-five cubits wide. From east to west it was a hundred and eighty-seven cubits: the place where the feet of the Israelites trod<sup>29</sup> was eleven cubits; the place where the feet of the priests trod<sup>30</sup> was eleven cubits; the altar was thirty-two cubits;

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

between the porch<sup>31</sup> and the altar was twenty-two cubits; the Sanctuary was a hundred cubits, and eleven cubits behind the Holy of Holies!<sup>32</sup> —

You must therefore say that ‘the bottom shall be a cubit’ refers to the height [of the base], ‘a cubit the breadth’ to the rebatement [of the sobeb], and ‘the border thereof by the edge thereof round about’ refers to the height<sup>33</sup> [of the horns], but [as to the space taken up by the horns]

- (1) I.e., half a cubit.
- (2) Ezek. XLIII, 13.
- (3) These were blocks measuring one cubit each side which were placed upon the four corners of the altar. The measurement of a span stated in this verse in regard to the horns is explained as referring to the distance from the middle of each surface in every direction, i.e., the four quarters of every surface each measured a span by a span, therefore the whole of the surface was a cubit-square.
- (4) I.e., the golden altar was also measured by the cubit of five handbreadths.
- (5) Sc. the golden altar, which was placed in the category of Temple vessels; on the other hand the outer altar was regarded as a Temple building.
- (6) Whereas the other parts of the altar were measured by a cubit of six handbreadths. The various parts of the altar and their measurements will be easily gathered from the adjoining diagram which represents one side of the altar. (See drawing). The numbers in the figure represent cubits: a=the base; b = wall of the sobeb; c = the sobeb; d = place for the altar fire, מערכה; e = the horns.
- (7) Which was six cubits.
- (8) In other words the sobeb was three handbreadths above the middle line of the altar.
- (9) Mid. III, 1.
- (10) I.e., twenty-seven handbreadths above the ground.
- (11) I.e., he bent down low and drained out the blood of the offering against the wall of the sobeb upon which he stood.
- (12) The blood of the burnt-offering of a bird must be applied above the red line, but by draining out the blood against the wall beneath his feet a cubit's distance down he has reached two handbreadths (taking the cubit to be five handbreadths) below the red line.
- (13) Lit., ‘the drawing in’. The cubit of five handbreadths spoken of in this verse was used

only for measuring the depth or width of each ledge or platform round the altar.

(14) I.e., the space taken up by the horns upon the altar surface.

(15) For the measurements of the other parts of the altar, save those parts mentioned in this verse, were by the cubit of six handbreadths.

(16) At which height from the ground ran the red line round the sides of the altar.

(17) Or one cubit.

(18) Since the draining of the blood was still performed in the upper part of the altar above the red line.

(19) On every side.

(20) Mid. III, 1.

(21) Since the rebatement or width of each ledge was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths.

(22) The four additional handbreadths.

(23) For the handbreadths that were not reckoned now amount to one whole cubit!

(24) On the top surface, beyond the horns, upon the altar.

(25) Ezek. XLIII, 16.

(26) I.e., each quarter of the top surface of the altar must measure twelve cubits by twelve, therefore the whole top surface must be twenty-four by twenty-four. And as this is the teaching of the verse it cannot be said that the measurement is not exact!

(27) At the construction of the altar.

(28) I.e., the last three cubits of each side of the base were of five handbreadths each, so that six of these cubits equaled five cubits of six handbreadths each; accordingly the length of each side was in reality thirty-one cubits.

(29) The court of the Israelites, at the entrance of the Temple court.

(30) The court of the priests.

(31) Heb. אולם, the entrance to the היכל, the Sanctuary.

(32) Lit., ‘the house of the mercy seat’; v. Mid. V, 1.

(33) So MS.M. and Sh. Mek., and such is the interpretation of Rashi. It is omitted in cur. edd.

## Menachoth 98a

it is immaterial whether the one or the other [cubit was used].<sup>1</sup> Accordingly the height of the altar was fifty-eight handbreadths,<sup>2</sup> and the half thereof was twenty-nine handbreadths. [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-three handbreadths, that is, six handbreadths less than half the height of the altar. And therefore we have learnt: ‘If he did it even

## MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

one cubit's distance below his feet, it was valid'. This may be proved too, for it is written, The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth.<sup>3</sup> This is conclusive. How much is a cubit of medium size? —

R. Johanan said, Six handbreadths. R. Jose b. Abin said, We have also learnt the same [in our Mishnah]: R. MEIR SAYS, THE TABLE WAS TWELVE HANDBREADTHS LONG AND SIX WIDE.<sup>4</sup> It follows that there was a cubit larger than this!<sup>5</sup> — There was, as we have learnt:<sup>6</sup> There were two cubits<sup>7</sup> in the Palace of Shushan,<sup>8</sup> one at the north-eastern corner and the other at the south-eastern corner. That at the north-eastern corner was longer than the cubit of Moses<sup>9</sup> by half a fingerbreadth, and that at the south-eastern corner was longer than the other by half a fingerbreadth; thus it was one fingerbreadth longer than the cubit of Moses. And why did they set up a large cubit<sup>10</sup> and a small one?<sup>11</sup> So that the workmen might receive [contracts of work] according to the measure of the smaller cubit and deliver [the work] according to the measure of the larger cubit, thereby avoiding any possible guilt of sacrilege.<sup>12</sup> And why two?<sup>13</sup> — One was for [work in] gold and silver<sup>14</sup> and the other was for building.<sup>15</sup> We have learnt elsewhere: The eastern gate on which was portrayed the palace of Shushan.<sup>16</sup> What was the reason for this? —

R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [offered different opinions]. One said, So that they be ever mindful whence they came;<sup>17</sup> the other said, So that the fear of the dominant power be ever before them.<sup>18</sup> R. Jannai said, The fear of the dominant power<sup>19</sup> should ever be before you, as it is written, And all these thy servants shall come down unto me, and bow down unto me saying;<sup>20</sup> but he did not say so of [the king] himself.<sup>21</sup> R. Johanan derives it from the following verse: And the hand of the Lord was on Elijah; and he girded up his loins, and ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel.<sup>22</sup> And the leaf thereof for healing.<sup>23</sup>

R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [each interpreted this verse]. One said, To loosen the mouth above;<sup>24</sup> the other said, To loosen the mouth below.<sup>25</sup> It has been [likewise] reported: Hezekiah said, To loosen the mouth of the dumb; Bar Kappara said, To loosen the mouth of barren women.

Our Rabbis taught: Had [Scripture] said, And thou shalt take fine flour and bake twelve cakes thereof... And thou shalt set them in two rows,<sup>26</sup> and not added, Six [in a row],<sup>26</sup> I would have said that one row may consist of four cakes and the other of eight; [Scripture] therefore said, Six [in a row]. Furthermore, had [Scripture] said, 'In two rows, six in a row', and it had not stated, 'Twelve', I would have said that there were to be three rows each of six cakes;<sup>27</sup> [Scripture] therefore said, 'Twelve'. And further, had [Scripture] said, 'Twelve', and also, 'In rows', but not, 'In two rows', nor, 'Six in a row', I would have said that there were to be three rows each of four cakes; [Scripture] therefore said, 'In two rows' and 'Six in a row'. Hence without these three expressions we should not have known [the proper practice]. And what was it? [The priest] used to set them in two rows each of six cakes. If he set one row of four and another of eight, he has not fulfilled the obligation. If he set two rows each of seven cakes, the top cake [of each row], says Rabbi, is regarded as though it was not. But does not the verse say, And thou shalt put upon ['al] each row pure frankincense?<sup>28</sup> —

R. Hisda said to R. Hammuna (others say, R. Hammuna said to R. Hisda): Rabbi consistently holds the view that 'al means 'by the side of'. As has been taught: Rabbi says, In the verse, And thou shalt put 'al each row pure frankincense, the preposition 'al has the sense of 'by the side of'. You say it has the sense of 'by the side of', but perhaps it is not so but rather it means actually upon it! When it says, And thou shalt place the veil as a screen 'al the ark,<sup>29</sup> you may learn from it

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

that ‘al [generally] has the sense of ‘by the side of’.

**EVERY ARTICLE THAT STOOD IN THE TEMPLE, etc.** Our Rabbis taught: Every article that stood in the Temple was placed with its length parallel with the length of the house, excepting the ark whose length was parallel with the breadth of the house.<sup>30</sup> So was it placed and so were its staves placed. What can this mean?<sup>31</sup> — It means as follows: So was it placed for so were its staves placed.<sup>32</sup> And whence do we know this<sup>31</sup> of the staves? — From the following [Baraita] which was taught: And the staves were so long,<sup>33</sup> I might have thought that they did not reach the curtain;<sup>34</sup> the text therefore further states, [That the ends of the staves] were seen [from the holy place].<sup>33</sup> But if I had the verse, [That the ends of the staves] were seen, only to go by I might have assumed that they tore through the curtain and protruded outside; the text therefore states, But they could not be seen without.<sup>33</sup> How then [are we to understand the verse]?

(1) I.e., whether the cubit was of five or of six handbreadths. Since the rebatement or width of the ledge of the base was measured by a cubit of six handbreadths and that of the middle ledge or sobeb by a cubit of five handbreadths, the altar space left by the horns would be twenty-six cubits and two handbreadths (or four handbreadths, according as one takes each side of the horn as one cubit of six handbreadths or of five respectively); and these extra handbreadths are not taken into account by the Tanna of the Mishnah.

(2) For the height of the several parts of the altar, with the exception of the one cubit the height of the base and the one cubit the height of the horns, was described by cubits of six handbreadths.

(3) Ezek. XLIII, 13. The structure of this verse is significant; in the opening part ‘cubit’ follows the article mentioned whereas in the latter part ‘cubit’ precedes it. The significance thereof is that in each case ‘cubit’ refers to a different dimension, in the former case to the height and in the latter to the width.

(4) And the table is described in the Torah (Ex. XXV, 23) as being two cubits long and one cubit wide. Now since R. Meir has taught supra p. 593 that all cubit measurements in the Temple were according to a cubit of medium size, it follows that

the cubit of six handbreadths was the medium sized one.

(5) For the cubit of six handbreadths was only the medium sized one. Where do we find a larger, cubit in use?

(6) Kel. XVII, 9.

(7) Two cubit sticks were deposited there as standards.

(8) A chamber built above the eastern gate of the Temple; v. infra and Mid. I, 3.

(9) Which was six handbreadths.

(10) Sc. the two cubits deposited in the Palace of Shushan.

(11) Sc. the cubit of Moses. Why did they not adopt the cubit of Moses as the standard cubit for all purposes?

(12) I.e., benefiting from that which belongs to the Temple; cf. Lev. V, 15. By returning the completed work according to a larger measure than that which they had contracted to do they precluded the possibility of profiting from the Temple.

(13) Why have two measures each larger than the cubit of Moses?

(14) As this work was costly it was unfair to increase the standard cubit by more than half a fingerbreadth.

(15) For building work the standard cubit was increased by one whole fingerbreadth.

(16) Mid. I, 3.

(17) From the exile in Persia, and so would offer thanks to God at all times for their deliverance.

(18) It served to them as a constant reminder that they were still under Persian rule.

(19) Lit., ‘kingship’.

(20) Ex. XI, 8.

(21) Moses out of respect for the king did not say to him, ‘Thou shalt come unto me and bow down to me’, although he knew that that would eventually be the case.

(22) I Kings XVIII, 46. Out of respect for royalty the prophet Elijah acted as the king's runner and accompanied him on his journey.

(23) Ezek. XLVII, 12.

(24) I.e., to make the dumb speak. The interpretation is a play upon the word לתרופה, ‘for healing’, which is taken as a compound of להטיר פה ‘for loosening the mouth’.

(25) A euphemism for the womb.

(26) Lev. XXIV, 5, 6.

(27) The expression ‘six in a row’, following immediately after the two rows already stated, would be interpreted as referring to a third row of six cakes. There is a variant text found in MS.M., also given by Rashi, which reads: There was to be a third row of three cakes; i.e., only the two rows shall be of six cakes each, but other additional rows may be of less than six cakes.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(28) Lev. XXIV, 7. The preposition על translated 'upon', implies that the dish of frankincense must actually be upon the row of six cakes, i.e., nothing shall intervene between the dish of frankincense and the row proper.

(29) Ex. XL, 3. The veil was clearly put up as a screen before the ark, accordingly על cannot have the meaning of 'upon'. From this verse Rabbi establishes his view that 'al generally means 'by the side of'.

(30) I.e., north to south.

(31) The staves actually pointed in the directions of east and west.

(32) Since the staves pointed eastward and westward and protruded at right angles to the length of the ark, it follows that the ark stood lengthwise from north to south.

(33) I Kings VIII, 8.

(34) Sc. the curtain that hung over the entrance to the Holy of Holies which was on the east side.

## Menachoth 98b

They pressed against the curtain and bulged out as the two breasts of a woman, as it is said, My beloved is unto me as a bundle of myrrh, that lieth betwixt my breasts.<sup>1</sup> But whence do we know that the staves lay along the breadth of the ark? Perhaps they lay along the length of the ark? — Rab Judah answered, Because in the space of one cubit and a half two men could not stand.<sup>2</sup> And whence do we know that four persons carried it?<sup>3</sup> — Because it is written, And the Kohathites<sup>4</sup> [which are at least] two, the bearers of the sanctuary<sup>4</sup> again two,<sup>5</sup> set forward.<sup>4</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: King Solomon made ten tables, as it is written, He made also ten tables and placed them in the Temple, five on the right side and five on the left.<sup>6</sup> If you were to say that five were on the right side of the [Temple] entrance<sup>7</sup> and five on the left side of the entrance, then we should have tables placed on the south side [of the Temple], but the Torah says, And thou shalt put the table on the north side.<sup>8</sup> You must therefore say that [the table] of Moses stood in the middle with five [tables] to the right of it and five to the left of it.<sup>9</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: King Solomon also made ten candlesticks, as it is written, And he made the ten candlesticks of gold according to the ordinance concerning them; and he set them in the Temple, five on the right hand and five on the left.<sup>10</sup> If you were to say that five were on the right side of the [Temple] entrance and five on the left side, we should then have candlesticks set on the north side [of the Temple], but the Torah says, And the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle towards the south.<sup>11</sup> You must therefore say that [the candlestick] of Moses stood in the middle with five [candlesticks] to the right of it and five to the left of it. One [Baraita] states that [the tables] stood in the inner half of the Sanctuary, whilst another [Baraita] states that they stood in the inner third of the Sanctuary! —

This, however, presents no difficulty, for the one [Baraita]<sup>12</sup> includes the Holy of Holies in the term 'Sanctuary', whilst the other<sup>13</sup> does not include the Holy of Holies in the term 'Sanctuary'.<sup>14</sup> Our Rabbis taught: [The tables] were placed [lengthwise] from east to west. So Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, From north to south. What is Rabbi's reason? —

He derives it from the candlestick: as the candlestick stood [with its branches] towards east and west, so these stood from east to west. But whence do we know this of the candlestick itself? — Since of the western lamp<sup>15</sup> the verse says, Aaron shall order it... before the Lord,<sup>16</sup> it follows that all the others were not before the Lord; now if one were to assume [that the candlestick stood with its branches] towards north and south, all the lamps would then be before the Lord.<sup>17</sup> And what is the reason for the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? —

He derives it from the ark: as the ark stood [lengthwise in the direction of] north and south, so these also stood [lengthwise] from

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

north to south. And why does not Rabbi derive it from the ark? —

One may infer [an object that stood] outside<sup>18</sup> from [another that stood] outside, but one may not infer [that which stood] outside from [that which stood] inside.<sup>19</sup> And why does not R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon derive it from the candlestick? —

He maintains that even the candlestick stood [with its branches extending] towards north and south. But is it not written, Aaron and his sons shall order it... [before the Lord]?<sup>20</sup>—

They were all made to face [the middle lamp].<sup>21</sup> For it has been taught:<sup>22</sup> The seven lamps shall give light in front of the candlestick;<sup>23</sup> this teaches that they were made to face the middle lamp. R. Nathan said, This shows that the middle one is specially prized.<sup>24</sup> It is quite clear, according to him who said [that the tables stood lengthwise] from east to west, to see how the ten [tables]<sup>25</sup> were placed in the twenty cubits;<sup>26</sup> but according to him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from north to south, how could the ten tables be placed in twenty cubits?<sup>27</sup> Furthermore,<sup>28</sup> how could the priests enter [the Holy of Holies]?<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, we would then have five tables on the south side!<sup>30</sup> And further, where did the table of Moses stand?<sup>31</sup> —

But according to your argument [this question could] also [be raised] against him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from east to west: Where did the table of Moses stand?<sup>32</sup> But in fact [there is no difficulty] for you have assumed, have you not, that they stood in one row? [In reality, however,] they stood in two rows.<sup>33</sup>

(1) Cant. I, 13. As the staves bulged in the curtain they obviously pointed eastward.

(2) As the ark was one cubit and a half wide if, as suggested, the staves lay along the length of the ark, there would then have been only the space of

one cubit and a half between the staves, and within this space two men could not have walked side by side carrying the ark.

(3) I.e., that two Levites walking side by side carried the ark in front and two behind. Perhaps only two persons carried it, one carrying the two ends of the staves on one side, and the other the two ends of the staves on the other side.

(4) Num. X, 21.

(5) Thus there were four Levites that carried the ark.

(6) II Chron. IV, 8.

(7) The entrance to the Temple was in the middle of the east side.

(8) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(9) They all stood, however, on the north side.

(10) II Chron. IV, 7.

(11) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(12) The latter.

(13) The former.

(14) The Sanctuary (lit., 'house') including the Holy of Holies was sixty cubits long, the first twenty cubits being taken up by the Holy of Holies and in the space of the next twenty cubits stood the tables. Now these latter twenty cubits were half the Sanctuary space (if one excludes from this term the Holy of Holies) or a third of the Sanctuary space (if one includes in that term the Holy of Holies).

(15) I.e., the second lamp from the eastern end.

(16) Ex. XXVII, 21; Lev. XXIV, 3.

(17) So that no one lamp could be said to be looking westwards any more than the others. Accordingly it must be concluded that the candlestick stood with its branches extended towards east and west.

(18) The Holy of Holies.

(19) The ark was within the Holy of Holies but the candlestick and the tables were outside in the Sanctuary.

(20) Which shows that only one lamp, 'it', was before the Lord, but if it is maintained that the candlestick stood with its branches extending to the north and to the south all the lamps alike would be before the Lord.

(21) Whilst the middle lamp alone faced the Holy of Holies.

(22) Meg. 21b.

(23) Num. VIII, 2.

(24) On Mondays, Thursdays and Sabbath afternoon, at least ten verses of the portion prescribed for the following Sabbath were read by three persons; and as 'the middle was specially prized' the second reader was privileged to read four verses whilst the other two read three verses each. V. also Tosaf. s.v. **שְׁתַּמְצֵי**.

(25) Each table being two cubits long and one cubit wide.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(26) I.e., the twenty cubits furthest from the entrance of the Sanctuary. It is assumed, for the present, that the ten tables were placed head to head in one long line, thus forming one table measuring twenty cubits by one cubit. Now although it is impossible to place lengthwise an object twenty cubits long in a space exactly twenty cubits long or wide, since there was more space available in the Sanctuary it was of small consequence if the table protruded a little beyond the twenty cubits allotted to it.

(27) For the Sanctuary was twenty cubits wide and the tables were placed parallel with the width of the Sanctuary.

(28) Assuming even that the tables would just fit in the width of the Sanctuary.

(29) I.e., the High Priest on the Day of Atonement. The tables formed a barrier across the entire width of the Sanctuary.

(30) In contravention of the Biblical ordinance. Cf. Ex. XXVI, 35.

(31) Which stood, according to the Baraita quoted above p. 601, between the other tables. There was thus insufficient room for all eleven tables.

(32) If it was among the other tables then one table must have stood completely in the front half of the Sanctuary!

(33) Each row consisting of five tables and measuring ten cubits by one cubit. The table of Moses stood by itself between the two rows.

## Menachoth 99a

Then according to him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from north to south it is quite in order,<sup>1</sup> but according to him who said that they stood lengthwise from east to west [there is a difficulty]. Let us consider, how far away was the table<sup>2</sup> from the [north] wall? Two cubits and a half;<sup>3</sup> then there was one cubit [the width of the table] itself, two cubits and a half the space between the tables,<sup>4</sup> one cubit [the width of the table] itself,<sup>5</sup> again two cubits and a half the space between the tables,<sup>6</sup> and one cubit [the width of the table] itself, [in all ten cubits and a half]; thus the tables had encroached to the extent of half a cubit upon the south side [of the Sanctuary]! — You have assumed, have you not, that the table of Moses stood between the two rows of tables? But it was not so, it actually stood at the head of the two

rows of tables,<sup>7</sup> whilst the latter stood lower down like pupils sitting before their master.

Our Rabbis taught: Solomon made ten tables; they set [the Showbread], however, only on that made by Moses, as it is written, And the table whereon the Showbread was.<sup>8</sup> Also Solomon made ten candlesticks; they lit, however, only that of Moses, as it is written, And the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof, to burn every evening.<sup>9</sup> R. Eleazar b. Shammua' says, On all the tables<sup>10</sup> they set [the Showbread], as it is written, And the tables whereon was the shewbread;<sup>11</sup> and they lit all the candlesticks, as it is written, And the candlesticks with their lamps, that they should burn according to the ordinance before the Sanctuary, of pure gold.<sup>12</sup>

R. Jose son of R. Judah says, They set [the Showbread] only on that of Moses; but how do I explain the verse which says, 'And the tables whereon was the Shewbread'?<sup>11</sup> These are the three tables that were in the Temple:<sup>13</sup> two stood inside the porch at the entrance of the House, the one of silver<sup>14</sup> and the other of gold. On the table of silver they laid the Showbread when it was brought in, and on the table of gold they laid the Showbread when it was brought out, since what is holy we must raise [in honor] but not bring down. And within [the Sanctuary] was a table of gold whereon the Showbread lay continually. Whence is it inferred that we may not bring down [what is holy]? —

Rabbi said, From the verse, And Moses reared up the tabernacle, and laid its sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bars thereof, and reared up its pillars.<sup>15</sup> And whence is it inferred that we must raise up [in honor what is holy]? —

R. Aha b. Jacob said, From the verse, Even the fire-pans of these men who have sinned at the cost of their lives, and let them be made beaten plates for a covering of the altar — for they are become holy, because they were

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

offered before the Lord — that they may be a sign unto the children of Israel.<sup>16</sup> At first they were but accessories of the altar and now they are part of the altar itself. Which thou didst break, and thou shalt put them in the ark.<sup>17</sup> R. Joseph learnt: This teaches us that both the tablets and the fragments of the tablets were deposited in the ark. Hence [we learn that] a scholar who has forgotten his learning through no fault of his<sup>18</sup> must not be treated with disrespect.<sup>19</sup>

(Mnemonic: *Suppression, misdeed, forgets.*)<sup>20</sup>

Resh Lakish said: There are times

- (1) For the tables were almost completely on the north side of the Sanctuary, overstepping but slightly the middle line.
- (2) Sc. the row of tables nearest the north wall.
- (3) This space provided sufficient room for two persons to walk side by side, for the priests who attended to the Showbread walked around the tables in pairs.
- (4) I.e., between the north row of tables and the table of Moses.
- (5) Sc. the table of Moses.
- (6) I.e., between the table of Moses and the south row of tables.
- (7) And was thus nearest to the Holy of Holies. Moreover, as the ground of the Temple sloped downwards from west to east, the table of Moses, being nearest the west side, was indeed on a higher elevation than the other tables.
- (8) I Kings VII, 48. Only one table is mentioned for the Showbread.
- (9) II Chron. XIII, 11. Thus only one candlestick was burning every evening.
- (10) I.e., sometimes on one table and sometimes on another.
- (11) Ibid. IV, 19. This verse speaks of many tables used for the Showbread.
- (12) Ibid. 20.
- (13) That were used in connection with the Showbread. V. next Mishnah, infra p. 607.
- (14) According to the next Mishnah it was of marble, but it had a bright appearance like silver. V. however, Tosaf. infra 99b s.v. 778.
- (15) Ex. XL, 18. Moses himself completed the erection of the Tabernacle, for since he had begun it, it would have been a degradation had he allowed others to complete it. Aliter: the verse opens with the expression ‘reared up’ and concludes also with this same expression, thus

signifying that what is holy must be ‘reared up’ and kept exalted and not brought down.

(16) Num. XVII, 3 (E. VV. XVI, 38).

(17) Deut. X, 2.

(18) Lit., ‘by reason of his misfortune’; i.e., through old age, sickness or trouble, but not through willful neglect.

(19) Since even the broken pieces of the tablets were also treated with sanctity and were placed in the ark.

(20) These words form the subject matter of the following three teachings of Resh Lakish respectively.

## Menachoth 99b

when the suppression of the Torah may be the foundation of the Torah,<sup>1</sup> for it is written, ‘Which thou didst break’: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses, ‘Thou didst well to break’!<sup>2</sup> Resh Lakish also said, A scholar who has committed a misdeed must not be reproached<sup>3</sup> publicly, for it is written, Therefore shalt thou stumble in the day, and the prophet also shall stumble with thee in the night,<sup>4</sup> that is to say, keep it dark,<sup>5</sup> like night.

Resh Lakish further said,<sup>6</sup> He who forgets one word of his study transgresses a negative precept, for it is written, [Only] take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things.<sup>7</sup> This being in accordance with the rule laid down by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a; for R. Abin said in the name of R. Ila'a, Wherever there occur in Holy Writ the expressions ‘take heed’,<sup>8</sup> ‘lest’, or ‘do not’, they are negative precepts. Rabina said, [He transgresses two negative precepts for] ‘take heed’ and ‘lest’ are two negative precepts. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, [He transgresses] three [negative precepts], for it is written, ‘[Only] take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things’. One might suppose that this is so even when he forgets it through no fault of his; the text therefore states, ‘And lest they depart from thy heart’:<sup>7</sup> Scripture thus speaks only of him who of set purpose puts them away from his heart. R. Doseithai son of

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

R. Jannai said, One might further suppose that this is so even when his study has been too hard for him; the text therefore states, Only.<sup>9</sup>

R. Johanan and R. Eleazar both said, The Torah was given in forty days and the soul is formed in forty days:<sup>10</sup> whosoever keeps the Torah his soul is kept, and whosoever does not keep the Torah his soul is not kept. A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: It is like the case of a man who entrusted a swallow to the care of his servant and said to him, 'Do you think that if you suffer it to perish I will take from you an issar<sup>11</sup> for its value? [No,] I will take your soul from you'.

*MISHNAH.* THERE WERE TWO TABLES INSIDE THE PORCH AT THE ENTRANCE OF THE HOUSE, THE ONE OF MARBLE<sup>12</sup> AND THE OTHER OF GOLD. ON THE TABLE OF MARBLE THEY LAID THE SHEWBREAD WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT IN, AND ON THE TABLE OF GOLD THEY LAID THE SHEWBREAD WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT OUT, SINCE WHAT IS HOLY WE MUST RAISE [IN HONOUR] BUT NOT BRING DOWN. AND WITHIN [THE SANCTUARY] WAS A TABLE OF GOLD WHEREON THE SHEWBREAD LAY CONTINUALLY.

FOUR PRIESTS ENTERED, TWO BEARING THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] IN THEIR HANDS AND TWO BEARING THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] IN THEIR HANDS; AND FOUR WENT IN BEFORE THEM, TWO TO TAKE AWAY THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] AND TWO TO TAKE AWAY THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE]. THOSE WHO BROUGHT THEM IN STOOD AT THE NORTH SIDE WITH THEIR FACES TO THE SOUTH, AND THOSE WHO TOOK THEM AWAY STOOD AT THE SOUTH SIDE WITH THEIR FACES TO THE NORTH.<sup>13</sup> THESE WITHDREW [THE OLD] AND THE OTHERS LAID DOWN [THE NEW], THE HANDBREADTH OF THE ONE BEING BY THE SIDE OF THE

HANDBREADTH OF THE OTHER,<sup>14</sup> FOR IT IS WRITTEN, BEFORE ME CONTINUALLY.<sup>15</sup>

R. JOSE SAYS, EVEN IF THESE [FIRST] TOOK AWAY [THE OLD] AND THE OTHERS LAID DOWN [THE NEW LATER ON], THIS TOO FULFILLS THE REQUIREMENT OF CONTINUALLY'. THEY WENT AND LAID [THE OLD BREAD] ON THE TABLE OF GOLD THAT WAS IN THE PORCH. THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] WERE THEN BURNT AND THE CAKES WERE DISTRIBUTED AMONG THE PRIESTS.<sup>16</sup> IF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ON A SABBATH THE CAKES WERE DISTRIBUTED IN THE EVENING.<sup>17</sup> IF IT FELL ON A FRIDAY THE HE-GOAT OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT<sup>18</sup> WAS CONSUMED IN THE EVENING.<sup>19</sup> THE BABYLONIAN [PRIESTS] USED TO EAT IT RAW FOR THEY WERE NOT FASTIDIOUS.<sup>20</sup>

*GEMARA:* It was taught: R. Jose says, Even if the old [Showbread] was taken away in the morning and the new was set down in the evening there is no harm. How then am I to explain the verse, 'Before me continually'? [It teaches that] the table should not remain overnight without bread. R. Ammi said, From these words of R. Jose<sup>21</sup> we learn that even though a man learns but one chapter in the morning and one chapter in the evening he has thereby fulfilled the precept of 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth'.<sup>22</sup>

R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, Even though a man but reads the Shema'<sup>23</sup> morning and evening he has thereby fulfilled the precept of '[This book of the law] shall not depart'. It is forbidden, however, to say this in the presence of 'amme ha-arez.<sup>24</sup> But Raba said, It is a meritorious act to say it in the presence of amme ha-arez.<sup>25</sup>

Ben Damah the son of R. Ishmael's sister once asked R. Ishmael, May one such as I who have studied the whole of the Torah

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

learn Greek wisdom?<sup>26</sup> He thereupon read to him the following verse, This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night.<sup>27</sup> Go then and find a time that is neither day nor night and learn then Greek wisdom. This, however, is at variance with the view of R. Samuel b. Nahmani. For R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan, This verse is neither duty nor command but a blessing. For when the Holy One, blessed be He, saw that the words of the Torah were most precious to Joshua, as it is written, His minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent,<sup>28</sup> He said to him, 'Joshua, since the words of the Torah are so precious to thee, [I assure thee,] 'this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth'!

A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: The words of the Torah should not be unto thee as a debt,<sup>29</sup> neither art thou at liberty to desist from it.<sup>30</sup> Hezekiah said, What is the meaning of the verse, Yea, He hath allured thee out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness?<sup>31</sup> Come and see that the manner of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that [of men] of flesh and blood. A man of flesh and blood allures another out of the ways of life into the ways of death;<sup>32</sup> but the Holy One, blessed be He, allures man out of the ways of death into the ways of life,<sup>33</sup> as it is written, 'Yea, He hath allured thee out of the mouth of straits', that is, out of Gehenna, whose mouth is narrow so that its smoke is stored up

(1) The interruption of the study of the Torah for the performance of a religious act, e.g., to attend a funeral, is sometimes the fulfillment of the Torah and brings with it a reward (Rashi).

(2) God thus expressed His approval of Moses' action. There is here a play upon the words אשר יישר (כחך) ששברת and שברת.

(3) In the par. passage M.K. 17a the reading is 'placed under the ban'.

(4) Hos. IV, 5.

(5) Lit., 'cover it up'.

(6) Cf. Aboth IV, 9 (10).

(7) Deut. IV, 9.

(8) Or 'observe', or 'keep'. These expressions are the various meanings of the Heb. root שמר.

(9) A term limiting the application of the rule to special cases.

(10) I.e., forty days after conception the soul is implanted in the embryo. In MS.M.: 'the soul is given in forty days'.

(11) V. Glos.

(12) V. supra p. 605 n. 7.

(13) The priests thus stood facing each other separated only by the breadth of the table, for the table stood lengthwise from east to west.

(14) I.e., the taking away of the old bread and the placing of the new were almost simultaneous.

(15) Ex. XXV, 30. The Showbread shall be before the Lord continually and at no time shall the table be without the bread.

(16) The cakes were shared out equally among the outgoing division of priests and the ingoing division, and were to be eaten during that day (i.e., on the Sabbath) and the night until midnight.

(17) I.e., at the conclusion of the Day of Atonement, and they could be eaten only during that night until midnight, for under no circumstances was the time for the eating extended.

(18) Num. XXIX, 11. This was the only offering (sc. the Musaf-offering) brought on the Day of Atonement whose flesh was consumed by the priests.

(19) After the fast and only until midnight. It was obviously eaten raw as it could not be cooked on the Sabbath.

(20) Lit., 'their minds (i.e. physical constitutions) were fine'.

(21) Who ruled that if the old Showbread was on the table for some time in the morning and the new for some time in the evening, that can be said to be 'continually'.

(22) Jos. I, 8.

(23) The passage commencing 'Hear, O Israel' (Deut. VI, 4ff).

(24) Plur. 'of 'am ha-arez, v. Glos. Such a pronouncement might deter the common people from educating their children in the study of the Torah, seeing that the Scriptural precept is fulfilled by the twice daily recital of the Shema'.

(25) For they would argue thus: if merely for the recital of the Shema' twice daily the reward is offered: 'Then thou shalt make thy ways prosperous and then thou shalt have good success' (Jos. ibid.), how great shall be the reward for those that devote their whole time to the study of the Torah!

(26) Probably the study of Greek philosophy. V. supra 64b p. 381, where an imprecation is

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

pronounced against those that learn Greek wisdom. V. Tosaf. l.c. s.v. ארר.

(27) Jos. *ibid.*

(28) Ex. XXXIII, 11.

(29) Which must be paid off, one's whole desire being to discharge the debt so as to be free from it.

(30) Cf. Ab. II, 16.

(31) Job. XXXVI, 16.

(32) Cf. Deut. XIII, 7 where the same expression is used of enticement into idolatry.

(33) I.e. — to the Torah which delivers from the fire of Gehenna.

## Menachoth 100a

within it.<sup>1</sup> And lest you say that as its mouth is narrow so the whole [of Gehenna] is narrow, the text therefore states, Deep and large.<sup>2</sup> And lest you say that it is not made ready for a king,<sup>3</sup> the text therefore states, Yea, for the king it is prepared.<sup>2</sup> And lest you say that there is no wood in it, the text therefore states, The pile thereof is fire and much wood.<sup>2</sup> And lest you say that this<sup>4</sup> is the sole reward [of the Torah], the text therefore states, And that which is set on thy table is full of fatness.<sup>5</sup>

IF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ON A SABBATH, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians they called [the Alexandrians] by the name of Babylonians.<sup>6</sup> It was likewise taught: R. Jose says, They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians they called [the Alexandrians] by the name of Babylonians. Said to him R. Judah, May your mind be at ease for you have set mine at ease.<sup>7</sup>

**MISHNAH.** IF [THE PRIEST] SET THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH, AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID,<sup>8</sup> AND ONE IS NOT LIABLE THEREBY FOR PIGGUL,<sup>9</sup> NOTHAR,<sup>10</sup> OR UNCLEANNES.<sup>10</sup> IF

HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID, AND ONE IS NOT LIABLE THEREBY FOR PIGGUL, NOTHAR, OR UNCLEANNES. IF HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID.<sup>11</sup> WHAT SHOULD HE DO? HE SHOULD LEAVE IT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING SABBATH,<sup>12</sup> FOR EVEN IF IT REMAINS MANY DAYS ON THE TABLE THERE IS NO HARM.

**GEMARA.** We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>13</sup> The officer said to them, 'Go forth and see if the time for slaughtering<sup>14</sup> has arrived' — If it had arrived he<sup>15</sup> that saw it called out, 'It is daylight',<sup>16</sup> Mattithiah b. Samuel<sup>17</sup> said, [He that saw it called out,] 'The whole east is alight'. 'As far as Hebron?'<sup>18</sup> and he answered, 'Yes'. And why was all this<sup>19</sup> necessary? Because once when the light of the moon arose they thought that the east was already alight and slaughtered the daily offering, and they had to take it away to the place of burning.

They<sup>20</sup> led the High Priest down to the place of immersion. This was the rule in the Temple: whosoever covered his feet<sup>21</sup> required an immersion, and whosoever made water required sanctification of hands and feet.<sup>22</sup> The father of R. Abin learnt:<sup>23</sup> Not only this<sup>24</sup> but also the burnt-offering of a bird whose head was nipped off at night and the meal-offering from which the handful was taken at night must be taken away to the place of burning. This is quite right with regard to the burnt-offering of a bird since [what is done] cannot be undone, but with regard to the meal-offering surely he can put back the handful in its place and take it again when it is day! —

He learnt it and he himself also gave the reason for it, namely, that vessels of ministry

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

hallow [what is put in them] even outside the proper time.<sup>25</sup> An objection was raised: Whatsoever is offered up by day<sup>26</sup> is hallowed by day, and whatsoever is offered up by night<sup>27</sup> is hallowed both by day and by night.<sup>28</sup> ‘Whatsoever is offered up by day is hallowed by day’, that is to say, by day only and not by night!<sup>29</sup> — It does not become hallowed [by night] so as to be permitted to be offered up, but it does become hallowed so that it can now become invalid.<sup>30</sup>

**R. Zera raised an objection: IF HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID. WHAT SHOULD HE DO? HE SHOULD LEAVE IT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING SABBATH, FOR EVEN IF IT REMAINS MANY DAYS ON THE TABLE THERE IS NO HARM. Now if you accept the view that vessels of ministry can hallow even outside the proper time, then it should become hallowed and also invalidated!<sup>31</sup> —**

Rabbah said, He who raised the objection, raised a valid one, but the father of R. Abin was quoting a Baraitha;<sup>32</sup> and we must say therefore that [the Tanna of that Baraitha] is of the opinion that the night is not considered ‘out of time’,<sup>33</sup> whereas the day is considered ‘out of time’.<sup>34</sup> But after all

- (1) In order that the wicked be tormented there with fire and smoke.
- (2) Isa. XXX, 33. The reference in the verse is to Gehenna.
- (3) I.e., a disciple who once devoted himself to the study of the Torah but has now forsaken it.
- (4) Deliverance from the fires of Gehenna, without further reward.
- (5) Job XXXVI, 16.
- (6) Using the name Babylonians as a term of abuse.
- (7) R. Judah was of Babylonian descent and therefore welcomed this interpretation of his colleague whereby his fellow-countrymen were cleared from the charge of gluttony.

(8) Since the frankincense had not been left for a full week, from Sabbath to Sabbath, on the table. Moreover it cannot be left until the next Sabbath (i.e., for thirteen days), for the bread would become invalid after the first Sabbath, since it had been set on the table at the proper time.

(9) If during the burning of the frankincense the priest intended to eat of the bread outside its prescribed time, it does not become Piggul (‘that which is refused or rejected’), and whosoever eats of it does not incur the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.), for the burning of the frankincense (i.e., the Mattir, v. Glos.) was not in order.

(10) Likewise the penalty of kareth is not incurred on the ground of Nothar, i.e., for eating the bread after the time prescribed for its eating has elapsed, or uncleanness, i.e., for eating the bread whilst in a state of uncleanness, for the bread was at no time rendered permitted to be eaten.

(11) For both the bread and the frankincense must remain on the table from one Sabbath to another Sabbath.

(12) For thirteen days in all. As neither the bread nor the frankincense is hallowed until the incidence of the first Sabbath, it may be left until the second Sabbath.

(13) Tam. III, 2; Yoma 27b, 28a.

(14) Sc. the daily morning sacrifice.

(15) He that went up on the roof to watch for the first light of the morning.

(16) בִּרְקָאֵי, morning brightness, from בִּרְקָ, lightning, shining light.

(17) He was one of the Temple officers, v. Shek. V, 1.

(18) Called out those that were down below in the Temple.

(19) To go up on the roof and keep watch for the first light of day.

(20) This part of the Mishnah continues the account of the service on the Day of Atonement.

(21) A euphemism for ‘relieving oneself’.

(22) By washing them in the laver that was in the Temple; for further notes, v. Yoma, Sonc. ed., p. 131.

(23) This entire passage is also found in Yoma 29a.

(24) That the daily offering if slaughtered at night is to be burnt.

(25) And once the handful has been taken and put into a vessel of ministry it may not be put back and mixed with the remainder of the meal-offering.

(26) All animal-offerings.

(27) E.g. drink-offerings.

(28) The text adopted here is in accord with Sh. Mek. and several MSS.; Cur. edd. insert ‘and whatsoever is offered up during the night is hallowed by night, and whatsoever is offered up

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

both by day and by night is hallowed both by day and by night'.

(29) Thus proving that vessels of ministry hallow only in the proper time.

(30) If, e.g., it was touched by a person lacking the atonement offering for the completion of his purification, or it was taken out of the Temple precincts, or it was kept overnight. Accordingly it cannot be put back with the remainder of the meal-offering.

(31) The bread and frankincense should be hallowed by the table even when set thereon on a Sunday, and therefore after a full week, i.e., after midnight of the next Sunday, they should become invalid. How then can it be suggested that it be left for thirteen days?

(32) So that a way must be found to reconcile the present argument with it.

(33) For with regard to holy things the night following the day is included in, and is part of, the day, accordingly vessels of ministry can hallow by night as well as by day, save that the offering up may not be performed by night.

(34) That which is a day too soon or a day too late is certainly out of time, and the vessel of ministry cannot hallow it. In our Mishnah, therefore, where the bread and frankincense are set on the table six days too soon, they certainly cannot be hallowed then by the table. Only when the Sabbath arrives do they become hallowed and so may be kept for a full week thereafter.

## Menachoth 100b

when Sabbath eve<sup>1</sup> approaches let it then become hallowed and also invalidated!<sup>2</sup> — Rabab<sup>3</sup> said, We must assume that he had removed it before then.<sup>4</sup> Mar Zutra, or as some say, R. Ashi said, You may even assume that he had not removed it before then, since, however, he had set it down not in accordance with its prescribed rites<sup>5</sup> it is as though a monkey had set it.<sup>6</sup>

**MISHNAH.** THE TWO LOAVES WERE EATEN NEVER EARLIER THAN ON THE SECOND DAY<sup>7</sup> AND NEVER LATER THAN ON THE THIRD DAY. HOW IS THIS EXPLAINED? [NORMALLY] THEY WERE BAKED ON THE DAY BEFORE THE FESTIVAL<sup>8</sup> AND EATEN ON THE FESTIVAL, THAT IS, ON THE SECOND DAY. IF THE FESTIVAL FELL ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH,<sup>9</sup> THEY

WOULD BE EATEN ON THE THIRD DAY. THE SHEWBREAD WAS EATEN NEVER EARLIER THAN ON THE NINTH DAY AND NEVER LATER THAN ON THE ELEVENTH DAY. HOW IS THIS EXPLAINED? [NORMALLY] IT WAS BAKED ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH AND EATEN ON THE SABBATH [OF THE FOLLOWING WEEK], THAT IS ON THE NINTH DAY. IF A FESTIVAL FELL ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH,<sup>10</sup> IT WOULD THEN BE EATEN ON THE TENTH DAY. IF THE TWO DAYS OF THE NEW YEAR [FELL BEFORE THE SABBATH],<sup>11</sup> IT WOULD THEN BE EATEN ON THE ELEVENTH DAY. [THE BAKING] OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR THE FESTIVAL. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAYS IN THE NAME OF R. SIMEON, SON OF THE DEPUTY [HIGH PRIEST], IT OVERRIDES THE FESTIVAL BUT NOT THE FAST-DAY.<sup>12</sup>

**GEMARA.** Rabina said, According to him who rules that offerings in fulfillment of a vow and freewill-offerings may not be offered on a Festival,<sup>13</sup> you should not say that Biblically they are allowed [to be offered] but the Rabbis forbade them only as a precautionary measure lest one defer [those offerings until the Festival],<sup>14</sup> but even Biblically they are not allowed [to be offered]; for the Two Loaves are obligatory for that day,<sup>15</sup> so that there is no reason to apprehend lest one defer [them until the Festival],<sup>16</sup> yet [our Mishnah] states: [THE BAKING] OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR THE FESTIVAL.

## CHAPTER XII

**MISHNAH.** IF MEAL-OFFERINGS AND DRINK-OFFERINGS BECAME UNCLEAN BEFORE THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY]. THEY MAY BE REDEEMED;<sup>17</sup> IF [THEY BECAME UNCLEAN] AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL, THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED. BIRD-OFFERINGS, THE WOOD, THE

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

FRANKINCENSE, AND THE VESSELS OF MINISTRY,<sup>18</sup> MAY NOT BE REDEEMED, FOR THE RULE OF REDEMPTION APPLIES ONLY TO [OFFERINGS OF] CATTLE.

**GEMARA.** Samuel said, Even though they<sup>19</sup> are clean they may be redeemed, for so long as they have not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry they are holy only as to their value, and whatsoever is holy as to its value may be redeemed. But have we not learnt [in our Mishnah] **BECAME UNCLEAN?** — The rule is the same even though they were not unclean, but because the Tanna wished to state the next clause, **AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED,** in which case even though they were unclean they still may not be redeemed, he therefore stated in the first clause, **BECAME UNCLEAN. IF [THEY BECAME UNCLEAN] AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL, THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED.**<sup>20</sup> But this is obvious, for they are holy in themselves! — It was necessary to be stated, for I might have argued that since what is blemished is described as unclean, then surely what is unclean should be like that which is blemished; and therefore as that which has become blemished may be redeemed even though it was holy in itself, so this too may be redeemed; we are therefore taught that the Divine Law did not describe what is blemished as unclean in that sense,<sup>21</sup>

(1) Lit., ‘the night of the twilight (of the Sabbath eve)’, i.e. Friday night.

(2) Since the night is considered ‘in time’ as on the day itself, then the bread and the frankincense should become hallowed on the Friday night, and after seven full days, i.e., on the Sabbath morning after the second Friday night, the bread should become invalid. According to our Mishnah, however, the bread may be eaten the whole of the second Sabbath day until midnight!

(3) In MS.M. and in the parallel passage in Yoma: ‘Rabina’.

(4) The priest had removed the bread and the frankincense on the Friday just before the Sabbath set in and had replaced it at its proper time on the Sabbath.

(5) For it is out of time, being set down six days too soon.

(6) Hence the table will not hallow it as soon as the Sabbath eve approaches neither will the Sabbath day itself hallow it, but the priest will have to enter on the morrow, remove it and replace it anew, and only then will the table hallow it. Where, however, the handful was taken from the meal-offering at night and put into a vessel of ministry, since night is not considered ‘out of time’, the vessel will hallow it; v. Yoma (Sonc. ed.) p. 138 and notes.

(7) After the baking.

(8) The Feast of Weeks or Pentecost.

(9) The Two Loaves would then be baked on the Friday, since the baking does not override the Sabbath.

(10) The Showbread would then be baked before the Festival, on Thursday.

(11) It would then be baked on Wednesday. The Festival of the New Year was generally kept two days, even in Palestine. V. R.H. 30b.

(12) The Day of Atonement. Where the Day of Atonement fell on a Friday the Showbread was then baked on a Thursday.

(13) V. Bez. 20b.

(14) One would thus be accumulating work specially for the Festival; moreover the owner may be prevented by some unforeseen circumstance from offering them on the Festival and will then have failed in the fulfillment of his obligations.

(15) Sc. the Feast of Weeks.

(16) For they can in no wise be brought before the prescribed day.

(17) For an offering so long as it has not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry is holy only for its value, *קדושת דמים* and may be redeemed; once it has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry it becomes holy in itself, *קדושת הגוף*, and may not be redeemed.

(18) So all MS.S. Cur. edd. add: After they have become unclean.

(19) Sc. meal-offerings and drink-offerings.

(20) So according to MS.M., Sh. Mek. and Z.K. This is a new passage introduced by a separate Mishnah heading.

(21) I.e., unclean after having been hallowed in a vessel of ministry.

## Menachoth 101a

for we do not find any case in which what has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry may be redeemed.<sup>1</sup> Where do we find what is blemished described as unclean? — It has

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

been taught: And if it be any unclean beast, of which they may not bring an offering unto the Lord:<sup>2</sup> this verse speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed. You say it speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed; perhaps it is not so, but actually it speaks of an unclean beast. When the verse says, And if it be of an unclean beast, then he shall redeem it according to thy valuation,<sup>3</sup> the unclean beast is already spoken of; what then am I to make of the verse, ‘And if it be any unclean beast’? The verse clearly speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed. I might suppose that they may be redeemed even though they have but a passing blemish; the text therefore states, ‘Of which they may not bring an offering unto the Lord’, [referring clearly to] such animals as may at no time be brought as an offering unto the Lord, but one must exclude from this verse animals which may not be brought to-day but which may be brought to-morrow.<sup>4</sup>

R. Huna b. Manoah raised an objection: BIRD-OFFERINGS, THE WOOD, THE FRANKINCENSE, AND THE VESSELS OF MINISTRY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED, FOR THE RULE OF REDEMPTION APPLIES ONLY TO [OFFERINGS OF] CATTLE. Now this is quite right with regard to bird-offerings, for they are holy in themselves, and the rule [of redemption] applies only to [offerings of] cattle; but why may not the wood,<sup>5</sup> the frankincenses and the vessels of ministry<sup>6</sup> be redeemed? It must be because the others<sup>7</sup> if still clean may not be redeemed,<sup>8</sup> and these<sup>9</sup> even though unclean are regarded as clean. For<sup>10</sup> wood and frankincense are no foodstuffs but are placed in the category of foodstuffs only by reason of sacred esteem.<sup>11</sup> Accordingly wood, so long as it has not been cut up into chips.<sup>12</sup> is not predisposed [to uncleanness]; and frankincense, so long as it has not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry, is similarly not predisposed [to uncleanness]; and as regards vessels of ministry, since they can be

made clean by immersion in a mikweh,<sup>13</sup> [they are not regarded as unclean]! — No, I still maintain that the others even though clean may be redeemed, but these [may not be redeemed even when unclean] because they are scarce.<sup>14</sup> I grant you that frankincense and vessels of ministry are scarce, but surely wood is not scarce! — Even wood is scarce, in view of a Master's ruling that wood in which a worm is found is unfit for the altar.<sup>15</sup>

R. Papa said, Had Samuel heard of the following [Baraitha] which was taught: ‘If a man consecrated unblemished animals for the Temple treasury, they may be redeemed only for the altar,<sup>16</sup> since what is fit for the altar can never be released from the altar’,<sup>17</sup> he would have retracted [his statement].<sup>18</sup> But it is not so; [in fact] he had heard of [that Baraitha] and yet did not retract his statement. For did you not say above that because they<sup>19</sup> were scarce they may not be redeemed? Then in this case too, since blemishes which disqualify cattle are of frequent occurrence, for even a skin over the eye disqualifies, they<sup>20</sup> are undoubtedly scarce.

R. Kahana said, [If they<sup>21</sup> became] unclean they may be redeemed, but [if they are] clean they may not be redeemed. And so said R. Oshaia, [If they became] unclean they may be redeemed, [but if they are] clean they may not be redeemed. Some there are who say that R. Oshaia said, Even though [they are] clean they may be redeemed. R. Eleazar says. All [meal-offerings] may be redeemed if [they have become] unclean, and if [they are] clean they may not be redeemed, excepting the tenth part of an ephah of the sinner's meal-offering,<sup>22</sup> since the Torah has stated [in the one case] from his sin<sup>23</sup> and [in the other] for his sin.<sup>24</sup>

R. Oshaia said, I have heard that if a meal-offering was made piggul<sup>25</sup> it does not, according to R. Simeon,<sup>26</sup> convey food

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

uncleanness. For it has been taught:<sup>27</sup>  
'Orlah,<sup>28</sup> diverse kinds of the vineyard,<sup>29</sup>

- (1) For even an animal-offering, once it has been hallowed by a vessel of ministry, i.e., slaughtered, can in no wise be redeemed.
- (2) Lev. XXVII, 11.
- (3) Ibid. 27.
- (4) When the blemish will have passed away.
- (5) Which became unclean before it was hallowed in a vessel of ministry.
- (6) Which became unclean.
- (7) Meal-offerings and drink-offerings.
- (8) Thus in conflict with Samuel's statement supra p. 617.
- (9) Wood, frankincense and vessels of ministry.
- (10) This sentence is omitted in MS.M. and other MSS., and is also deleted by Sh. Mek.
- (11) The honor in which sacred things are held makes them fit to contract uncleanness even though according to ordinary standards they cannot contract uncleanness. V. Pes. 35a; Hul. 36b.
- (12) And so fit to be used on the altar.
- (13) V. Glos.
- (14) And if they could be redeemed there might not be left sufficient for the Temple requirements.
- (15) Supra 85b.
- (16) I.e., they are to be sold for an offering.
- (17) Cur. edd. add here: 'For though they are consecrated for their value only they may not be redeemed, since they are clean'. This is an obvious gloss, and is not found in MS.M. nor in other MSS. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.
- (18) That meal-offerings and drink-offerings may be redeemed even though they are still clean; v. supra p. 617.
- (19) Wood fit for the altar, frankincense, and vessels of ministry.
- (20) Animals free from all blemishes and so fit for the altar.
- (21) Meal-offerings and drink-offerings.
- (22) This may be redeemed even though still clean. According to R. Gershom: it may not be redeemed at all even though unclean.
- (23) Lev. V, 6, 10.
- (24) Ibid. 13. For the offences enumerated in Lev. V, 1-4 a rich man must bring for a sin-offering a she-lamb or a she-goat, a poor man two doves, and one in extreme poverty a meal-offering. But it is to be observed that concerning the first two Scripture uses the expression, **וּכְפַר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן הַשָּׂאֵרִי** And the priest shall make atonement for him from his sin, whilst concerning the latter Scripture says, **עַל הַשָּׂאֵרִי** And the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin. From these variations of expression the Rabbis derived the law that if a rich man sinned and set apart money for his animal-offering and then became poor, he

has only to bring doves or a meal-offering from a part of the money set aside (i.e., **מִהַטְּאֵרֵוֹ** from the money set apart for his sin) and the remainder he may retain for himself. And on the other hand, if a poor man sinned and set apart money for his meal-offering and then became rich, he must add to the money set aside (i.e., **עַל הַשָּׂאֵרִי** for, in addition to, the money set apart for his sin), and bring the offering prescribed for a rich man, or if he brought a tenth of flour for his meal-offering, he must redeem it and add money to it in order to acquire a bird-offering or an animal-offering. Thus we see that this meal-offering is redeemed even though clean.

(25) E.g., while taking out the handful the priest expressed the intention of burning the handful or of eating the remainder outside the prescribed time.

(26) Who holds that whatsoever is forbidden for any kind of use cannot convey food-uncleanness.

(27) So MS.M.; cur. edd.: 'We have learnt'. It is not found, however, in the Mishnah, but in Tosef. 'Uk. III and Bek. 9b.

(28) V. Glos. This and all the others enumerated are forbidden for any kind of use.

(29) V. Deut. XXII, 9.

## Menachoth 101b

an ox condemned to be stoned,<sup>1</sup> the heifer whose neck was to be broken,<sup>2</sup> the birds of the leper,<sup>3</sup> the firstling of an ass,<sup>4</sup> and meat cooked in milk<sup>5</sup> — all these convey food-uncleanness.<sup>6</sup>

R. Simeon says, All these do not convey food-uncleanness. R. Simeon, however, agrees that meat cooked in milk conveys food-uncleanness, for there was a time when it was permitted.<sup>7</sup> And R. Assi had said in the name of R. Johanan, What is the reason for R. Simeon's view? [Because it is written], All food therein which may be eaten;<sup>8</sup> [therefore], food which you may give others<sup>9</sup> to eat is termed food,<sup>10</sup> but food which you may not give others to eat<sup>11</sup> is not termed food. And the meal-offering which was made Piggul is also a food which you may not give others to eat.<sup>12</sup> If that is so,<sup>13</sup> then meat cooked in milk [should convey food-uncleanness] by virtue of the fact that it is a food which you may give others to eat!<sup>14</sup>

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

For it has been taught:<sup>15</sup> R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, Meat cooked in milk is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use, for it is written, For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk;<sup>16</sup> whilst elsewhere it is written, And ye shall be holy men unto Me; therefore ye shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field; [ye shall cast it to the dogs].<sup>17</sup> Just as there it is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use,<sup>18</sup> so here too it is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use! — He gave one reason and yet another. For one thing it<sup>19</sup> is a food which you may give others to eat,<sup>20</sup> and besides even for [the Israelite] himself there was a time when it was permitted.<sup>21</sup>

An objection was raised [from the following]: R. Simeon says, There is nothar<sup>22</sup> which conveys food-uncleanness and there is also Nothar which does not convey food-uncleanness. Thus if [the flesh of the offering] had remained overnight before the sprinkling of the blood, it does not convey food-uncleanness;<sup>23</sup> but if [it had remained overnight] after the sprinkling of the blood,<sup>24</sup> it conveys food-uncleanness. And an offering that had been made Piggul, be it of the most holy or of the less holy offerings, does not convey food-uncleanness. But a meal-offering that had been made Piggul conveys food-uncleanness!<sup>25</sup> — This is no difficulty, for in the one case there was a time when it had been permitted,<sup>26</sup> whilst in the other<sup>27</sup> there was no time when it had been permitted. How is it that there was no time when it had been permitted? — Where [the grain] had been consecrated [for a meal-offering] while it was still growing. But one could have redeemed it!<sup>28</sup>

This of course presents no difficulty according to that version which gives R. Oshaia's view thus: If they became unclean they may be redeemed, but if they are clean they may not be redeemed. But according to

the other version which gives as his view: Even though they are clean they may be redeemed, [then the question will be asked here,] one could have redeemed it! —

[That is so but] the fact is that it had not been redeemed. But if one so desired one could have redeemed it, and we have heard R. Simeon say that whatsoever stands to be redeemed is as though it were redeemed. For it was taught:<sup>29</sup> The [Red] Cow<sup>30</sup> conveys food-uncleanness, since there was a time when it was permitted [to be eaten]. And Resh Lakish observed that R. Simeon used to say that the Red Cow could be redeemed even on its woodpile!<sup>31</sup> —

There is no comparison at all. The Red Cow can rightly be regarded as ready to be redeemed, for if another cow finer than this one is obtainable, it is a meritorious act to redeem it; but as regards meal-offerings, is there any meritorious act to redeem [what has been consecrated for a meal-offering]?<sup>32</sup> But in the case where [a portion of the sacrifice] had remained overnight before the sprinkling [of the blood], there was a duty to sprinkle the blood, and if one so desired one could have sprinkled it, nevertheless the [Baraitha] states that it does not convey food-uncleanness!<sup>33</sup> —

We must assume that there was no time left during the day for the sprinkling [of the blood].<sup>34</sup> Then what would be the position where there was sufficient time left in the day [for the sprinkling]? It would convey food-uncleanness! If so, instead of teaching, 'If [it remained overnight] after the sprinkling [of the blood] it conveys food-uncleanness', [the Tanna] should have drawn a distinction in the very case itself<sup>35</sup> in the following terms: This<sup>36</sup> applies only where no time was left during the day [for the sprinkling of the blood], but if there was sufficient time left in the day [for the sprinkling] it conveys food-uncleanness!<sup>37</sup> —

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

That is just what [the Tanna] meant to teach: If [the portion of the sacrifice] had remained overnight before [the blood] was ready for the sprinkling,<sup>38</sup> it does not convey food-uncleanness; but if after [the blood] was ready for the sprinkling, it conveys food-uncleanness.<sup>39</sup> But in the case where an offering, either of the most holy or of the less holy kind, had been made Piggul, there was a duty to sprinkle [the blood in the proper manner],<sup>40</sup>

- (1) V. Ex. XXI, 28. The ox had been slaughtered after it had been condemned to be stoned for killing a human being.
- (2) V. Deut. XXI, 1ff. The heifer was slaughtered after it had been brought down to the rough valley, and as soon as it was brought down there it became forbidden for all purposes.
- (3) Which had been slaughtered. V. Lev. XIV, 4.
- (4) Which had been slaughtered for a gentile but was not quite dead yet; v. Hul. 117b, Sonc. ed., p. 648, n. 5. The firstling of an ass is before redemption forbidden for all purposes. V. Ex. XXXIV, 20.
- (5) It is assumed for the present that this is also forbidden for all purposes. V. infra.
- (6) If they had been rendered unclean, e.g. by a reptile, they can convey uncleanness to other foodstuffs by contact.
- (7) For before the meat had been cooked in the milk, although it had been left to soak therein, both the meat and the milk were permitted to be eaten.
- (8) Lev. XI, 34.
- (9) Sc. gentiles.
- (10) And conveys food-uncleanness.
- (11) And what is forbidden for all uses may not be given away even to gentiles.
- (12) For it must be burnt.
- (13) That R. Simeon derives his view from the exposition of the verse quoted, and therefore what is permitted for use conveys food-uncleanness.
- (14) I.e., according to R. Simeon.
- (15) V. Hul. 116a.
- (16) Deut. XIV, 21.
- (17) Ex. XXII, 30.
- (18) Since it may be cast to the dogs. And as it is one's duty to provide for one's animals this is accounted as a benefit.
- (19) Sc. meat cooked in milk.
- (20) And for that reason alone it conveys food-uncleanness.
- (21) V. supra p. 621, n. 10. On the other hand, the other forbidden things enumerated were at no time permitted to be eaten, since a living animal is

deemed to be forbidden until it has been ritually slaughtered.

(22) I.e., 'that which remained'; the portion of a sacrifice that had not been eaten or sacrificed upon the altar within the time prescribed. It may not be eaten or put to any kind of use, but must be burnt.

(23) In this case the flesh of the sacrifice had never been permitted to be eaten, hence it is not regarded as a foodstuff.

(24) Accordingly the flesh was permitted to be eaten the same day after the sprinkling of the blood until midnight.

(25) This last ruling is contrary to R. Oshaia's ruling supra p. 620.

(26) The flour of the meal-offering had been permitted for food before it had been consecrated for the meal-offering, hence even though it is now Piggul it still conveys food-uncleanness. This is the case dealt with by the Baraitha quoted.

(27) That dealt with by R. Oshaia.

(28) Accordingly there would have been a time when it was permitted for food.

(29) V. Hul., Sonc. ed., pp. 455-6.

(30) Even though it is forbidden for all purposes.

(31) I.e., even after it had been slaughtered upon the specially erected woodpile and is ready for burning it may be redeemed if a finer animal is obtainable.

(32) Of course not. Therefore it is not regarded as already redeemed.

(33) Obviously we do not accept the principle that whatever is in the condition ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled.

(34) I.e., the sacrifice was slaughtered almost at sunset, so that the blood could not possibly have been sprinkled in the proper time; accordingly the flesh was never permitted as food.

(35) Viz., where it had remained overnight before the sprinkling.

(36) That the sacrificial portion which remained overnight does not convey food-uncleanness.

(37) And it goes without saying that if it remained overnight after the sprinkling it conveys food-uncleanness.

(38) I.e., there was no time left in the day for the sprinkling.

(39) As there was time left in the day for the sprinkling it is regarded as already sprinkled; accordingly the flesh is considered as having been in the permitted state, and therefore conveys food-uncleanness.

(40) I.e., free from any intention that makes the offering Piggul.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

## Menachoth 102a

and if one so desired one could have sprinkled it properly, nevertheless [the Baraita] states that it does not convey food-uncleanness. Now presumably the Piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling!<sup>1</sup> — No, the Piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering.<sup>2</sup> Then what would be his ruling where the Piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling? It would, as suggested, convey food-uncleanness. If so, instead of teaching ‘A meal-offering that had been made Piggul conveys food-uncleanness, [the Tanna] should have drawn a distinction in [the case of the animal-offering] itself in these terms: This<sup>3</sup> applies only where the Piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering, but if the Piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling it conveys food-uncleanness! It was necessary [for the Tanna] to teach the case of the meal-offering that had been made Piggul; for notwithstanding that the Piggul-intention was expressed at the time of the taking of the handful, and the taking of the handful in the meal-offering corresponds to the slaughtering [in the animal-offering],<sup>4</sup> nevertheless the meal-offering conveys food-uncleanness, since there was a time when it was permitted in the beginning.<sup>5</sup>

R. Ashi said, I stated this argument before R. Nahman [and he said to me,] You may even say that the expression, ‘if it had remained overnight [before the sprinkling]’ shall be taken in the ordinary sense;<sup>6</sup> and, moreover, you may say that the Piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling,<sup>7</sup> [and there is no difficulty at all],<sup>8</sup> for whilst we accept the principle ‘If he so desired he could have redeemed it’,<sup>9</sup> we do not accept the principle ‘If he so desired he could have sprinkled it’.<sup>10</sup>

An objection was raised [from the following]:<sup>11</sup> R. Joshua laid down this general rule: Whatsoever had a period of permissibility to the priests is not subject to

the law of sacrilege,<sup>12</sup> and whatsoever had no period of permissibility to the priests is subject to the law of sacrilege. What is that which had a period of permissibility to the priests? That which remained overnight or became unclean or was taken out [of the Sanctuary].<sup>13</sup> And what is that which had no period of permissibility to the priests? Offerings that were slaughtered [while the intention was expressed of eating of the flesh thereof] outside the proper time or outside the proper place, or whose blood was received or sprinkled by those that were unfit.<sup>14</sup> It says here in the first part: ‘That which remained overnight or became unclean or was taken out’. Now this means, does it not, that it actually remained overnight,<sup>15</sup> and [yet it is considered as having had a period of permissibility to the priests by virtue of the fact that] here if one so desired one could have sprinkled the blood,<sup>16</sup> and [therefore] it states that it is not subject to the law of sacrilege? —

No, it means that it is ready [to become disqualified] if taken out or made unclean.<sup>17</sup> But what would be the position where it had actually remained overnight?<sup>15</sup> It would be subject to the law of sacrilege, would it not?<sup>18</sup> Then instead of saying, ‘Whatsoever had a period of permissibility to the priests’ and ‘Whatsoever had no period of permissibility to the priests’ [the Tanna] should have said, ‘Whatsoever had been permissible to the priests is not subject to the law of sacrilege, and whatsoever had not been permissible to the priests is subject to the law of sacrilege!’<sup>19</sup>—

The fact is, answered R. Ashi, that one cannot point out a contradiction between the ruling concerning the law of sacrilege and that concerning uncleanness. The law of sacrilege applies only to that which is holy and not to that which is not holy;<sup>20</sup> therefore once the holiness has departed<sup>21</sup> how can it revert? On the other hand, food-uncleanness applies only to that which is a foodstuff and

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

not to that which is not a foodstuff; therefore where the blood has been sprinkled [the flesh of the offering] has thereby become a foodstuff and so conveys food-uncleanness, but where the blood has not been sprinkled<sup>22</sup> [the flesh of the offering] has not become a foodstuff and so does not convey food-uncleanness.<sup>23</sup> An objection was raised [from the following]:<sup>24</sup> If a man brought a suspensive guilt-offering<sup>25</sup> and it became known to him that he had not sinned, if the animal was not yet slaughtered it may go forth and pasture among the flock.<sup>26</sup> This is the opinion of R. Meir. The Sages say

(1) Before the sprinkling, however, the offering was still valid, and the blood was then ready to be sprinkled in the proper manner; the flesh therefore should convey food-uncleanness. As the Tanna does not rule so we are forced to the conclusion that whatever is ready for sprinkling is not considered as already sprinkled.

(2) So that there was never a time when the offering was in a permitted state.

(3) That an offering which had been made Piggul does not convey food-uncleanness.

(4) Cf. supra 13b. And it has been stated that where the Piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering the flesh does not convey food-uncleanness.

(5) Before it was consecrated.

(6) Not as suggested above that 'before the sprinkling' meant that there was no time during the day for the sprinkling and 'after the sprinkling' that there was time in the day for the sprinkling, but the former expression means that the sprinkling had not actually taken place and the latter that it had actually taken place.

(7) Nevertheless the flesh of the offering does not convey food-uncleanness.

(8) In the apparent contradiction between the views of R. Simeon; for with regard to the Red Cow he applies the principle 'Whatsoever stands to be redeemed is considered as redeemed', yet with regard to the offering conveying food-uncleanness he does not apply the similar principle 'Whatsoever stands to be sprinkled is considered as sprinkled'.

(9) For the redemption can be accomplished by word of mouth, and therefore even though not yet redeemed it is considered as already redeemed.

(10) For so long as the act of sprinkling has not been performed, the fact that it can be sprinkled if so desired does not cause it to be regarded as already sprinkled.

(11) Me'il. 2a.

(12) I.e., the misappropriation of the property of the Temple, for which a guilt-offering is prescribed. Cf. Lev. V, 15f. That which had at some time been permitted to the priests, even though it is now no longer permitted, is not regarded as 'the holy things of the Lord' (ibid.), and the law of sacrilege does not apply to it.

(13) In these three cases the flesh had been permissible at some time, i.e., before it had been kept overnight or before it had become unclean or before it had been taken out.

(14) V. Zeb. 15b. In these cases the flesh of the offering had at no time been permissible since the offering was never valid.

(15) I.e., both the flesh and the blood of the offering had remained overnight, for the blood had not yet been sprinkled.

(16) And whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled; thus contrary to R. Nahman and R. Ashi.

(17) I.e., the blood has already been sprinkled, so that the flesh is perfectly valid now but may yet be rendered invalid if taken outside the Sanctuary or made unclean. This is Rashi's first interpretation, according to which the words *וּרְאוּיָהּ לְלִיךְ* are to be omitted from the text. They are deleted by Sh. Mek. V., however, Rashi's second interpretation and Tosaf. s.v. *לָא*.

(18) Since we do not accept the principle that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled.

(19) The expression 'a period of permissibility' signifies a potential permissibility; i.e., there was the possibility of the offering becoming permissible if only the blood had been sprinkled, though in fact the blood had not been sprinkled and so the flesh had not become permissible. Since, however, it is now assumed that the blood had actually been sprinkled, so that the flesh had in fact become permissible to the priests, the Tanna should have used the expression, 'Whatsoever had been permissible'. This last expression does not preclude the fact that the flesh is now no longer permissible to the priests for it has remained overnight; accordingly the difficulty raised by Tosaf. is disposed of. This interpretation follows the suggestion of R. Samuel Strashun, namely, that the question in the Gemara involves merely the omission of the word *שְׁמֵהּ* from the rule stated by the Tanna.

(20) Lit., 'is on account of the holiness or non-holiness (of the offering)'.

(21) As soon as the blood is ready to be sprinkled the holiness of the flesh of the offering is gone, since the principle is well-established that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled. Cf. B.K. 76b.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(22) Even though the blood was ready to be sprinkled.

(23) The text of this last sentence in cur. edd. is profuse and redundant; the reading adopted is that of MS.M. and Sh. Mek.

(24) Ker. 23b.

(25) Heb. אָשָׁם תְּלוּי. The guilt-offering brought by a person who is in doubt whether he has committed an act which must be atoned for by a sin-offering. This sacrifice is therefore merely suspensive until the doubt will be settled and the person will know whether he must bring a sin-offering or not.

(26) The animal is deemed to be non-holy and may join the flock.

## Menachoth 102b

it must be left to pasture until it becomes blemished, when it shall be sold and its money spent on a freewill-offering. R. Eliezer says, It should be offered, for if it was not offered for this sin it can be taken as offered for some other sin.<sup>1</sup> If it became known to him [that he had not sinned] only after it was slaughtered, the blood must be poured out and the flesh burnt.<sup>2</sup> If the blood had already been sprinkled, the flesh may be eaten.<sup>3</sup> R. Jose says, Even if the blood was still in the basin, it should be sprinkled and the flesh eaten. And Raba had said that R. Jose adopted the principle stated by R. Simeon that whatsoever stands to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled!<sup>4</sup> — Is that [indeed] the reason [for R. Jose's view]? [No]. In the West<sup>5</sup> it was said in the name of R. Jose b. Hanina that this is the reason for R. Jose's view: Vessels of ministry hallow what is invalid<sup>6</sup> so that it may be offered up in the first instance.

Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana: Since R. Simeon holds that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled, then similarly [he holds that] whatsoever is ready to be burnt is considered as already burnt, consequently why should nothar<sup>7</sup> and the Red Cow convey food-uncleanness? They are but ashes,<sup>8</sup> are they not? — He replied, Sacred esteem renders them fit [to convey uncleanness].

Thereupon Rabina said to R. Ashi, I grant you that sacred esteem can have the effect of rendering the object itself invalid, but can it have the effect of rendering the object unclean so that it should transmit uncleanness up to the first and second degrees?<sup>9</sup> [For in that case] you could solve the question raised by Resh Lakish:<sup>10</sup> [If] the dry portion of a meal-offering<sup>11</sup> [becomes unclean], does it transmit uncleanness up to the first and second degrees or not? — Resh Lakish's question was [whether it was so] by the law of the Torah <sup>12</sup> whereas we are speaking of [the uncleanness imposed] by the Rabbis.<sup>13</sup>

*MISHNAH.* IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED] ON A GRIDDLE', AND HE BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A PAN, OR 'A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED IN A PAN', AND HE BROUGHT ONE PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT HE HAS BROUGHT,<sup>14</sup> BUT HE HAS NOT DISCHARGED THE OBLIGATION OF HIS VOW. BUT [IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF] TO BRING THIS [MEAL] AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE', AND HE BROUGHT IT PREPARED IN A PAN; OR AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED IN A PAN', AND HE BROUGHT IT PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, IT IS INVALID.<sup>15</sup>

IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN ONE VESSEL, AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS, OR IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT HE HAS BROUGHT, BUT HE HAS NOT DISCHARGED THE OBLIGATION OF HIS VOW. BUT [IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING] THESE [TWO TENTHS] IN ONE VESSEL', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS, OR IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, THEY ARE INVALID.<sup>16</sup>

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN ONE VESSEL' AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS, AND WHEN THEY SAID TO HIM, THOU DIDST VOW TO BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL', HE STILL OFFERED THEM IN TWO VESSELS, THEY ARE INVALID;<sup>17</sup> BUT IF HE THEREUPON OFFERED THEM IN ONE VESSEL THEY ARE VALID.

IF HE SAID I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, AND WHEN THEY SAID TO HIM, 'THOU DIDST VOW TO BRING THEM IN TWO VESSELS', HE THEREUPON OFFERED THEM IN TWO VESSELS THEY ARE VALID; BUT IF HE STILL KEPT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, THEY ARE RECKONED AS TWO MEAL-OFFERINGS WHICH HAVE BEEN MIXED.<sup>18</sup>

*GEMARA.* All the cases indeed had to be stated. For if the Tanna had only taught us the first cases<sup>19</sup> we should have said that the reason [why he has not fulfilled his obligation] was that he had promised a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and brought one prepared in a pan, but in the other cases,<sup>20</sup> where both<sup>21</sup> were meal-offerings prepared on a griddle or both were meal-offerings prepared in a pan, we should have said that he has even discharged the obligation of his vow; [hence those other cases were necessary to be stated]. And if he had only stated those cases we should have said that the reason for the ruling was that he had divided up the meal-offering, but in the former cases, where he had not divided up the meal-offering, we should have said that it was not so; therefore all the cases were necessary [to be stated].

Our Rabbis taught: What he has brought he has brought, but he has not discharged the obligation of his vow. R. Simeon says, He has even discharged the obligation of his vow.

TO BRING THIS [MEAL] AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE. But it has been taught: The vessels of ministry have not hallowed them!<sup>22</sup> — Abaye answered, They have not hallowed them to that extent that they may be offered [upon the altar], but they have hallowed them to the extent that they can become invalid.<sup>23</sup> Abaye further said, This<sup>24</sup> has been taught

(1) For R. Eliezer has already stated his view that a man may offer a suspensive guilt-offering every day. V. Ker. 25a.

(2) For it is now manifest that what was slaughtered was not an offering but an unconsecrated animal, and as it was slaughtered in the Temple court it must be destroyed.

(3) For at the time of the sprinkling this man required atonement and the offering was a valid offering, consequently its flesh may be eaten.

(4) We thus see that by this principle the flesh of the offering is deemed to be a foodstuff so that it may be eaten by the priests as soon as the blood was ready for sprinkling; but this is contrary to R. Ashi's contention.

(5) Palestine.

(6) Not what is actually invalid, but, as in the case in question, where the offering turned out to be unnecessary.

(7) V. Glos.

(8) For they are destined to be burnt.

(9) And the expression 'conveys food-uncleanness' obviously means that it transmits the uncleanness to another object, the latter becoming unclean in the second degree.

(10) V. Hul. 36a, Sonc. ed. p. 194ff; and Pes. 20a.

(11) I.e., that part of the meal-offering which was not moistened by the oil and so was not rendered susceptible to uncleanness in the usual manner by moistening by a liquid but only by sacred esteem.

(12) I.e., whether that which was deemed a foodstuff or that which was made susceptible to uncleanness only by sacred esteem, and which subsequently suffered uncleanness, can by the law of the Torah transmit the uncleanness to another foodstuff, so that if the latter were consecrated meat it would have to be burnt.

(13) The ruling that Nothar and the Red Cow convey food-uncleanness is therefore only Rabbinic, and one would not burn consecrated meat on account of such uncleanness.

(14) And it is regarded as a freewill meal-offering.

(15) Since the flour was designated for one meal-offering it may not be used for another.

(16) For where the meal-offering was brought in two vessels instead of in a single vessel, two

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

handfuls are taken from the meal-offering instead of one, and moreover in each vessel the flour is less than the amount promised. And where it was brought in one vessel instead of in two vessels, only one handful is taken therefrom instead of two, and moreover the flour in this vessel is too much, for there should be in it one tenth and not two.

(17) In this case the offerings cannot be regarded as freewill-offerings seeing that when his attention was drawn to the terms of his vow he did not reply that what he was offering was a freewill-offering and not in fulfillment of his vow.

(18) And if each tenth is distinct so that the handful can still be taken from each by itself, they are valid. V. supra 23a. In the earlier case of this Mishnah, where he said, 'Let two tenths be brought in two vessels', and he brought them in one vessel, it must be assumed that the two tenths were so much mixed together that the handful could not have been taken from each by itself, and therefore they are invalid.

(19) Where a man promised to bring a meal-offering prepared on a griddle, and he brought one prepared in a pan, or vice versa.

(20) Where he promised to bring a meal-offering in one vessel and he brought it in two, or vice versa.

(21) Sc. what he had promised and what he had actually brought.

(22) The vessels in which the meal-offerings are put when brought to the Temple do not hallow the offerings, accordingly the meal-offering which had wrongfully been put into a pan could be transferred to a griddle, why then is it invalid?

(23) If they are taken out of the vessels assigned to them.

(24) That where a man vowed to bring this flour as a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and he brought it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan it is invalid.

## Menachoth 103a

only in the case where he determined [the kind of vessel] at the time of his vowing, but [where he determined the kind of vessel] at the time of his setting it apart,<sup>1</sup> it is not [invalid]; [for Scripture says,] According as thou hast vowed,<sup>2</sup> and not 'according as thou hast set apart'.

This has also been stated: R. Aha b. Hanina said in the name of R. Assi who said it in the name of R. Johanan, This has been taught

only in the case where he determined the kind of vessel at the time of his vowing, but [where he determined the kind of vessel] at the time of his setting it apart, it is not [invalid]; [for Scripture says,] 'According as thou hast vowed', and not 'according as thou hast set apart'.

*MISHNAH.* IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING OF BARLEY', HE MUST BRING ONE OF WHEAT;<sup>3</sup> IF 'OF COARSE MEAL', HE MUST BRING IT OF FINE FLOUR; IF 'WITHOUT OIL AND WITHOUT FRANKINCENSE', HE MUST NEVERTHELESS BRING IT WITH OIL AND FRANKINCENSE; IF 'HALF A TENTH, HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH; IF A TENTH AND A HALF', HE MUST BRING TWO. R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT, BECAUSE HE DID NOT MAKE HIS OFFERING IN THE MANNER IN WHICH PEOPLE USUALLY MAKE THEIR OFFERINGS.

*GEMARA.* But why is this? Here is a vow and also its annulment!<sup>4</sup> — The view [expressed in our Mishnah], said Hezekiah, Is that of Beth Shammai who maintain that one must always regard the first words [of a man's statement as binding].<sup>5</sup> For we have learnt: [If a man said,] 'I will be a Nazirite [and abstain] from dried figs and pressed figs', Beth Shammai say, He becomes a Nazirite [in the ordinary sense];<sup>6</sup> but Beth Hillel say, He does not become a Nazirite.<sup>7</sup> R. Johanan said, You may even say that it is the view of Beth Hillel too, for [we assume that] the man added, 'Had I but known that one may not vow a meal-offering in this manner, I should not have vowed in this manner but in that'.

Hezekiah said, This was taught only in the case where he said a meal-offering of barley', but where he said 'a meal-offering of lentils', he has not [to bring a meal-offering of wheat]. But let us consider: Hezekiah explained our Mishnah according to the view of Beth Shammai, did he not? But since Beth

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

Shammai maintain that one must always regard the first words [of a man's statement] as binding then surely it is immaterial whether he said 'of barley' or 'of lentils'! — He abandoned that view.<sup>9</sup> But why did he abandon it? —

Raba said, Because our Mishnah was to him difficult to understand. Why does it state 'a meal-offering of barley' and not 'of lentils'?<sup>10</sup> Obviously it is because of the man's error; now in regard to barley a man may err<sup>11</sup> but surely not in regard to lentils.<sup>12</sup> R. Johanan, however, said, Even [if he said] 'of lentils',<sup>13</sup> But consider: R. Johanan explained our Mishnah in accordance with the view of Beth Hillel, did he not? And Beth Hillel's view is based upon the man's error; now [I grant you that] a man may err in regard to barley, but surely he would not err in regard to lentils!<sup>14</sup>—

He<sup>15</sup> said so only as the result of Hezekiah's argument. [For he reasoned with him thus:] Why did you abandon your view? Because our Mishnah does not state 'of lentils'. But it may be that [that was so obvious that] it was not even necessary to be stated! Thus not only where he said 'of lentils', in which case it can only be said that he is revoking his vow,<sup>16</sup> do we hold that we must adopt the first words [of his statement]; but even where he said 'of barley', in which case it might be said that he has erred,<sup>17</sup> we still say that we must adopt the first words [of his statement].

(1) The man vowed to bring a meal-offering but did not specify the kind of vessel in which it was to be prepared, and only later when setting apart the flour for his meal-offering he mentioned the vessel in which it was to be prepared. If then he actually prepares it in a vessel different from that mentioned by him previously, it is still valid.

(2) Deut. XXIII, 24.

(3) Since all freewill meal-offerings must be brought of wheaten fine flour, to which oil and frankincense must be added.

Cf. Lev. II, 1.

(4) For by the additional words 'of barley' he obviously meant to annul his expressed vow, since

every one knows that only wheat may be offered as a meal-offering and not barley.

(5) Therefore as soon as he said, 'I take upon myself to bring a meal-offering', that constituted a binding vow, and his subsequent words 'of barley' cannot nullify the effect of his opening words.

(6) And he must abstain from wine and grapes. Cf. Num. VI, 1ff.

(7) Supra 81b; Nazir 9a.

(8) That he must bring a meal-offering of wheat.

(9) That our Mishnah represents the view of Beth Shammai. He accordingly accepts the explanation of R. Johanan.

(10) For according to Beth Shammai's view that a man is bound by his first words, then even though he added 'of lentils' he should also be liable to bring a meal-offering of wheat. The fact that our Mishnah implies a distinction between barley and lentils proves that Beth Shammai's view is not upheld.

(11) He genuinely believed that he may bring a meal-offering of barley, since there are in fact meal-offerings of barley, e.g., the meal-offering of jealousy (cf. Num. V, 15). His intention, however, was to bring a proper meal-offering, and therefore in place of the meal-offering of barley he must bring one of wheat.

(12) By adding 'of lentils' he obviously intended to revoke his promise, accordingly he is exempt, since we do not accept the view that a man is bound by his first words.

(13) He must bring a meal-offering of wheat.

(14) V. p. 633, n. 7.

(15) R. Johanan, in affirming that the ruling is applicable even though he said 'of lentils'.

(16) For no man would be so mistaken as to believe that he may bring a meal-offering of lentils, obviously then he is retracting his vow, and this he cannot do since he is already bound by his first words.

(17) For he believed that he could bring a meal-offering of barley. He therefore only intended a meal-offering of barley and since this cannot be brought he should be exempt entirely.

## Menachoth 103b

Ze'iri said, This<sup>1</sup> applies only where he said 'a meal-offering', but where he did not say 'a meal-offering'<sup>2</sup> it is not so.<sup>3</sup> R. Nahman was once sitting and reciting the above statement [of Ze'iri]. Thereupon Raba raised the following objections against R. Nahman: IF 'OF COARSE MEAL', HE MUST BRING IT OF FINE FLOUR. Is it not the case that

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

he did not say ‘a meal-offering’? — No, he actually said ‘a meal-offering’.

IF ‘WITHOUT OIL AND WITHOUT FRANKINCENSE’, HE MUST NEVERTHELESS BRING IT WITH OIL AND FRANKINCENSE. Is it not the case that he did not say ‘a meal-offering’? No, he actually said ‘a meal-offering’.

IF ‘HALF A TENTH’, HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH. Is it not the case that he did not say ‘a meal-offering’? — No, he actually said ‘a meal-offering’. If so, consider the next clause: IF ‘A TENTH AND A HALF’, HE MUST BRING TWO. But as soon as he said a meal-offering [of a tenth] he immediately was bound to bring a tenth, and when he added ‘and a half’ it is of no account!<sup>4</sup> — The case must be that he said, ‘I take upon myself to bring a meal-offering of half a tenth and a tenth’; for as soon as he said ‘a meal-offering’ he immediately was bound to bring a tenth, when he added ‘half a tenth’ it was of no account, and when he finally said ‘a tenth’ he became bound to bring another tenth. If so, what can be the reason for the last statement: R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT, BECAUSE HE DID NOT MAKE HIS OFFERING IN THE MANNER IN WHICH PEOPLE USUALLY MAKE THEIR OFFERINGS?<sup>5</sup> — Raba answered, R. Simeon stated this according to the view of R. Jose who maintained that a man is bound by his last words too.<sup>6</sup>

**MISHNAH.** A MAN MAY OFFER A MEAL-OFFERING CONSISTING OF SIXTY TENTHS AND BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL IF<sup>7</sup> A MAN SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER SIXTY TENTHS’, HE MAY BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL. BUT IF HE SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER SIXTY-ONE TENTHS’, HE MUST BRING SIXTY IN ONE VESSEL AND THE ONE IN ANOTHER VESSEL; FOR SINCE THE CONGREGATION BRING ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE FEAST [OF TABERNACLES] WHEN IT FALLS ON A

SABBATH SIXTY-ONE TENTHS [AS A MEAL-OFFERING],<sup>8</sup> IT IS ENOUGH FOR AN INDIVIDUAL THAT [HIS MEAL-OFFERING] BE LESS BY ONE TENTH THAN THAT OF THE CONGREGATION.

R. SIMEON SAID, BUT SOME OF THESE [SIXTY-ONE TENTHS] ARE FOR THE BULLOCKS AND SOME FOR THE LAMBS, AND THEY MAY NOT BE MIXED ONE WITH THE OTHER!<sup>9</sup> BUT THE FACT IS THAT UP TO SIXTY TENTHS THEY CAN BE MINGLED [IN ONE VESSEL].<sup>10</sup> THEY SAID TO HIM, CAN SIXTY BE MINGLED [IN ONE VESSEL] AND NOT SIXTY-ONE? HE ANSWERED, SO IT IS WITH ALL THE MEASURES PRESCRIBED BY THE SAGES: A MAN MAY IMMERSE HIMSELF IN FORTY SE’AHS<sup>11</sup> OF WATER, BUT HE MAY NOT IMMERSE HIMSELF IN FORTY SE’AHS LESS ONE KORTOB.<sup>11</sup>

**GEMARA.** This question was asked before<sup>12</sup> R. Judah b. Ila'i: How do we know that if a man said, ‘I take upon myself to offer Sixty-one tenths’, he must bring sixty in one vessel and the one in another vessel? R. Judah b. Ila'i, the chief speaker on all occasions,<sup>13</sup> opened the discussion and said, Since we find that the congregation bring on the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] when it falls on a Sabbath sixty-one tenths, it is enough for an individual that [his meal-offering] be less by one tenth than that of the congregation.

R. Simeon said to him, But some of these [sixty-one tenths] are for the bullocks and the rams and some for the lambs, with some the mixture is thick and with some it is thin,<sup>14</sup> some are mingled in the morning and some in the evening,<sup>15</sup> and they may not be mixed one with the other! Thereupon [R. Judah] said to him, You explain it. He replied, It is written, And every meal-offering mingled with oil or dry:<sup>16</sup> thus the Torah says, Bring a meal-offering that can be mingled [in one vessel]. To this he objected saying, Can sixty be mingled [in one vessel] and not sixty-one?

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

He replied, So it is with all the measures prescribed by the Sages: a man may immerse himself in forty se'ahs [of water], but he may not immerse himself in forty se'ahs less one kortob; an egg's bulk of food can convey food-uncleanness, but an egg's bulk of food less one sesame seed cannot convey food-uncleanness; [a cloth that is] three handbreadths square is susceptible to midras-uncleanness,<sup>17</sup> but [that which is] three handbreadths square less one thread is not susceptible to Midras-uncleanness. But what of it if they cannot be mingled? Have we not learnt:<sup>18</sup> If he did not mingle it, it is valid?—

R. Zera answered, Wherever mingling is possible the mingling is not indispensable, but wherever mingling is not possible<sup>19</sup> the mingling is indispensable. R. Bibi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi, Once a mule belonging to the house of Rabbi died, and the Sages measured the blood that flowed out therefrom [to ascertain whether there was] a quarter-log.<sup>20</sup> R. Isaac b. Bisna raised an objection from the following: R. Joshua and R. Joshua b. Bathyra testified that the blood of carcasses was clean. Moreover R. Joshua b. Bathyra related that it once happened that wild asses were speared in the royal square for the lions, and the Festival pilgrims had to wade up to their knees in blood, and nothing was said to them about it! He<sup>21</sup> remained silent.

Thereupon R. Zerika said to him, Why does not the Master give an answer? He replied, How can I answer? Behold R. Hanin has said, It is written, And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee:<sup>22</sup> this refers to one who buys grain from year to year;<sup>23</sup> and thou shalt fear night and day:<sup>22</sup> this refers to one who buys grain from week to week;<sup>24</sup> and shalt have no assurance of thy life:<sup>25</sup> this refers to one who has to rely upon the bread dealer.<sup>26</sup>

(1) The ruling that we adopt the first words of a man's statement.

(2) But said, 'I take upon myself of barley'. Aliter: He said, 'I take upon myself a meal-offering-of

(מזונה) barley'. In this case the word מזונה cannot stand by itself.

(3) But he is entirely exempt.

(4) Consequently he should only bring one tenth and not two.

(5) Since it is assumed that a man is bound by his first words, and this man in his opening words had made an offering in the proper manner.

(6) A man's whole statement must be considered, and as he said 'a half tenth and a tenth' it is undoubtedly an unusual offering and he is therefore entirely exempt. This view of R. Jose is to be found in Tem. 25b.

(7) This sentence is omitted in MS.M. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(8) On this day were offered (cf. Num. XXIX, 12ff) thirteen bullocks, each requiring three tenths of flour as a meal-offering, two rams, each requiring two tenths, and fourteen lambs, each requiring one tenth; thus 39 + 4 + 14 tenths 57. In addition there were two further tenths for the two lambs of the daily offering, and two more for the two lambs of the Sabbath Additional offering; thus making a total of 61.

(9) For the quantity of oil for the tenths varied; each tenth that accompanied the bullock or the ram required two logs of oil, hence the mixture was thick, whereas the tenth that was brought with each lamb required three logs of oil, thus making a thin mixture. Accordingly the sixty-one tenths were not all put in one vessel.

(10) With one log of oil, which according to R. Eliezer b. Jacob (supra 88a) is the amount prescribed for any number of tenths up to sixty. The Mishnah here accepts the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. But even according to the Rabbis it will be admitted that sixty tenths with a corresponding number of logs of oil cannot well be mingled together in one vessel (v. Rashi supra 18b s.v. (ששים ויחיד).

(11) V. Glos.

(12) Lit., 'above'.

(13) A title given to R. Judah, also in Ber. 63b and Shab. 33b.

(14) V. supra n. 1.

(15) For not all the sixty-one tenths were offered at one time, since these included the tenth offered with the daily offering in the morning and that offered in the evening.

(16) Lev. VII, 10.

(17) V. Glos.

(18) Supra 18a.

(19) E.g., sixty-one tenths in one vessel with one log of oil.

(20) For a quarter-log of blood (which, it is estimated, when congealed is equal to an olive's bulk) of a carcass conveys uncleanness like the carcass itself; cf. 'Ed. V, 1; VIII, 1.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

- (21) R. Bibi.
- (22) Deut. XXVIII, 66.
- (23) I.e., who has no fields of his own to cultivate but must purchase his provisions yearly.
- (24) Lit., 'from Sabbath eve to Sabbath eve'.
- (25) Deut. XXVIII, 66.
- (26) For his daily needs.

## Menachoth 104a

And I<sup>1</sup> have to rely upon the bread dealer. How does the matter stand?<sup>2</sup> — R. Joseph answered, R. Judah was the Master [in regard to all matters of religious law] in the house of the Nasi,<sup>3</sup> and it was he that gave the above decision,<sup>4</sup> and it was in accordance with the law that he reported. For we have learnt:<sup>5</sup> R. Judah reports six instances of lenient rulings by Beth Shammai and stringent rulings by Beth Hillel.<sup>6</sup> Beth Shammai pronounce the blood of a carcass clean; but Beth Hillel pronounce it unclean. R. Jose son of R. Judah said, Even when Beth Hillel pronounced it unclean they said so only in respect of a quarter-log of blood, since it can congeal and amount to an olive's bulk.<sup>7</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ONE MAY NOT OFFER ONE [LOG], TWO, OR FIVE [LOGS],<sup>8</sup> BUT ONE MAY OFFER THREE, FOUR, SIX,<sup>9</sup> OR ANYTHING ABOVE SIX.<sup>10</sup>

**GEMARA.** The question was asked: Is the wine of the drink-offerings indivisible or not?<sup>11</sup> In what circumstances [does the question arise]? Where, e.g., a man brought five [logs of wine]. If you say that the wine of the drink-offerings is not indivisible, then four logs can be drawn off and offered, since that is the proper quantity for a ram, and the remaining log would be for a freewill-offering;<sup>12</sup> but if you say that it is indivisible, then these five logs may not be offered until the quantity is made up.<sup>13</sup> How is it then?

Abaye said, Come and hear: There were six [money chests] for freewill-offerings.<sup>14</sup> And to the question, What did they represent? the reply was given, They represented the

surplus<sup>15</sup> of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper, the surplus of the bird-offerings, and the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering. Now if it were so,<sup>16</sup> then another money chest should have been prepared for the surplus of the drink-offerings? — Those<sup>17</sup> served only for freewill-offerings of the community,<sup>18</sup> whereas these<sup>19</sup> were quite frequent, and therefore the surplus of the drink-offerings of one man could be joined to that of another and could in this way be offered.<sup>20</sup>

Raba said, Come and hear: Home-born:<sup>21</sup> this teaches us that a man may offer wine for a drink-offering.<sup>22</sup> How much [must he bring]? Three logs. Whence do we know that if he desired to bring more he may do so? Because the text states, Shall be.<sup>23</sup> We might suppose that he may bring less, the text therefore states, After this manner.<sup>24</sup> Now what is meant by 'bring more'? Shall I say [it means the bringing of] four or six logs? But why are three logs admitted? [Surely] because that quantity is proper for a lamb! Then similarly four and six logs are proper for a ram and a bullock respectively?<sup>25</sup> Hence it must mean [the bringing of] five logs,<sup>26</sup> thus proving that the wine for the drink-offerings is not indivisible. This indeed proves it.

R. Ashi said, But we have not learnt so [in our Mishnah]! [For it states]: ONE MAY NOT OFFER ONE [LOG], TWO, OR FIVE [LOGS], BUT ONE MAY OFFER THREE, FOUR, SIX, OR ANYTHING ABOVE SIX. Now here five is stated alongside with two, therefore as two can under no circumstances be admitted for drink-offerings, so five cannot be admitted at all? — This does not necessarily follow; each follows its own rule.<sup>27</sup>

Abaye said, If you are able to prove that the wine of the drink-offerings is not indivisible,

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

then it is not indivisible.<sup>28</sup> But if you prove that it is indivisible, then I am clear as to the law with regard to any number of logs up to ten,<sup>29</sup> but about eleven

- (1) Lit., 'that man'. R. Bibi was in straitened circumstances and had difficulties in obtaining a living, consequently his mind was not at ease to concentrate on the question raised.
- (2) Is a quarter-log of blood of a carcass unclean or not?
- (3) Sc. Rabbi, in whose house the above incident about the mule occurred. Chronologically it is very difficult to accept that R. Judah b. Ila'i held a position in the household of R. Judah the prince (or Rabbi). V. however Tosaf. s.v. מורייהו.
- (4) To measure the blood so as to ascertain whether there was a quarter-log or not.
- (5) 'Ed. V, 1; Shab. 77a.
- (6) This is exceptional, for generally the school of Hillel follow the more lenient ruling.
- (7) Which is the minimum quantity of carcass (גבילה) that conveys uncleanness.
- (8) Of wine as a drink-offering. One may offer only such quantities as conform with the quantities prescribed for one or several of the specific animal-offerings, and these are: six logs for each bullock, four for each ram, and three for each lamb. Nowhere is such a quantity as one log, or two, or five prescribed.
- (9) Corresponding to the wine-offering of a lamb, a ram, and a bullock respectively.
- (10) Thus seven logs could be applied for the drink-offerings of one ram and one lamb, eight for two rams, nine for one bullock and one lamb, and so on.
- (11) Where a certain quantity of wine is offered, is it to be regarded as one whole so that it must be offered together as one drink-offering, or may it be divided up and some taken for one offering and the remainder applied in any manner available for it?
- (12) The remaining log would either be sold and the money obtained put into the chest of freewill-offerings or it would be added to two more logs and used as the drink-offering of the daily offering.
- (13) I.e., he must bring another log so as to make up six logs, the quantity prescribed for a bullock.
- (14) V. Shek. VI, 5, and infra 107b.
- (15) I.e., if a certain sum of money had been set apart for an animal-offering and the price fell, the surplus money was put into a money chest and eventually was expended on burnt-offerings for the community. The offerings enumerated were each in some aspect different from the others,

hence the surplus of each was kept in a separate chest.

(16) That the wine of the drink-offerings was not indivisible, and therefore in the case in question four logs, the quantity prescribed for a ram, could be drawn off and offered, and the remaining log would be for a freewill-offering.

(17) The surplus in each of the six cases enumerated.

(18) For the surplus money cannot be used for its original purpose.

(19) The surplus of the drink-offerings.

(20) For drink-offerings were offered at all times, even unaccompanied by an animal-sacrifice; accordingly the surplus of several offerings of wine could be combined and offered. There was therefore no need for a special chest in which to collect the surplus of each drink-offering.

(21) Num. XV, 13; with reference to the drink-offerings.

(22) Even though it is unaccompanied by an animal-offering.

(23) Ibid. XXVIII, 14: Half a hin of wine shall be for a bullock. The expression 'shall be' is superfluous and therefore serves to include a larger quantity than that prescribed. The reference might also be to Num. XV, 15.

(24) Ibid. 13.

(25) And surely no verse is required to include these quantities.

(26) And this quantity is expressly included by the verse. As to the procedure, four logs, the quantity prescribed for a ram, would be offered and the fifth would be a surplus.

(27) Two logs, admittedly, cannot under any circumstances be offered, but five may be offered in the manner already described, namely, four logs, being the drink-offering of a ram, are offered, and the remaining log is kept for a freewill-offering. Our Mishnah disallows the offering of five logs only in the first instance, for it is not proper to bring at the outset such a quantity as must inevitably lead to a surplus.

(28) Therefore any quantity above two logs may be offered.

(29) Thus offerings of one, two, or five logs may not be brought, but any other quantity, up to and including ten, may. V. supra p. 638, n. 13.

## Menachoth 104b

I am in doubt. How am I to regard it? Shall I say that the man intended to offer the drink-offerings of two bullocks,<sup>1</sup> and therefore these may not be offered until this quantity has been made up? Or [shall I rather say that]

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

‘he intended to bring the drink-offerings of two rams and one lamb? [In other words, the question is:] Do we say that he meant to bring the drink-offerings corresponding to two quantities of one kind and one of the other or not?<sup>2</sup> The question remains unsolved.

**MISHNAH.** ONE MAY OFFER WINE<sup>3</sup> BUT NOT OIL. THIS IS THE OPINION OF R. AKIBA. BUT R. TARFON SAYS, ONE MAY ALSO OFFER OIL.<sup>4</sup> R. TARFON SAID, AS WE FIND THAT WINE WHICH IS OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION<sup>5</sup> MAY BE OFFERED AS A FREEWILL-OFFERING,<sup>6</sup> SO OIL WHICH IS OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION MAY BE OFFERED AS A FREEWILL-OFFERING. R. AKIBA SAID TO HIM, NO, IF YOU SAY SO OF WINE IT IS BECAUSE IT IS OFFERED BY ITSELF EVEN WHEN OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION;<sup>7</sup> CAN YOU SAY THE SAME OF OIL WHICH IS NOT OFFERED BY ITSELF WHEN OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION?<sup>7</sup> TWO [MEN] MAY NOT JOINTLY OFFER ONE TENTH; BUT THEY MAY JOINTLY OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING OR A PEACE-OFFERING, AND OF BIRDS EVEN A SINGLE BIRD.

**GEMARA.** Raba said, From the opinions of both we may infer that a man may offer every day the meal-offerings of the drink-offerings.<sup>8</sup> But is not this obvious? [No,] for I might have thought that in regard to the freewill meal-offering the Divine Law has specified but five kinds of meal-offerings<sup>9</sup> and no more; we are therefore taught that that is so only where [the kind of the meal-offering] was not expressed,<sup>10</sup> but where it was expressly stated<sup>11</sup> then it was so stated.

**TWO [MEN] MAY NOT JOINTLY OFFER [ONE TENTH].** What is the reason? Shall I say because there is written, Bringeth?<sup>12</sup> But with the burnt-offering too there is written, Bringeth!<sup>13</sup> But you will say that the reason this is so with the burnt-offering<sup>14</sup> is that there is written, Your burnt-offerings;<sup>15</sup> then with the meal-offering too there is written,

And your meal-offerings!<sup>15</sup> — The reason is that there is written in connection with [the meal-offering] the word ‘soul’.<sup>16</sup> And so too it was taught in a Baraitha: Rabbi says, It is written, [Whosoever he be of the house of Israel] that bringeth his offering, whether it be any of their vows, or any of their freewill-offerings, which they bring unto the Lord;<sup>17</sup> thus every offering may be brought jointly, and the verse excluded only the meal-offering in connection with which the expression ‘soul’ is used.

R. Isaac said, Why is the meal-offering distinguished in that the expression ‘soul’ is used therewith? Because the Holy One, blessed be He, said, ‘Who is it that usually brings a meal-offering? It is the poor man. I account it as though he had offered his own soul to Me’. R. Isaac said, Why is the meal-offering distinguished in that five kinds of oil dishes<sup>18</sup> are stated in connection with it? This can be likened to the case of a human king for whom his friend had prepared a feast. As the king knew that [his friend] was poor, he said to him, ‘prepare it<sup>19</sup> for me in five kinds of dishes so that I will derive pleasure from you’.

## CHAPTER XIII

**MISHNAH.** [IF A MAN SAID], ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A TENTH’, HE MUST BRING ONE [TENTH]; IF ‘TENTHS’, HE MUST BRING TWO [TENTHS]. [IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TENTHS] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS<sup>20</sup> [IF HE SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING’, HE MAY BRING WHICHEVER KIND HE CHOOSES.<sup>21</sup>

R. JUDAH SAYS, HE MUST BRING A MEAL-OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, FOR THAT IS THE PRINCIPAL MEAL-OFFERING. [IF HE SAID] A MEAL-OFFERING’ OR ‘A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING’, HE MUST BRING ONE

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

[OF ANY KIND]; IF 'MEAL-OFFERINGS' OR A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERINGS', HE MUST BRING TWO [OF ANY ONE KIND]; [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN KIND], BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT KIND I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING THE FIVE KINDS [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A MEAL-OFFERING OF [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF] TENTHS<sup>22</sup> BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED, HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS. BUT RABBI SAYS, HE MUST BRING MEAL-OFFERINGS [OF EVERY NUMBER] OF TENTHS FROM ONE TO SIXTY.<sup>23</sup>

**GEMARA.** This<sup>24</sup> is obvious! — It was necessary to state the next clause: IF 'TENTHS', HE MUST BRING TWO [TENTHS]. But this too is obvious, for the minimum of 'tenths' is two! — It was necessary to state the following clause: [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TENTHS] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS.<sup>25</sup> Whose view is taught here? Said Hezekiah: It is not that of Rabbi, for Rabbi has said, HE MUST BRING MEAL-OFFERINGS [OF EVERY NUMBER] OF TENTHS FROM ONE TO SIXTY. R. Johanan said, You may even say that it sets forth the view of Rabbi, but [we must assume that] the man said, 'I specified [a certain number of] tenths but I had not determined them for one vessel', in which case he must bring sixty tenths in sixty vessels.<sup>26</sup>

[IF HE SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING', HE MAY BRING WHICHEVER KIND HE CHOOSES, etc. A Tanna taught: It is because Holy Writ stated it first.<sup>27</sup> In that case, if a man said, 'I take upon myself to bring a burnt-offering'. he should have to bring a bullock,<sup>28</sup> since Holy Writ stated that

(1) I.e., twelve logs.

(2) For the quantity is odd and unusual. V. Tosaf. 104a s.v. 7ב

(3) By itself, without it being accompanied by a meal-offering of flour and oil. As for the manner in which wine was offered, v. Zeb. 91b.

(4) A handful of the oil was taken and burnt upon the altar and the remainder was eaten by the priests.

(5) Viz., as the drink-offering which accompanied most animal-offerings.

(6) V. the exposition from the term 'home-born' supra p. 640.

(7) For the wine of the drink-offering was not mixed with anything, whereas the oil was mingled with the fine flour.

(8) I.e., the meal-offering of fine flour mingled with oil and the offering of wine, which accompany most

animal-offerings, may be brought at any time as an entire and separate offering even without an animal-offering. The dispute between R. Akiba and R. Tarfon refers only to the offering of oil by itself, but certainly not to the offering of oil which is part of the meal-offering of the drink-offerings.

(9) In Lev. II, the following five kinds of meal-offerings are described: (i) the meal-offering of fine flour, (ii) the meal-offering prepared on a griddle, (iii) the meal-offering prepared in a pan, (iv) the meal-offering baked in the oven and made into cakes, and (v) that baked in the oven and made into wafers.

(10) Thus where a man pledged himself to bring a meal-offering without specifying the kind he was to bring he is bound to bring one of the five kinds described in the Torah.

(11) That he is offering the meal-offering of the drink-offerings.

(12) Lev. II, 1. The verb used is in the singular, signifying that the offering shall be brought by an individual and not by two persons jointly.

(13) Ibid. I, 3.

(14) That it may be brought jointly.

(15) Num. XXIX, 39. Here the plural pronominal suffix is used.

(16) Lev. II, 1. Heb. זָבַח. The term usually found with sacrifices is מָנָה or שָׂאֵל, man.

(17) Ibid. XXII, 18.

(18) Each of the five kinds of meal-offerings, v. supra p. 642, n. 2, is prepared with oil.

(19) Sc. the little that you possess.

(20) For this is the maximum size of the meal-offering of an individual; and therefore even if that which he promised was less it matters naught, for when bringing this quantity he should stipulate that what is over and above the amount he promised shall be reckoned as a freewill meal-offering.

(21) Of the five kinds of meal-offerings described in Lev. II. V. supra p. 642, n. 2.

(22) To be brought in one vessel.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

(23) Since he had specified a certain number of tenths to be brought in one vessel it would not meet the case, according to Rabbi, were he to bring the maximum quantity, namely sixty tenths, in one vessel, for Rabbi is of the opinion that once a certain number of tenths have been determined for one vessel that vessel may contain neither more nor less than the number specified. Accordingly the only possible solution is to bring sixty meal-offerings, each containing a different number of tenths; in this way he will certainly have brought the meal-offering he specified.

(24) The first clause of the Mishnah.

(25) This is the correct interpretation of the text, following MS.M. and Z.K. In cur. edd. the clause: [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED, etc.' is erroneously placed — as a fresh quotation from our Mishnah introducing a new passage.

(26) Bringing one tenth in each vessel. For the only doubt here is as to the number of tenths, since he left the matter open whether he would bring them in one or more vessels; whereas in the last clause of our Mishnah the doubt is as to the correct number of tenths to be brought in one vessel.

(27) For this reason is the meal-offering of fine flour described by R. Judah as the principal meal-offering.

(28) Which is contrary to the law, v. infra.

## Menachoth 105a

first; and if 'of the flock', he should have to bring a lamb<sup>1</sup> since Holy Writ stated that first; and if 'of the birds', he should have to bring turtle-doves,<sup>2</sup> since Holy Writ stated them first. Wherefore then have we learnt: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a burnt-offering', he should bring a lamb; but R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, [He may bring] a turtledove or a young pigeon?<sup>3</sup> And R. Judah does not differ there! — We must therefore say that it is accounted the principal meal-offering because it has no descriptive name.<sup>4</sup> But the Tanna gave as the reason 'Because Holy Writ stated it first!' — This is what he meant to say. Which is the meal-offering described as 'the principal one' by virtue of the fact that it has no descriptive name? It is that which Holy Writ stated first.<sup>5</sup> But this is obvious, for [R. Judah] expressly mentioned the meal-offering of fine flour! — It is merely stated as a mnemonical sign.<sup>6</sup>

[IF HE SAID,] 'A MEAL-OFFERING' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING', etc. R. Papa raised the following question. What if he said 'kinds of meal-offering'? [Shall I say that] since he said 'kinds!<sup>7</sup> he obviously meant two, and the term 'meal-offering' [is generic], since all meal-offerings are referred to as 'meal-offering', as it is written, And this is the law of the meal-offering?<sup>8</sup> Or [shall I rather say that] since he said 'meal-offering'<sup>9</sup> he meant only one meal-offering, and by the expression 'kinds of meal-offering' he meant to imply, 'Of the kinds of meal-offering I take upon myself [to bring] one meal-offering'? —

Come and hear: [IF HE SAID,] 'A MEAL-OFFERING' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING', HE MUST BRING ONE [OF ANY KIND]. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring two! — Read the next clause: IF MEAL-OFFERINGS' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERINGS', HE MUST BRING TWO. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring only one! The truth is that we cannot decide from here.

Come and hear: [If he said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a kind of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of the same kind. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would only have to bring one! — Perhaps the inference is this: [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering', he must bring two meal-offerings of two kinds. But it has been taught otherwise: [If he said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a kind of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of the same kind. But if he said, 'I take upon myself to bring kinds of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of two kinds. It follows from this, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring only one! — Perhaps that [Baraita] represents the view of R. Simeon who ruled that one may bring it<sup>10</sup> the half in cakes and the half in wafers; accordingly the expression 'kinds

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

of meal-offering' refers to that meal-offering which may be of two kinds. According to the Rabbis, however, who ruled that one may not bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers, he would then have to bring two meal-offerings of two kinds.<sup>11</sup>

**[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN KIND] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT KIND I SPECIFIED'. HE MUST BRING THE FIVE KINDS.** Who is the Tanna that taught this?<sup>12</sup> — R. Jeremiah said, It is not R. Simeon; for according to R. Simeon who stated that he may bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers,<sup>13</sup> even though R. Judah's view were accepted, that all meal-offerings consisted of ten cakes each,<sup>14</sup> he would have to bring fourteen meal-offerings because of the doubt.<sup>15</sup> Abaye said. You may even say that it is R. Simeon. for we have heard R. Simeon express the view that one may bring an offering and make conditions about it.<sup>16</sup> For it has been taught:<sup>17</sup> R. Simeon says. On the following day<sup>18</sup> he brings his guilt-offering and a log [of oil]

- (1) And not a goat.
- (2) And not young pigeons.
- (3) Infra 107a.
- (4) The meal-offering of fine flour is invariably referred to as 'the meal-offering', whereas the others have a descriptive name attached to them, as the meal-offering prepared on a griddle, or in a pan, or baked in the oven.
- (5) Namely, the meal-offering of fine flour.
- (6) The Tanna of the Baraitha gave us a further help as an aid to the memory in order to remember that the principal meal-offering is the meal-offering of fine flour.
- (7) In the plural.
- (8) Lev. VI, 7.
- (9) In the singular.
- (10) Sc. the meal-offering baked in the oven; v. supra 63a.
- (11) For the fulfillment of the expression 'kinds of meal-offering'.
- (12) That because of the doubt he must bring the five kinds of meal-offerings.
- (13) I.e., the meal-offering baked in the oven must consist of ten pieces, but it may be made up partly of cakes and partly of wafers. v. supra 63a.

(14) As opposed to R. Meir's view that all meal-offerings must consist of twelve pieces each. V. supra 76a.

(15) For he would have to bring the eleven possible variations of the baked meal-offering, viz., ten cakes and no wafers, nine cakes and one wafer, eight cakes and two wafers, seven cakes and three wafers... no cakes and ten wafers, plus the three other kinds of meal-offering, a total of fourteen meal-offerings. According to R. Meir there are thirteen variations of the baked meal-offering, beginning with twelve cakes and no wafers, and so the total would be sixteen.

(16) And therefore, in the case of our Mishnah, he would only have to bring one baked meal-offering of ten cakes and one of ten wafers (in addition, of course, to the other three kinds of meal-offering) and declare, 'If I had specified to bring it all in cakes, or all in wafers, then let the cakes or the wafers be offered in fulfillment of my vow and the others be a freewill-offering; and if I had specified to bring it partly in cakes and partly in wafers, then let that number of each kind which I had specified be offered in fulfillment of my vow and the rest be offered as a freewill-offering'.

(17) Tosef. Neziruth VI. The case dealt with is that of a Nazirite who was in doubt whether he was rendered unclean or not and also whether he was still a confirmed leper or not; and the Tanna of the Baraitha rules that he may eat consecrated food after sixty days. V. Tosaf s.v. למחרת.

(18) After sixty days have elapsed. Cf. Naz. 59b.

## Menachoth 105b

with it and says. 'If I was a leper, then this is my guilt-offering and this the log of oil for it; but if not, let this be a freewill peace-offering'. And that guilt-offering must be slaughtered on the north side,<sup>1</sup> its blood must be applied upon the thumb and the great toe,<sup>2</sup> it requires the laying on of hands,<sup>3</sup> and drink-offerings,<sup>3</sup> and the waving of the breast and the thigh,<sup>3</sup> and it may be eaten by the males of the priesthood during that day and the following night [until midnight].<sup>4</sup> And<sup>5</sup> although the Master in [the Tractate] 'The Slaughtering of Consecrated Animals'<sup>6</sup> has explained that 'R. Simeon permitted a man to bring an offering and make conditions about it in the first instance only where there was no other possible way of making the man fit,<sup>7</sup> but in all the other cases<sup>8</sup> he permitted it only where it had actually been done but not in

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

the first instance', that distinction applies only to peace-offerings, since [the effect of the conditions expressed is] to reduce the time allowed for the eating,<sup>9</sup> and so consecrated food is rendered invalid [before its time]; but in the case of meal-offerings<sup>10</sup> he would permit it even in the first instance.

R. Papa said to Abaye, But according to R. Simeon who said that he may bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers, he is then bringing one tenth out of two tenths and one log out of two logs!<sup>11</sup> — [He replied,] We have heard R. Simeon express the view that if a man brought one tenth out of two tenths and one log out of two logs he has fulfilled his obligation.<sup>12</sup> But how does he take out the handful?<sup>13</sup> — He [takes one handful from the cakes and another from the wafers and] makes the following conditions and says. 'If I had specified [a meal-offering] of cakes only or of wafers only, then the handful I have taken from the cakes should serve the cakes and the handful I took from the wafers should serve the wafers;<sup>14</sup> but if I had specified [originally a meal-offering] the half in cakes and the half in wafers, then the handful I have taken from the cakes should serve half for the cakes and half for the wafers, and the handful I have taken from the wafers should also serve half for the wafers and half for the cakes'. But surely he must take one handful from the cakes

(1) Like the guilt-offering, which is a most holy offering.

(2) Like the guilt-offering of the leper.

(3) Like the peace-offering. The special rites peculiar to the guilt-offering as well as those peculiar to the peace-offering must be observed with this offering, as it is not known which it is.

(4) Like the guilt-offering.

(5) This sentence, as has already been pointed out by Sh. Mek., is an insertion of the Saboraim.

(6) This is the Talmudic title of Tractate Zebahim. V. Zeb. 76b.

(7) To eat consecrated meat; as in the case of the Nazirite who was in doubt as to his leprosy.

(8) As the case mentioned in Zeb. l.c. where a guilt-offering was confused with peace-offerings.

(9) Guilt-offerings may be eaten only on the day of the offering and the night following, whereas peace-offerings may be eaten during two days and one night. Where therefore a guilt-offering was confused with peace-offerings and each animal is taken and offered according to the restrictions of the two kinds of offerings, the flesh thereof would only be eaten during the shorter period and what was left over would be burnt perhaps unnecessarily.

(10) For all meal-offerings are alike in that they must be eaten the same day and the night following.

(11) For if this man's original vow was to bring a specified number of cakes and a specified number of wafers, his obligation would be, fulfilled only by combining the required number of cakes from the meal-offering of ten cakes with the required number of wafers from the meal-offering of ten wafers; and as each meal-offering consisted of one tenth of flour and one log of oil, he would thus be making up one offering from two offerings; and this is not allowed.

(12) I.e., if a man, in duty bound to bring one tenth of flour and one log of oil as a meal-offering, brought two tenths in separate vessels and two logs in separate vessels, and took the half from one and the half from the other, he has thereby fulfilled his obligation.

(13) From the meal-offering that is made up partly of cakes and partly of wafers, since in fact the cakes and the wafers are separate meal-offerings.

(14) One being in fulfillment of his vow and the other a freewill meal-offering.

## Menachoth 106a

and the wafers [mixed together].<sup>1</sup> whereas here he takes the handful from the cakes for the wafers and from the wafers for the cakes! — We have heard R. Simeon say that if when taking the handful there came into his hand only one of the two kinds he has fulfilled his obligation.<sup>2</sup> But what [is to be done] with the residue of the oil; for if he had originally specified [a meal-offering] the half in cakes and the half in wafers, the residue of the oil would be put into the cakes, but if he had originally specified [a meal-offering of] wafers the residue of the oil would be consumed by the priests?<sup>3</sup> — The opinion of R. Simeon son of Judah is followed. For R. Simeon son of Judah said in the name of R. Simeon.<sup>3</sup> He anoints them<sup>4</sup> in the form of the

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

Greek letter Chi,<sup>5</sup> and the residue of the oil is consumed by the priests.<sup>6</sup>

R. Kahana said to R. Ashi, But should not the doubt include also the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings;<sup>7</sup> for Raba has said, A man may offer every day the meal-offerings of the drink-offerings [which accompany animal-offerings]? — The doubt includes only that meal-offering (mnemonic: *individual, by itself, frankincense, log, handful*) which is brought by an individual but not that which is brought by the community. The doubt includes only that which is brought by itself but not that which is brought to accompany the animal-offering. The doubt includes only that which requires frankincense but not that which does not require frankincense. The doubt includes only that which requires but one log of oil but not that which requires three logs. The doubt includes only that from which the handful is taken but not that from which the handful is not taken.

[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED A MEAL-OFFERING [OF A CERTAIN NUMBER] OF TENTHS’. Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] ‘I specified a meal-offering of [a certain number of] tenths and I determined them for one vessel,<sup>9</sup> but I do not know what number I specified’, he must bring a meal-offering of sixty tenths. This is the opinion of the Sages. But Rabbi says, He must bring meal-offerings of [every number of] tenths from one to sixty, that is, one thousand eight hundred and thirty [tenths].<sup>10</sup> [If he said,] ‘I specified [a certain number of tenths of a certain kind] but I do not know what kind I specified or what number I specified’, he must bring the five kinds of meal-offering each consisting of sixty tenths, that is, three hundred tenths. This is the opinion of the Sages. But Rabbi says, He must bring the five kinds of meal-offering, and of each kind every number of tenths from one to sixty, that is, nine thousand one hundred and fifty [tenths].<sup>11</sup> What is the issue between them?—

R. Hisda said, They differ as to whether or not it is permitted to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary;<sup>12</sup> Rabbi holds that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary,<sup>13</sup> while the Sages hold that it is permitted.<sup>14</sup> Raba said. All hold that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary, but they differ as to whether or not it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering; the Sages holding that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering,<sup>15</sup> while Rabbi holds that it is forbidden.

Abaye said to Rabba, According to the Sages who hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, should not two handfuls be taken therefrom?<sup>16</sup> — [He replied.] First one handful is taken and then another. But he would be taking the handful from the offering of obligation for the freewill-offering and from the freewill-offering for the offering of obligation! — He leaves it to the mind of the priest and says, ‘What the priest’s hand takes up the first time<sup>17</sup> shall be [the handful] for the offering of obligation, and what it takes up the second time<sup>18</sup> shall be for the freewill-offering.’ But how are [the handfuls] to be burnt? If he burns the handful of the freewill-offering first, then how may he thereafter burn the handful of the offering of obligation; perhaps the entire meal-offering was his offering of obligation, consequently the remainder [of the meal-offering] has diminished [between the taking of the handful<sup>19</sup> and the burning thereof].<sup>20</sup> and a Master has stated<sup>21</sup> that if the remainder had diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof the handful may not be burnt on behalf of it? And if he burns the handful of the offering of obligation first, then how may he thereafter burn the handful of the freewill-offering;

(1) Where the meal-offering consists partly of cakes and partly of wafers the two kinds must be

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

broken into pieces and mixed together and the handful taken from the mixture. V. supra 63b.

(2) Even though he took the handful from one kind in respect of the other kind.

(3) V. supra 75a.

(4) Sc. the wafers, in the offering consisting partly of cakes and partly of wafers.

(5) V. supra p. 445, n. 2.

(6) So that in either case the residue of oil is consumed by the priests.

(7) Accordingly where a man has forgotten the kind of meal-offering he offered he should because of the doubt also bring this meal-offering as a sixth kind.

(8) Sc. the meal-offering with the drink-offerings.

(9) V. supra p. 645, n. 3.

(10) This being the sum of the numbers from one to sixty.

(11)  $1830 \times 5 = 9150$ .

(12) But all agree that it is forbidden to mix together (i.e., bring in one vessel) the meal-offering that is brought as an obligation with the meal-offering that is brought as a freewill-offering.

(13) He therefore cannot bring sixty tenths in one vessel and declare that the quantity corresponding to the amount he specified shall be in fulfillment of his vow and the rest shall remain unconsecrated, since it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary; neither can he say that the rest shall be a freewill-offering, since it is forbidden to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering. The only solution, according to Rabbi, is to bring in sixty vessels meal-offerings of every number of tenths from one to sixty, and declare that the vessel which contains the quantity he specified shall be in fulfillment of his vow and all that which is in the other vessels shall be freewill-offerings.

(14) He therefore brings sixty tenths in one vessel and declares that what is over and above the amount he specified shall remain unconsecrated.

(15) He therefore brings sixty tenths in one vessel and declares that what is over and above the amount he specified shall be a freewill-offering.

(16) One for the offering of obligation and one for the freewill-offering.

(17) Lit., 'now'.

(18) Lit., 'at the end'.

(19) Sc. the first handful, which represents the offering of obligation.

(20) For one handful, that representing the freewill-offering, has already been burnt.

(21) Supra 8a, 9a.

## Menachoth 106b

perhaps the entire meal-offering was his offering of obligation, and any offering a portion of which had been put on the fire of the altar is subject to the prohibition ye shall not burn?<sup>1</sup> — R. Judah son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi replied, It<sup>2</sup> is burnt as wood, in accordance with a ruling of R. Eliezer. For it was taught: R. Eliezer says, [It is written,] They shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar;<sup>3</sup> thus 'for a sweet savor you may not bring it<sup>4</sup> up, but you may bring it up as wood.

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Perhaps all hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, but they differ over R. Eliezer's ruling: the Sages accepting R. Eliezer's rulings<sup>5</sup> while Rabbi does not accept R. Eliezer's ruling!<sup>6</sup> — He replied. If one could say that according to Rabbi it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, and that Rabbi does not accept R. Eliezer's ruling, then he could bring sixty tenths in one vessel and one tenth in another vessel, bring the two into contact,<sup>7</sup> and take the handful from each.<sup>8</sup>

Raba said, All hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, moreover all accept R. Eliezer's ruling, but they differ on the same principles as those which underlie the dispute between R. Eliezer b. Jacob and the Rabbis. For we have learnt:<sup>9</sup> Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths required sixty logs [of oil]. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says. Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths required but one log [of oil], for it is written, For a meal-offering even a log of oil.<sup>10</sup> The Sages hold the same view as the Rabbis who<sup>11</sup> say that sixty logs are required for sixty tenths, one log for each tenth,<sup>12</sup> while Rabbi holds the same view as R. Eliezer b. Jacob who says that only one log is required. and therefore<sup>13</sup> we do not know whether to regard [the sixty tenths] as one

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

meal-offering for which one log is sufficient or as two meal-offerings for which two logs are necessary.

R. Ashi said, They differ in the case of [one who vowed to bring] a small animal and brought a large one. The Sages hold that [one who vowed to bring] a small animal and brought a large one has fulfilled his obligation.<sup>14</sup> while Rabbi holds that he has not fulfilled his obligation. But they have already differed in this matter, for we have learnt: [If he said] ‘a small animal’ and he brought a large one, he has fulfilled his obligation; but Rabbi says, He has not fulfilled his obligation!<sup>15</sup> —

Both disputes were necessary For if the dispute had only been stated here, I should have said that only here do the Sages say [that by bringing a larger offering he has fulfilled his obligation] since in either case<sup>16</sup> only one handful [is offered], but in the other case, since there are more sacrificial portions [in a larger animal]. I might say that they agree with Rabbi [that he has not thereby fulfilled his obligation]. And if the dispute had only been stated there, I should have said that only there does Rabbi say [that he has not fulfilled his obligation, since there are more sacrificial portions], but in this case I might say that he agrees with the Sages; therefore [both disputes] were necessary.

(Mnemonic: *Wood, Gold, Wine, Burnt-offering, Thank-offering, Ox.*)<sup>17</sup>

**MISHNAH.** [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER [PIECES OF] WOOD’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN TWO LOGS. IF ‘FRANKINCENSE’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. THE HANDFUL IS SPECIFIED IN FIVE CASES: IF A MAN SAID, ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING FRANKINCENSE’. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. IF HE OFFERED A MEAL-OFFERING HE MUST BRING A HANDFUL OF FRANKINCENSE WITH IT. IF A

MAN OFFERED UP THE HANDFUL OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT] HE IS LIABLE.<sup>18</sup>

THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE]<sup>19</sup> REQUIRE TWO HANDFULS. [IF A MAN SAID.] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER GOLD’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A GOLDEN DENAR;<sup>20</sup> IF SILVER’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A SILVER DENAR; IF ‘COPPER’. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN [THE VALUE OF] A SILVER MA'AH.<sup>20</sup> [IF HE SAID.] ‘I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD BRING] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I SPECIFIED’. HE MUST BRING SO MUCH UNTIL HE SAYS. ‘I CERTAINLY DID NOT INTEND TO GIVE SO MUCH!’

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: Offering:<sup>21</sup> this signifies that one may offer wood as a freewill-offering. And how much must it be? Two logs. For so it is written, And we cast lots for the offering of wood.<sup>22</sup> Rabbi says, The wood-offering is included under the term ‘offering’. And therefore requires salt and also requires to be brought near [the altar].<sup>23</sup> Raba said, According to Rabbi's view the handful must be taken from the wood-offering.<sup>24</sup> R. Papa said, According to Rabbi's view the wood-offering requires other wood.<sup>25</sup>

IF ‘FRANKINCENSE’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. How do we know this? — Because it is written, And he shall take up therefrom his handful of the fine flour of the meal-offering and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense.<sup>26</sup> The frankincense is thus compared with the taking up of the meal-offering: as the taking up of the meal-offering was a handful so the frankincense must consist of a handful. Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] ‘I take upon myself [to bring an offering] for the altar’, he must bring frankincense, for nothing is offered entirely upon the altar but frankincense. [If he said,] ‘I specified an offering for the altar but I do not know what it was I specified’, he must bring of everything that is offered entirely upon the

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

altar.<sup>27</sup> Is there nothing else?<sup>28</sup> But what about the burnt-offering? — There is the skin thereof which belongs to the priests. And what about the burnt-offering of a bird? — There are

- (1) Lev. II, 11. Once the prescribed portion of an offering has been duly offered upon the altar, the rest of that offering may not be burnt on the altar. How then may the second handful be burnt upon the altar?
- (2) Sc. the second handful, that representing the freewill-offering.
- (3) Lev. II, 12.
- (4) Sc. the remainder of the offering from which a portion has been taken and already burnt.
- (5) Accordingly sixty tenths are brought in one vessel, and when the second handful is about to be burnt, having already burnt the first handful, he declares, 'If this vessel also contains a freewill-offering then this handful is rightly being burnt on its behalf, but if the contents of the vessel are entirely the meal-offering of obligation then this handful is being burnt merely as wood and not as an offering.'
- (6) He cannot therefore bring sixty tenths in one vessel, since he could not burn the second handful, for he might be transgressing the prohibition of ye shall not burn.
- (7) I.e., he should bring the two vessels near to each other so that the flour of the one should actually mix with the flour of the other.
- (8) Accordingly he would first take the handful from the larger vessel containing the sixty tenths, and declare, 'If I specified all these tenths for my meal-offering, then this is the handful for it; but if not, let this handful serve for the number of tenths specified for my meal-offering'. Then he would take the handful from the smaller vessel containing the single tenth and declare that it shall serve for the freewill meal-offering of the smaller vessel and also for the remaining tenths of the first vessel; and this would be quite in order, since the two vessels are in contact. As this solution is not put forward by Rabbi it must be that he is of the opinion that it is forbidden to mix in one vessel the meal-offering of obligation with the freewill-offering.
- (9) Supra 88a.
- (10) Lev. XIV, 21.
- (11) In the cited Mishnah.
- (12) He therefore brings sixty tenths with sixty logs and declares that as many tenths as make up his original vow, with the corresponding number of logs of oil, shall serve in fulfillment of his vow, and the remainder shall be a freewill meal-offering.

- (13) If sixty tenths are brought in one vessel.
- (14) And the same is the case where a man brings more tenths than he had vowed for his meal-offering.
- (15) Supra 107b.
- (16) Whether the meal-offering is large or small.
- (17) A list of the six Mishnahs that follow (according to the division of the Mishnahs in the separate editions of the Mishnah) each commencing with the same formula: 'I take upon myself to offer .
- (18) To the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.). This ruling is apparently in accord with R. Eliezer's view that liability is incurred only if the entire handful of the meal-offering is offered outside; v. Zeb. 109b. Tosaf, however suggest that the handful spoken of here is not the handful of flour of the meal-offering but one of the handfuls of the two dishes of frankincense, and the ruling here is intended to refute R. Eliezer's view who maintains (Zeb. 110a) that liability is incurred only if the two handfuls of the frankincense were offered outside. Accordingly the expression 'handful' in this connection does not exclude an olive's bulk but signifies anything less than the two handfuls. V. Tosaf. s.v. המעלה.
- (19) That were set on the table with the Showbread.
- (20) V. Glos.
- (21) Lev. II, 1.
- (22) Neh. X, 35.
- (23) Like the meal-offering it must be brought to the south-western corner of the altar.
- (24) The wood must be cut up into small thin strips and a handful taken and burnt upon the altar.
- (25) As with every offering wood from the Temple store is taken in order to burn this wood-offering.
- (26) Lev. VI, 8.
- (27) He must bring, therefore, an offering of frankincense, a burnt-offering of cattle, a burnt-offering of birds, a wine-offering, and the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings, for all these can in a less strict sense be described as offered entirely upon the altar; v. infra. The fact that this man specified an offering for the altar, and did not merely say 'for the altar', which would have implied frankincense alone, proves that in this case 'for the altar' is to be interpreted less strictly and therefore includes the above offerings.
- (28) That is offered entirely upon the altar.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

## Menachoth 107a

the crop and the feathers.<sup>1</sup> And what about the drink-offerings? — They flow down into the pits.<sup>1</sup> And what about the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings? — Since there is the ordinary meal-offering which is eaten by the priests. It is therefore not definite.<sup>2</sup>

[IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER GOLD’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A GOLDEN DENAR. Perhaps he meant a bar [of gold]! — R. Eleazar said, [We must suppose that] he said [gold] coin. Perhaps he meant small gold coins! — R. Papa said, Small gold coin is not usually made.

IF ‘SILVER’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A SILVER DENAR. Perhaps he meant a bar [of silver]! — R. Eleazar said, [We must suppose that] he said [silver] coin. Then perhaps he meant small silver coin! — R. Shesheth said, It must be that in this place small silver coin was not current.

IF ‘COPPER’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN THE VALUE OF A SILVER MA'AH. It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, He must bring not less than a small copper hook. What is it fit for?<sup>3</sup> — Abaye said, With it one could trim the wicks and cleanse the lamps. Of iron it was taught: Others say, He must bring not less than a ‘scarecrow’.<sup>4</sup> And how much is that? — R. Joseph said, One cubit square. Some report it thus: He must bring not less than one cubit square. What is it fit for? — R. Joseph said, For a scarecrow.

*MISHNAH.* [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER WINE’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN THREE LOG.<sup>5</sup> IF ‘OIL’, HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN ONE LOG;<sup>6</sup> BUT RABBI SAYS, NOT LESS THAN THREE LOGS.<sup>7</sup> [IF HE SAID,] I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD OFFER] BUT I DO NOT

KNOW WHAT QUANTITY I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING THAT QUANTITY WHICH IS THE MOST THAT IS BROUGHT ON ANY ONE DAY.<sup>8</sup>

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis taught: Home-born:<sup>9</sup> this teaches us that a man may offer wine as a freewill-offering. How much [must he bring]? Three logs. Whence do we know that if he desired to bring more he may do so? Because the text states, Shall be.<sup>10</sup> We might suppose that he may bring less, the text therefore states, After this manner.<sup>9</sup>

IF ‘OIL’. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN ONE LOG; BUT RABBI SAYS, NOT LESS THAN THREE LOGS. On what principle do they differ? — The scholars suggested to R. Papa. They differ as to whether we say, ‘Deduce from it and again from it’. Or ‘Deduce from it and establish it in its own place’.<sup>11</sup> The Rabbis<sup>12</sup> are of the opinion that we say, ‘Deduce from it and again from it’. Thus [‘deduce from it’]: as one may offer a meal-offering as a freewill-offering, so one may offer oil; and ‘again from it’: as the meal-offering needs but one log [of oil], so the offering of oil needs but one log. Rabbi, however, is of the opinion that we say, ‘Deduce from it and establish it in its own place’. Thus: as one may offer a meal-offering as a freewill-offering, so one may offer oil as a freewill-offering; and ‘establish it in its own place’: it shall be like the drink-offerings [of wine]: as the drink-offerings [of wine] require three logs, so the offering of oil requires three logs.

Thereupon R. Papa said to them, If Rabbi derived it from the meal-offering [he would certainly have said that the minimum quantity was one log], for all are of the opinion that we say ‘Deduce from it and again from it’. The fact is, however, that Rabbi derived it from the expression ‘Home-born’.<sup>13</sup> R. Huna son of R. Nathan said to R. Papa. How can you say so?<sup>14</sup> Behold it has been taught: Offering:<sup>15</sup> this teaches us that a

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

man may offer oil as a freewill-offering. And how much [must he bring]? Three logs. Now whom have you heard say, Three logs. It is only Rabbi; and yet he derives it from the expression ‘offering’! — He replied, If it was taught, it was taught.<sup>16</sup>

**[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD OFFER] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT QUANTITY I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING THAT QUANTITY WHICH IS THE MOST THAT IS BROUGHT ON ANY ONE DAY. A Tanna taught: Like the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] when it falls on a Sabbath.<sup>17</sup>**

**MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING,<sup>18</sup> HE MUST BRING A LAMB.<sup>19</sup> R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID, [HE MAY BRING] A TURTLE-DOVE OR A YOUNG PIGEON.**

**[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD<sup>20</sup> BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A BULL CALF.**

**[IF HE SAID, ‘I SPECIFIED] A BEAST OF THE CATTLE<sup>21</sup> BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING A BULL, A BULL CALF, A RAM, A HE-GOAT, A HE-KID. AND A HE-LAMB.**

**[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED [SOME KIND] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED’,**

(1) For notes v. supra p. 443. nn. 6 and 7.

(2) To say that the meal-offering is an offering entirely for the altar.

(3) In the Temple.

(4) Lit., ‘keeping off the ravens’. An iron sheet studded with spikes that was placed on the Temple roof to prevent birds perching there. V. Mid. IV, 6. According to Aruch: an iron figure placed on the roof to scare the birds away. V. Tosaf. s.v. פליה.

(5) This being the smallest quantity of wine prescribed in the drink-offerings that accompanied the animal-offering. viz., three logs for a lamb.

(6) The minimum quantity of oil prescribed for a meal-offering.

(7) This being the minimum prescribed in meal-offerings that are offered with the drink-offerings.

(8) V: Gemara.

(9) Num. XV, 13; stated with reference to the drink-offerings.

(10) Ibid. 15.

(11) V. supra p. 368, n. 1.

(12) The first Tanna of our Mishnah.

(13) Ibid. 13. And just as it was deduced from this expression that wine may be offered by itself as a freewill-offering. Rabbi also derives therefrom that oil may similarly be offered as a freewill-offering. Accordingly wine and oil are to be on a par, and as wine requires a minimum of three logs so it is with oil too.

(14) That Rabbi derives the rule that oil may be offered as a freewill-offering from the drink-offerings and not from the meal-offering.

(15) Lev. II, 1; stated with reference to the freewill meal-offering.

(16) ‘I admit then that I am wrong.’

(17) On this day were offered thirteen bullocks, two rams, and eighteen lambs, v. Num. XXIX, 12ff; and as for each bullock were required six logs of wine and of oil, for each ram four logs; and for each lamb three logs, the total number of logs of wine, and similarly of oil, offered on this day was 140.

(18) Which must be a male animal.

(19) This is the least expensive animal that can be offered as a burnt-offering.

(20) בקר

(21) בהמה.

## Menachoth 107b

**HE MUST ADD TO THESE A TURTLE-DOVE AND A YOUNG PIGEON. [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A THANK-OFFERING OR A PEACE-OFFERING’,<sup>1</sup> HE MUST BRING A LAMB.**

**[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A COW, A BULL CALF AND A HEIFER.**

**[IF HE SAID, I SPECIFIED] A BEAST OF THE CATTLE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED’, HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A COW, A BULL CALF AND A HEIFER. A RAM AND A EWE, A HE-GOAT AND A SHE-**

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

GOAT, A HE-KID AND A SHE-KID, A HE-LAMB AND A EWE-LAMB.

[IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER AN OX. HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF A MANEH;<sup>2</sup> IF 'A CALF', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF FIVE SELA'S; IF 'A RAM', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF TWO SELA'S;<sup>2</sup> IF 'A LAMB', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF ONE SELA'.

IF HE SAID 'AN OX VALUED AT ONE MANEH', HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH A MANEH APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; IF A CALF VALUED AT FIVE SELA'S'. HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH FIVE SELA'S APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; IF 'A RAM VALUED AT TWO SELA'S', HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH TWO SELA'S APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; AND IF A LAMB VALUED AT ONE SELA', HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH ONE SELA' APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS.

[IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER] AN OX VALUED AT A MANEH', AND HE BROUGHT TWO TOGETHER WORTH A MANEH, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. EVEN IF ONE WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR AND THE OTHER ALSO WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR.

[IF HE SAID] 'A BLACK ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A WHITE ONE, OR A WHITE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A BLACK ONE, OR 'A LARGE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A SMALL ONE, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

[IF HE SAID] 'A SMALL ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A LARGE ONE, HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION; BUT RABBI

SAYS, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

*GEMARA.* They<sup>3</sup> do not differ, for each rules according to the custom of his place.<sup>4</sup> Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering valued at a sela' for the altar', he must bring a lamb, for there is nothing else valued at a sela' offered upon the altar save a lamb. [If he said,] 'I specified [an offering valued at a sela'] but I do not know what it was I specified', he must bring every kind of offering valued at a sela' that is offered upon the altar.<sup>5</sup>

[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A BULL CALF. But why? Let him bring a bull, for in any event [that should fulfill his obligation]!<sup>6</sup> — This represents Rabbi's view, who maintains that [if a man offered to bring] a small animal and he brought a large one he has not fulfilled his obligation.

If it is Rabbi's view here, then read the following clauses: [IF HE SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER] AN OX VALUED AT A MANEH', AND HE BROUGHT TWO TOGETHER WORTH A MANEH, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. EVEN IF ONE WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR AND THE OTHER ALSO WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR. [IF HE SAID] 'A BLACK ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A WHITE ONE, OR 'A WHITE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A BLACK ONE, OR 'A LARGE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A SMALL ONE, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. [IF HE SAID] 'A SMALL ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A LARGE ONE, HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION; BUT RABBI SAYS, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. It will then be that the first and last clauses represent Rabbi's view while the middle

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

clauses represent the view of the Rabbis! — That is so, the first and last clauses represent Rabbi's view while the middle clauses represent the view of the Rabbis; and [the Tanna of the Mishnah] wished to tell us that this ruling [in the first part of the Mishnah] is really a matter of dispute between Rabbi and the Rabbis.<sup>7</sup> We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>8</sup> There were six [money chests] for freewill-offerings.<sup>9</sup> What did they represent?<sup>10</sup>

(Mnemonic: *K.N.Z.P.Sh. 'A.*)<sup>11</sup> —

Hezekiah said, They represented the six priestly groups;<sup>12</sup> and the Sages installed [six money chests] so that they should be at peace with each other.<sup>13</sup> R. Johanan said, Because of the abundant offerings [the Sages] installed [six] money chests so that the money became not mouldy.<sup>14</sup> Ze'iri said, They served for the offerings of a bull, a calf, a ram, a lamb, a kid and a goat;<sup>15</sup> this<sup>16</sup> being in accord with Rabbi who said that if a man offered to bring a small animal and he brought a large one he has not fulfilled his obligation. Bar Padda said, They served for the moneys of] bullocks,<sup>17</sup> rams,<sup>18</sup>

- (1) Which may be either a male or female animal.
- (2) One maneh = 25 sela's; one sela' = 4 denars. The prices mentioned for the various beasts are traditional, though there is a Biblical indication that the ram was to be worth two sela's in Lev. V, 15.
- (3) R. Eleazar b. Azariah and the first Tanna.
- (4) Both agree that the cheapest should be offered, but in the place where the first Tanna lived lambs were cheaper than pigeons, whereas in the town where R. Eleazar b. Azariah lived the reverse was the case.
- (5) The fact that this man specified the offering and did not merely say 'an offering valued at a sela' for the altar' proves that he believed that others besides a lamb were included in the last expression. He must therefore bring a lamb, a meal-offering, and frankincense, each valued at a sela'.
- (6) For even if he offered to bring a bull calf, the offering of a bull which is larger would surely fulfill his obligation!
- (7) According to the Sages the offering of a bull alone in the first clause would suffice.

- (8) Shek. VI, 5. V. supra 104a.
- (9) There were in all thirteen money chests (שופרות, horn-shaped chests) in the Temple, seven bearing inscriptions indicating the kind of money that was to be put in them, while six were allocated for money for freewill-offerings. These were offered as burnt-offerings on behalf of the community and the skins fell to the priests.
- (10) Why were six necessary for the purpose?
- (11) So Sh. Mek. and Dik. Sof. a.l. These are the characteristic letters of the teachers who propose answers to this question.
- (12) The priests were divided into twenty-four divisions (משמרות), each division serving in the Temple for one full week every half year. The division was sub-divided into six families or groups (בתיאבות) and each group was in service on one day in the week. On the Sabbath the whole division was called upon to do the service.
- (13) For each priestly group there was a separate money chest for freewill-offering; so that whenever the altar was idle and the occasion thus arose for offering burnt-offerings, the money would be taken from that chest allotted to the group in service on that day, and the skins of the animals offered would be shared among the priests of that group. In this way altercation and strife between the priestly groups would be avoided.
- (14) Which would be the case if all the money were to be placed in one chest.
- (15) The money for these offerings was put into separate chests. E.g., if a man undertook to offer a bull for a burnt-offering, he would bring a maneh (this being the price of a bull, v. our Mishnah) and put it into the chest that bore the inscription 'bull'; the priests would then come and take the money from that chest, purchase a bull, and offer it.
- (16) The need for six chests.
- (17) If a bullock which had been set aside for a sin-offering of the community had been lost and another had been offered in its place, and afterwards it was found, it was left to pasture until it contracted a physical blemish when it was sold. The money so obtained was put into a chest specially set aside for this purpose.
- (18) The money obtained on selling the ram of the guilt-offering for theft or for sacrilege when it was no longer required for that purpose (as in the circumstances described in the prec. n.) was put into a second chest.

## Menachoth 108a

lambs,<sup>1</sup> goats,<sup>2</sup> surplus moneys,<sup>3</sup> and the ma'ah.<sup>4</sup> They all do not agree with

## MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

Hezekiah's answer, because there is no reason to apprehend any strife, since each [priestly group] served on its own day.<sup>5</sup> Neither do they agree with R. Johanan's answer, because there is no fear of the money becoming moldy. Nor do they agree with Ze'iri's answer, because they do not wish to interpret it in accordance with the view of an individual.<sup>6</sup> Nor do they agree with Bar Padda's answer, [for why have a separate chest for] surplus moneys? Were not all the other moneys surplus moneys?<sup>7</sup> Moreover the ma'ahs went in the shekel [chamber]!<sup>8</sup> For it was taught: Where did the surcharge go? Into the shekel [chamber]. So R. Meir.

R. Eleazar says, Into the freewill-offering [chests]. Samuel said, They served for the surplus<sup>9</sup> of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering,<sup>10</sup> the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper,<sup>11</sup> the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering,<sup>12</sup> and the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering.<sup>13</sup> R. Oshaia said, They served for the surplus of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper, the surplus of the bird-offerings, and the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering.<sup>14</sup> Why does not Samuel accept R. Oshaia's answer? —

Bird-offerings have already been stated.<sup>15</sup> [Can it then be suggested that] R. Oshaia learnt that Mishnah and did not include bird-offerings? But we know that R. Oshaia learnt it and included bird-offerings! — One [chest] was for [the money for] the bird-offerings<sup>16</sup> and the other for the surplus money of the bird-offerings. And why does not R. Oshaia accept Samuel's answer? — Because he agrees with him who says that the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering must be left to rot. For it was taught: The surplus of the meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, and the surplus of the

meal-offering was left to rot. What does this mean? —

R. Hisda said, It means this: The surplus of the sinner's meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, and the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was left to rot. Rabbah said, Even the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, but [the Baraita teaches that] the surplus of the cakes of the thank-offering was left to rot. There is also the following dispute [on the matter]: As for the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering. R. Johanan said, It was to go for freewill-offerings. R. Eleazar said, It was to be left to rot. An objection was raised: [We have learnt:] The surplus of [money set aside for] shekels is free for common use, but the surplus of [money set aside for] the tenth of an ephah, and the surplus of [money set aside for] the bird-offerings of men who had an issue, for the bird-offerings of women who had an issue, for the bird-offerings of women after childbirth, or for sin-offerings or guilt-offerings-their surplus is for freewill-offerings.<sup>17</sup> This refers, does it not, to the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering? — No, it refers to the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering.<sup>18</sup>

R. Nahman b. R. Isaac said, The most reasonable view is that of him who holds that the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was left to rot. For it was taught: [It is written,] He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon; for it is a sin-offering.<sup>19</sup> R. Judah said, 'It' is called a sin-offering, but no other<sup>20</sup> is called a sin-offering; this teaches us that the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering is not called a sin-offering and that it requires frankincense. Now since it is not called a sin-offering the surplus thereof must be left to rot.

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

**MISHNAH.** [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘THIS OX SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH,<sup>21</sup> HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF.

[IF HE SAID,] ‘THESE TWO OXEN SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND THEY SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING ONE OX WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.<sup>22</sup> [IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF.

[IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’. AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.

(1) The money obtained for the lamb which had originally been set aside for the guilt-offering of a Nazirite or of a leper was put into a third chest and not confused with the money obtained from the guilt-offerings that was placed in the second chest, for the latter guilt-offerings were brought in order to obtain atonement whilst the former were brought in order to render the person fit.

(2) Sc. the he-goats offered as sin-offerings on behalf of the community on the Festivals. The money obtained for these he-goats (in the circumstances described supra n. 1) was put into a fourth chest.

(3) Where a sum of money had been set aside for any of the offerings mentioned and the price of animals fell, the surplus money was put into a fifth chest set there for this purpose.

(4) A small silver coin, equal to the sixth part of a zuz or denar. This was the amount of surcharge (Heb. קילבון) which every Israelite had to add to his annual half-shekel contribution to the Temple as compensation to the Temple treasury for any loss incurred in exchanging the half-shekels into other coinage. These ma'ahs were put into a sixth chest and the money was expended on free-will burnt-offerings on behalf of the community.

(5) Hence one chest would have sufficed. And if on any day the altar was idle the priests serving on that day would draw money from the chest for burnt-offerings and benefit from the skins. This could equally happen to any priestly group on any day, so that there are no grounds for quarrels.

(6) Sc. Rabbi. According to the Sages the money for all offerings could be put into one chest and the priests would spend it on bullocks for burnt-offerings.

(7) V. supra nn. 1 to 4. All these come under the heading of surplus money.

(8) In accordance with the view of R. Meir, and not into the chest of freewill-offerings.

(9) Arising when money had been set aside for a particular offering and the price thereof fell.

(10) Sc. the guilt-offering for theft and the guilt-offering for sacrilege. These required a separate chest and could not be mixed with the moneys of other guilt-offerings, for the former were rams brought for atonement whilst the latter were lambs brought in order to render the person fit.

(11) The surplus money of the guilt-offering of the leper could not be mixed with that of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, for the offering rites of the former differed greatly from the latter. The former offering required the application of its blood on the right thumb and right great toe of the leper whereas the latter did not; the former required drink-offerings whereas the latter did not, moreover the former rendered the leper clean to enter the camp, whereas the latter rendered the Nazirite fit to resume his Nazirite vow.

(12) This was exceptional, for the surplus of all other meal-offerings was used by the offerer for another meal-offering and was not used for communal freewill-offerings.

(13) Which the High Priest offered daily, half of it in the morning and half in the evening; v. Lev. VI, 13.

(14) V. Supra 104a.

(15) Among the seven chests reserved for special purposes was one whereon was inscribed ‘Bird-offerings’. V. Shek. VI, 5.

(16) Into this chest those who but needed an offering for the completion of their purification put their money for bird-offerings, and when evening came they could eat consecrated food, resting assured that the priests had of a certainty offered their bird-offerings during the day.

(17) Shek. II,5.

(18) Which was also a tenth of an ephah of fine flour.

(19) Lev. V, 11 referring to the sinner's meal-offering.

(20) Sc. the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering.

(21) It is no more fit for sacrifice but it must be sold and another burnt-offering brought with the price thereof.

(22) In the first instance; if, however, he did bring two, even Rabbi agrees that it is valid.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

## Menachoth 108b

**GEMARA.** But have you not stated in the earlier [Mishnah]: [If a man said, ‘I take upon myself to offer] an ox valued at a maneh’, and he brought two together worth a maneh, he has not fulfilled his obligation? — It is different here where he said ‘THIS OX’, and it suffered a blemish.<sup>1</sup>

[IF HE SAID,] ‘THESE TWO OXEN SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING, AND THEY SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING ONE OX WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT. Why?<sup>2</sup> — Because it is like the case where he vowed a large animal and he brought a small one.<sup>3</sup> For even though they have suffered a blemish.<sup>4</sup> Rabbi does not permit it in the first instance. Should he not then differ in the first case too?<sup>5</sup> — Rabbi indeed disagrees with the whole teaching, but he waited until the Rabbis had stated their view in full and then expressed his dissent. This can also be proved, for [the Mishnah] states: [IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT. This proves it.<sup>6</sup> The question was raised: What is the rule where a different kind is brought for the original kind?<sup>7</sup> —

Come and hear: [If a man said,] ‘This ox shall be a burnt-offering’, and it suffered a blemish, he may not bring a ram with the price thereof, but he may bring two rams with the price thereof. But Rabbi forbids it, for one may not mix them.<sup>8</sup> This proves it.<sup>9</sup> But if that is the case, why two [rams]? [They should also permit him to bring] one, since according to the view of the Rabbis, where

the original offering suffered a blemish,<sup>10</sup> it makes no difference whether a large or a small animal [is brought with the price thereof]! —

Two Tannaim differ as to the view of the Rabbis.<sup>11</sup> ‘Rabbi forbids it, for one may not mix them’. Now the reason [for Rabbi's view] is that one may not mix them, but if one were allowed to mix them it would be permitted;<sup>12</sup> but we have learnt: [IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] ‘THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.<sup>13</sup> — Two Tannaim differ as to the view of Rabbi.<sup>14</sup> As for unblemished animals,<sup>15</sup> [if a man vowed] a calf and he brought a bullock, or a lamb and he brought a ram, he has fulfilled his obligation. This is an anonymous teaching in accord with the view of the Rabbis.

HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF, etc. R. Menashya b. Zebid said in the name of Rab, This rule<sup>16</sup> applies only where the man said, ‘This ox shall be a burnt-offering’;<sup>17</sup> but if he said, ‘I take upon myself that this ox shall be a burnt-offering’, there is a definite obligation.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps he only meant: ‘I take upon myself to bring [this ox]’!<sup>19</sup> — The fact is that if such a statement was at all made it was made in these terms: R. Menashya b. Zebid said in the name of Rab, This rule<sup>20</sup> applies only where the man said, ‘This ox shall be a burnt-offering’ or where he said, ‘I take upon myself that this ox shall be a burnt-offering’; but if he said, ‘I take upon myself that this ox or its value<sup>21</sup> shall be a burnt-offering’, there is a definite obligation.<sup>22</sup>

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

**MISHNAH.** IF A MAN SAID, ‘ONE OF MY LAMBS SHALL BE HOLY’, OR ‘ONE OF MY OXEN SHALL BE HOLY’, AND HE HAD TWO ONLY, THE LARGER ONE IS HOLY. IF HE HAD THREE, THE MIDDLE ONE IS HOLY.

[IF HE SAID,] ‘I SPECIFIED ONE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHICH IT WAS I SPECIFIED’, OR [IF HE SAID,] ‘MY FATHER TOLD ME<sup>23</sup> [THAT HE HAD SPECIFIED ONE] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHICH IT IS’, THE LARGEST ONE AMONG THEM MUST BE HOLY.

**GEMARA.** [THE LARGER ONE IS HOLY.] We thus see that he that sanctifies, sanctifies in a liberal spirit. Now turn to the next clause: THE MIDDLE ONE IS HOLY, which shows that he that sanctifies, sanctifies in an illiberal spirit! — Samuel said, It means that we must take into account the possibility of the middle one also [being holy], for that shows a liberal spirit as compared with the smallest.<sup>24</sup> What then should [this man] do?<sup>25</sup>—

Hiyya<sup>26</sup> b. Rab said, He must wait until the middle one suffers a blemish and then transfer its sanctity to the largest one.<sup>27</sup> R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha, This<sup>28</sup> applies only where a man said, ‘One of my oxen shall be holy’. but if he said, ‘An ox among my oxen shall be holy’, then the largest among them is holy, for he meant thereby: the [finest] ox among my oxen.<sup>29</sup> But surely this is not right, for R. Huna b. Hiyya said in the name of ‘Ulla, If a man said to his fellow, ‘I sell you a house among my houses’, he may show him an attic [‘aliyyah’]!<sup>30</sup> Is it not because this expression implies the worst?<sup>31</sup> —

No; [‘aliyyah means] the finest of his houses.<sup>32</sup> An objection was raised: If a man said, ‘An ox among my oxen shall be holy’, and so, too, if an ox belonging to the Sanctuary was confused with other [unconsecrated oxen], the largest one among them must be holy, and all the others must be

sold to be used for burnt-offerings,<sup>33</sup> but the price thereof is free for common use? — This<sup>34</sup> refers only to the case where an ox belonging to the Sanctuary was confused with others.<sup>35</sup> But it says here ‘and so too’! — That refers only to the ruling that the largest one [must be holy]. A further objection was raised: If a man said, ‘I sell you a house among my houses’, and one [of his houses] fell down, he may show him the fallen house;<sup>36</sup> or if he said, ‘I sell you a slave among my slaves’, and one [of his slaves] died, he may show him the dead slave.

(1) Since he specified the ox, as soon as it became unfit for sacrifice the obligation of his vow has come to an end, and he is not bound to replace it by another; accordingly when it is sold and another offering brought with the price thereof it need not be quite the same as the original offering.

(2) Why does Rabbi forbid it?

(3) For generally speaking two oxen, even though together only equal in price to one, are more profitable than one.

(4) So that the obligation of this man's vow has come to an end.

(5) Sc. the first clause of our Mishnah which reads: [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘THIS OX SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. According to Rabbi this, too, should be forbidden, for it is like the case where a man vowed a small animal and he brought a large one.

(6) For the last clause of the Mishnah, viz., the offering of a ram with the price of the blemished lamb, is on all fours with the first clause, viz., the offering of two oxen with the price of the blemished one; and as Rabbi expressly differs with the Rabbis in the last clause, he obviously differs with them in the first clause too.

(7) Where, e.g., an ox which had been assigned for an offering had suffered a blemish, may one bring rams with the price of the blemished ox or not?

(8) Sc. the two meal-offerings which must accompany the two rams. Each meal-offering must be brought in a separate vessel, accordingly the present offering with its two meal-offerings is quite different from the original offering which required but one meal-offering.

(9) That one may bring a different kind (rams) with the price of the original blemished animal (the ox).

(10) And the obligation of this man's vow has then come to an end.

# MENACHOS – 86b-110a

(11) And one Tanna is of the opinion that even according to the Rabbis it is forbidden in the first instance to bring a smaller animal with the price of the larger blemished animal.

(12) To bring a different kind of animal for an offering with the price of the blemished animal.

(13) Notwithstanding that the present offering and the original offering are alike in that each requires but one meal-offering.

(14) One Tanna maintains that Rabbi insists only upon the present and the original offering being alike in the number of vessels required for the accompanying meal-offering; but the other Tanna holds that Rabbi insists upon the animals being identical.

(15) Lit., ‘clean animals’. This is a continuation of the Baraitha quoted above in answer to the question that was raised.

(16) That with the price of the blemished ox he may bring two.

(17) For in truth the obligation of this man's vow came to an end when the ox suffered a blemish.

(18) To bring one burnt-offering. The use of the expression ‘I take upon myself’ imposes an obligation upon the man to bring the offering according to the terms of his vow which was here one burnt-offering and not two.

(19) With the emphasis upon ‘this’. Therefore if the ox became unfit that discharges his vow.

(20) That with the price of the blemished ox he may bring two.

(21) I.e., if the ox suffers a blemish and is sold.

(22) V. p. 668, n. 8.

(23) Before he died.

(24) Thus both the largest animal and the middle one might be the one that was sanctified, for each can be regarded as a liberal offering as compared with the smallest animal.

(25) In order to be allowed to use one of these two animals.

(26) So according to MSS. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read: R. Hiyya.

(27) So that now the largest animal is the holy one without any shadow of doubt, for it was either holy in the first place or it has now become holy; on the other hand the middle one is now free for common use.

(28) That we must consider the possibility of the middle one also being holy.

(29) For so is the superlative degree expressed in Hebrew; cf. שיר השירים ‘the song of songs’, the finest song, קדש הקדשים, the holy of holies’, the most holy.

(30) As the subject matter of the sale. Heb. עלייה, ‘an upper room, an attic’.

(31) Similarly the expression ‘an ox among my oxen would imply the smallest animal, contrary to R. Nahman.

(32) The word עלייה is here taken in the sense of ‘the finest’, ‘the most distinguished’.

(33) For we take into account the possibility of any one of the others being the holy one, thus contrary to R. Nahman who ruled that the expression an ox among my oxen’ definitely indicates the largest one.

(34) The ruling that all must be sold for burnt-offerings.

(35) But where a man said, ‘An ox among my oxen shall be holy’, there is no doubt at all that no other than the largest one was intended.

(36) As the one that was sold.

## Menachoth 109a

But why? Let us rather see which [house] it was that fell down, or which [slave] it was that died!<sup>1</sup> — You are speaking, are you not, of a purchaser? But it is quite a different matter in the case of a purchaser, for the holder of a deed is always at a disadvantage.<sup>2</sup> And now that you have arrived at this answer, you may even say that ‘aliyyah<sup>3</sup> [means the attic, and] the worst [room was meant], for the reason that the holder of a deed is always at a disadvantage.

**MISHNAH.** [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING, HE MUST OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE;<sup>4</sup> AND IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS,<sup>5</sup> HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

[IF HE SAID,] ‘I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING BUT I WILL OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS’. HE MUST OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE,<sup>6</sup> YET IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, SUCH IS NO BURNT-OFFERING.

[IF A MAN SAID.] ‘I WILL BE A NAZIRITE’. HE MUST BRING HIS OFFERINGS<sup>7</sup> IN THE TEMPLE; AND IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN

## MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

[IF HE SAID,] I WILL BE A NAZIRITE BUT I WILL BRING MY OFFERINGS IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS'. HE MUST BRING THEM IN THE TEMPLE, YET IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, SUCH A ONE IS NOT A NAZIRITE.

*GEMARA.* [YET IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS] HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. But he has only killed the offering [and not sacrificed it]!<sup>8</sup> — R. Hamnuna answered, It is regarded as though he said, 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering on the condition that I shall not be held responsible for it.<sup>9</sup> Whereupon Raba said to him, In that case will you also say the same of the final clause which reads: [IF HE SAID,] 'I WILL BE A NAZIRITE BUT I WILL BRING MY OFFERINGS IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS, HE MUST BRING THEM IN THE TEMPLE, YET IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION, namely, that it is regarded as though he said, 'I will be a Nazirite on the condition that I shall not be held responsible for the offerings'? But surely a Nazirite is not released [from his vow] until he has brought his offerings! —

The fact is, said Raba, that this man merely intended to offer a gift<sup>10</sup> [to God], saying to himself, 'If the Temple of Onias can serve my purpose, I will take the trouble [and offer it there]; but further than that<sup>11</sup> I cannot put myself out'. And with regard to the Nazirite vow, too, this man merely intended to exercise self-denial,<sup>12</sup> saying to himself, 'If the Temple of Onias can serve my purpose, I will take the trouble [and bring the offerings there]; but further than that I cannot put myself out'. R. Hamnuna, however, says, With regard to the Nazirite it is as you say, but in the case of the burnt-offering his vow

was intended to imply: 'I will not be held responsible for it'.<sup>13</sup>

R. Johanan is also of the same opinion as R. Hamnuna; for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering but I will offer it in the Temple of Onias', and he offered it in the Land of Israel,<sup>14</sup> he has fulfilled his obligation but he has incurred the penalty of kareth.<sup>15</sup> There has also been taught [a Baraitha] to the same effect: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering but I will offer it in the wilderness',<sup>16</sup> and he offered it beyond the Jordan,<sup>14</sup> he has fulfilled his obligation but he has incurred the penalty of kareth.

*MISHNAH.* THE PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS MAY NOT MINISTER IN THE TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM; AND NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER;<sup>17</sup> FOR IT IS WRITTEN, NEVERTHELESS THE PRIESTS OF THE HIGH PLACES CAME NOT UP TO THE ALTAR OF THE LORD IN JERUSALEM. BUT THEY DID EAT UNLEAVENED BREAD AMONG THEIR BRETHREN.<sup>18</sup> THUS THEY ARE LIKE THOSE THAT HAD A BLEMISH:<sup>19</sup> THEY ARE ENTITLED TO SHARE AND EAT [OF THE HOLY THINGS]. BUT THEY ARE NOT PERMITTED TO OFFER SACRIFICES.

*GEMARA.* Rab Judah said, If a priest had slaughtered an animal to an idol,<sup>20</sup> his offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savor. R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, Where is there Scriptural proof for this? It is written, Because they ministered unto them before their idols, and became a stumbling-block of iniquity unto the house of Israel; therefore have I lifted up My hand against them, saith the Lord God, and they shall bear their iniquity,<sup>21</sup> and immediately afterwards it is written, And they shall not come near unto Me, to minister unto Me in the priest's office.<sup>22</sup> Thus only if they performed service

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

[unto idols are they disqualified], but slaughtering is no service.<sup>23</sup> It was stated: [If a priest had] inadvertently sprinkled blood<sup>24</sup> [to an idol].

R. Nahman says, His offering [in the Temple]<sup>25</sup> is a sweet savor; but R. Shesheth says, His offering is not a sweet savor.

R. Shesheth said, Whence do I derive my view? It is written, ‘And became a stumbling-block of iniquity unto the house of Israel’. Now this surely means either through stumbling or through iniquity; and ‘stumbling-block’ signifies an inadvertent act, and ‘iniquity’ a deliberate act!<sup>26</sup>

R. Nahman, however, says, It means a stumbling-block of iniquity.<sup>27</sup> R. Nahman said, Whence do I derive my view? From the following Baraita which was taught: It is written, And the priest shall make atonement for the soul that erreth, when he sinneth in error:<sup>28</sup> this teaches us that the priest may make atonement for himself by his own sacrifice. Now how [did he minister unto the idol]? Will you say, by slaughtering before it? Then why does the verse speak of sinning in error? It is the same even though he sinned deliberately!<sup>29</sup> It can only be that he ministered unto the idol by sprinkling before it.<sup>30</sup>

R. Shesheth, however, can say. I still say by slaughtering before it, but it is not the same if he did so deliberately for he then became a priest to the idol.<sup>31</sup> They<sup>32</sup> have indeed followed up these principles of theirs, for it has been stated: If a priest had deliberately slaughtered [an animal to an idol].

R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savor; but R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savor. ‘R. Nahman said, His offering is a sweet savor — for he had not performed a service [before the idol].<sup>33</sup>

‘R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savor’ —

(1) And if it was the best house that fell down or the best slave that died, only then should the purchaser suffer the loss, but not if it was not the best, for according to R. Nahman the terms of the transaction implied that the best was being sold.

(2) It is for the purchaser who has the deed of sale in his possession to prove that nothing but the best was the subject of the sale, otherwise it will be assumed that the worst was sold. With regard to offerings for the altar, however, it will always be assumed that the best was intended.

(3) In the case stated by R. Huna b. Hiyya in the name of ‘Ulla, supra p. 670.

(4) At Jerusalem.

(5) The Temple erected in the neighborhood of Heliopolis in Egypt by Onias IV. who had fled from Palestine 164 B.C.E. It was modeled on the Temple in Jerusalem, and the regular system of sacrifices was established there. It was despoiled and suppressed by the Emperor Vespasian about the same time as the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple; v. Josephus Antiquities. XIII, 3ff.

(6) For by his opening words ‘I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering’ there rests upon him an obligation to bring a burnt-offering.

(7) Lit., ‘he must shave’. This expression is used throughout for the offerings which the Nazirite brings on the completion of his vow when he shaves ‘his consecrated head’. V. Num. VI. 18.

(8) For what is slaughtered outside the Temple is not regarded as the sacrifice of the offering, consequently apart from the liability that is incurred for slaughtering outside the Temple he does not thereby fulfill the obligation of his vow.

(9) Since the Temple of Onias is not different from any other place outside the Temple, his saying ‘I will offer it in the Temple of Onias’ clearly implied that wherever the animal was slaughtered that was the fulfillment of his obligation. He is, of course, liable for slaughtering it outside the Temple.

(10) And he did not pledge himself to offer a burnt-offering at all; accordingly there does not arise here the prohibition of slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple.

(11) I.e., to have to bring it to the Temple in Jerusalem. We must suppose that he was living far from the Land of Israel but near to the Temple of Onias.

(12) But there was no Nazirite vow at all.

(13) And consequently he is in this case culpable for slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple.

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

(14) In Palestine, but not at the Temple in Jerusalem.

(15) For slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple. For kareth v. Glos. He has, however, fulfilled his obligation and need not bring another burnt-offering to the Temple, for by his saying, 'I will offer it in the Temple of Onias' he implied that wheresoever the animal would be slaughtered that would be the fulfillment of his obligation. V. supra p. 672, n. 2.

(16) In which the Israelites journeyed and where the Tabernacle was erected by Moses.

(17) A euphemism for idolatry.

(18) II Kings XXIII, 9.

(19) Cf. Lev. XXI, 17ff.

(20) And he afterwards repented.

(21) Ezek. XLIV, 12.

(22) Ibid. 13.

(23) For even in the Temple it may be performed by non-priests.

(24) This is, of course, an act of service.

(25) On a subsequent occasion.

(26) Thus whether the service in honor of the idol was performed inadvertently (through stumbling) or deliberately (through iniquity) the priest is debarred for all time from offering sacrifices in the Temple.

(27) I.e., a deliberate act of service.

(28) Num. XV, 28. The apparently superfluous expression 'when he sinneth in error' is interpreted as referring to a priest who, having sinned by ministering to idols, is now offering his own sacrifice and making atonement for himself (for the whole passage refers to the sin of idolatry).

(29) For slaughtering is no service.

(30) And as he did so in error he may minister in the Temple. for the Baraita teaches that he may offer his own sacrifice; thus in accord with R. Nahman's view.

(31) Notwithstanding that slaughtering is no service.

(32) R. Nahman and R. Shesheth.

(33) For slaughtering is no service.

## Menachoth 109b

for he had become a priest to idols.

R. Nahman said, Whence do I derive my view? From the following which was taught: If a priest ministered before idols and repented, his offering is a sweet savor. In what circumstances [did he minister]? Will you say, inadvertently? Then what is the point of 'and repented'? He has always been

repentant!<sup>1</sup> It must obviously be [that he ministered] deliberately. And further, if by sprinkling, then even though he repented it avails naught, for he had performed a service [before the idol]! It can only be by slaughtering [before it].

R. Shesheth, however, will say, I still maintain that he ministered inadvertently, and [the Baraita] means to say as follows: If he had always been repentant, that is to say, when he ministered [before the idol] he ministered inadvertently, his offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savor; otherwise his offering is not a sweet savor. If a priest had prostrated himself before an idol, R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savor; and R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savor. If he had acknowledged an idol, R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savor; and R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savor. Now all these disputes had to be stated. For if only the first<sup>2</sup> had been stated, I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say [that his offering was not a sweet savor] since he had performed a service [before the idol], but where he had slaughtered [before the idol], since that was no service, I would have said that he agreed with R. Nahman. [Hence the latter dispute had to be stated.] And if the dispute regarding slaughtering had only been stated, [I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say that his offering was not a sweet savor] since he had performed some services [before the idol], but not where he had prostrated himself before the idol, for that was no service. Hence the latter had to be stated. And if the dispute regarding prostrating [before the idol] had only been stated, [I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say that his offering was not a sweet savor] since he had done some act [before the idol], but not where he had merely acknowledged the idol, for that was a mere matter of words. Therefore all had to be stated.

## MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

**NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER.<sup>4</sup> Since it says here, NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER, it follows that the Temple of Onias was not an idolatrous shrine. Our Tanna thus concurs with the view of him who said that the Temple of Onias was not an idolatrous shrine. For it was taught: In the year in which Simeon the Just died, he foretold them that he would die. They said to him, ‘Whence do you know it?’ He replied. ‘Every Day of Atonement there met me an old man, dressed in white and wrapped in white, who entered with me [into the Holy of Holies] and left with me; but this year there met me an old man, dressed in black and wrapped in black, who entered with me but did not leave with me’. After the Festival [of Tabernacles] he was ill for seven days and then died. Thereafter his brethren the priests forbore to pronounce the Name in the priestly benediction.<sup>5</sup> In the hour of his departure [from this life], he said to them, ‘My son Onias shall assume the office [of High Priest] after me’.**

**His brother Shime'i, who was two years and a half older than he, was jealous of him and said to him, ‘Come and I will teach you the order of the Temple service. He<sup>6</sup> thereupon put upon him a gown,<sup>7</sup> girded him with a girdle, placed him near the altar, and said to his brethren the priests. ‘See what this man promised his beloved<sup>8</sup> and has now fulfilled: "On the day in which I will assume the office of High Priest I will put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle"'.<sup>9</sup> At this his brethren the priests sought to kill him.<sup>9</sup> He fled from them but they pursued him. He then went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honor of idols. When the Sages heard of this they said, If this is what happened [through the jealousy] of one<sup>6</sup> who had never assumed the honour,<sup>10</sup> what would happen [through the jealousy] of one who had once assumed**

**the honor [and had been ousted from it]! This is the view of the events according to R. Meir.**

**R. Judah said to him, That was not what happened, but the fact was that Onias did not accept the office of High Priest because his brother Shime'i was two years and a half older than he. For all that Onias was jealous of his brother Shime'i and he said to him, ‘Come and I will teach you the order of the Temple service’. He<sup>9</sup> thereupon put on him a gown, girded him with a girdle, placed him near the altar, and said to his brethren the priests, ‘See what this man promised his beloved and has now fulfilled: "On the day that I will assume the office of High Priest I will put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle"'.<sup>9</sup> At this his brethren the priests sought to kill him,<sup>6</sup> but he explained to them all that occurred. They thereupon sought to kill Onias; he fled from them but they pursued him. He fled to the King's palace,<sup>11</sup> but they pursued him there; and whoever saw him cried out, There he is, there he is. He thereupon went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honor of God; for so it is written, In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord.<sup>12</sup> When the Sages heard of this they said, If this is what happened [through the jealousy] of one<sup>13</sup> who had [at first] shunned the honor, what would happen [through the jealousy] of one who seeks the honor!**

**It was taught: R. Joshua b. Perahiah said, At first<sup>14</sup> whoever were to say to me ‘Take up the honour’,<sup>15</sup> I would bind him and put him in front of a lion; but now<sup>16</sup> whoever were to say to me, ‘Give up the honour’,<sup>17</sup> I would pour over him a kettle of boiling water. For [we see that] Saul [at first] shunned [the throne], but after he had taken it he sought to kill David. Mar Kashisha son of R. Hisda said to Abaye. How does R. Meir<sup>18</sup> interpret that verse<sup>12</sup> adduced by R. Judah? — As in the following [Baraita] which was taught: After**

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

the downfall of Sennacherib Hezekiah went out and found princes sitting in their golden carriages. He adjured them not to serve idols, as it is written, In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan,<sup>19</sup>

(1) For one who sinned in error has not transgressed the law that he should stand in need of repentance.

(2) Where the priest had sprinkled blood before the idol.

(3) Slaughtering, although not a priestly service, is indeed an essential service with regard to the offering.

(4) Sc. idolatry.

(5) V. Tosaf. Sot. 38a. s.v. הרי; and Yoma (Sonc. ed.) p. 196 n. 1.

(6) Shime'i.

(7) A light garment. 'The easy dress worn in the house and, under the cloak, in the street, but in which it was unbecoming to appear in public' (Jast.). According to Rashi: a leather gown.

(8) His wife.

(9) Onias.

(10) Of the High Priesthood. Lit., 'went down to it'.

(11) The King's Mount, Har ha-Meleq (Tur Malka) v. Git. (Sonc. ed.) p. 254, n. 4.

(12) Isa. XIX, 19.

(13) Onias.

(14) The translation of this passage follows the text as found in cur. edd. and as established by R. Kalonymus the father of R. Meshullam. There is, however, another text found in MS.M. and quoted by R. Gershom, Rashi and Tosaf. which reads: בתחילה כל האומר עולה או מנחה אני משיל עליי: קומקום של המין: Whosoever pledges a burnt-offering or a meal-offering first (i.e., without having first set apart the animal or the flour for the purpose). I would pour over him a kettle of boiling water. The reason for this denunciation is that later this man might not find an animal or flour available for his purpose and his vow will therefore be left unfulfilled. This subject, however, is entirely out of place here.

(15) Lit., 'go up to it'.

(16) Having taken a position of honor. R. Joshua b. Perahiah had been appointed to the position of Nasi, or President of the Sanhedrin, cf. Hag, 16a; he fled to Alexandria owing to Sadducee hostility but was recalled later by Simeon b. Shetah; v. Sot. 47a.

(17) Lit., 'go down from it'.

(18) Who considers the Temple of Onias to have been an idolatrous shrine.

(19) Sc. the Hebrew tongue spoken in the land of Canaan.

## Menachoth 110a

and swear to the Lord of hosts.<sup>1</sup> Thereupon they went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honor of God, as it is written, In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt. One shall be called the city of Heres.<sup>2</sup> What is meant by The city of Heres? —

As R. Joseph rendered it in Aramaic: The city of Beth Shemesh [the sun], which is destined to destruction, will be said to be one of them.<sup>3</sup> But whence do we know that Heres signifies the sun? For it is written, Who commandeth the sun [heres] and it riseth not.<sup>4</sup> Bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth.<sup>5</sup> 'Bring My sons from far': R. Huna said, These are the exiles in Babylon, who are at ease like sons. 'And My daughters from the ends of the earth': These are the exiles in other lands, who are not at ease,<sup>6</sup> like daughters.<sup>7</sup>

R. Abba b. R. Isaac said in the name of R. Hisda — others say, Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, From Tyre to Carthage the nations know Israel and their Father who is in heaven; but from Tyre westwards<sup>8</sup> and from Carthage eastwards<sup>8</sup> the nations know neither Israel nor their Father who is in heaven.

R. Shimi b. Hiyya raised the following objection against Rab: Is it not written, For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name is great among the nations; and in every place offerings are burnt and presented unto My name, even pure oblations?<sup>9</sup> — He replied. You, Shimi!<sup>10</sup> They call Him the God of Gods.<sup>11</sup> 'And in every place offerings are burnt and presented unto My name'. 'In every place'! Is this possible? —

# MENOCHOS – 86b-110a

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan. This refers to the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Torah in whatever place they are: [God says,] I account it unto them as though they burnt and presented offerings to My name. ‘Even pure oblations’: this refers to one who studies the Torah in purity; that is, one who marries a wife and afterwards studies the Torah.<sup>12</sup> A song of Ascents. Behold, bless ye the Lord, all ye servants of the Lord, that stand in the house of the Lord in the night seasons.<sup>13</sup> What is the meaning of ‘in the night seasons’? —

R. Johanan said, This refers to the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Torah at nights: Holy Writ accounts it to them as though they were occupied with the Temple service. This is an ordinance for ever to Israel.<sup>14</sup> R. Giddal said in the name of Rab, This refers to the altar built [in heaven].<sup>15</sup> where Michael, the great Prince,<sup>16</sup> stands and offers up thereon an offering.<sup>17</sup> R. Johanan said, It refers to the scholars who are occupied with the laws of Temple service: Holy Writ imputes it to them as though the Temple were built in their days.

Resh Lakish said, What is the significance of the verse, This is the law for the burnt-offering, for the meal-offering, for the sin-offering, and for the guilt-offering?<sup>18</sup> It teaches that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the Torah is as though he were offering a burnt-offering, a meal-offering a sin-offering, and a guilt-offering, Raba asked, Why then does the verse say. ‘For the burnt-offering, for the meal-offering’? It should have said, ‘a burnt-offering, a meal-offering’! Rather, said Raba, it means that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the Torah needs neither burnt-offering, nor meal-offering, nor sin-offering, nor guilt-offering.<sup>19</sup>

R. Isaac said, What is the significance of the verses, This is the law of the sin-offering;<sup>20</sup> and This is the law of the guilt-offering?<sup>21</sup>

They teach that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the laws of the sin-offering is as though he were offering a sin-offering, and whosoever occupies himself with the study of the laws of the guilt-offering is as though he were offering a guilt-offering.

*MISHNAH.* IT IS SAID OF THE BURNT-OFFERINGS OF CATTLE, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR;<sup>22</sup> AND OF THE BURNT-OFFERINGS OF BIRDS, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR;<sup>23</sup> AND OF THE MEAL-OFFERING, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR:<sup>24</sup> TO TEACH YOU THAT IT IS THE SAME WHETHER A MAN OFFERS MUCH OR LITTLE, SO LONG AS HE DIRECTS HIS HEART TO HEAVEN.

*GEMARA.* R. Zera said, Where do we find a Scriptural reference to this? In the verse, Sweet is the sleep of a laboring man, whether he eat little or much.<sup>25</sup> R. Adda b. Ahabah said, In the following verse, When goods increase, they are increased that eat them; and what advantage is there to the owner thereof, [saving the beholding of them with his eyes]?<sup>26</sup>

It was taught: R. Simeon b. ‘Azzai said. Come and see what is written in the chapter of the sacrifices. Neither el<sup>27</sup> nor elohim<sup>27</sup> is found there, but only the Lord, so as not to give sectarians any occasion to rebel.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, it is said of a large ox, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savor’; of a small bird, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savor’; and of a meal-offering, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savor’: to teach you that it is the same whether a man offers much or little, so long as he directs his heart to heaven. And lest you say, He needs it for food, the text therefore states, If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is Mine and the fullness thereof.<sup>29</sup> And it also says, For every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains; and the wild

# MENOSCHOS – 86b-110a

beasts of the field are mine. Do I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?<sup>30</sup> I did not bid you to sacrifice so that you should say, I will do His will that He may do my will.<sup>31</sup> You do not sacrifice for My sake, but for your own sakes, as it is written, Ye shall sacrifice it at your will.<sup>32</sup> Another interpretation is: 'Ye shall sacrifice it at your will': sacrifice it of your own free will, sacrifice it with the proper intention.

As Samuel once enquired of R. Huna, Whence do we know that the offering is invalid if the act [of slaughtering] was performed incidentally?<sup>33</sup> [He replied,] Because it is written, And he shall slaughter the bullock,<sup>34</sup> thus teaching that the slaughtering should be intended for the bullock. Said the other, This we already know;<sup>35</sup> but whence do we know that this rule is indispensable? [He replied,] Because it is written, 'Ye shall sacrifice it at your will', that is to say, sacrifice it with the proper intention.<sup>36</sup>

- (1) Ibid. 18.
- (2) Isa. XIX, 18.
- (3) חרס has the meaning of 'destruction' and also 'the sun'.
- (4) Job IX, 7. Heb. חרס
- (5) Isa. XLIII, 6.
- (6) Lit., 'whose minds are settled'. The Jews living in Babylon were for the most part less subject to persecution than their brethren in other lands.
- (7) Woman's tranquil frame of mind is more readily disturbed by troubles than man's.
- (8) Geographically this is difficult to understand, for westwards of Tyre is the Mediterranean Sea and eastwards of Carthage is that region which, according to the first part of this sentence, is inhabited by those people who recognize their Father who is in heaven. It has already been suggested by M. Schwartz, *Dos Heilige Land*, p. 274 that 'westwards' and 'eastwards' should be transposed. Cf. also Neubauer, *Geographie*. p. 294.
- (9) Mal. I, 11.
- (10) V. supra p. 186, n. 3.
- (11) But they do not worship Him.
- (12) So that he is undisturbed by impure thoughts.
- (13) Ps. CXXXIV, 1.
- (14) II Chron. II, 3. This verse implies that the altar-offerings will never cease.

- (15) Cf. Hag. 12b.
- (16) Israel's guardian angel; v. Dan. XII, 1. Cf. Yoma 77a.
- (17) Sc. the souls of the righteous. V. Tosaf s.v. ומיכאל.
- (18) Lev. VII, 37.
- (19) The verse accordingly means: The Torah is for, i.e., in lieu of, the burnt-offering, the meal-offering, etc.: the study of the Torah makes atonement like the offering of sacrifice. Another interpretation: לא עולה stands for עולה 'no (need for) burnt-offering'; cf. Ned. 11a.
- (20) Ibid. VI, 18.
- (21) Ibid. VII, 1.
- (22) Lev. I, 9.
- (23) Ibid. 17.
- (24) Ibid. II, 2.
- (25) Eccl. V, 11. Heb. עוֹבֵד is here given the meaning of 'one who brings an offering' (cf. Isa. XIX, 21) and the interpretation of the verse is: Sweet is the sleep of the man who brings an offering; be it little or much, he shall enjoy the reward thereof.
- (26) Ibid. 10. The interpretation of the verse is: When offerings increase there are many priests that eat them; but what advantage is the abundance of offerings to the Holy One, the Owner of all, saving the beholding of the heart that prompts the offering?
- (27) Heb. אל and אלהים, meaning God. For these terms are also used in connection with idols (Maharsha).
- (28) By finding support in Scripture for their heretical belief in the plurality of deities.
- (29) Ps. L, 12.
- (30) Ibid. 10, 11, 13.
- (31) The ritual of sacrifice was an ordinance of God which was to be performed not in order to obtain a reciprocal favor from Him, but simply because He had willed it so.
- (32) Lev. XIX, 5.
- (33) If, e.g., a man was handling a knife, when it accidentally fell from his hand and it slaughtered an offering.
- (34) Ibid. I, 5.
- (35) Lit., 'this is in our hands'.
- (36) Since we have two verses each directing that the slaughtering of the sacrifice must be intentional, this rule becomes indispensable, in accordance with the Rabbinic dictum: Wherever Scripture repeats an injunction in connection with holy things it is meant to be indispensable.