

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud

Book II

Folios 27a-58b



MENOCHOS

**TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH
WITH NOTES**

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771
www.613etc.com

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Menachoth 27a

for here is written, Upon the wood. The question arises only according to him who maintains that 'upon' may mean 'near to'. How is it then? Do we also explain 'upon' here as 'near to'; or perhaps, since the phrases 'upon the wood' and 'upon the altar' are in juxtaposition, as in the latter phrase 'upon' is taken in its literal meaning so in the former 'upon' is to be taken in its literal meaning? — This, too, remains undecided.

MISHNAH. OF THE HANDFUL THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE.¹ OF THE TENTH² THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE WINE³ THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE OIL⁴ THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE HANDFUL AND THE FRANKINCENSE THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER.

GEMARA. [OF THE HANDFUL THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE.] Why is it so? — Because Scripture stated his handful twice.⁵

OF THE TENTH THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. Why? — Because it is written, Of the fine flour thereof,⁶ [signifying that] if any part thereof was lacking it is invalid.

OF THE WINE THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. [Because it is written,] Thus.⁷ OF THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. [As to the oil] of the drink-offerings, [because it is written], Thus, and of the freewill meal-offering, because it is

written, And of the oil thereof,⁶ [signifying that] if any part thereof was lacking it is invalid.

OF THE FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER, [Because it is written,] Of the fine flour thereof and of the oil thereof,⁶ and further, Of the bruised corn thereof and of the oil thereof.⁸

OF THE HANDFUL AND THE FRANKINCENSE THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. [Because it is written,] With all the frankincense thereof,⁹ and further, And all the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering.¹⁰

MISHNAH. OF THE TWO HE-GOATS¹¹ OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO LAMBS¹² OF THE FEAST OF WEEKS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO LOAVES¹³ THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO ROWS¹⁴ [OF THE SHEWBREAD] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO DISHES¹⁴ [OF FRANKINCENSE] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE ROWS AND THE DISHES THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE OFFERING OF THE NAZIRITE,¹⁵

OF THE THREE KINDS USED FOR THE RED COW,¹⁶ OF THE FOUR KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE THANK-OFFERING,¹⁷ OF THE FOUR KINDS [OF PLANTS] USED FOR THE LULAB,¹⁸ AND OF THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE [PURIFICATION OF THE] LEPER,¹⁹ THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] OF THE RED COW²⁰ THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS BETWEEN THE STAVES OF THE ARK,²¹ AND

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

OF THOSE TOWARDS THE VEIL AND UPON THE GOLDEN ALTAR,²² THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS.

GEMARA. OF THE TWO HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THE [ABSENCE OF ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.²³

OF THE TWO LAMBS OF THE FEAST OF WEEKS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER — for the expression ‘shall be’ is used therewith.²⁴

THE TWO LOAVES — for the expression ‘shall be’ is used therewith.²⁴

THE TWO ROWS — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.²⁵

THE TWO DISHES — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.²⁵

THE ROWS AND THE DISHES — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.

THE TWO KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE OFFERING OF THE NAZIRITE — for it is written, So he must do.²⁶

THE THREE KINDS USED FOR THE RED COW — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.²⁷

THE FOUR KINDS OF CAKES USED IN THE THANK-OFFERING — for [the thank-offering] has been placed side by side with the offering of the Nazirite, in the verse, With the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving,²⁸ and the Master said, Of his peace-offerings, includes the peace-offering of the Nazirite.²⁹

THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE LEPER — for it is written, This shall be the law of the leper.³⁰

THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE LULAB — for it is written, And ye shall take,³¹ signifying the taking of them all. R. Hanan b. Abba said, This³² was taught only in the case where he did not have them at all, but where he had them all one does not invalidate the other.³³ An objection was raised against him. It was taught: Of the four kinds used for the lulab two are fruit-bearing³⁴ and two are not;³⁵ those which bear fruits must be joined to those which bear no fruits and those which bear no fruits must be joined to those which bear fruits. And a man does not fulfill his obligation unless they are all bound in one band. And so it is with Israel's conciliation with God, [it is achieved] only when they are all in one band, as it is said, That buildeth his chambers in the heaven, and hath founded his band upon the earth.³⁶ —

This is a matter of dispute between Tannaim. For it was taught: The lulab is valid whether it be bound with the others or not; but R. Judah says, If it is bound with the others it is valid, and if it is not so bound it is not valid. What is the reason for R. Judah's view? —

He draws an analogy by means of the expression ‘taking’ used [both here and] also in connection with the bunch of hyssop:³⁷ as there the kinds must be bound in one bunch, so here they must be bound in one band. The Rabbis, however, do not draw this analogy by means of the expression ‘taking’. With whose view then would the following Baraita agree? For it was taught: It is a meritorious act to bind the lulab with the other species; nevertheless if one did not bind it, it is valid! If with R. Judah's view, why then is it valid if one did not bind it? And if it agrees with the view of the Rabbis, why does it say ‘It is a meritorious act’?³⁸ — Indeed it agrees with the view of the Rabbis, and it is a meritorious act only on the principle of This is my God and I will beautify him.³⁹

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] OF THE RED COW, THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.⁴⁰

OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS BETWEEN THE STAVES OF THE ARK, AND OF THOSE TOWARDS THE VEIL AND UPON THE GOLDEN ALTAR, THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. As for the offerings of the Day of Atonement, because the term ‘statute’ is used therewith;⁴¹ and as for the bullock offered when the anointed High Priest sinned in error, and the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error, and the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry, because of the following teaching: It is written, Thus shall he do with the bullock, as he did with the bullock of the sin-offering.⁴² Wherefore is it written?⁴² In order to repeat thereby the laws of the sprinkling,⁴³

(1) Lit., ‘the smaller part hinders the larger part’. The offerings mentioned must be absolutely whole, but if they were lacking even the smallest quantity they are invalid as offerings.

(2) The tenth of an ephah of flour prescribed for the meal-offering.

(3) Which formed part of the drink-offerings offered with most sacrifices, cf. Num. XV, 4ff: a half-hin for a bullock, a third-hin for a ram, and a quarter-hin for a lamb.

(4) Offered with the drink-offerings in the same quantity as prescribed for the wine (v. prec. n.), or the log of oil required for the freewill meal-offering.

(5) Cf. Lev. II, 2 and V, 12. This repetition signifies that it must be absolutely whole and that every part thereof is indispensable.

(6) Ibid. II, 2. This rule is derived from the superfluous suffix ך in the word, corresponding to the Eng. ‘thereof’.

(7) Num. XV, 11. The term ‘thus’ indicates that it must be offered in the manner prescribed without any variations whatsoever.

(8) Lev. II, 16. According to Rabbinic interpretation ‘bruised corn’ and ‘fine flour’ are identical save that the former is applied to the ‘Omer-offering. Hence there is a repetition of the items to indicate their indispensability.

(9) Lev. II, 2.

(10) Ibid. VI, 8.

(11) Ibid. XVI, 5.

(12) Ibid. XXIII, 19.

(13) Offered with the lambs on the Feast of Weeks, cf. *ibid.* 17.

(14) Cf. *ibid.* XXIV, 5ff.

(15) Unleavened leaves and unleavened wafers; v. Num. VI, 15.

(16) Cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool; v. *ibid.* XIX, 6.

(17) Unleavened cakes, unleavened wafers, cakes of soaked fine flour, and leavened cakes; v. Lev. VII, 12, 13.

(18) לילב, the palm-branch, which with the citron, the myrtle and the willow branches, was used in the Temple and Synagogue service on the Feast of Tabernacles; v. *ibid.* XXIII, 40.

(19) Cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, and the two living birds; v. *ibid.* XIV, 6.

(20) Num. XIX, 4.

(21) Of the blood of the bullock and of the he-goat on the Day of Atonement; v. Lev. XVI, 14, 15.

(22) Of the blood of the abovementioned offerings (v. p. 172, n. 13) and also of the blood of the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error (Lev. IV, 17,18). and of the bullock offered when the anointed High Priest sinned in error (*ibid.* 6, 7).

(23) Lev. XVI, 34. The term ‘statute’ used in connection with any law or ceremony implies the absolute indispensability of the rites connected therewith.

(24) *Ibid.* XXIII, 17. The expression ‘shall be’ invariably indicates indispensability.

(25) *Ibid.* XXIV, 9.

(26) Num. VI, 21.

(27) *Ibid.* XIX, 2.

(28) Lev. VII, 13.

(29) V. *infra* 78a.

(30) *Ibid.* XIV, 2.

(31) *Ibid.* XXIII, 40. The Heb. וּלְקַחְתֶּם is interpreted as though divided into two words: וּלְקַח, ‘and he shall take’, and תֶּם, ‘wholly’ ‘completely’; hence all the four kinds must be taken together.

(32) That the absence of any one kind invalidates the others.

(33) I.e., for the purposes of the precept they need not be taken bound together in one hand.

(34) The ethrog (the citron) and the lulab (the palm branch).

(35) The myrtle and the willow.

(36) Amos IX, 6. The people are founded and established on earth only when they are in one band — that is, when all the sections of the community are united, the righteous (the fruit-bearing) and the unrighteous (the non-fruit-bearing); this is symbolized by the taking and

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

binding together in one band of the four species. It is evident therefore from this Baraitha that the four species must be bound together, contra R. Hanan.

(37) Used in the purification rites of the leper, v. Lev. XIV, 4.

(38) Since according to the Rabbis it is immaterial whether they are bound together or not.

(39) Ex. XV, 2. Thus it is a meritorious act generally to perform the precepts in the most beautiful manner possible.

(40) Num. XIX, 2.

(41) Lev. XVI, 34.

(42) Ibid. IV, 20. This verse is stated in connection with the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error, and its purport apparently is to direct that the service of this offering be performed in the same manner as the offering of the anointed High Priest mentioned in the foregoing paragraph. On examination, however, it will be seen that this injunction is superfluous, since all the details of the service, as stated in connection with the foregoing offering, are repeated here in full.

(43) Thus rendering the sprinklings indispensable.

Menachoth 27b

so that if one sprinkling was omitted the whole is invalid.¹

Our Rabbis taught: If the seven sprinklings of the blood of the Red Cow were made under the name of some other [offering] or were not directed rightly,² they are invalid; but as for those [sprinklings which must be performed] inside³ or [the sprinklings in the purification rites] of a leper,⁴ if they were made under the name of some other [offering], they are invalid, but if they were not rightly directed, they are valid. But has it not also been taught, with regard to the sprinklings of the blood of the Red Cow, that if they were sprinkled under the name of another they are invalid, whilst if they were not rightly directed they are still valid? —

Said R. Hisda, This is no difficulty; for ones [Baraitha] states the view of R. Judah and the other that of the Rabbis. For it was taught: If a man that lacked atonements unwittingly entered the Temple court he is

liable to bring a sin-offering, but if he entered deliberately he has incurred the penalty of kareth;⁷ and, needless to say, this is so of a Tebul yom⁷ and others that were unclean. If a man that was clean overstepped the boundary⁸ and entered the Temple he has thereby incurred forty [stripes]; and if he entered within the veil⁹ or towards the front of the mercy-seat¹⁰ he has thereby incurred death [at the hands of heaven]. R. Judah says, If he entered into the Temple or within the veil he has thereby incurred forty [stripes], and if he entered towards the front of the mercy-seat he has thereby incurred death. Wherein do they differ? —

In the interpretation of the following verse: And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, towards the front of the mercy-seat which is upon the ark; that he die not.¹¹ The Rabbis¹² maintain that [against entering] into the holy place there is the prohibition ‘that he come not’,¹³ and [against entering] within the veil or towards the front of the mercy-seat there is the warning ‘that he die not’; whereas R. Judah maintains that [against entering] into the holy place or within the veil there is the prohibition ‘that he come not’, and [against entering] towards the front of the mercy-seat there is the warning ‘that he die not’. What is the reason for this view of the Rabbis? —

If the law is as R. Judah maintains, the Divine Law should only have stated ‘into the holy place’ and ‘towards the front of the mercy-seat’, but not ‘within the veil’, for I should have said, If for entering the holy place one incurs stripes, how much more so for entering within the veil! Why then did the Divine Law also state ‘within the veil’? That you might infer that there is the penalty of death for it. And R. Judah, [how does he reply to this]? —

Had the Divine Law only stated ‘into the holy place’ and not ‘within the veil’ I might have

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

thought that by the expression ‘into the holy place’ only ‘within the veil’ was meant, so that [against entering] into the Temple there is not even a prohibition! And the Rabbis? —

You could not possibly have thought so, since the entire Temple is referred to as ‘the holy place’, as it is written, And the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy.¹⁴ And what is the reason for R. Judah's view? — If the law is as the Rabbis maintain, the Divine Law should only have stated ‘into the holy place within the veil’, but not ‘towards the front of the mercy-seat’, for I should have said, If for entering within the veil one incurs death, how much more so for entering towards the front of the mercy-seat! Why then did the Divine Law also state ‘towards the front of the mercy-seat’? That you might infer that only [for entering] towards the front of the mercy seat is there the penalty of death, whereas [for entering] within the veil there is only a prohibition. And the Rabbis, [how do they reply to this]? —

Indeed it was unnecessary, and the only reason why the Divine Law stated ‘towards the front of the mercy-seat’ in this verse was in order to exclude [from the prohibition] entering by the side.¹⁵ As it was taught by a Tanna in the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob: The verse, Towards the front of the mercy-seat on the east,¹⁶ establishes the principle that wherever Scripture says ‘the front’ it means the east side. And R. Judah?¹⁷ —

[He says,] The verse should then have only stated [here] ‘the front’, why does it also state ‘towards’? To teach that ‘towards’ must be interpreted with exactness.¹⁸ And the Rabbis? —

[They say,] ‘Towards’ need not be interpreted exactly. Now¹⁹ since R. Judah maintains that the expression ‘towards the front of the mercy-seat’ must be interpreted with exactness, similarly he would hold that

the expression ‘and he shall sprinkle towards the front’ must also be interpreted exactly;²⁰ whilst the Rabbis hold that just as the one need not be interpreted exactly so the other need not be interpreted exactly.²¹ R. Joseph, however, demurred, saying, Then according to R. Judah, if ‘towards’ must be interpreted exactly, ‘upon’²² would also have to be interpreted exactly, would it not? And it would follow therefore that during the second Temple, inasmuch as there was no ark nor mercy-seat,²³ no sprinklings were to be made [on the Day of Atonement]! —

Rabbah b. ‘Ulla answered, It is written, And he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary,²⁴ that is, for the place that is sanctified for the holy sanctuary.²⁵

Raba said, Both²⁶ state the view of the Rabbis, [yet here is no contradiction]

- (1) Lit., ‘he has done nothing’. It appears from Rashi that at this point in the text there followed a lengthy argument exactly as found in Zeb. 39a. The addition is also found in MS.M. and it reads as follows: I only know this of the seven sprinklings upon the veil, since whenever seven sprinklings are ordained it is established that the omission of one renders the whole invalid; but whence do I know this also of the four sprinklings upon the altar? Because Scripture says. So he shall do with this (Lev. IV, 20). The expression ‘the bullock’ (ibid.) includes the bullock of the Day of Atonement; the expression ‘as he did with the bullock’ (ibid.) includes the bullock offered by the anointed High Priest; and the expression ‘of the sin-offering’ (ibid.) includes the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry. V. Rashi.
- (2) In accordance with Num. XIX, 4, the blood of the Red Cow had to be sprinkled in the direction of ‘the entrance of the tent of meeting’.
- (3) E.g., the offerings of the Day of Atonement or the sin-offering of the anointed High Priest.
- (4) The officiating priest sprinkled of the oil that was in the palm of his hand seven times in the direction of the Holy of Holies; v. Lev. XIV, 16.
- (5) The latter Baraitha.
- (6) A person who had duly immersed after his uncleanness, had awaited sunset, but had not yet brought the prescribed offerings. Such a person still retains a slight measure of uncleanness.
- (7) V. Glos.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(8) A non-priest was not permitted to enter into the Temple Hall beyond the first eleven cubits from the entrance on the east side. Cf. Yoma 16b.

(9) I.e., into the Holy of Holies.

(10) This is still further in the Holy of Holies; he stepped close to the mercy-seat which formed the cover for the Ark.

(11) Lev. XVI, 2.

(12) I.e., the first Tanna in the foregoing Baraitha whose view is expressed anonymously as being the general accepted view of the Rabbis.

(13) An ordinary prohibition for the transgression of which the punishment of forty stripes is incurred.

(14) Ex. XXVI, 33.

(15) I.e., any entry into the Holy of Holies not made in the ordinary way through the door on the east with the face looking westward; e.g., by breaking through the north wall or the south wall of the Holy of Holies and entering thereby, or by entering through the door on the east but with the face looking either northward or southward. For such an entry one would not incur any penalty.

(16) Lev. XVI, 14.

(17) Is not the expression 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' required to show that the east side was meant?

(18) The expression 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' is not stated (argues R. Judah) merely to indicate that the east side is meant, since for that purpose 'the front', without 'towards', would have been sufficient. Its true purpose is to teach that only for entering towards the front of the mercy-seat is the penalty of death at the hands of heaven incurred, but not for merely entering within the veil.

(19) The Gemara now proceeds to elaborate the answer proposed by R. Hisda supra that one Baraitha states the view of R. Judah and the other that of the Rabbis.

(20) And therefore if the blood of the Red Cow was not sprinkled quite in the direction towards the front of the Holy of Holies, it is invalid.

(21) And the sprinklings are valid even though made not quite in the proper direction.

(22) In connection with the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the Day of Atonement it is written, And he shall sprinkle with his finger upon the mercy-seat (Lev. XVI, 14); and therefore unless the sprinkling is made actually upon the mercy-seat it is invalid.

(23) According to tradition these were hidden away by Josiah (v. Yoma 52b), and so were not in use during the Second Temple.

(24) Lev. XVI, 33.

(25) The High Priest shall 'make atonement', i.e., sprinkle the blood on to the place sanctified for the ark.

(26) Sc. the two teachings which were shown above to be contradictory.

Menachoth 28a

for in the one case [the priest] stood facing the west with his back to the east¹ and sprinkled, whereas in the other he stood facing the south with his back to the north² and sprinkled.

The Master said, 'But as for those [sprinklings which must be performed] inside, or [the sprinklings in the purification rites] of a leper, if they were made under the name of some other [offering], they are invalid, but if they were not rightly directed, they are valid'. But it has been taught: Whether they were made under the name of some other [offering] or were not rightly directed, they are valid!

Said R. Joseph: This is no contradiction; one Baraitha states the view of R. Eliezer, the other that of the Rabbis. R. Eliezer who likens the guilt-offering to the sin-offerings³ likens also the log [of oil of the leper] to the guilt-offering;⁴ the Rabbis, however, do not liken one with the other.⁵ But according to R. Eliezer is it permitted to deduce a law by analogy from another law which has itself been deduced by analogy?⁶ — Raba therefore answered, Both teachings state the view of the Rabbis; one deals with the validity⁷ [of the offering], whereas the other deals with the acceptances [of the offering in fulfillment of the owner's obligation].

MISHNAH. OF THE SEVEN BRANCHES OF THE CANDLESTICK,⁹ THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN LAMPS THEREOF, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE TWO PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE MEZUZAH,¹⁰ THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. OF THE FOUR PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

TEFILLIN,¹¹ THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. OF THE FOUR FRINGES,¹² THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS, SINCE THE FOUR TOGETHER FORM ONE PRECEPT. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS.

GEMARA. [OF THE SEVEN BRANCHES OF THE CANDLESTICK, etc.] Why is it so? — Because the expression ‘shall be’ is used therewith.¹³

Our Rabbis taught: The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold; if it was made from scraps [of gold] it is invalid, but if made from any other metal it is valid. Now why is it invalid if made from scraps? It is, presumably, because Scripture says ‘beaten work’ and also ‘shall be’;¹⁴ then when made from other metals too it should be invalid, should it not, since Scripture says, ‘of gold’ and also ‘shall be’? — The verse also says, Shall the candlestick be made, to include other metals. Perhaps it is to include scraps! — You cannot think so, for the expression ‘shall be’ refers to ‘beaten work’.¹⁵ But does not the expression ‘shall the candlestick be made’ also refer to ‘beaten work’?¹⁶ —

Scripture stated, Of beaten work, Of beaten work, twice,¹⁷ signifying that this condition is indispensable. But is it not also written, Gold, Gold, twice,¹⁷ so that this too is indispensable? — What is this that you say? It is well if you hold that if made out of scraps it is invalid and if out of other metal it is valid, for then the repetition of the terms ‘gold’ and ‘beaten work’ is made use of in the exposition [which follows]. But if you hold that if made out of scraps it is valid and if out of other metals it is invalid, what use then will you make of the repetition of the terms ‘gold’ and ‘beaten work’?¹⁸ What is the exposition [referred to]? —

It was taught: Of a talent of pure gold shall it be made, with all these vessels:¹⁹ if made of gold it must be a talent [in weight], if not of gold it need not be a talent. Its cups, its knops, and its flowers:²⁰ if made of gold there must then be cups, knops and flowers, if not of gold there need be neither cups nor knops nor flowers. Perhaps I ought also to say, If made of gold there must then be branches, if not of gold there need be no branches! — That would be called a lamp.²¹ And this was the work of the candlestick, beaten work of gold:²² if of gold it must be beaten work, if not of gold it need not be beaten work. And what use is made of the [second] expression ‘beaten work’ in this last [verse]? —

It serves to exclude the trumpets.²³ For it was taught: The trumpets had to be made [each] from one mass and of silver; if made from scraps [of silver] they are valid, if from other metals they are invalid. Now why are they invalid if made from other metals? presumably because it is written ‘of silver’²⁴ and also ‘shall be’;²⁴ then when made from scraps they should also be invalid, should they not, since it is written ‘beaten work’²⁴ and ‘shall be’? Scripture therefore stated in connection with the candlestick, It was beaten work,²² ‘it’ [was beaten work] but not the trumpets.

Our Rabbis taught: All the vessels

- (1) This was the right and proper position for sprinkling the blood of the Red Cow, and it is valid even though the sprinklings were not quite in the direction of the Holy of Holies.
- (2) In which case both the position of the priest who sprinkled the blood and the direction in which it was sprinkled were wrong, and therefore it is invalid.
- (3) By reason of the juxtaposition of these two kinds of offering in one verse, Lev. VII, 7: As is the sin-offering so is the guilt-offering, the laws of each are placed on the same footing; and as the sin-offering is rendered invalid if any vital service was performed under any other name but its own, so it is with the guilt-offering too. V. Zeb. 10b.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(4) By the juxtaposition of the log of oil and the guilt-offering of the leper in one verse, *ibid.* XIV, 21, the further analogy is made: as the guilt-offering is rendered invalid by the performance of any of its vital services under another name (by analogy with the sin-offering, *v. prec. n.*), so it is too with the service of the sprinkling of the oil in the purification rites of the leper.

(5) So that the ruling in the latter Baraitha is in accordance with the view of the Rabbis.

(6) *V. supra* p. 179, nn. 7 and 8. It is absolutely disallowed to deduce any law in connection with holy things by the process of double analogy. Cf. *Zeb.* 49b.

(7) The latter Baraitha implied that the offering was valid, but only to this extent, that the remainder of the log of oil was thereby rendered permitted to the priests.

(8) The former Baraitha by ruling ‘they are invalid’ merely wished to convey that the sprinklings were not accepted in fulfillment of the leper's obligation; and therefore he is still prohibited from entering the camp of Israel and from eating consecrated food.

(9) Cf. *Ex.* XXV, 31ff.

(10) *V. Gos.* The two portions are: *Deut.* VI, 4-8, and XI, 13-21.

(11) *V. Gos.* The four portions are: *Deut.* VI, 4-8; XI, 13-21; *Ex.* XIII, 1-10 and 11-16.

(12) Cf. *Num.* XV, 38.

(13) *Ex.* XXV, 36: Their knops and their branches shall be of one piece with it.

(14) The term ‘beaten work’ implies hammered out of one piece, and since the expression ‘shall be’ is added in the verse, this condition of ‘beaten work’ is indispensable. The expressions used in this exposition are in *Ex.* XXV, 31: And thou shalt make a candlestick of pure gold: of beaten work shall the candlestick be made... its cup, its knops and its flowers shall be of one piece with it.

(15) Thus ruling out the use of broken pieces.

(16) And therefore by reason of the general and comprehensive expression ‘shall the candlestick be made’ it should also be permitted if made out of broken pieces, or scraps of gold.

(17) *Ibid.* vv. 31 and 36.

(18) The force of the argument centers around the term ‘beaten work’ which is used four times in connection with the candlestick: twice in *Ex.* XXV (in vv. 31 and 36) and twice in *Num.* VIII, 4. If it is held that it is invalid if made out of scraps, then this term was stated twice to indicate that this condition was indispensable, and on two more occasions for the purposes given in the following exposition. If, however, it is valid if made out of scraps, then at least in one instance this term is superfluous. *V. Sh. Mek a.l.*

(19) *Ex. ibid.* 39.

(20) *Ex.* XXV, 31.

(21) But not a *מנורה*, a branched candlestick.

(22) *Num.* VIII, 4.

(23) Cf. *ibid.* X, 2ff. Thus the two silver trumpets need not be beaten work.

(24) *Ibid.*

Menachoth 28b

which Moses had made were valid for him and valid also for future generations; the trumpets, however, were valid for him but invalid for future generations. What is the reason for the trumpets?

Should you say because it is written, Make thee,¹ that is, for thyself only but not for future generations; then the verse, And make thee an ark of wood,² would also signify for thyself only but not for future generations.³ But in fact the expression ‘thee’ [in the latter verse] means, according to one opinion,⁴ of thine own, or according to another opinion, ‘I would have preferred it to come from thine own rather than from theirs’;⁵ then here⁶ too it means the same thing! — Here⁷ it is different, since ‘thee’ is stated twice: ‘Make thee’ and ‘They shall be unto thee’.⁸

R. Papa the son of R. Hanin recited the following teaching before R. Joseph: The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold; if it was made of silver it is still valid; if of tin or lead or gasitron,⁹ Rabbi declares it to be invalid, but R. Jose b. Judah declares it to be valid. If it was made of wood or of bone or of glass, all agree that it is invalid. Thereupon he said to him,¹⁰ What can be the reason for this?¹¹ He replied, Both masters interpret [the verse] by the principle of ‘general proposition and specification’,¹² but they differ in this: one¹³ concludes, as the thing specified is clearly a metal, so all metals are permitted; but the other concludes, as the thing specified is a valuable [metal], so only valuable [metals] are permitted.¹⁴ Then said [R. Joseph] to him, Set aside your teaching in view of mine, for it has been taught: If vessels of ministry were made of wood, Rabbi

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

declares them invalid, but R. Jose b. Judah declares them valid. In what do they differ?

Rabbi interprets [the verse] by the principle of ‘general proposition and specification’, whereas R. Jose b. Judah interprets it by the principle of ‘amplification and limitation’. Rabbi interprets the verse by ‘general proposition and specification’ thus, And thou shalt make a candlestick¹⁵ is a general proposition, ‘of pure gold’ is a particular specification, ‘of beaten work shall the candlestick be made’ is another general proposition; we thus have two general propositions separated by a particular specification, in which case you may only include such things as are similar to the thing specified, and as the thing specified is clearly a metal so all metals are included. R. Jose b. Judah on the other hand interprets the verse by ‘amplification and limitation’ thus, ‘And thou shalt make a candlestick’ is an amplifying proposition, ‘of pure gold’ is a limitation, ‘of beaten work shall the candlestick be made’ is another amplifying proposition; we thus have two amplifying propositions separated by a limitation, in which case they include [well-nigh] everything. What do they include? Everything.¹⁶ And what do they exclude? Earthenware.¹⁷

On the contrary, Set aside your teaching because of mine! — You cannot say so,¹⁸ for it was taught: If there was no gold available for it,¹⁹ it may be made of silver, of copper, of iron, of tin or of lead. R. Jose b. Judah allows it even of wood. And another Baraitha also taught: A man may not make a house after the design of the Temple, or a porch after the design of the Temple porch, or a courtyard after the design of the Temple court, or a table after the design of the table [in the Temple], or a candlestick after the design of the candlestick [in the Temple]. He may, however, make one with five, six or eight [branches], but with seven he may not make one, even though it be of other metal.²⁰ R.

Jose b. Judah says, He should not make one even of wood, for thus did the Hasmonean kings make it.²¹ But [the Rabbis] said to him, Is any proof to be deduced from that? In fact it was made of iron bars which they overlaid with tin;²² when they [the Hasmoneans] grew richer they made one of silver, and when they grew still richer they made one of gold.

Samuel said in the name of an old scholar, The height of the candlestick was eighteen handbreadths: three handbreadths for the base and the flower upon it,²³ two handbreadths plain,²⁴ one handbreadth for cup, knop and flower, again two handbreadths plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, then one handbreadth plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, then again one handbreadth plain, and one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, and then two handbreadths plain; there now remained²⁵ three handbreadths, in which space were three cups, a knop and a flower. The cups were like Alexandrian goblets,²⁶ the knops like Cretan apples, and the flowers like the blossoms around the capitals of columns. It will be found, therefore, that there were twenty-two cups, eleven knops, and nine flowers. Of the cups the [omission of] one invalidates the others, of the knops the [omission of] one invalidates the others, and of the flowers the [omission of] one invalidates the others; moreover, of the cups, the knops and the flowers, the [omission of] one kind invalidates the others. It is quite clear that there were twenty-two cups, for it is written, And in the candlestick were four cups,²⁷ and it is also written, Three cups like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop and a flower;²⁸ so that its own four²⁹

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

- (1) Ibid.
- (2) Deut. X, 1.
- (3) But this was not the case, for the same ark which Moses had made was used in the future generations.
- (4) V. Yoma 3b.
- (5) If only this were possible; but it is not since it is the duty of the whole community to provide it. In cur. edd. the expression 'as though it were possible' (the usual expression used when referring to God in anthropomorphic terms) is here inserted, but it is not found in any MS., and indeed it is quite unnecessary here.
- (6) In the case of the trumpets.
- (7) In the case of the trumpets.
- (8) Num. X, 2.
- (9) גטיסרין prob. ** tin; perhaps of a special kind, as distinguished from צעץ, ordinary tin.
- (10) R. Joseph said to R. Papa.
- (11) This distinction in R. Jose b. Judah, according to which it is valid if made of lead or of tin, but invalid if made of wood.
- (12) V. infra.
- (13) R. Jose b. Judah.
- (14) Rabbi therefore excludes lead and tin, and also wood.
- (15) Ex. XXV, 31.
- (16) All substances, even wood.
- (17) Since it is of little value. This Baraitha, according to which R. Jose allows all substances except earthenware, and Rabbi allows all metals, overrides the former Baraitha quoted by R. Papa.
- (18) For according to R. Papa's teaching R. Jose does not allow wood, but this is in conflict with the two Baraithas which follow.
- (19) Sc. the candlestick.
- (20) Since the seven-branched candlestick of the Temple was permitted to be made of other metals too, and even of wood according to R. Jose b. Judah.
- (21) Sc. the Temple candlestick, after they had retaken and purified the Temple.
- (22) Many MSS. read: 'with wood'.
- (23) V. infra, p. 185, n. 6.
- (24) I.e., without any ornamentation.
- (25) In the central or main shaft of the candlestick.
- (26) Which were wide at the top and tapered down towards the base.
- (27) Ex. XXV, 34; the reference being to the central shaft.
- (28) Ibid. 33.
- (29) I.e., of the central shaft.

Menachoth 29a

and the eighteen of the [six] branches make twenty-two. It is also clear that there were

eleven knops, for the knops thereof implies two, and six of the [six] branches and the knop [from which the first pair of branches rose], and the knop [from which the second pair rose], and the knop [from which the third pair rose], thus making a total of eleven. But how do we arrive at nine flowers? Its own two and the six of the [six] branches make only eight? —

R. Salmon said, It is written, Unto the base thereof, and unto the flowers thereof, it was beaten work.¹ Rab said, The height of the candlestick was nine handbreadths. Thereupon R. Shimi b. Hiyya raised the following objection to Rab. We have learnt:² There was a stone before the candlestick in which were three steps; on this the priest stood to trim the lamps.³ He answered, You, Shimi!⁴ I meant only from the point where the branches begin [to rise] and upwards.⁵ It is written, And the flowers, and the lamps and the tongs, of gold, of finished gold.⁶ What is meant by 'finished gold'?

R. Ammi said, They finished up all Solomon's fine gold.⁷ For Rab Judah said in Rab's name, Solomon had made ten candlesticks, and for each one he had used one thousand talents of gold; each had been cast in the furnace one thousand times so that it was reduced to one talent.⁸ But surely it is not so, for it is written, And all King Solomon's drinking vessels were of gold, and all the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold; none were of silver; it was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon!⁹ — We said Solomon's fine gold [was finished up]. And would it lose so much?¹⁰

Surely it has been taught: R. Jose b. Judah said, It once happened that the candlestick which was used in the Temple was found to be larger than that made by Moses by a Gordian¹¹ golden denar; thereupon it was cast eighty times into the furnace so that it was brought down to a talent! — Since it had

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

been made long ago it would remain in that condition.¹²

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan, What is the meaning of the expression, 'Upon the pure candlestick'?¹³ It signifies that its pattern came down from the place of purity.¹⁴ Will you then say that the expression 'Upon the pure table'¹⁵ also signifies that its pattern came down from the place of purity? One would rather say that 'pure' [in the latter case] implies that it can contract uncleanness; then [in the former case] too 'pure' implies that it can contract uncleanness? —

[This does not follow at all,] for it is right to say so there [in regard to the table] because of Resh Lakish's exposition. For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the expression 'upon the pure table'? It signifies that it can contract uncleanness. But is not [the table] an article of wood made to rest, and an article of wood made to rest cannot contract uncleanness? This proves that they used to lift it up and exhibit the Showbread on it to those who came up for the festivals, saying to them, Behold, God's love for you!¹⁶ (Wherein is seen 'God's love for you'? — It is as R. Joshua b. Levi had stated. For R. Joshua b. Levi had stated, A great miracle was wrought in regard to the Showbread, for at its removal it was as [fresh as when] it was set,¹⁷ as it is written, To put hot bread in the day that it was taken away.)¹⁸ But in this case [of the candlestick], to say that the term 'pure' implies that it can contract uncleanness is too obvious [and unnecessary], for it is a metal vessel and metal vessels certainly contract uncleanness! We must therefore say that its pattern came down from the place of purity.

It was taught: R. Jose b. Judah says, An ark of fire and a table of fire and a candlestick of fire came down from heaven; and these Moses saw and reproduced, as it is written, And see that thou make them after their pattern, which is being shown thee in the

mount.¹⁹ Will you then say the same [of the tabernacle], for it is written, And thou shalt rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof which hath been shown thee in the mount!²⁰ — Here it is written 'according to the fashion thereof', whilst there 'after their pattern'.²¹

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, The angel Gabriel had girded himself with a kind of belt²² and demonstrated unto Moses the work of the candlestick, for it is written, And this was the work of the candlestick.²³

A Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael stated, Three things presented difficulties to Moses, until the Holy One, blessed be He, showed Moses with His finger, and these are they: the candlestick, the new moon,²⁴ and the creeping things.²⁵ The candlestick, as it is written, And this was the work of the candlestick. The new moon, as it is written, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months.²⁶ The creeping things, as it is written, And these are they which are unclean.²⁷ Others add, Also the rules for slaughtering [beasts], as it is written, Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar.²⁸

OF THE TWO PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE MEZUZAH THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. Is not this obvious?²⁹ — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, The law had to be taught in respect of the title of the letter yod.³⁰ And is not this, too, obvious?³¹ —

It had to be taught in regard to the other statement of Rab Judah in the name of Rab. For Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a margin of parchment is invalid.³²

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Ashian b. Nidbak said in the name of Rab Judah, If the inner [leg] of the letter he33 was perforated, it is still valid; if the [right] leg was perforated it is invalid. R. Zera said, This was explained to me by R. Huna — and R. Jacob said, This too was explained to me by Rab Judah — as follows: If the inner [leg] of the he was perforated, it is still valid; if the [right] leg was perforated and there still remained thereof the size of a small letter,³⁴ it is valid; otherwise it is invalid.

It once happened to Agra, the father-in-law of R. Abba,

(1) Num. VIII, 4. The flower (in the Heb. פִּרְחָה, in the sing.) in this verse is in addition to those mentioned in Ex. XXV, 31ff; hence there were nine. This extra flower was placed at the foot of the candlestick close to the pedestal.

(2) Tam. III, 9.

(3) And if the entire height of the candlestick was only nine handbreadths, then surely the priest had no need of stone or steps to reach it.

(4) Rab expresses surprise at his pupil Shimi who puts to him a question whose answer is only too obvious.

(5) And as this point was in the centre of the candlestick, there were nine handbreadths from it to the top, and similarly from this point to the base; so that Rab's view is entirely in accord with Samuel's supra.

(6) II Chr. IV, 21. The Heb. Expression מְכֻלֵּי זָהָב, in E.VV. 'perfect gold', is very difficult; hence the suggestion in the Gemara.

(7) Deriving מְכֻלֵּי from כָּלָה 'to complete, exhaust, finish up'.

(8) This lavish and extravagant use of gold would naturally exhaust all his gold, however great his supply was.

(9) I Kings X, 21. It is evident that Solomon had an unlimited supply.

(10) By repeated refinings to be reduced from one thousand talents to one talent.

(11) Cur. edd. קוֹרְדִּיקָנִי; v. Jast. s.v. גוֹרְדִּינִי. The word is omitted in MS.M.

(12) I.e., since it had been well wrought and refined in Solomon's days, when centuries later it was cast eighty times into the furnace it would not then have lost very much.

(13) Lev. XXIV, 4.

(14) I.e., from Heaven. The pattern of the candlestick was shown by God unto Moses; v. infra.

(15) Ibid. 6.

(16) The table was therefore mobile and not regarded as a vessel made to rest; consequently it could contract uncleanness. It is right therefore that the term 'pure' in connection with the table should mean free from uncleanness.

(17) When the Showbread was removed after having remained seven days upon the table it was as fresh as on the day when it was placed thereon.

(18) I Sam. XXI, 7. The Heb. חָם 'hot' is interpreted as referring to the bread that was taken away, thus indicating that it was still fresh and hot.

(19) Ex. XXV, 40.

(20) Ibid. XXVI, 30.

(21) The latter expression signifies that a model or picture was actually shown to Moses, whereas the former expression signifies merely that the tabernacle was to be constructed in accordance with the instructions and directions received by Moses.

(22) After the manner of artificers who tie up their clothes with a belt or girdle when engaged upon delicate work so as not to be hampered in their work.

(23) Num. VIII, 4. The term 'this' implies that something was held up as a pattern or model to illustrate the instructions given.

(24) The proper observance of the first appearance of the new moon.

(25) The identification of the clean and unclean reptiles.

(26) Ex. XII, 2.

(27) Lev. XI, 29.

(28) Ex. XXIX, 38. And as the first act of the offering is the slaughtering the expression 'this' clearly refers to an actual demonstration unto Moses of the rules and regulations of slaughtering.

(29) That one imperfect letter can invalidate the whole. For the law insists upon perfect writing in Scrolls of the Law, tefillin, and mezuzah.

(30) I.e., even if the lower (according to Tosaf. 'the upper') stroke of the letter yod was missing, it is invalid.

(31) Since without the stroke it is no yod and it would not be recognizable as such.

(32) The letter must not be joined to or run into either the preceding or following letters, but must be surrounded by a blank margin of the parchment.

(33) I.e., the left or detached leg of the letter ה. It is referred to as inner for in early MSS. this leg was almost in the middle of the letter. Aliter: the inner space of the letter.

(34) I.e., the upper part of the leg was still joined to the roof of the letter, thus ה, so that it can be read as a he, although reduced in size.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Menachoth 29b

that the [right] leg of the letter he in the word ha'am¹ had been severed by a perforation; whereupon he came to R. Abba who ruled that if there still remained thereof the size of a small letter it is valid, otherwise it is invalid.

It once happened to Rami b. Tamre, also known as² Rami b. Dikule, that the leg of the letter wow in the word wa-yaharog³ had been severed by a perforation; whereupon he came to R. Zera who said, Go, fetch a child that is neither too clever nor too foolish; if he is able to read the word as wa-yaharog, it is valid; otherwise, the word is yaharog⁴ and it is invalid.

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, When Moses ascended on high he found the Holy One, blessed be He, engaged in affixing coronets to the letters.⁵ Said Moses, 'Lord of the Universe, Who stays Thy hand?'⁶ He answered, 'There will arise a man, at the end of many generations, Akiba b. Joseph by name, who will expound upon each tittle heaps and heaps of laws'. 'Lord of the Universe', said Moses; 'permit me to see him'. He replied, 'Turn thee round'. Moses went and sat down behind eight rows⁷ [and listened to the discourses upon the law]. Not being able to follow their arguments he was ill at ease, but when they came to a certain subject and the disciples said to the master 'Whence do you know it?' and the latter replied 'It is a law given unto Moses at Sinai' he was comforted. Thereupon he returned to the Holy One, blessed be He, and said, 'Lord of the Universe, Thou hast such a man and Thou givest the Torah by me!' He replied, 'Be silent, for such is My decree'.⁸ Then said Moses, 'Lord of the Universe, Thou hast shown me his Torah, show me his reward'. 'Turn thee round', said He; and Moses turned round and saw them weighing out his flesh at the market-stalls.⁹ 'Lord of the Universe', cried Moses, 'such Torah, and

such a reward!' He replied, 'Be silent, for such is My decree'.

Raba said, There are seven letters which require each three strokes, and these are they: shin, 'ayin, teth, nun, zayin, gimmel, and zadde.¹⁰

R. Ashi said, I have observed that scribes who are most particular add a vertical stroke to the roof of the letter heth,¹¹ and suspend the [inner] leg of the letter he. They add a vertical stroke to the roof of the letter heth, signifying thereby that He lives in the heights of the word.¹² And they suspend the [inner] leg of the letter he for the reason given in the following discussion. For R. Judah the patriarch asked R. Ammi, What is the meaning of the verse, Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in Yah the Lord is an everlasting rock?¹³ He replied, It implies that if one puts his trust in the Holy One, blessed be He, behold He is unto him as a refuge in this world and in the world to come. This, retorted the other, was my difficulty: why does the verse say in Yah and not Yah? The reason is as was expounded by R. Judah b. R. Ila'i. [Yah, he said,] refers to the two worlds which the Holy One, blessed be He, created, one with the letter he and the other with the letter yod. Yet I do not know whether the future world was created with the yod and this world with the he or this world with the yod and the future world with the he; but since it is written, These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created:¹⁴ read not be-hibare'am,¹⁵ when they were created, but be-he bera'am,¹⁶ He created them with the he; hence I may say that this world was created with the he and the future world with the yod. And wherefore was this world created with the he? —

Because it is like an exedra¹⁷ and whosoever wishes to go astray¹⁸ may do so. And wherefore is the [left] leg [of the he] suspended? — To indicate that whosoever repents is permitted to re-enter.¹⁹ And why

should he not re-enter by the same [way as he went out]? — Such an opportunity would not arise;²⁰ and this is consistent with Resh Lakish's view. For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the verse, If it concerneth the scorers, He scorneth them, but unto the humble He giveth grace?²¹ If a man comes to purify himself, they assist him; but if he comes to defile himself, they open the door for him. And wherefore has [the letter he] a coronet? — Because the Holy One, blessed be He, says, If a man repents I will set a crown upon him. And why was the future world created with the letter yod? — Because the righteous men therein are but few.²² And why is its head bent low? — Because the righteous men therein hang their heads low, for the good deeds of one are not like [the good deeds of] the other.²³

R. Joseph said, Rab gave two rulings in connection with scrolls [of the Law] but to each there is a refutation. The first is this: Rab said, If a scroll of the Law has two mistakes in every column it may be corrected, but if three, it must be hidden away. And the refutation [is from the following]. It was taught: If three it may be corrected, but if four it must be hidden away.

A Tanna taught: If there was one column free from mistakes it saves the whole scroll.²⁴ R. Isaac b. Samuel b. Martha said in the name of Rab, provided only the scroll was for the most part written correctly. Abaye asked R. Joseph, How is it if in that column there were three mistakes?²⁵ — He replied, Since it is permitted to correct them they are regarded as already corrected. This rule²⁶ applies only when letters are missing, but when there are too many letters it does not matter.²⁷ And why is it not so when letters are missing?²⁸ — R. Kahana answered, Because it would look speckled.²⁹ Agra, the father-in-law of R. Abba, had a scroll in which there were additional letters, so he came to R. Abba who told him the law: This rule applies only when letters are missing,

(1) הקעם, Ex. XIII, 3, in connection with the tefillin (Rashi).

(2) So in all MSS. and early edd. and so emended by Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. 'the father-in-law of'.

(3) I.e., the initial waw in ויהרג (meaning 'and he killed'), occurring in one of the Scriptural portions of the Tefillin, in Ex. XIII, 15.

(4) יהרג. Strictly speaking ייהרג which would be read as yehareg (meaning 'will be killed') and being followed by 'the Lord' would have a blasphemous connotation.

(5) These are the Taggin, i.e., three small strokes written on top of the letters שעטניגצ in the form of a crown. V. infra Raba's statement, and note thereon.

(6) I.e., is there anything wanting in the Torah that these additions are necessary?

(7) Of R. Akiba's disciples.

(8) Lit., 'so it has come to My mind'.

(9) R. Akiba died a martyr's death at the hands of the Romans during the Hadrianic persecution. V. Ber. 61b.

(10) שעטניגצ V. supra n. 2. There is diversity of opinion as to the proper placing of these strokes. V. Tosaf a.l. In the Scrolls of the Law used at the present time in Ashkenazic communities the form of ornamentation is this, e.g., ש.

(11) Here, too, there are diverse opinions as to the form. The word חטרי which has been translated in the text, following Rashi, by 'add a vertical stroke' from חוטרא, 'a stick', may also mean 'make hump-like', from חטרתא 'the camel's hump'. The form of this letter in Scrolls of the present day is ה.

(12) The letter heth is the initial letter of the word חי, 'He lives', and the stroke or tower above indicates that the abode of the living God is on high.

(13) Isa. XXVI, 4. The latter half of the verse reads כי ביה ה' צור עולמים and this is interpreted as meaning 'for with Yah (i.e., with the letters yod and he) the Lord formed the worlds.'

(14) Gen. II, 4.

(15) בהבראם.

(16) בהי בראם .

(17) The world is like an exedra, i.e., closed on three sides and open on the fourth (v. B.B. 25a and b); and so, too, is the letter he. Hence it was most appropriate for this world to be created by the letter he.

(18) Sc. from the right path; i.e., to be rebellious.

(19) Through the small opening at the side.

(20) The repentant sinner requires encouragement and support, so that an additional entrance is made ready for him.

(21) Prov. III, 34.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(22) The letter yod is the smallest letter of the alphabet, and in shape its head droops downwards.

(23) So that each feels a certain sense of shame in the presence of the other.

(24) Even though in the other columns there are very many mistakes. Of course the mistakes have to be corrected.

(25) Is this column to be regarded as free from mistakes since the three mistakes in it may be corrected?

(26) That a scroll with four mistakes in each column must be hidden away.

(27) Since the additional letters can easily be erased.

(28) The missing letters can surely be inserted.

(29) The insertion of missing letters above the lines would make the whole look irregular.

Menachoth 30a

but when there are additional letters it does not matter. The other ruling of Rab is this: Rab said, He who is writing a scroll of the Law and has reached the end may finish off even in the middle of the column. And an objection is raised from the following: He who is writing a scroll of the Law and has reached the end may not finish off in the middle of the column as one does with other books, but he should reduce each line as he goes on until he reaches the end of the column! — Rab was referring to other books. But he says ‘a scroll of the Law’! — He meant the books of the Law.¹ But this cannot be so, for R. Joshua b. Abba cited R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab, The words ‘in the sight of all Israel’² are to be written in the middle of the column! — He means the middle of the line.³ It was stated: The Rabbis say, [One may finish] even in the middle of the line;⁴ but R. Ashi says, [One may finish] only in the middle of the line.³ And the law is: Only in the middle of the line.

R. Joshua b. Abba cited R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab, The last eight verses of the Torah must be read [in the Synagogue service] by one person alone.⁵ Whose view is followed here? It surely is not R. Simeon's, for it was taught:⁶ It is written, So Moses the

servant of the Lord died there.⁷ Now is it possible that Moses whilst still alive would have written, ‘So Moses... died there’? The truth is, however, that up to this point Moses wrote, from this point Joshua the son of Nun wrote. This is the opinion of R. Judah, or, according to others, of R. Nehemiah.

Said R. Simeon to him, Can we imagine the scroll of the law being short of one letter? Is it not written, Take this book of the Law, and put it, etc.⁸ We must say that up to this point the Holy One, blessed be He, dictated and Moses repeated and wrote, and from this point the Holy One, blessed be He, dictated and Moses wrote⁹ with tears [in his eyes], as it says of another occasion, Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words to me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book.¹⁰ Must we then say that the view stated is not in accordance with R. Simeon?¹¹ — You may even say that it follows the view of R. Simeon, for since they differ [from the rest of the Torah] in one way, they differ in another.¹²

R. Joshua b. Abba again cited R. Giddal who said in the name of Rab, He who buys a scroll of the Law in the market is regarded as one that has seized a precept in the market, but he who writes it, him the Scripture regards as if he had received it at mount Sinai. R. Shesheth said, Even if he corrected but one letter he is regarded as if he had written it.

(Mnemonic ‘A.G.L.M.’).¹³

Our Rabbis taught: A man should use sheets [of parchment] which contain from three to eight columns; he should not use one which contains less columns or more.¹⁴ And he should not put in too many columns¹⁵ for it would look like an epistle, nor too few columns¹⁶ for the eyes would wander;¹⁷ but [the width of the column should equal] the word *lemishpehothekem* written three times.¹⁸ If a man happened to possess a sheet with nine columns, he should not divide it

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

[into two sheets of] three and six columns, but [into sheets of] four and five columns.¹⁹ These rules apply only [to sheets] at the beginning [or in the middle] of the scroll, but at the end of the scroll even one verse or one column [may take up the whole sheet]. One verse! Surely you cannot mean that!²⁰ —

Say rather: One verse in one column.²¹ The width of the margin below shall be one handbreadth, above three fingerbreadths, and between one column and the other the space of two fingerbreadths. In books of the Law²² the margin below shall be three fingerbreadths, above two fingerbreadths, and between one column and the other the space of a thumb-breadth. Between each line there must be the space of a line, between each word the width of a letter, and between each letter a hairbreadth. A man should not reduce the size of the script on account of the margin above or below,²³ or on account of the space between one line and another, or the requisite space between one section and another. If [when almost at the end of a line] he has to write a word of five letters he must not write two letters in the column and three outside,

(1) I.e., each of the first four books of the Torah may finish in the middle of a column, but the fifth book which would complete the scroll of the Law, Rab agrees, must be written in the form of a colophon gradually reducing the lines so as to reach the end of the column.

(2) These are the last words of the Torah.

(3) But at the end of the column. I.e., the last words in the last line of the column are written in the middle of the line.

(4) And also in the middle of the column (Rashi; but v. Sh. Mek. a.l.).

(5) These verses may not be divided into two portions to be read by two persons.

(6) B.B. 15a.

(7) Deut. XXXIV, 5.

(8) Ibid. XXXI, 26, said by Moses before he died. If then Moses did not complete the Torah he would not have referred to it as the book of the Law.

(9) But did not repeat the words as heretofore, because of his grief.

(10) Jer. XXXVI, 18. Baruch the scribe when writing down the Lamentations as spoken by Jeremiah did not repeat the words because of the grief they caused him.

(11) For since these verses were, according to R. Simeon, written by Moses they should in no wise be different from any other section in the Torah; accordingly it should be permitted to divide these verses into two portions.

(12) These verses have a special law since they were written in special circumstances.

(13) A mnemonic made up of the characteristic Hebrew letters of the rules which follow.

(14) As each sheet was sewn to the others it is advisable for the sake of utility not to have the seams too near or too far apart from each other.

(15) I.e., the maximum number of columns (8) in a small sheet.

(16) I.e., the minimum number of columns (3) in a large sheet.

(17) For the length of the line in each column would be unduly large and the eyes would stray so that the reader would be in doubt as to which line he must read next.

(18) למשפחותיכם. I.e., thirty letters.

(19) So as to make the sheets as far as is possible of similar width.

(20) Since it is necessary to end at the foot of the column, how is it conceivable to fill the whole sheet with one verse?

(21) I.e., the column may be made very narrow, perhaps with only one word on each line, or even enlarging the script, so as to fill up the whole column.

(22) הומשיהם, also written in scroll form but not intended to be used for the Synagogue service.

(23) The size of the script should be uniform in the column and should not be reduced on the first or last lines so as to obtain the proper marginal space above or below.

Menachoth 30b

but three in the column and two outside.¹ If [when he has come to the end of the line] he has to 'write a word of two letters, he may not insert it between the columns but must write the word at the beginning of the next line.

If [the scribe] omitted the Name of God [and had already written the next word], he should erase the word that was written and insert it above the line, and should write the Name upon the erasure. This is the opinion of R.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Judah. R. Jose says, He may even insert the Name above the line. R. Isaac says, He may even wipe away² [the word that was written] and write [the Name in its place]. R. Simeon of Shezur says, He may write the whole Name above the line but not a part of it. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Meir, He may write the Name neither upon an erasure nor upon a word that has been wiped away, neither may he insert it above the line. What must he do then? He must remove the whole sheet and hide it away.

It was stated: R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, The halachah is that he may insert the Name above the line. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Isaac b. Samuel, The halachah is that he may wipe away [the written word] and write [the Name in its place]. Why does not R. Hananel say that the halachah follows this Master,³ and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah say that it follows the other Master?⁴ — Because there is another reading which reverses the names.⁵

Rabin b. Hinena said in the name of ‘Ulla who had it from R. Hanina, The halachah is in accordance with R. Simeon of Shezur.⁶ Moreover, wherever R. Simeon of Shezur stated his view the halachah is in accordance with it. In what connection was this ruling [of R. Hanina] stated? Should you say in connection with the above: ‘R. Simeon of Shezur says, He may write the whole Name above the line but not a part of it’; but since it has been reported in that connection that R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, The halachah is that he may insert the Name above the line, and that Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Isaac b. Samuel, The halachah is that he may wipe away [the written word] and write [the Name in its place], if then [R. Hanina's ruling was stated in connection with the above Baraitha], he should have also stated his view [together with the others]!⁷ —

Rather it was stated in connection with the following: ‘R. Simeon of Shezur says, Even if its is five years old and is plowing in the field it is still rendered clean by reason of the slaughtering of its dam’.⁹ But since it was reported in that connection that Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hanina, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur, if this were so then he also should have said it there!¹⁰ —

Rather it was stated in connection with the following: At first it was held: If a man whilst being led out in chains [to execution] said, ‘Write out a bill of divorce for my wife’, it was to be written and also to be delivered to her.¹¹ Later they laid down that the same rule applied to one who was leaving on a sea journey or setting out with a caravan. R. Simeon of Shezur says, It also applies to a man who was dangerously ill. Or [it was stated] in connection with the following:¹² If the terumah¹³ which had been separated from the tithe of demai¹³ produce fell back into its place,¹⁴ R. Simeon of Shezur says, Even on a weekday one need only ask [the seller] about it and eat it by his word.¹⁵ But since it was reported in that connection that R. Johanan said, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur in the case of ‘The dangerous ill man’ and in ‘The terumah separated from the tithe of demai produce’,¹⁶ if this were so then he too should have said it there. —

Rather it was stated in connection with the following: R. Jose b. Kippar says in the name of R. Simeon of Shezur, If Egyptian beans had been sown only for seed¹⁷ and part of them had taken root before the New Year and part after the New Year, one may not then separate terumah and the tithes from one part on behalf of the other, for one may not separate terumah and tithes from new produce on behalf of the old or from old produce on behalf of the new. What then should one do? One should collect the whole crop into one heap [and then separate the terumah and the tithes from it], so that the

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

new produce in the terumah or tithe would be deemed to be taken in respect of the new produce that is left in the heap, and the old produce in the terumah or tithe would be deemed to be in respect of the old produce that is left in the heap. But since it was reported in that connection that R. Samuel b. Nahmani said In the name of R. Johanan, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur, if this were so, then he too should have said it there! — In fact, said R. Papa, it was stated in connection with the case of the ‘Chest’. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, It was stated in connection with the case of the ‘Wine’. R. Papa said

(1) If therefore there is sufficient space for three letters he may write the word allowing two letters to encroach upon the margin; but if there is not sufficient space for three letters he must write the whole word in the next line.

(2) Whilst the ink is still moist. The writing upon such a surface would not be as clear and distinct as upon an erased surface.

(3) Sc. R. Jose.

(4) Sc. R. Isaac.

(5) I.e., the opinions assigned to R. Jose and R. Isaac are reversed; hence it was necessary when stating the halachah to report the actual decision.

(6) In Upper Galilee.

(7) I.e., with R. Hananel and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah.

(8) Sc. an animal which was extracted alive out of the womb after the slaughtering of its dam.

(9) Hul. 74b.

(10) I.e., if R. Hanina's ruling was stated in connection with the above quoted Mishnah then Rabin b. Hinena should also have stated his tradition of the halachah alongside with Ze'iri in Hul. l.c.

(11) Even though he gave no instructions that it was to be delivered to his wife. It is assumed that he intended it to be delivered to her but omitted to say so owing to his perturbed state of mind. Git. 65b.

(12) Demai IV, 1.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) I.e., it was mixed up with ordinary ‘common’ produce. The mixture now may be eaten only by priests and would have to be sold to the priest at a low price, so that the loss to the owner is considerable.

(15) In the special circumstances, because of the loss involved and the produce being demai (i.e., produce that had been bought from an ‘am ha-

arez who was not trusted with regard to the separation of the tithes), the Rabbis permitted the owner to enquire of the seller about it and to rely upon his word if the seller assured him that he had separated the various dues. If this occurred on the Sabbath it would certainly be permitted to ask the seller about the produce and to rely upon his word, for the honor of the Sabbath (v. Dem. l.c.), but according to R. Simeon of Shezur this is permitted even on a weekday.

(16) Keth. 55a, and Hul. 75b.

(17) In which case they become subject to terumah and tithes from the moment they take root; v. R.H. 13b.

Menachoth 31a

in connection with the ‘Chest’, for we have learnt:¹ A chest, say Beth Shammai, should be measured on the inside;² but Beth Hillel say, On the outside.³ They agree, however, that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rim should not be included in the measurement. R. Jose says, They agree that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rim should be included, but that the space between them should not be included. R. Simeon of Shezur says, If the legs were a handbreadth high the space between them should not be included, but if less, it should be included in the measurement.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said in connection with ‘Wine’, for we have learnt:⁴ R. Meir says, Oil [when rendered unclean] is always unclean in the first degree.⁵ The Sages say, Honey also. R. Simeon of Shezur says, Wine also. Are ‘we to infer that the first Tanna holds that it is not so with wine?⁶ — Render: R. Simeon of Shezur says, [Only] wine.

It was taught: R. Simeon of Shezur related, Once my untithed produce got mixed up with tithed produce,⁷ so I went and asked R. Tarfon about it and he advised me, Go and buy some [demais produce] in the market and separate the tithes from it on behalf of the mixture too.⁹ He¹⁰ evidently was of the opinion that¹¹ the majority of ‘amme ha-arez⁸ separate the tithes, so that in this case

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

he would be taking the tithe from what is exempt [from the tithe by the law of the Torah] in respect of what is also exempt [by the Torah]. But why did he not advise him, Go and buy produce from a gentile?¹² — Because he holds that a gentile cannot own land in the land of Israel so fully as to release it from the obligation of tithe¹³ so that he would be taking the tithe from what was subject [to tithe by the Torah] in respect of what was exempt.

Another version states: He advised him, Go and buy produce from a gentile. Evidently he was of the opinion that a gentile can own land so fully in the land of Israel as to release it from the obligation of tithe, so that in this case he would be taking the tithe from what is exempt [by the Torah] in respect of what is exempt too. And why did he not advise him, God and buy' [demai produce] in the market? — Because he holds that the majority of amme ha-arez do not separate the tithes.¹⁴

R. Yemar b. Shelemya sent the following question to R. Papa: Does the ruling of Rabin b. Hinena who cited 'Ulla in the name of R. Hanina, namely, that the halachah was in accordance with R. Simeon of Shezur; and moreover, that wherever R. Simeon of Shezur stated his view the halachah was in accordance with it, include that case where untithed produce got mixed up with tithed produce? He replied, It does. R. Ashi said, Mar Zutra told me that R. Hanina of Sura was puzzled at the question. It is obvious, said he;

(1) Kel. XVIII, 1.

(2) To determine its capacity. If it can hold forty se'ahs liquid or two kors dry ware it is not susceptible to uncleanness, for it is no longer deemed to be a 'vessel'.

(3) I.e., the sides of the chest and the top and bottom are to be included in the measurement.

(4) Toh. III, 2.

(5) For with whatever grade of uncleanness a liquid came into contact, whether with a primary source of uncleanness or with what was unclean in

the first or second degree, it will always be unclean in the first degree. Cf. Pes. 14b.

(6) Surely all agree that wine is a liquid and the above principle (v. prec. note) applies.

(7) And since the greater part of this mixture was tithed produce the whole is deemed by the law of the Torah to be tithed produce, and is not subject to any further tithe at all. It is, however, subject to tithe by Rabbinic law. The interpretation adopted here is the second given by Rashi, which is indeed preferred by him.

(8) V. Glos.

(9) Demai produce, too, is exempt from tithe by the law of the Torah (because we adopt the majority principle and the majority of 'amme ha-arez separate the tithes), but is subject to it only by Rabbinic law. It is therefore identical with the produce of the mixture.

(10) R. Tarfon.

(11) The words 'According to the law of the Torah a substance loses its identity when mixed in a larger quantity' found here in the text are omitted in all MSS., and are struck out here by Sh. Mek.

(12) Produce grown in a field belonging to a gentile is, it is assumed for the present, exempt by the law of the Torah from the tithe, but is subject to it only 'by Rabbinic law.

(13) The produce of his field is therefore subject to the tithe by the law of the Torah.

(14) So he would then be taking the tithe from what was subject to tithe by the law of the Torah in respect of what was exempt by the law of the Torah

Menachoth 31b

for does it say 'Wherever he stated his view in the Mishnah'? It simply says, 'Wherever he stated his view'.

R. Ze'ira said in the name of R. Hananel who said it in the name of Rab, If a rent [in a scroll of the Law] extended into two lines [of the script] it may be sown together; but if into three lines it may not be sewn together.¹ Rabbah the younger said to R. Ashi, Thus said R. Jeremiah of Difti in the name of Raba: The rule that we have laid down, namely, that if it extended into three lines it may not be sewn together, applies only to old scrolls; but in the case of new scrolls it would not matter.² Moreover 'old' does not mean actually old, nor 'new' actually new, but the one means prepared with gall-nut juices³ and

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

the other means not so prepared. It is [permitted to sew it] only with sinews but not with thread.

R. Judah b. Abba raised the question: How is it if [the rent extended] between the columns⁴ or between one line and another? — This remains unanswered.

R. Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hananel who cited it in the name of Rab, If a mezuzah⁵ was written in lines consisting of two words each it is valid. The question was raised: How is it if the first line consisted of two words, the second of three, and the third of one word?⁶ — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, Certainly [it is valid], for it has merely been written like the song.⁷ An objection was raised: If he wrote it like the song or the song like it, it is invalid! — That was taught in connection with a scroll of the Law. It has also been reported: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan (others say: R. Aha b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan), If the mezuzah was written [in lines of unequal length consisting of] two words, three words, and one word, it is valid, provided it was not in the form of a tent, nor tail-like.⁸

R. Hisda said, The words, 'above the earth'⁹ must be [alone] in the last line. Some say [they must be written] at the end of the line, others say at the beginning. 'Some say, at the end of the line', for it is written, As the heaven is high above the earth.¹⁰ 'Others say, at the beginning', as the heaven is far from the earth.¹¹

R. Helbo said, I have seen R. Huna rolling up the mezuzah beginning at 'one' and finishing at 'hear';¹² moreover, he left [the space between] the sections closed.¹³ An objection was raised: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said, R. Meir used to write [the mezuzah] on dukstus¹⁴ in the form of a column,

(2) And no matter how far the rent extended, it may be sewn together again.

(3) In that case even though old it is strong, and will withstand any rent, and therefore it may be sewn together again. This is the interpretation according to Alfasi, Hil. Sef. Tor., and Maim. Yad, Sef. Tor. IX, 15. Rashi explains: if treated with gall-nut juice it becomes darkened and is at once regarded as old. A very difficult explanation.

(4) I.e., to such an extent that had it been in a column it would have gone beyond three lines of script. The question is whether it may be sewn together or not.

(5) V. Glos.

(6) The lines were of unequal length thus: **

(7) Sc. the song of Moses, Ex. XV. In the first column of the song the lines are of unequal length, v. Meg. 16b.

(8) The words in the consecutive lines must not increase in a regular order, that is, like a tent, narrow above and wide below thus: ** nor decrease in a regular order, that is, tapering off like a tail thus: ** V. Sh. Mek. notes 5 and 6.

(9) Deut. XI, 22; the last words in the mezuzah.

(10) Ps. CIII, 11. The penultimate line in the mezuzah ends with 'the heaven', so that if 'above the earth' were written at the end of the last line it would be seen that 'the heaven' is directly above 'the earth', in conformity with the expression in Psalms.

(11) And the furthest distance between these words is obtained by placing 'the heaven' at the end of the penultimate line and 'the earth' at the beginning of the last line.

(12) The opening line of the mezuzah is: Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One (Deut. VI, 4): and as Heb. Is written from right to left, it is clear therefore that R. Huna used to roll up the mezuzah beginning at the left with the word 'one' and finishing at the right with the word 'hear'.

(13) I.e., he began the second passage in the mezuzah on the same line as that on which the first passage ended, allowing only a short blank space between the two passages.

(14) דוכסוסטוס. In making parchment it was the usual practice to split the thickness of the skin and divide it into two sheets, each sheet being treated and prepared. The parchment made from the inner sheet, i.e., the side next to the flesh of the animal, was regarded as the best quality (this was known as קלף, and that made from the outer sheet, i.e., the side next to the hair, was an inferior quality (this was known as דוכסוסטוס).

(1) But the whole sheet of parchment must be removed.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Menachoth 32a

leaving a space above and a space below, and leaving [the space between] the sections open.¹ And I said to him, Master, what is the reason for this? And he answered, Because [the portions] are not close to each other in the Torah.² And R. Hananel said in the name of Rab that the halachah follows R. Simeon b. Eleazar. Now presumably [the halachah referred to the ruling] of leaving [the space between] the sections open? — No, it referred to the ruling of leaving a space [above and below]. And how much space must there be? — R. Menashya b. Jacob (others say: R. Samuel b. Jacob) said, The space taken up by the clasps of the scribes.³

Said Abaye to R. Joseph, And do you not hold that Rab's statement [of the halachah] referred to the leaving of the space [above and below]? But is it not the fact that Rab usually relies upon the practice of people, and the general practice is to leave [the space between] the sections closed?⁴ For Rabbah said in the name of R. Kahana who had it from Rab, If Elijah were to come and say that halizah⁵ may be performed with a covered shoe, he would be obeyed; [were he, however, to say] that halizah may not be performed with a sandal, he would not be obeyed, for the people have long ago adopted the practice [of performing it] with a sandal. R. Joseph, however, reported in the name of R. Kahana who had it from Rab, If Elijah were to come and say that halizah may not be performed with a covered shoe, he would be obeyed; [were he, however, to say] that halizah may not be performed with a sandal, he would not be obeyed, for the people have long ago adopted the practice [of performing it] with a sandal. And it was asked, What is the difference between them? And it was suggested that the practical difference between them was as to whether a covered shoe may be used in the first instance!⁶ — We must say therefore [that Rab's statement of

the halachah referred] to the leaving of the space;⁷ this proves it.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, The precept is to leave [the space between the sections] closed, nevertheless if it was left open it is valid; for when R. Simeon b. Eleazar spoke of 'leaving the space between the sections open', he meant, even open. Shall we say that the following supports his view? For it was taught:⁸ Similarly, if scrolls of the Law or tefillin had worn out, one may not make out of them a mezuzah, for one may not bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity.⁹ Now it follows that if it were permitted to bring down to a lower sanctity one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin or a scroll of the Law]; but how is this possible? Here the portions are closed but there they are open!¹⁰ — Perhaps [it would have been permitted] only to complete¹¹ [the mezuzah]. And if it were permitted to bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity, [you say that] one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin]? But it has been taught:¹² It is a law handed to Moses at Sinai that the [Scriptural portions in the] tefillin must be written on kelaf¹³ and the mezuzah on dukstus.¹³ Kelaf is the side [of the skin] next to the flesh, and dukstus is the side next to the hair!¹³ — This is only a recommendation. But it was taught: If one did otherwise, it is invalid! — That refers only to the tefillin. But it was taught that if one did otherwise in either case, it is invalid!¹⁴ — The two cases refer to the tefillin only, but in the one case he wrote the portions on that side of kelaf nearest to the hair, and in the other case

(1) I.e., the second passage is begun on a fresh line, leaving blank the rest of the line in which the first passage ended.

(2) The two passages of the mezuzah are not consecutive in the Torah, the one comes from Deut. VI, 4-9 and the other from XI, 13-21. The second passage is therefore to be begun on a separate line.

(3) Clasps were used by scribes to prevent the sheets of parchment from rolling up.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(4) Accordingly Rab would certainly not have ruled that the space between the sections must be left open which is contrary to the general practice. Hence his ruling could only refer to the space to be left above and below.

(5) **הליצה** lit., ‘drawing off’ sc. the shoe; v. Deut. XXV, 5-9. The adopted practice was for the widow to take off a sandal from the foot of her brother-in-law. There was some doubt, however, whether the ceremony may be performed with a covered shoe instead of a sandal. Cf. Yeb. 102a.

(6) According to Rabbah's version it is not right nowadays to use a covered shoe for this ceremony in the first instance when a sandal is available, until there has been a definite ruling by Elijah that it is permitted. On the other hand, according to R. Joseph's version a covered shoe may be used nowadays even though a sandal is available, until we have a ruling to the contrary. It is thus evident that Rab relies upon the practice of the people.

(7) But on the question as to whether the space between the sections is to be left open or closed, Rab as usual follows the general practice, which is that it is to be closed.

(8) Shab. 79b.

(9) The mezuzah is deemed to be of a lesser sanctity since it contains only two Scriptural portions, whereas the tefillin contain four.

(10) For in the scroll of the Law the space after the **שבע** (i.e., Deut. VI, 4-9, the first passage in the mezuzah) is closed, and in the mezuzah it is to be left open. We must therefore say that R. Simeon b. Eleazar meant that it may even be left open, thus supporting R. Nahman's view!

(11) I.e., if a word or a line was missing in the mezuzah it would be permitted to patch it up with the same word or the same line cut out from the worn out scroll of the Law or from the tefillin, were it not for the general restriction against lowering the sanctity of a sacred object. But the space between the sections of the mezuzah must in fact be left open.

(12) Shab. 79b.

(13) V. supra p. 202, n. 5.

(14) Presumably the expression ‘in either case’ refers to the tefillin and the mezuzah, and we are here taught that any variation, e.g., writing the mezuzah on **kelaf** or the tefillin on **duksustus**, renders them invalid.

Menachoth 32b

he wrote them on that side of **duksustus** nearest to the flesh.¹ Alternatively I can say that the ruling, ‘If one did otherwise in either case² [it is invalid]’, is dependent upon

Tannaim. For it was taught: If one did otherwise in either case,² it is invalid; R. Ahai declares it valid on the authority of R. Ahai b. R. Hanina (others say, On the authority of R. Jacob b. R. Hanina). Again, if it were permitted to bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity, [you say that] one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin]? But it must be written on ruled lines!³ For R. Minyomi b. Hilkiyah said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria who said it in the name of Rab, A mezuzah that is not written on ruled lines is invalid. Moreover, R. Minyomi b. Hilkiyah on his own authority said that [the rule for writing] the mezuzah on ruled lines is a law handed to Moses at Sinai!—

Tannaim differ on this point, for it was taught: R. Jeremiah said in the name of our Master:⁴ Tefillin and Mezuzoth may be written from memory⁵ and need not be written on ruled lines. The halachah⁶ is: Tefillin need not be written on ruled lines, the mezuzah must be written on ruled lines, and both may be written from memory. What is the reason? — They are well known by heart.

R. Helbo said, I once saw R. Huna when he wished to sit down on a couch upon which lay a scroll of the Law, invert a vessel on the ground, place the scroll upon it, and then sit on the couch. For he was of the opinion that it was forbidden to sit on a couch upon which lay a scroll of the Law. This is at variance with the opinion of Rabbah b. Bar Hanah; for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, It is permitted to sit on a bed upon which lies a scroll of the Law. And if someone should whisper in your ear [seeking to contradict you] saying, It is related of R. Eleazar that once, while sitting on his bed, he remembered that a scroll of the Law lay on it, whereupon he slipped off and sat upon the ground, and it appeared as though he had been bitten by a serpent, [answer him that] there the scroll of the Law was actually lying upon the ground.⁷

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel, If one wrote it like a letter,⁹ it is invalid. Why? — Because of the inference that is made by the expression ‘writing’, which is used here [in connection with the mezuzah] and also there in connection with the scroll.¹⁰

Rab Judah also said in the name of Samuel, If one hung it on a stick,¹¹ it is invalid. Why? Because it must be upon thy gates.¹² A Baraitha has also been taught to this effect: If one hung it on a stick, or attached it [to the wall] behind the door, it is a danger¹³ and it is no fulfillment of the precept. The household of King Monobaz used to do so when staying at a hostel,¹⁴ merely in remembrance of the mezuzah.

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, The precept is to fix it within the space of the door.¹⁵ Is not this obvious? Does not the Divine Law say, And upon thy gates?¹⁶ — I might have thought that, since Raba stated that the [proper performance of the] precept is to fix it

(1) And in either case it is invalid, for the Scriptural portions of the tefillin must be written only on the internal side of kelaf, i.e., the side nearest to the flesh, and any variation would render invalid. On the other hand the mezuzah may be written on any kind of parchment, kelaf or dukstus.

(2) I.e., both as regards the tefillin and the mezuzah.

(3) Whereas the Scriptural portions of the tefillin are not written on ruled lines, so that the portions of the tefillin cannot serve for the mezuzah.

(4) Rabbi(?)

(5) Lit., ‘not from the writing’; i.e., without a copy.

(6) I.e., the law which was given to Moses at Sinai; so Rashi Meg. 18b.

(7) And as an expression of his sorrow for the Scroll that was lying on the ground R. Eleazar also sat down on the ground. Had it, however, been on the bed, he would not have objected to anyone sitting on the same bed.

(8) Sc. the mezuzah. And so throughout this passage.

(9) I.e., it was written without having ruled the lines beforehand and without special care as to the spelling of the words (Rashi).

(10) In connection with the mezuzah it is written (Deut. VI,9): And thou shalt write them, and in connection with the Book of the Law it is written (Ex. XVII, 14): Write this for a memorial in the book; as the latter must be written with accuracy as to spelling and upon ruled lines, so the mezuzah too must be written with accuracy and upon ruled lines. Rashi also suggests the inference from the writing of a divorce (lit., ‘a book of divorcement, v. Deut. XXIV, 1), which must also be written with accuracy; but see Tosaf. s.v. כתובה.

(11) I.e., a stick was fastened to the door-post and the mezuzah was hung on the stick.

(12) Deut. VI, 9. It must be upon the actual door-post.

(13) For one might easily knock against it (Tosaf.).

(14) Since there is no obligation to affix Mezuzoth to a temporary abode.

(15) I.e., upon that side of the door-post which faces the door but not upon the side which faces the street or the house within.

(16) Deut. VI, 9. It must be fixed on the side where the door shuts, which is on the inside of the framework of the door-post.

Menachoth 33a

in the handbreadth nearest to the street, the further it is from the house the better, he therefore teaches us [that it is not so].

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, If one wrote it on two sheets,¹ it is invalid. An objection was raised: It was taught: If one wrote it on two sheets and fixed it on the two door-posts, it is invalid. It follows, however, that if it was placed on one doorpost it is valid!² — _____ [The Baraitha] meant that it could be placed on two door-posts.³

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, In the law of mezuzah one must be guided by the conclusiveness of the hinge. What is meant by ‘the hinge’? — R. Adda said, The sockets [for the pin of the hinge]. In what circumstances?⁴ — For example, where there is a door between two houses, one house being for men and the other for women.⁵

The Exilarch once built a house and said to R. Nahman, ‘Fix the Mezuzoth for me’;

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

whereupon R. Nahman replied, ‘First put the door[-posts] in their places’.⁶

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, If one fixed it in the manner of a bolt,⁷ it is invalid. But this cannot be, for when R. Isaac b. Joseph came [from Palestine] he reported that all the Mezuzoth in Rabbi's house were fixed in the manner of a bolt, and also that the door through which Rabbi used to enter the House of Study had no mezuzah! — This is no contradiction, for in the one case it was attached horizontally,⁸ in the other it was bent at a right angle.⁹ But this¹⁰ too cannot be, for the door through which R. Huna used to enter the House of Study had a mezuzah! — That [door] was used more frequently [than the others]. And Rab Judah has said in the name of Rab that in the law of mezuzah one must decide upon the [door] most frequently used.¹¹

R. Zera said in the name of R. Mattena who said it in the name of Samuel, The proper performance of the precept is to fix it at the beginning of the upper third of the door-post. But R. Huna said, It must be raised one handbreadth from the ground and it must be one handbreadth away from the lintel, otherwise the whole of the door-post is valid for the mezuzah. An objection was raised: It must be raised one handbreadth from the ground and it must be one handbreadth away from the lintel, otherwise the whole of the door-post is valid for the mezuzah. So R. Judah. R. Jose says, It is written, And thou shalt bind them,¹² and And thou shalt write them:¹³ as the binding [of the tefillin] is high up,¹⁴ so the writing must be placed high up.¹⁵ Now according to R. Huna this is well, for he agrees with R. Judah; but with whom does Samuel agree? Neither with R. Judah nor with R. Jose! —

R. Huna the son of R. Nathan answered, Indeed he agrees with R. Jose,

(1) So Tosaf. and Asheri. According to Rashi: ‘in two columns’.

(2) Even though written on two sheets; contra Rab Judah.

(3) In the Baraita cited, the two sheets were actually placed on one door-post, but it could have been placed on the two door-posts since there were separate sheets; thus it is in accordance with Rab Judah.

(4) Is one to be guided by the conclusiveness of the hinge.

(5) The mezuzah must be affixed to the right door-post as one enters the house; in this case, however, where one door communicates between two houses, whilst each house has its own door leading into the street, it is difficult to establish which house leads into the other, and on which door-post of this door is the mezuzah to be fixed. We are therefore taught the following test: that side of the door where the sockets for the door-pin are placed is considered to be the inside. Accordingly the mezuzah must be affixed to the right door-post as one enters that house on the inside of which the sockets are found.

(6) For only then arises the duty to fix the mezuzah.

(7) I.e., horizontally.

(8) In which case it is invalid.

(9) I.e., partly horizontal and partly vertical; like the thigh and the leg which form a right angle at the knee when sitting. In this case it is valid.

(10) The report that the door through which Rabbi used to enter the House of Study had no mezuzah.

(11) I.e., in a room which has more than one door the mezuzah must be affixed to that door which is most frequently used.

(12) Deut. VI, 8.

(13) Ibid. 9.

(14) At the top of the head; v. infra 37a.

(15) At the top of the door-post, close to the lintel.

Menachoth 33b

for by ‘the beginning of the upper third’ he meant that as the furthest point, for one should not fix it lower than a third of the door-post away from the lintel.

Raba said, The proper performance of the precept is to fix it in the handbreadth nearest to the street. Why? — The Rabbis say, So that one should encounter a precept immediately [on one's return home]; R. Hanina of Sura says, So that it should protect the entire house.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. Hanina said, Come and see how the character of the Holy One, blessed be He, differs from that [of men] of flesh and blood. According to human standards, the king dwells within, and his servants keep guard on him from without; but with the Holy One, blessed be He, it is not so, for it is His servants that dwell within and He keeps guard over them from without; as it is said, The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand.¹

R. Joseph the son of Raba stated in his discourse in the name of Raba, If one set it deep in the door-post, to the depth of a handbreadth, it is invalid. Shall we say that the following Baraitha supports him? For it was taught: If one set it in the post [of the door] or if one added another frame,² and there was the depth of a handbreadth,³ another mezuzah is necessary, but if less, no other mezuzah is necessary! — That [first clause of the Baraitha] refers to a door behind a door.⁴ But this is expressly stated further on, [thus,] If there was a door behind a door and there was a depth of a handbreadth, another mezuzah is necessary, but if less, no other mezuzah is necessary! — This is merely stated as illustrating [the cases mentioned].

A Tanna taught: If a man set up a door-frame of [hollow] reeds, he may cut away a length of reed and place [the mezuzah in the hollow]. R. Aha the son of Raba said, This was taught only if he first set up the door-frame and then cut away a length of reed and placed [the mezuzah] therein; but if he first cut away a length [of the reed] and placed therein [the mezuzah] and then set up [the whole as a door-frame], it is invalid, because of the principle ‘Thou shalt make, but not [use] what is ready made’.⁵

Raba also said, Faulty⁶ doors are exempt from mezuzah. What is meant by ‘faulty doors’? — In this R. Rehumai and Abba Jose differ; one says, Those that have no upper

beam;⁷ and the other says, Those that have no side-posts.⁸

R. Hisda said, An exedra⁹ is exempt from mezuzah, since it has no door-posts. It follows, however, that if it had door-posts it would require a mezuzah, but surely [the posts] were made only as supports for the ceiling! — He meant to say this: even though it has door-posts it is exempt, for they were made only as supports for the ceiling. Abaye said, I have seen that the halls in the Master's house, although they have posts, have no Mezuzoth. Obviously he was of the opinion that they serve only as supports for the ceiling. An objection was raised: A lodge,¹⁰ an exedra, and a balcony, each requires a mezuzah! — The reference here is to the exedra of a school-house.¹¹ But the exedra of a school-house is a proper room, is it not? — We must say that the reference is to a Roman exedra.¹²

Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, An entrance-lodge requires two Mezuzoth. What is meant by ‘an entrance-lodge’? — R. Papa the Elder said in the name of Rab, It is a lodge, with one door opening on to the courtyard and another leading to the dwelling-houses.

Our Rabbis taught: A lodge which leads into a garden and thence into an outhouse¹³ is, according to R. Jose, considered as the outhouse.¹⁴ But the Sages say, It is considered as the air space¹⁵ [of the garden]. Rab and Samuel both said, If the door opens from the garden into the house,¹⁶ there is no dispute at all that it requires a mezuzah, since it clearly admits into the house; they differ only where the door opens from the house into the garden,¹⁷ the one maintaining that the outhouse is the main thing,¹⁸ the other that the garden is the main thing.¹⁹ But Rabbah and R. Joseph both said, If the door opens from the house into the garden²⁰ there is no dispute at all that it is exempt, since it is clearly the door for the garden; they differ

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

only where the door opens from the garden into the house, the one maintaining that it serves for entering into the house,²¹ the other that it was entirely

(1) Ps. CXXI, 5. The mezuzah which is upon thy right hand protects the house.

(2) To the existing door-frame upon which there was already fixed a mezuzah.

(3) In the first clause, presumably this means that it was set in deep in the post to the depth of a handbreadth, and in the second clause this means that the thickness of the new frame was a handbreadth, so that the mezuzah on the original frame is now sunken in to the depth of a handbreadth.

(4) The post referred to in the first clause of the Baraitha was a post that served as the right door-post for two doors. Thus, through the first door one entered the house, and at right angles to this door and hard by it on the right there opened another door through which one entered into an inner room. If the thickness of this door-post was a handbreadth or more, then two Mezuzoth are necessary, but if less, then one mezuzah serves for both doors. Similarly the framework spoken of in the second clause of the Baraitha refers also to this post, thus a jamb was added on each side of this door-post making the thickness of the whole more than a handbreadth. Another explanation is that the Baraitha refers to a small door that is made in a large door; if the width from the right edge of the small door to the right edge of the large door is a handbreadth or more, then each door requires a mezuzah; but if less, one mezuzah (i.e., the one on the doorpost of the large door) serves for both doors.

(5) The principle stated here, which is derived from the law of sukkah (v. Deut. XVI, 13) and of zizith (v. ibid. XXII, 12), where in both texts the expression 'thou shalt make' is used, is that one's duty is fulfilled only when the precept has been performed after the obligation for its performance has fallen due. In this case, however, the mezuzah was fixed to the door-post before the latter had been set in position and then there was no obligation for a mezuzah; therefore when later it is set in position the mezuzah is 'ready made' and cannot serve the purpose.

(6) 'Semitic doors' (R. Han. in Tosaf. 'Erub. 11a, s.v. פתחי).

(7) Or 'doors to a room which has no ceiling'. But v. Tosaf. a.l.

(8) Or 'lintels'.

(9) A hall, closed on three sides and open on the fourth.

(10) The watchman's lodge at the entrance of a house.

(11) A hall having four walls but which do not reach to the roof.

(12) Which had sides only a few feet high and the rest of each side was made up of lattice-windows.

(13) Thus: Fig. 1 Fig. 2 The dispute is concerning that door which leads from the lodge into the garden.

(14) And requires a mezuzah.

(15) And does not require a mezuzah. This reading 'as the air space' is obviously the correct one and is supported by MSS. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read 'as the lodge', which gives no sensible meaning.

(16) In the ensuing argument 'house', בית, stands for בית שער, the lodge; cf. Alfasi and Asheri, where the word בית is used at the beginning of the passage too. The interpretation as preferred by Rashi is as follows: if the hinges of the door in question are on the inside, so that the door opens inside (v. Fig. 1), this is conclusive evidence that the door belongs primarily to the lodge (v. supra p. 207), and therefore it requires a mezuzah. V. Rashi for other interpretations of this uncertain passage.

(17) I.e., the hinges are on the outside, so that the door opens outside into the garden (v. Fig. 2).

(18) This is R. Jose's view. He holds that the purpose of this door is not so much for the garden as for the outhouse which can be reached only through this door; and as the outhouse requires a mezuzah so does this door too require a mezuzah.

(19) The Sages' view. It is therefore exempt from the mezuzah.

(20) V. p. 211, n. 8.

(21) Sc. the lodge. This is R. Jose's view.

Menachoth 34a

made for the sake of the garden. Abaye and Raba decided in accordance with the views of Rabbah and R. Joseph, whilst R. Ashi decided in accordance with the views of Rab and Samuel, adopting the stricter ruling.¹ And the law is in accordance with the views of Rab and Samuel, adopting the stricter ruling.

It was stated: As for a staircase which leads from one room to an upper room,² R. Huna said, If it has but one door, it requires one mezuzah only, but if it has two doors, it requires two Mezuzoth.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. Papa said, One can learn from R. Huna's dictum that a room that has four doors requires four Mezuzoth. Is not this obvious? — It was necessary to be stated even though one [door] was mostly used.³ Amemar said, A door which is in the corner⁴ requires a mezuzah. Thereupon R. Ashi said to Amemar, But it has no posts! — He replied, Here are its posts.⁵

R. Papa once came to Mar Samuel's house and saw there a door which had only one door-post, and that on the left side, to which was affixed a mezuzah. He said, Apparently this is in accord with R. Meir,⁶ but might not R. Meir have said so only when [the post was] on the right side; did he say so when it was on the left side? What is [your authority for] this?⁷ — It was taught: [Upon the doorposts of] thy house:⁸ that is, upon the right side as you enter. You say, the right side, but perhaps it is not that but the left side? The verse therefore says, 'Thy house'. How is this derived [from the verse]? Rabbah explained, 'As you enter' implies the right side, for when a man steps [into his house] he steps in with his right foot first. R. Samuel b. Aha quoting Raba b. 'Ulla derived it in the presence of R. Papa from the following verse: And Jehoiada the priest took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar, on the right side as one cometh into the house of the Lord; and the priests that kept the threshold put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.⁹ What is this view of R. Meir? —

It was taught: A house that has only one door-post requires a mezuzah according to R. Meir; but the Sages exempt it. What is the reason for the Sages' view? — Because it is written The door-posts.¹⁰ And what is the reason for R. Meir's view? — It was taught: It is written 'The door-posts', and I know that the minimum of 'door-posts' is two; since, however, in the second portion¹¹ the verse also says the doorposts,¹² which is unnecessary, we have then an inclusive term

following another inclusive term, and whenever an inclusive term follows another inclusive term its effect is to restrict;¹³ Scripture has thus brought down the law to one door-post.¹⁴

This is the argument of R. Ishmael. R. Akiba says, This is unnecessary; for it is written, Upon the lintel and on the two side-posts.¹⁵ Now there was no need for Scripture to say, 'two'; what then does it mean by 'two'? It lays down the principle that wherever 'door-posts' are mentioned only one is meant unless the verse expressly says 'two'.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And thou shalt write them.¹⁶ It is possible to think that this means that one should write [the portion] upon the stones [of the house], therefore it uses the expression 'writing' here and the expression 'writing' there,¹⁷ and as in the latter case it means upon a scroll so here it means upon a scroll. Or perhaps argue this way: it uses the expression 'writing' here and the expression 'writing' there,¹⁸ as there it means upon the stones so here it means upon the stones. Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer the 'writing' which is intended as a precept for all times from the 'writing' which is also intended as a precept for all times, but we may not infer the 'writing' which is intended as a precept for all times from the 'writing' which is not intended as a precept for all times.¹⁹ And [it²⁰ must be written with ink] as it says elsewhere, Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words unto me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book.²¹

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, But the Divine Law says upon the door-posts,²² and you say we must infer the 'writing' here from the 'writing' there [that it shall be written on a scroll]! [He replied,] The verse says, 'And thou shalt write them', which implies a perfect writing,²³ and then [place it] upon the door-posts. But since then it is

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

written, 'And thou shalt write them',²⁴ wherefore do I need the analogy of the common expressions? — Without the analogy I should have said that one must write it upon a stone²⁵ and set it up upon the threshold [as the door-post], it therefore teaches us otherwise.

OF THE FOUR PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE TEFILLIN, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. Is not this obvious?²⁶ — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, The law had to be taught in respect of the tittle of the letter yod. And is not this, too, obvious? — It was necessary to be taught in respect of the other statement of Rab Judah; for Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a margin of parchment is invalid.

- (1) I.e., accepting R. Jose's ruling. So that in all the circumstances stated a mezuzah is necessary.
- (2) It was usual to place a door at the foot of the staircase or at the top so as to afford privacy to the tenants of the upper and lower floors. Sometimes a door was placed both at the foot and at the top of the staircase.
- (3) All four doors, nevertheless, must be provided with Mezuzoth.
- (4) I.e., the door was placed in a corner of the room at an angle to each of the adjoining walls (see drawing). According to Asheri the meaning is that the whole of one wall was taken up by the door.
- (5) The extremities of the two walls to which the door is attached form the door-posts.
- (6) Who holds that a door which has only one door-post must, nevertheless, have a mezuzah.
- (7) That the right side only was meant.
- (8) Deut. VI, 9. Heb. ביתך 'thy house' is interpreted as ביאתך 'thy entering'.
- (9) II Kings XII, 10. Hence whatever is to be placed at the entrance of a house must be placed on the right side.
- (10) Deut. *ibid.* The use of the plural implies a minimum of two.
- (11) Inscribed in the mezuzah.
- (12) *Ibid.* XI, 20.

(13) For here each expression by itself indicates plurality, and since it is repeated Scripture thereby intimates that the condition of plurality is no longer essential.

(14) That a door which has only one door-post requires a mezuzah.

(15) Ex. XII, 23.

(16) Deut. VI, 9.

(17) In the law of a bill of divorce; cf. *ibid.* XXIV, 1. So Rashi; Tosaf. suggest that the reference is to the scroll used in the case of a woman suspected of adultery, cf. Num. V, 23, or to the Book of the Law written by the king, cf. Deut. XVII, 18.

(18) With reference to the memorial of stones to be set up by the Israelites when they cross the Jordan, and upon which are to be written all the words of the law; cf. *ibid.* XXVII, 3ff.,

(19) The engraving upon the stones was an ordinance for that time only.

(20) The mezuzah as well as the bill of divorce and the other cases mentioned above in n. 3.

(21) Jer. XXXVI, 18.

(22) I.e., actually written upon the wood.

(23) The Heb. וכתבתם 'and thou shalt write them', is interpreted as though divided into two words: כתב ותם meaning, a perfect writing; and this is the case only when writing is applied with ink upon a scroll, for any writing with ink upon wood or stones would be imperfect and indistinct.

(24) Signifying that the writing must be upon a scroll.

(25) I.e., one must carve the words upon a stone, which would also be a perfect and distinct writing.

(26) V. *supra* 29a for this identical passage, p. 189 and the notes thereon.

Menachoth 34b

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, Letotefeth, Letotefeth, and letotafoth,¹ making four in all.² So R. Ishmael. R. Akiba says, There is no need of that interpretation, for 'tot' means two in Katpis and 'foth' means two in Afriki.⁴

Our Rabbis taught: I might have said that one should write [the Scriptural portions] upon four pieces of parchment and put them in four compartments made out of four pieces of leather; the verse therefore says, And for a memorial between thine eyes:⁵ one memorial I commanded you, but not two or three memorials. How then should one do? One should write them upon four pieces of parchment and put them in four

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

compartments made out of one piece of leather.⁶ If, however, one wrote them upon one parchment and put them in the four compartments,⁷ that is sufficient. There must be a blank space between each [portion]. So Rabbi; but the Sages say, This is not necessary. They agree, however, that between each there must be a line or a thread.⁸ And if the divisions [between the compartments] were not noticeable,⁹ they are invalid.

Our Rabbis taught: How must one write them? The portions for the hand-tefillah¹⁰ one should write upon one piece of parchment; if one wrote them upon four pieces of parchment and put them in one compartment that is still valid. They must, however, be fastened together,¹¹ for it is written, And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand¹² and as outside it is one sign, so inside, too, it must be one sign. This is the opinion of R. Judah. But R. Jose says, This is not necessary.¹³ Moreover, said R. Jose, R. Judah Berabbi¹⁴ concedes to me that if a man has no hand-Tefillah but has two head-Tefillahs, he may cover up one of them with a skin and place it [on his arm]. ‘Concede’, [you say,] but that is the very issue between them!¹⁵ —

Raba answered, R. Jose's statement proves that R. Judah withdrew his opinion. Surely this cannot be, for R. Haninah sent [from Palestine] the following ruling in the name of R. Johanan: The hand-Tefillah may be converted for use on the head but the head-Tefillah may not be converted for use on the arm, for one may not bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity!¹⁶ — This is no difficulty, for one [ruling] refers to an old one¹⁷ and the other to a new one.¹⁸ And according to him who maintains that the mere designation [of a thing for a certain purpose] has a certain force,¹⁹ [we must say that the owner] had made a reservation with regard to it from the very outset.²⁰

Our Rabbis taught: What is the order [of the four Scriptural portions in the head-Tefillah]?

‘Sanctify unto Me’²¹ and ‘And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee’²² are on the right, while ‘Hear’²³ and ‘And it shall come to pass if ye shall hearken diligently’²⁴ are on the left. But there has been taught just the reverse? —

Abaye said, This is no contradiction, for in the one case²⁵ the reference is to the right of the reader,²⁶ whereas in the other it is to the right of the one that wears them; the reader thus reads them²⁷ according to their order.²⁸

R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, If a man reversed the order of the Scriptural portions, it is invalid. Abaye said, This is so

(1) The word *לְטַפָּח* (frontlets, i.e., the tefillin) occurs three times in the Torah, twice (Deut. VI, 8 and XI, 18)

defectively written, *לְטַפָּח* so that in each instance the word might be read in the singular, and once (Ex. XIII, 16) written plene, *לְטַפָּחוֹת*, which indicates the plural number,’ thus making a total of four. It must be noted that this Talmudic statement does not agree with the Masoretic text, for *לְטַפָּחוֹת*, written plene, is not to be found at all in our versions. V. Tosaf. s.v. *לְטַפָּח*.

(2) Hence the rule that the tefillin worn on the head must be composed of four compartments, each containing a specified portion of Scripture.

(3) perhaps the Coptic language.

(4) The language of N. Africa.

(5) Ex. XIII, 9.

(6) This was constructed with the aid of a mould or frame over which the hide, flexible and moist, was tautly stretched and allowed to harden, thus assuming the required form.

(7) The four portions were written upon one long strip of parchment with large blank spaces between one portion and the other, and the parchment was so placed in the compartments that each portion occupied a separate compartment, and the blank spaces of the parchment corresponded with the spaces between the compartments.

(8) I.e., although the Sages do not insist upon the leaving of a blank space between one portion and the other, they nevertheless concede to Rabbi that each portion must be separated and marked off from the others at least by a thread. Others explain: even when the four portions are in four

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

separate compartments, each portion must be tied up with a thread. V. Sh. Mek. n. 4.

(9) Although consisting of four compartments they were so firmly united that the divisions were no longer noticeable from the outside.

(10) I.e., the Tefillah (sing. of tefillin) that is put on the arm.

(11) Into one piece, either sewn together or joined together with glue.

(12) Ex. XIII, 9.

(13) Sc. to join the pieces of parchment into one.

(14) 'The eminent scholar' (Rashi). V. Nazir (Sonc. ed.) p. 64, n. 1.

(15) R. Judah maintaining that the hand-Tefillah must be one inside as it is outside.

(16) The head-Tefillah is deemed to be of a higher sanctity than that worn on the arm, since the former bears upon it two letters of the Name **יהוה** 'Almighty', whereas the hand-Tefillah bears only the last letter of this name; cf. infra 35b. In view of this ruling, then, how can it be said that both R. Judah and R. Jose agree that the head-Tefillah may be converted for use upon the hand merely by covering it with a piece of leather?

(17) I.e., the head-Tefillah had already been worn on the head, in which case its sanctity may not be lowered by converting it for use upon the arm.

(18) The Tefillah had been made as a head-Tefillah and also designated for that purpose but had not yet been worn; in that case it may be converted for use on the arm.

(19) V. Sanh. 47b, Meg. 26b, and Ber. 23b. The fact that it was intended to be used as a head-Tefillah will debar it from being used upon the arm.

(20) Namely, that if he should require it for use as a hand-Tefillah he will convert it to that use.

(21) Ex. XIII, 1-10.

(22) Ibid. 11-16.

(23) Deut. VI, 4-9.

(24) Ibid. XI, 13-21.

(25) In the first Baraitha.

(26) I.e., the person facing the one that wears the tefillin.

(27) When reading the portions from right to left (Rashi).

(28) Sc. as they are found in the Torah, and that is, the order as given in the first Baraitha (Rashi). According to R. Tam's interpretation of the first Baraitha, which states the order from the reader's point of view, the sections occupy the following places: 'Sanctify' is on the extreme right, to the left of it is 'And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee', next to it is 'And it shall come to pass if ye shall hearken diligently', and on the extreme left is 'Hear'.

Menachoth 35a

only [if he put] a portion that should be inside outside or what should be outside inside,¹ but if he put what should be inside also inside or what should be outside also outside,² it does not matter.

Thereupon Raba said to him, Why is it that [the placing of] an inside portion outside or of an outside portion inside is not valid? It is, is it not, because that which should look out into the open does not do so, whilst that which should not look out into the open actually does so? Then, likewise, [the placing of] an outside portion also outside or an inside portion also inside [should also be invalid], since what should look out into the open on the right looks out on the left, and what should look out into the open on the left looks out on the right? We must rather say that there is no such distinction.³

R. Hananel also said in the name of Rab, The underside⁴ of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. Abaye said, The duct⁴ of the tefillin is also a law given to Moses at Sinai. Abaye also said, The shins⁵ of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. The division [between the compartments] must reach as far as the stitches. But R. Dimi of Nehardea said, As long as it is noticeable it need not [reach as far as the stitches].

Abaye also said, The parchment [for the Scriptural portions] of the tefillin must be examined against a flaw, since we require the writing to be perfect and it would not be so [if it had a flaw]. But R. Dimi of Nehardea said, This is not necessary, for the pen⁶ would detect [any flaw]. R. Isaac said, That the straps [of the tefillin] must be black is a law given to Moses at Sinai. An objection was raised: The tefillin must be tied with straps of the same [material as the tefillin themselves.]⁷ The straps may be either green or black or white; but they should not be red because it is repellent,⁸ and also for another reason.⁹

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. Judah said, It is related of one of R. Akiba's disciples that he used to tie his tefillin with strips of blue wool, and R. Akiba made no comment. But is it possible that that righteous man actually saw his disciple do so and he did not prevent him? They said to him, He certainly did not see him do so, for had he seen him he would not have allowed him.

It is related further of Hyrkanos the son of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos that he used to tie his tefillin with strips of purple wool, and he [R. Eliezer] made no comment. But is it possible that that righteous man actually saw his son do so and he did not prevent him? They said to him, He certainly did not see him do so, for had he seen him he would not have allowed him. Now it is stated here, at all events, [that the straps may be] either green or black or white! — This is no contradiction, for here it speaks of the outside of the strap and there of the inside.¹⁰ But if of the inside, how can it be repellent or give any ground for suspicion?¹¹ — It might sometimes become twisted.¹²

A Tanna taught: That the tefillin must be square is a law given to Moses at Sinai. R. Papa¹³ said, [This refers to] the stitching¹⁴ and the diagonal.¹⁵ Shall we say that the following [Mishnah] supports this view? For we have learnt: If a man made his tefillin round, it is a danger¹⁶ and it is no fulfillment of the precept!¹⁷ — R. papa said, That [Mishnah] deals with the case where they were made round like a nut.¹⁸

R. Huna said, As long as the surface of the sides¹⁹ of the tefillin is whole they are valid. R. Hisda said, If two [sides]²⁰ were split they are still valid; but if three, they are invalid. Said to him Raba, Your ruling that if two [sides] were split they are still valid is true only if [the rents were] not facing each other,²¹ but if they were facing each other they are invalid. And even if they were facing each other [they are invalid] only if they were new²² [tefillin], but if they were old it would not matter.

Abaye asked R. Joseph, What is meant by new, and what by old? He replied, If when one stretches the leather it rebounds, it is old; otherwise it is new.

(1) I.e., the portions of the first and second compartments or of the third and fourth had been interchanged.

(2) I.e., the portions of the second and third compartments (both inner portions) or of the first and fourth compartments (both outer portions) had been interchanged.

(3) And any change in the order of the portions will render the tefillin invalid.

(4) Each Tefillah, it must be remembered, is in the form of a square leather box upon a base, that of the hand consisting of one compartment and of the head of four compartments. In order to obtain the necessary shape (usually in the form of a cube) a mould or frame is used over which the skin whilst moist and pliable is tautly stretched. On being removed from the frame the skin is cut around to an equal length on three sides, whilst on the fourth side there is left a long strip of skin which, after allowing for a projection on this fourth side in order to provide a loop or a duct through which the straps are passed, is bent under the whole box so as to form the underside or the base of the Tefillah. After inserting the necessary texts into the several compartments the base is stitched carefully to the extremities of the box on three sides.

(5) The letter shin must be embossed on the right and left sides of the head-Tefillah. The shin on the right side (when worn by the person) is of the usual shape, whilst the shin on the left side has four heads, thus **.

(6) At the time of writing the Scriptural portions.

(7) I.e., of leather; but not with strips of wool or silk or linen.

(8) For it might be said that the straps had been stained with the blood of a sore or a wound.

(9) The suspicion that the wearer of these tefillin had had relations with his wife during her period of menstruation, and the straps had consequently been dyed red with blood.

(10) R. Isaac only stated that the outside of the strap must be black; the inside, however, may be of any color as stated in the Baraitha, except red.

(11) Since the inside of the strap is not seen.

(12) And the inside would be seen.

(13) According to MS.M., 'Rab'. In the parallel passage in Meg. 24b, 'Raba'. So Alfasi.

(14) The stitching of the underside to the box (v. supra p. 218, n. 6) must be done very carefully so that the box should remain a perfect square; thus

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

the stitches should not be pulled too much for fear that the leather will become creased and so lose its correct shape. V. Tosaf. s.v. תפילין and also Tosaf. Meg. 24b, s.v. בתפרין.

(15) I.e., it must be an exact square so that the diagonal should be one and two-fifths times the length of the side.

(16) For if he knocks against anything the round head-Tefillah would pierce his skull.

(17) Meg. 24b.

(18) I.e., the underside was convex and oval and did not lie flat on the head. In that case only is there a danger, but not where the base is flat and only the box is made round like a cylinder.

(19) I.e., the external sides of the box, or the sides which form the divisions between the compartments.

(20) According to Maim. (v. Yad, Tef. III, 18 and Kesef Mishneh a.l.) the reference is to the stitching of the tefillin, and the rules are here stated where two or more stitches had snapped.

(21) Or: next to each other, i.e., in adjoining compartments.

(22) For it is evident that the leather was of an inferior quality.

Menachoth 35b

Or else, if when one holds up the strap, [the box] hangs on to it,¹ it is new; otherwise it is old.

Abaye was once sitting before R. Joseph when the strap of his tefillin suddenly snapped. He thereupon asked R. Joseph, May one tie it together? He answered, The verse says, And thou shalt bind them,² signifying that the binding shall be perfect.

R. Aha the son of R. Joseph asked R. Ashi, May one sew it together, turning the seam on the inside?-He answered, Go and see how the people act.³ R. Papa said, Curtailed straps⁴ are still valid. But this is not correct; for since R. Hiyya's sons stated, Curtailed blue threads⁵ are valid, and curtailed hyssop twigs⁶ are valid, it is clear that only there [are they valid] since they are only accessories of precepts, but it is not so here, as [the straps] are accessories of holy things.⁷ Apparently there is a fixed length [for the strap], what then is the minimum length? —

Rami b. Hama said in the name of Resh Lakish, To the middle finger.⁸ R. Kahana explained it, [To the middle finger] when bent, but R. Ashi explained it, [To the middle finger] when extended.

Rabbah used to tie the knot at the back of his head and allow [the straps] to fall straight down [over his shoulders].⁹ R. Aha b. Jacob used to tie the knot and then plait [the straps] together. Mar the son of Rabina used to do according to our custom.¹⁰

R. Judah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in the name of Rab, The knot¹¹ of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. R. Nahman said, Their ornamentation should be on the outside.¹²

Once as R. Ashi was sitting before Mar Zutra the strap of his tefillin twisted round, whereupon Mar Zutra said to him, Is not the Master of the opinion that their ornamentation should be on the outside? He replied, [Yes, but] I did not notice it. It is written,⁷ And all the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon thee; and they shall be afraid of thee.¹³ It was taught: R. Eliezer the Great says, This refers to the Tefillah of the head.¹⁴ And I will take away My hand, and thou shalt see My back.¹⁵ Said R. Hana b. Bizna in the name of R. Simeon the Pious, This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, showed Moses the knot of the tefillin.

Rab Judah said, The knot of the tefillin should be placed high up,¹⁶ so that Israel be high up and not low down. Moreover, it should face the front, so that Israel be in front and not behind.

R. Samuel b. Bidri said in the name of Rab (according to some, R. Aha Arika said it in the name of R. Huna, whilst according to others, R. Menashya said it in the name of Samuel), When must one recite the blessing

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

over the tefillin? As soon as they have been put on. But this cannot be, for has not Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel that with regard to all precepts the blessing must be recited prior to the performance thereof? — Abaye and Raba both said, It means, from the time they have been put on until they have been tied.¹⁷

- (1) And does not snap.
- (2) Deut. VI, 8. The Heb. וקשרתם 'and thou shalt bind them' is interpreted as two words, וקשר תם 'the binding shall be perfect', or 'the binder (i.e., the strap) shall be perfect'; the strap must therefore be whole and not tied together with a knot.
- (3) And the people are not in the habit of sewing the straps together again; it is therefore forbidden to do so (Rashi).
According to R. Tam it is permitted since the people do sew the straps together.
- (4) I.e., the straps which usually hang down after the head-Tefillah has been placed upon the head, had been cut short and only stumps of them remained.
- (5) Of the zizith, v. infra 38b.
- (6) Used in the purification rites of a leper; cf. Lev. XIV, 4.
- (7) The accessories of holy things are of a higher sanctity and are treated with greater stringency than the accessories of precepts; v. Meg. 26b.
- (8) The reference evidently is to the length of the strap of the hand-Tefillah, and the rule is that it must reach from the place that the Tefillah is laid upon the arm to the middle finger (either bent or extended). So 'Aruch, Maim., and Tosaf. According to Rashi the reference is to the length of the straps that hang down beyond the knot that is tied at the back of the head. And the answer given 'To the first finger', is explained by R. Kahana as that length corresponding to the greatest distance between the first and middle fingers, and by R., Ashi as that length corresponding to the greatest distance between the first finger and the thumb. The translation in the text follows the explanation of the 'Aruch.
- (9) At the back (Rashi); or, in front over the shoulders (Tosaf.).
- (10) I.e., he used to let the straps hang down over his shoulders in front.
- (11) I.e., the special shape of the knot of the head-Tefillah which must resemble the letter dalet and of the hand-Tefillah which must resemble the letter yod. These two letters, together with the letter shin that is embossed on the sides of the head-Tefillah, form the Name שדי, Almighty.
- (12) The letters formed by the knots of the tefillin should be clearly seen from the outside. Another

explanation: that side of the straps which is polished black should be on the outside.

- (13) Deut. XXVIII, 10.
- (14) Since the head-Tefillah contains the greater part of the Divine Name.
- (15) Ex. XXXIII, 23. V. Ber. 7a.
- (16) This, according to Rashi, refers to the position of the knot of the head-Tefillah, which must be placed high up at the back of the head and not low down at the nape of the neck. Asheri cites R. 'Amram Gaon that the reference here is to the position of the knot of the hand-Tefillah, i.e., high up on the arm.
- (17) For as long as they have not been tied the precept is not yet performed.

Menachoth 36a

R. Hisda said, If a man spoke between the putting on of the [hand-] Tefillah and the [head-] Tefillah, he must make another blessing.¹ [Evidently] only if he spoke, he must [make another blessing], but not if he did not speak. But R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna sent [from Palestine] the following decision in the name of R. Johanan: Over the hand-Tefillah one must say, 'Blessed [art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe,] who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast commanded us to put on the tefillin'. Over the head-Tefillah one must say, Blessed... who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast given us command concerning the precept of the tefillin!' — Abaye and Raba both said, It means, if he did not speak [between one Tefillah and the other] he must only recite one blessing, but if he did speak he must recite the two blessings.²

One taught: If a man spoke between [the putting on of] one Tefillah and the other Tefillah, he has committed a transgression and returns home on account of it from the battle line.³

One taught: When a man puts on the tefillin, he should put on first the hand-Tefillah and then the head-Tefillah, and when he takes them off, he should take off first the head-Tefillah and then the hand-Tefillah. Now it is right that when he puts them on he should

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

put on first the one on the hand and then the one on the head, since it is written, And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand,⁴ and then it says, And they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes;⁴ but whence do we know that on taking them off he should first take off the one from the head and then the one from the hand? — Rabbah said, R. Huna explained it to me. The verse says, And they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes, that is to say, so long as they are ‘between thine eyes’ both shall be there.⁵

Our Rabbis taught: When must one recite the blessing over the tefillin?⁶ At the time when it is proper to put them on.⁷ Thus, if a man rises early to go out on a journey and is afraid his tefillin might get lost,⁸ he should put them on, and as soon as the proper time arrives he should touch them⁹ and recite the blessing over them. And until when must one keep them on? Until sunset. R. Jacob said, Until every foot has left the market.¹⁰ But the Sages say, Until the time when people go to sleep. The Sages and¹¹ R. Jacob, however, admit that if a man took them off in order to enter a privy or a bath-house and in the meantime the sun had set, he has not to put them on again. R. Nahman said, The halachah agrees with R. Jacob, since R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna used to say the evening prayer while still wearing them.¹² Another version reads: R. Nahman said, The Halacha does not agree with R. Jacob.¹³

(1) When putting on the head-Tefillah.

(2) As reported by R. Hiyya. So that in ordinary circumstances only one blessing is recited, namely at the putting on of the hand-Tefillah, which blessing serves for the head-Tefillah too. If, however, one interrupted with talk between one Tefillah and the other then the second blessing must be recited before putting on the head-Tefillah. So Rashi and Alfasi, but v. Tosaf. s.v. טז.

(3) In accordance with the Biblical injunction, ‘What man is there that is fearful and fainthearted? let him go and return unto his house (Deut. XX, 8), which is explained by R. Jose as alluding to the man who is afraid because of his transgressions. V. Sot. 44a.

(4) Deut. VI, 8.

(5) This teaching, according to Rashi, is inferred from the fact that the verse uses in connection with the head-Tefillah the expression ‘and they shall be’, which is in the plural. Accordingly the head-Tefillah must never be alone upon the person; therefore it should be put on last and taken off first.

(6) If one has put them on before daybreak.

(7) That is, the time in the early morning when a man can see a friend of his at a distance of four cubits and recognize him. V. Ber. 9b.

(8) If he were to carry them in his hand.

(9) As though he were putting them on at that moment.

(10) I.e., after darkness has fallen.

(11) So in many MSS. and in Alfasi, and so Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read ‘(admit) to R. Jacob’.

(12) Hence they are worn after sunset.

(13) But the halachah follows the first Tanna's view that the tefillin are to be taken off at sunset (Tosaf.).

Menachoth 36b

But did not R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna say the evening prayer while still wearing them? — They certainly differ [from the above ruling]. And could Rabbah b. R. Huna have said so? Did not Rabbah b. R. Huna say that if it was doubtful whether darkness had already fallen or not, one should not take them off¹ nor put them on? Now it follows from this that if it were certain that darkness had fallen one would have to take them off! — This was stated with regard to the eve of Sabbath.² But what can be his view? If he holds that the night is a time for tefillin, then the Sabbath is also a time for tefillin, and if, on the other hand, he holds that the night is not a time for tefillin, then the Sabbath, too, is not a time for tefillin, since the same passage which excludes the Sabbath [from the wearing of tefillin] also excludes the night. For it was taught:³ It is written, And thou shalt observe this ordinance in its season from day to day.⁴ ‘Day’, but not night; ‘from day’, but not all days; hence the Sabbaths and the Festivals are excluded. So R. Jose the Galilean; but R. Akiba says, This ordinance refers only to the Passover-offering!⁵ — He derives it from the text from which R. Akiba derives it.⁶ For it was taught: One might have

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

thought that a man should put on the tefillin on Sabbaths and on Festivals, Scripture therefore says, And it shall be for a sign upon thy hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes,⁷ that is, [only on those days] which stand in need of a sign [are tefillin to be worn], but Sabbaths and Festivals are excluded, since they themselves are a sign.⁸

R. Eleazar said, Whosoever puts on the tefillin after sunset transgresses a positive precept.⁹ R. Johanan said, He transgresses a negative precept.¹⁰ Shall we say that they differ in the principle stated by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a? For R. Abin said in the name of R. Ila'a, Wherever the expression 'observe', 'lest', or 'do not', is used it indicates a negative precept. One¹¹ therefore accepts R. Abin's principle while the other¹² does not! — No, all accept the principle stated by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a, but they differ in this point: one¹² maintains that the expression 'observe' when used in connection with a prohibition has the force of a negative precept and when used in connection with a command has the force of a positive precept; but the other¹¹ maintains that the expression 'observe' even when used in connection with a command has the force of a negative precept.

R. Eleazar also said, If one's purpose is to guard them it is allowed.¹³ Rabina related, I was once sitting before R. Ashi when darkness had already fallen and he put on his tefillin;¹⁴ so I said to him, 'Is it my Master's purpose to guard them?' 'Yes', he replied. I saw, however, that his purpose was not to guard them. He was of the opinion that that was the law,¹⁵ but one should not rule so [in actual practice].¹⁶

Rabbah b. R. Huna said, A man must from time to time touch his tefillin;¹⁷ this may be inferred by an a fortiori argument from the plate.¹⁸ If of the plate, which contains the Divine Name only once, the Torah says, And it shall be always upon his forehead,¹⁹

implying that his mind must not be diverted from it; how much more is this to apply to the tefillin which contain the Divine Name so many times!

Our Rabbis taught: Thy hand,²⁰ that is the left hand. You say it is the left hand, but perhaps it is the right! It is written, Yea, My hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, and My right hand hath spread out the heavens.²¹ And it is also written, Her hand she put to the tent-pin, and her right hand to the workmen's hammer.²² And it is also written, Why withdrawest Thou Thy hand, even Thy right hand? Draw it out of Thy bosom and consume them.²³

- (1) If one was wearing the tefillin at the time.
- (2) When Rabbah b. R. Huna agrees that the tefillin must be taken off by the time darkness has fallen, since Sabbath is not the proper time for the wearing of the tefillin.
- (3) 'Er. 96a.
- (4) Ex. XIII, 10, literally translated.
- (5) Of which the preceding verse speaks. And the expression 'from day to day' would be translated as 'from year to year'.
- (6) Rabbah b. R. Huna maintains that the night is a proper time for tefillin but the Sabbath is not, for only the latter is excluded in the verse.
- (7) Ibid. 16.
- (8) Of the relation of God to Israel. Cf. Ex. XXXI, 17.
- (9) For the prohibition against wearing the tefillin at night is only inferred from the verse which states And thou shalt observe this ordinance... from day to day, thereby excluding the nights, and a prohibition derived from a positive precept has the force of a positive precept only.
- (10) For the expression 'observe' indicates a negative precept.
- (11) R. Johanan.
- (12) R. Eleazar.
- (13) To put on the tefillin (or, to keep them on, v. Sh. Mek, n. 1) after sunset, where the safety of the tefillin is concerned.
- (14) According to MS.M., Alfasi, and Sh. Mek. the text should be: 'And he was still wearing the tefillin.
- (15) That the night is also the time for tefillin.
- (16) Lest one falls asleep whilst wearing the tefillin.
- (17) With his hand while wearing them. I.e., they must constantly be in his mind.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(18) The plate of gold worn by the High priest upon the forehead upon which were engraved the words: Holy to the Lord

(Ex. XXVIII, 36).

(19) Ex. XXVIII, 38.

(20) Heb. יד; in Ex. XIII, 9, and also in a number of other verses, in connection with the tefillin.

(21) Isa. XLVIII, 13. Here יד clearly means the left hand, in contradistinction from ימין, the right hand. This is also seen in the other verses quoted.

(22) Jud. V, 26.

(23) Psalms LXXIV, 11.

Menachoth 37a

R. Jose ha-Horem¹ says, But we also find the right hand referred to as ‘hand’, for it is written, And when Joseph saw that his father was laying his hand, the right one!² And the other? It is referred to as ‘the hand, the right one’, but never as ‘the hand’. R. Nathan says, All this is unnecessary, for since it is written And thou shalt bind them³ and And thou shalt write them,⁴ as writing is with the right hand so the binding shall be with the right hand, and if the binding is to be with the right hand then obviously [the hand-Tefillah] must be put on the left hand. Whence does R. Jose ha-Horem learn that it must be put on the left hand? — He derives it from that same passage from which R. Nathan derives it. R. Ashi said, He derives it from thy hand,⁵ which, being written with the letter he at the end, indicates the weaker hand. Thereupon R. Abba said to R. Ashi, perhaps it means, the stronger hand?⁶ — He replied, Is it written with the letter heth? This is further disputed by Tannaim. It was taught. Thy hand, written with the he, indicates the left hand. Others say, Thy hand, includes a man that has but the stump of the arm.⁷ Another [Baraitha] taught: One that has no [left] arm is exempt from tefillin. Others say, ‘Thy hand’, includes a man that has but the stump of the arm.

Our Rabbis taught: A left-handed man puts his tefillin on his right hand for that is his left.⁸ But it has also been taught that he must put it on his left hand which is also the left of

all people! — The latter was taught of a person who is ambidextrous.

A Tanna in the school of Manasseh taught: Upon thy hand,⁹ that is, on the biceps muscle; between thine eyes,⁹ that is, on the skull. On what part? It was said in the school of R. Jannai, Where the skull of a babe is still tender.

Pelemo enquired of Rabbi, If a man has two heads on which one must he put the tefillin? ‘You must either leave’,¹⁰ he replied, ‘or regard yourself under the ban’. In the meantime there came a man [to the school] saying, ‘I have begotten a first-born child with two heads, how much must I give the priest?’¹¹ An old man came forward and ruled that he must give [the priest] ten sela's. But this is not so! For Rami b. Hama learnt: From the verse. The firstborn of man thou shalt surely redeem,¹² I might conclude that this would apply even when the firstborn was rendered trefah¹³ within thirty days [of his birth]. Scripture therefore added,

(1) There are a number of variants to this word, and the meaning is extremely doubtful. In cur. edd. הקורם, the net-maker (Jast.); others read הקרום, the flat-nosed, being called by this epithet either because of his physical deformity or, more probably, because of the teaching he reported concerning a firstling that was flat-nosed; v. Bek. 43b. Other variants are הקרם and הקרם, possibly place-names.

(2) Gen. XLVIII, 17. This destroys the argument of the first Tanna.

(3) Sc. the Tefillin; Deut. VI, 8.

(4) Sc. the Mezuzah; ibid. 9.

(5) Ex. XIII, 16. ידכה, with superfluous ‘he’, is interpreted as יד כהה, the weaker hand.

(6) Interpreting ידכה as יד כה, for the letters he and heth are frequently interchanged since they resemble each other so closely in form and pronunciation.

(7) ‘The weaker hand’ meaning also the broken arm or amputated arm with but a stump left. The tefillin must be put on this stump.

(8) I.e., the weaker hand.

(9) Ex. XIII, 9.

(10) Sc. the school. Rabbi thought that this question was put merely from a desire to scoff at him.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(11) For his redemption. The fixed sum for redemption was five shekels (sela's in the Rabbinic tongue), cf. Num. XVIII, 16.

(12) Ibid. 15.

(13) Heb. **טריפה**, afflicted with a fatal organic disease This is R. Tam's interpretation; according to Rashi, the child was killed.

Menachoth 37b

Howbeit,¹ limiting thereby [the general application]!² — In this case it is different since the Divine Law declared [the law of redemption] to be governed by the expression 'per head'.³

The Master said, 'Upon thy hand, that is, on the biceps muscle'. Whence is this derived? — Our Rabbis taught: Upon thy hand, that is, the upper part of the hand.⁴ You say it is the upper part of the hand, but perhaps it means actually upon the hand?⁵ Since the Torah ordains that one must put tefillin upon the hand and also upon the head, as in the latter case it is to be upon the upper part of the head so in the former it is to be upon the upper part of the hand. R. Eliezer says, This is unnecessary; for the verse says, 'And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand', implying that the sign shall be unto thee but not unto others.⁶ R. Isaac says, This too is unnecessary; for it is written, And ye shall lay up these My words in your heart... and ye shall bind them,⁷ implying that it must be placed over against the heart.⁸

R. Hiyya and R. Aha the son of R. Ivia used to place it exactly over against the heart. R. Ashi was once sitting before Amemar. The latter had an injury on his arm and his tefillin were exposed;⁹ whereupon R. Ashi said to him, Does not the Master hold 'it shall be for a sign unto thee but not unto others'? — That, he replied, was stated only to indicate the place, namely, where it is a sign unto thee only.¹⁰

Whence is it derived that it must be upon the upper part of the head? — Our Rabbis

taught: 'Between thine eyes', that is, the upper part of the head. You say it is the upper part of the head, but perhaps it means actually between the eyes? It is written here, 'Between thine eyes', and it is written there, Nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead;¹¹ as in the latter case it means the upper part of the head where baldness can be made, so in the former case too it means the upper part of the head where baldness can be made. R. Judah says, This is unnecessary; for since the Torah ordains that one must put tefillin on the hand and also on the head, as in the former case it is put on a place which can be declared unclean as a leprous spot by one symptom only,¹² so in the former case it must be put on a place which can be declared unclean as a leprous spot by one symptom only;¹² one must therefore rule out the place between the eyes where flesh and hair are to be found, [and so can be declared unclean by two symptoms,] either by [the appearance of] white hair or yellow hair.

OF THE FOUR FRINGES, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS, SINCE THE FOUR TOGETHER FORM ONE PRECEPT. [R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS.] What is the practical difference between the two?¹³ — R. Joseph said, They differ in respect of a linen garment with [woolen] fringes.¹⁴ Rabbah b. Abina said, They differ in respect of a five-cornered garment.¹⁵ Rabina said, They differ in respect of R. Huna's dictum. For R. Huna said, If a man went out in the street on the Sabbath wearing a garment not provided with proper fringes as required by law, he is liable to a sin-offering.¹⁶

R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said, If a man cut off [one corner of] his garment,¹⁷ he has gained nothing, for he has simply made it into a five-cornered garment.¹⁸ R. Mesharsheya said, If a man folded up his garment,¹⁹ he has gained nothing, for it is

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

regarded as spread out.²⁰ We have also learnt:²¹ Water-skins that [have been pierced and] have been tied up again are not susceptible to uncleanness,²² excepting those tied up with an Arab knot.²³ R. Dimi of Nehardea said, If a man sewed together [the folded corners of] his garment,²⁴ he has gained nothing, for if he has no use for the corners he should cut them off and throw them away.²⁵

R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name that the halachah agrees with R. Ishmael.²⁶ The halachah, however, is not in accordance with him.

Rabina was once walking behind Mar son of R. Ashi [in the street] on one of the Sabbaths preceding the Festival,²⁷ when suddenly a corner of [Mar's] garment with its fringe had torn away, but Rabina told him nothing about it. When he came home and Rabina told him that it had torn away there [in the street], he said, 'Had you told me of it I should then and there have cast it off'.²⁸ But has not a Master said, Great is the dignity of man since it overrides a negative precept of the Torah?²⁹ — Rab b. Shabba explained it before R. Kahana

(1) Ibid. Heb. 78, having a limiting force, and so excluding certain cases.

(2) Accordingly in the case of a child with two heads, since it cannot continue to live, the father should be exempt entirely from the payment of redemption money!

(3) Num. III, 47. Consequently as this child has two heads and is now living there must be a payment of ten sela's for his redemption.

(4) Sc. the muscle of the arm.

(5) I.e., the palm of the hand.

(6) And if actually put on the hand it would immediately be noticeable by all. It must consequently be put high up on the arm which part is usually covered with the sleeve.

(7) Deut. XI, 18.

(8) I.e., upon the muscle of the arm, at a point nearest the heart.

(9) For his coat had been cut away around the arm so as to give greater freedom to his injured arm.

(10) I.e., on the upper part of the arm. It need not, however, be at all times covered and hidden from view.

(11) Deut. XIV, 1.

(12) A leprous spot on any part of the body that is free from hair, as the hand, is deemed to be unclean by the appearance of white hairs therein (Lev. XIII, 3), whilst a leprous spot on any part covered with hair, as the head, is deemed to be unclean by the appearance of yellow hairs therein (ibid. 30).

(13) Since the first Tanna and R. Ishmael are agreed that the four fringes are indispensable.

(14) In ordinary circumstances such a garment may not be worn, save where the precept of zizith is concerned. Where, however, one fringe is missing, the entire precept, according to the first Tanna has gone, and the cloak is therefore forbidden as containing diverse kinds, wool and linen; but according to R. Ishmael it is permitted, since each fringe is a separate precept.

(15) A five-cornered garment must be provided with fringes (v. infra 43a), but they differ as to the number of fringes necessary; according to the first Tanna there must be four fringes only, since four make up the precept, whilst according to R. Ishmael each corner must have a fringe, since each fringe is a separate precept.

(16) For bearing an unnecessary burden on the Sabbath, since the fringes were not in accordance with the law. Now if the garment had only three fringes, according to the first Tanna the precept is not thereby fulfilled, hence by reason of R. Huna's dictum the fringes are regarded as an unnecessary burden on the Sabbath; but according to R. Ishmael, the precept is thereby performed, so that R. Huna's ruling would not apply to this case.

(17) Either he cut away a square piece at the corner, leaving behind two right-angled corners, thus making the garment five-cornered; or, he cut away one corner diagonally, leaving two obtuse-angled corners.

(18) Which must also be provided with fringes.

(19) I.e., he turned up each corner of the garment in order to render the garment exempt from fringes (and in the subsequent case of R. Dimi, he sewed down these corners) (Rashi 2); or, he folded the garment (and according to R. Dimi he sewed the fold) and inserted the fringes in the new corners formed by the fold (Rashi 2).

(20) And therefore even now it must be provided 'with fringes in its corners.

(21) Kel. XXVI, 4.

(22) Since the knot is only temporary and will be untied, the water-skin is regarded even now as a pierced vessel, and is therefore not susceptible to uncleanness.

(23) For these remain so permanently.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(24) V. supra n. 4.

(25) But as long as the corners are not cut off the garment must be provided with fringes.

(26) With all the practical results that follow from that view, as stated above.

(27) For it was usual to preach on the laws of the Festival four Sabbaths before the Festival. V. Pes. 6a.

(28) For since the garment was not now properly provided with fringes (R. Ishmael's view not being accepted as law) it is regarded as an unnecessary burden carried on the Sabbath.

(29) And as it would be undignified for a man of his eminence to remove his garment in the street he is permitted to carry it on the Sabbath.

Menachoth 38a

as referring to the prohibition, Thou shalt not turn aside.¹ Another version states that [Rabina] told him of it there [in the street]; whereupon [Mar] said to him, 'Do you think that I am going to cast it off here? Has not a Master said, Great is the dignity of man since it overrides a negative precept of the Torah?' 'But has not Rab b. Shabba explained it before R. Kahana as referring to the prohibition, Thou shalt not turn aside?' 'Here also it is only a karmelith,² so that the prohibition is only Rabbinic.

CHAPTER IV

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BLUE [IN THE FRINGES] DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE, NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE³ THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HAND-TEFILLAH DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE HEAD-TEFILLAH, NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HEAD-TEFILLAH INVALIDATE THE HAND-TEFILLAH.⁴

GEMARA. Must we say that our Mishnah is not in accordance with Rabbi? For it was taught: That ye may look upon it,⁵ implies that the [absence of] one invalidates the other. So Rabbi. But the Sages say, The [absence of] one does not invalidate the other. What is the reason for Rabbi's view? — Because the text says, The corner,⁶ [which

implies that the fringes must be] of the same [color] as that of the corner,⁷ and it also says, A blue thread;⁶ and then the Divine Law says. 'That ye may look upon it', that is, both must be there together as one. But the Rabbis [say]. 'That ye may look upon it', signifies each one by itself. Must we then say that [our Mishnah] is not in accordance with Rabbi? — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, You may even say that it follows Rabbi's view, for [our Mishnah deals here] only with the question of precedence. As it was taught: The [proper performance of the] precept is to insert the white threads before the blue; but if a man inserted the blue before the white, it is indeed valid, but he has not fulfilled the precept. What is meant by 'has not fulfilled the precept'?

(1) Sc. from the sentence which they shall declare unto thee, Deut. XVII, 11. I.e., the principle is that only a Rabbinic prohibition, though having for its sanction this verse in the Torah, can be set aside on account of man's dignity.

(2) כרמלית, an area which is neither a public nor a private domain, in which, however, it is forbidden to carry anything on the Sabbath by Rabbinic decree.

(3) There should be, according to law, four threads inserted in each of the four corners of the garment, two white and two blue (or, three white and one blue); nevertheless the absence of one color is of no consequence provided there was the proper number of threads in all. Consequently it is valid if there were four blue threads, or four white threads.

(4) And if a man has only one Tefillah (sing. of tefillin) he should put on that one.

(5) Num. XV, 39.

(6) Ibid. 38.

(7) As garments were usually of white linen, there must therefore be white threads as fringes.

(8) Or, to twine, v. Sh. Mek. n. 3. The white threads, as derived above from 'the corner', precede the blue in the verse.

Menachoth 38b

Should you say it means that he has not fulfilled the precept of the white [threads] but has fulfilled the precept of the blue, but according to Rabbi the absence of one invalidates the other!¹ — Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, It means that he has not

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

fulfilled the precept and yet has performed the precept, for 'has not fulfilled the precept' only means that he has not performed the precept in the best way. This then explains the clause, **NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE;**² but how can one explain the other clause, **THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE?**³ Moreover,⁴ it has been reported: Levi once said to Samuel, Arioch,⁵ you are not to sit down⁶ until you explain to me the following: **THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE, NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE.** What does it mean? — He answered, This refers to the fringes in a [white linen] garment; for it is proper to insert the white threads first, since Holy Writ says 'the corner', [signifying that the fringes] of the same [color] as the corner [must be inserted first]; nevertheless, if one inserted the blue first it does not matter. Well, this explains.

NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE, but how can one explain, **THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE?** — Rami b. Hama answered, The latter rule refers to a garment that is entirely blue, in which case it is proper to insert the blue threads first, since Holy Writ says 'the corner', [signifying that the fringes] of the same [color] as the corner [must be inserted first]; nevertheless, if one inserted the white threads first it does not matter. Raba objected, Does then the color affect the law?⁷ — Raba therefore explained that [our Mishnah] refers to the curtailment of the threads; thus whether the blue [threads] were curtailed and the white remained or the white were curtailed and the blue remained, it does not matter. As the sons of R. Hiyya said, Curtailed blue threads are valid; curtailed hyssop twigs are valid. What is the minimum length of a curtailed thread? — Bar Hamduri stated in the name of Samuel, There must be sufficient to make a loop therewith. The question was raised: Does 'sufficient to make a loop' mean to

make a loop of all the threads together,⁸ or of each thread separately? — This remains undecided.

R. Ashi raised the question: How is it if [the curtailed threads] are so thick that one cannot make a loop with them, although had they been thinner one could have made a loop with them? — R. Aha the son of Raba answered R. Ashi, They are most certainly [valid], since the precept is all the more noticeable thereby.⁹ Who is the Tanna that disagrees with Rabbi?¹⁰ — It is the Tanna of the following Baraitha. For it was taught: R. Isaac says in the name of R. Nathan who said it in the name of R. Jose the Galilean and who in turn said it in the name of R. Johanan b. Nuri, If a man has no blue threads he should insert all white threads.¹¹

Raba said, You can infer from this¹² that one must make a knot after each joint;¹³ for should you hold that this is not necessary, then how could the sons of R. Hiyya have said, Curtailed blue threads are valid, also curtailed hyssop twigs are valid? As soon as the upper knot¹⁴ becomes loose it would all become undone!¹⁵ —

(1) Since it is considered as though the precept of the white threads had not been fulfilled at all, this omission according to Rabbi impairs the validity of the blue; how then can it be said that if the proper precedence was not adhered to it, it is still valid?

(2) I.e., even though the blue was inserted first it is not invalid.

(3) Which would mean apparently that even though the white was inserted first it is not invalid. But that is the proper order of precedence!

(4) In cur. edd. is inserted here an answer by Rami b. Hama which is actually given below. It is omitted here in all MSS. and by Sh. Mek.

(5) A title of dignity applied to Samuel the contemporary of Rab; probably a Persian adaptation of 'judge' (Jast.) V. Rashi here, and in Shab. 53a and also in Hul. 76b. V. also Kid. (Sonc. ed.) p. 189, n. 11.

(6) Lit., 'sit on your legs', with reference to their custom of sitting on the ground with their legs crossed under them.

MENACHOS – 27a-58b

(7) Once it is established that the white threads must be inserted first — established by reason of the fact that most garments were of white linen and the rule that the fringes similar in color to the corner of the garment must be inserted first—this law stands and is not altered by reason of the color of the garment.

(8) In which case the curtailed thread would have to be longer than where the loop was to be made by the curtailed thread by itself.

(9) For there is here the minimum length for curtailed threads, and moreover they are thicker and therefore more noticeable.

(10) I.e., whose view is put forward by the Sages in the Baraitha supra p. 233.

(11) For the omission of one color does not prevent the use of the other. This Tanna clearly disagrees with Rabbi.

(12) From the statement of R. Hiyya's sons.

(13) Each fringe is in part wound around with thread (גדיל), and in part hangs loose (ענף). After the threads have been inserted in the hole at the corner of the garment and folded over double, one thread is taken and wound around the others, and after several windings a knot is made and then the windings begin over again. Each series of windings is called a joint (חוליא), and at the end of each joint a knot (קשר) is made to prevent the windings from becoming undone.

(14) I.e., the uppermost and first knot when holding up the garment by the fringe; or the last or nethermost knot when the garment is worn.

(15) Since a thread has snapped close to the last knot it would inevitably follow that this knot would become undone, and if there were no other knots at each joint, the entire fringe would become undone, in which case it certainly cannot be valid.

Menachoth 39a

Perhaps [they said so only where] there were knots [after each joint].¹ Raba also said, You can infer from this that the upper knot² is an ordinance of the Torah;³ for should you say it is a Rabbinic ordinance,⁴ then why was it necessary for the Torah to permit the insertion of [woolen] fringes in a [linen] garment?⁵ One would have no doubt about it, for if one merely fastens together [two pieces] with one fastenings⁶ no connection is thereby formed!⁷ You can therefore infer from this that it is an ordinance of the Torah.

Rabbah son of R. Adda said in the name of R. Adda who said it in the name of Rab, If a thread had snapped at the top,⁸ it is invalid. R. Nahman was sitting and repeating the above rule when Raba raised the following objection against him: This⁹ applies only at the outset,¹⁰ but later on¹¹ the remnants thereof and the curtailed threads thereof may be of any length whatsoever. Now what is meant by 'remnants' and what by 'curtailed threads'? Presumably 'remnant' means that a part [of the thread] had broken off and a part had remained, and 'curtailed' means that [the thread] had entirely broken away!¹² — No, both terms must be taken together thus, the remnants of the curtailed threads may be of any length whatsoever. Then it should have mentioned only 'the curtailed threads'; why does it add 'the remnants'? — It teaches us that there must be left a remnant of the curtailed threads sufficient to make a loop therewith.

Rabbah was sitting and reciting the following in the name of Rab: The thread that is used for winding is included in the number of threads.¹³ Whereupon R. Joseph said to him, It was Samuel who said it and not Rab. It has also been reported: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said, R. Josiah of Usha told me that the thread used for winding is included in the number of threads.

Rabbah again was sitting and reciting the following in the name of Samuel: If the greater part of the fringe¹⁴ was wound around,¹⁵ it is still valid. Whereupon R. Joseph said to him, It was Rab who said it and not Samuel. Indeed it has been reported: R. Huna b. Judah said in the name of R. Shesheth who said it in the name of R. Jeremiah b. Abba who in turn said it in the name of Rab, If the greater part of the fringe was wound around, it is still valid.

R. Hiyya the son of R. Nathan reports it as follows: R. Huna said in the name of R. Shesheth who said it in the name of R.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Jeremiah b. Abba who said it in the name of Rab, If the greater part of the fringe was wound around, it is still valid. And even if only one joint¹⁶ was made, it is valid. It is most becoming, however, for the fringe to be wound around¹⁷ for a third [of its length] and the remaining two thirds [to hang loose] as locks.¹⁸

What is the minimum length of a joint? — It was taught: Rabbi says, [In a joint] the thread must be wound once, twice and a third time. It was taught: If a man wishes to make few,¹⁹ he should not make less than seven, and if many, he should not make more than thirteen. If few, he should not make less than seven, to correspond to the seven heavens;²⁰ and if many, he should not make more than thirteen, to correspond to the seven heavens plus the six intervening spaces.

A Tanna taught: At the start one begins to wind with the white thread, since Holy Writ says ‘the corner’ [signifying that the thread] of the same [color] as the corner [must be used first], and at the end one finishes the winding with a white thread, since what is holy we may raise [to a higher degree of sanctity] but not bring down.²¹

Once Rab and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah were sitting together when a man passed by wearing a garment entirely blue, to which were attached fringes

(1) Where, however, there were no knots after each joint, a curtailed thread would render the whole invalid. Hence there is no proof that there must be a knot after each joint.

(2) Here Rashi suggests, either the last knot (as above) that is furthest from the garment at the end of all the windings, or (v. Tosaf. s.v. קשר) the first knot that is made as soon as the threads have been inserted in the corner of the garment.

(3) I.e., a law given to Moses at Sinai.

(4) But by Biblical law it is not necessary to tie the threads together, not even to the garment.

(5) This is established by the juxtaposition of the texts, viz., (Deut. XXII, 12) Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together, and (12) Thou shalt make thee twisted cords, intimating

that the former prohibition is superseded by the precept of zizith.

(6) I.e., joining cloths of wool and of linen with a single stitch or knot.

(7) So that by merely threading the woollen strands through the linen garment there is no infringement of the law of ‘mixed stuffs’; hence there was no necessity for an express permission by Holy Writ.

(8) Close to the garment; the entire thread had thus broken away.

(9) That the fringes must be of a prescribed minimum length; cf. infra 41b.

(10) I.e., in the first instance when attaching the fringes to the garment.

(11) I.e., if at one time the fringes had been of the prescribed length, but had later been reduced.

(12) And yet it is valid, contra R. Nahman.

(13) To make up the requisite number of eight threads.

(14) Lit., ‘the blue’.

(15) Contrary to the prescribed requirement of two thirds hanging loose as locks, v. infra.

(16) חוליא, a section of the fringe around which a thread has been wound several times, and bounded at each end by a knot.

(17) This part is termed גדיל.

(18) Lit., ‘a branch’ ענף.

(19) Sc. joints; so Rashi and Maim. According to Nimukke Joseph the reference is to the number of windings in each joint.

(20) v. Hag. 12b. For the connection between the heavens and the zizith v. infra 43b.

(21) The white thread is deemed to be of a higher degree of sanctity since it is mentioned first in the text. The middle joint is wound round with the blue thread.

Menachoth 39b

which were entirely wound around;¹ whereupon Rab remarked, A fine garment, but the fringes are not fine; but Rabbah b. Bar Hana said, A fine garment and fine fringes. Wherein do they differ? —

Rabbah b. Bar Hana maintains, since Holy Writ says ‘twisted cords’² and also ‘thread’,³ [the fringe] may be either [entirely] a twisted cord or [entirely] in loose threads. Rab, however, maintains that there must always be loose threads; but the expression ‘twisted cords’ is required only for the determination of the number of threads; for the expression

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

‘twisted cord’ would imply two threads,⁴ but ‘twisted cords’⁵ implies four; one must therefore twist them into a cord, but from the middle they must hang down in separate threads.⁶

Samuel said in the name of Levi, [White] woolen threads⁷ fulfill [the precept of fringes] in a linen garment. The question was raised: Would [white] linen threads⁷ fulfill [the precept of fringes] in a woolen garment? Do we hold that only [white] woolen threads fulfill [the precept] in a linen garment, for since blue [woolen threads] fulfill [the precept in any garment]⁹ white [woolen threads] also fulfill the precept, but [white] linen threads cannot fulfill the precept in a woolen garment; or, we can argue, since it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together. Thou shalt make thee twisted cords,¹⁰ accordingly it matters not whether woolen threads are put in a linen garment or linen threads in a woolen garment?¹¹ —

Come and hear. Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, Woolen threads fulfill the precept in a linen garment and linen threads in a woolen garment; [blue] woolen threads together with [white] linen threads fulfill the precept in any garment, even [in a garment] of silk. This differs from R. Nahman's view, for R. Nahman said, Silk garments are exempt from zizith.

Raba raised the following objection against R. Nahman: It was taught: Garments of silk or of raw silk or of floss-silk must be provided with zizith!¹² — That is merely a Rabbinic enactment. But then consider the next clause [of that Baraitha]: Woolen threads and linen threads fulfill the precept in every case.¹³ Now if you say that it is so¹⁴ by the law of the Torah then that is why diverse kinds are permitted for them; but if you say that it¹⁴ is merely a Rabbinic enactment, how can it be that diverse kinds are permitted for them? — Render, either

woolen threads or linen threads.¹⁵ And that is indeed the more reasonable view to take, for it reads in the final clause [of that Baraitha]: These¹⁶ fulfill the precept in a garment of the same material but not in a garment of a different material. Now if you say that it is merely a Rabbinic enactment, then that is why these fulfill the precept in a garment of the same material; but if you say that it is so by the law of the Torah, surely [according to the Torah] only wool and linen can discharge the obligation!¹⁷ — This is not a conclusive argument, for the text may be explained in accordance with Raba's argument. For Raba pointed out a contradiction: It is written, The corner,¹⁸ [which implies that the fringes are to be of] the same kind [of material] as that of the corner, but it is also written, Wool and linen.¹⁹ How are the texts to be reconciled? Wool and linen fulfill [the precept of zizith] both in garments of their own kind [of material] as well as in garments of a different kind, whereas other kinds of threads²⁰ fulfill the precept only in a garment of their own kind [of material], but not in a garment of a different kind [of material].

R. Nahman,²¹ however, agrees with the view of the Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael. For a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael taught: Since in the Torah the word ‘garments’ is used without being specified,²² but in one particular case²³ Holy Writ specified ‘wool and linen’, the inference is that all garments are understood as being of wool or of linen.

Abaye said, This teaching of a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael differs from that of another Tanna of the same school. For a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael taught: By garment²³ I understand only a garment of [sheep's] wool; whence can I include garments of camel hair, of hare's hair, of goat's hair, or of raw silk or floss-silk or fine silk? Scripture therefore says, Or a garment.²⁴

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(1) The entire fringe had been covered with windings of thread so that no part hung loose as the locks of hair. I.e., it was all גדיל and no ענף.

(2) Deut. XXII, 22. Heb. גדילים.

(3) Num. XV, 38. Heb. פתיל.

(4) For a twisted cord cannot be made of less than two threads.

(5) In the plural.

(6) Or: 'that which is used for winding shall be of it', i.e., the thread that is wound around the others is included in the number of threads.

(7) Together with the blue woolen threads.

(8) Lit., 'discharge'. Sc. the garment of its obligation.

(9) For in every garment of whatever material blue threads must be inserted, and these blue threads, תכלה, must be of wool.

(10) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(11) The precept is always fulfilled thereby.

(12) Shab. 20b.

(13) Meaning apparently that if the blue threads are of wool and the white threads of linen they together fulfill the obligation of zizith in any silk garment.

(14) That silk garments must be provided with zizith.

(15) But the two kinds together would not be permitted to be used as fringes in a silk garment.

(16) Sc., threads of silk.

(17) For only wool and linen are mentioned in connection with the zizith; cf. Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(18) Num. XV, 38.

(19) Cf. Deut. XXII, 11, 12, which shows that the fringes must be either of wool or of linen, whatever the material of the garment is.

(20) E.g., silk.

(21) Who maintains that silk garments require fringes only by Rabbinic ordinance, for according to the law of the Torah only garments of wool and of linen are subject to zizith.

(22) Cf. Num. XV, 38: That they make them fringes in the corners of their garments; or with reference to uncleanness by creeping things, Lev. XI, 32.

(23) With reference to plagues in garments, Lev. XIII, 47, 48.

(24) Ibid. 47: Whether it be a woolen garment or a linen garment; the conjunction 'or' includes other garments too as being subject to the law of plagues.

halachah is in accordance with Beth Hillel. R. Eliezer son of R. Zadok said, Is it not a fact that any one in Jerusalem who attaches blue threads [to his linen garment] causes amazement?³ Rabbi said, If that is so, why did they forbid it?⁴ Because people are not versed in the law.⁵

Raba son of R. Hanan said to Raba, Then let ten people insert it and let them go about in the market place and so the law will be made known to all!⁶ People will wonder at it all the more.⁷ Then let it be announced at the public lecture! — It is to be feared that people will use imitation blue.⁸ But it is no worse than if it were white!⁹ — Since one could use threads of the same material [as the garment], it is not [allowed to do otherwise];¹⁰ this being in accordance with Resh Lakish's view, for Resh Lakish said, Wherever you find a positive precept and a negative precept [in opposition], if you can possibly observe both,¹¹ well and good, otherwise let the positive precept come and override the negative one. But it can be examined,¹² can it not? — Rather we apprehend that it may have been used for testing.¹³ But it can be announced on public notices,¹⁴ can it not? — And are we to rely upon public notices?¹⁵ Whereupon Raba said, If

(1) It is even forbidden to wear a linen garment that is provided with fringes on account of the prohibition of diverse kinds, linen and wool, which prohibition is not waived even for the performance of the law of zizith.

(2) For the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived by the precept of zizith, this being inferred by reason of the juxtaposition of the two texts; cf. Deut. XXII, 11 and 12.

(3) But it is not forbidden, thus contrary to Beth Shammai's view. Aliter: it causes amazement by reason of the flagrant transgression of the law, thus R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok is in conflict with Beth Hillel.

(4) Since it is not forbidden in law, why did Beth Shammai impose the restriction? Aliter: since Beth Hillel's view was accepted as the law, why should it create amazement in Jerusalem?

(5) And if it were permitted to wear diverse kinds in pursuance of the precept of zizith people might forget about the precept and would wear diverse kinds in all circumstances.

Menachoth 40a

Our Rabbis taught: A linen garment is, according to Beth Shammai, exempt from zizith;¹ but Beth Hillel declare it liable.² The

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(6) That the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only in pursuance of the precept of zizith.

(7) That pious men should be wearing garments of diverse kinds, wool and linen.

(8) קלא אילן, a vegetable blue dye, probably indigo, being an imitation of the genuine blue תכלת which is obtained from the blood of a mollusk. Now the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only when woolen threads dyed with genuine blue are used, but not when they are dyed with imitation blue.

(9) The threads dyed with this imitation blue should be regarded as though not dyed at all, and it has been established that in the absence of blue threads ordinary white woolen threads may be used in their stead.

(10) Since genuine blue is unobtainable and in its place white threads are used, it is proper to use those threads which are of the same material as the garment, thus avoiding any clashing between precepts and obviating the one overriding the other; so that only white threads of linen may be used as fringes in a linen garment.

(11) By carrying out the positive precept without at the same time transgressing the prohibition, as here by attaching white threads of linen as fringes in a linen garment.

(12) Every blue thread can be subjected to a test so as to ascertain whether the blue dye is genuine or imitation; v. infra 42b. According to another interpretation given in Rashi, the purchaser of the blue thread can inspect the dye in the pan of the dyer in order to ascertain whether the dye is genuine or not.

(13) This thread of blue may be the testing thread, i.e., the thread that was dipped into the pan of dye in order to ascertain whether the dye had reached its proper strength and consistency, and it may not be inserted in a garment, for it is essential that the dyeing of the thread be prepared specifically for the purpose of zizith and not for testing purposes. According to the second interpretation (v. prec. n.): the inspection is of no avail, for the dyer may have drawn off a small quantity so as to test its color and then have poured it back into the pan, which action renders the entire contents of the pan invalid for the zizith.

(14) Notifying all dyers that the testing thread may not be used in a garment. And according to the second interpretation: notifying all dyers that the quantity taken for the test may not be poured back into the pan.

(15) Some people may ignore these notices, either through inadvertence or deliberately.

Menachoth 40b

in respect of leaven on the Passover Festival or in respect of the Day of Atonement which involve the penalty of kareth we rely upon public notices,¹ how much more so may we rely upon them here where only the transgression of a positive precept can be involved!² — Rather, said Raba, I suggested the following explanation³ and in the West it was similarly⁴ reported in the name of R. ‘Zera: The apprehension is that the linen garment may have been torn within three fingerbreadths’ distance [from the hem] and it had been sewn together [with linen threads, and the threads were left hanging for the fringe],⁵ and the Torah has said, ‘Thou shalt make and not use what is ready made’.⁷ R. Zera [it was reported,] removed [the fringes from] his linen garment.⁸ Rab Zera said, It is also to be feared that one will use it as a night wrap.⁹ Raba also said, I stated the following and in the West it was similarly reported in the name of R. Zera: If the garment is made of cloth and the corners thereof of leather, it is subject to zizith; If the garment is made of leather¹⁰ and the corners thereof of cloth, it is exempt. What is the reason? Because we consider the main part of the garment. R. Ahai, however, always decided according to the material of the corner.¹¹

Raba said in the name of R. Sehora who said it in the name of R. Huna, If a man inserted fringes in the corners of a three-cornered garment and then added a fourth corner [and inserted a fringe therein], it is invalid, because of the rule ‘Thou shalt make, and not use what is ready made’.¹² An objection was raised: The pious men of old used to insert the zizith¹³ as soon as three fingerbreadths of the garment had been woven!¹⁴ — Render: they used to insert the fringes as soon as the last three fingerbreadths had been reached. Do we then always apply the rule ‘Thou shalt make, and not use what is ready made’? Surely R. Zera has said that if a man inserted fringes in a garment that was already

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

provided with fringes,¹⁵ it is valid!¹⁶ — Raba replied, Since one thereby transgresses the law of Thou shalt not add thereto,¹⁷ the act done is not considered at all. R. Papa demurred: How do you know that this man's intention was to add [to the other fringes]? Perhaps it was to cancel the others, so that there was no transgression of 'Thou shalt not add thereto'; accordingly the act done is considered an act.¹⁸

R. Zera said in the name of R. Mattena who said it in the name of Samuel, [A garment that is provided with] fringes does not come within the prohibition of diverse kinds,¹⁹ and [it is the same] even though the garment was exempt from zizith. What is meant by 'a garment exempt from zizith'? Does it mean a garment smaller than the prescribed measure? But it has been taught: A garment with which a child can cover his head and most of his body,

(1) The decisions of the Sanhedrin concerning intercalation of the year whereby the year is deemed to be a leap year and thus postponing the Passover Festival for a month, or intercalation of the month whereby another day is added to the month and thus postponing the Day of Atonement (or any Festival that comes in the subsequent month) by one day, were announced to the public by means of notices and letters.

(2) For the use of the test thread (or the thread dyed from the quantity taken for testing) is but an infringement of a positive precept, for Holy Writ declares, That they make them fringes (Num. XV, 38), that is to say, the threads must be prepared specifically for the zizith.

(3) Why it is forbidden to insert the blue woolen threads in a linen garment.

(4) Lit., 'in agreement with me'.

(5) So that when the garment is repaired it is already provided with part of the fringe, which is invalid for the precept.

(6) Deut. XXII, 12.

(7) Accordingly when threads of wool are added to the fringe the prohibition of diverse kinds applies and it is not waived by the precept since the precept is not properly performed.

(8) For the same reason as explained above by Raba.

(9) Which is exempt from zizith. And whenever the garment is used not in pursuance of the

performance of the precept (e.g., if worn by night) one transgresses the prohibition of diverse kinds.

(10) And a leather garment is exempt from zizith.

(11) And the rule is just the reverse of that stated by Raba.

(12) A three-cornered garment is exempt from zizith, accordingly when the first three fringes were inserted there was no obligation for fringes, and when the obligation falls due, i.e. when the fourth corner is added, the fringes are found to be already made.

(13) Lit., 'the blue' (threads).

(14) As soon as a strip three fingers wide (the minimum size of a garment) had been woven they used to insert two fringes, one at each corner, and the other two fringes they inserted when the cloth was finished. Now it is clear that the obligation of fringes falls due only when the weaving is finished, nevertheless, it is taught here, that the first two fringes are deemed valid and are not regarded as ready made.

(15) A second fringe was inserted at each corner close to the existing fringe, and when all eight fringes were attached, the first set of four fringes were cut away.

(16) I.e., the second set of fringes satisfy the law, although when these fringes were inserted there was no obligation for them, since the first set of fringes had not yet been removed.

(17) Deut. XIII, 1. At the time when each fringe of the second set is inserted there is a transgression of this precept, so that the fringe so made is null and void, and therefore only when the first set is removed does the second set of fringes come into existence. Where, however, the fringes were inserted in a three-cornered garment, this act, not being an infringement of the law, is an act of consequence, and when a fourth corner is added and a fringe attached thereto, the first three fringes are disqualified as being ready made.

(18) Nevertheless R. Zera rules that the second set of fringes is valid even though it was ready made; thus in conflict with the principle laid down.

(19) And it may be worn by a person that is not subject to the law of zizith, e.g. a woman (R. Tam).

Menachoth 41a

and in which a grown-up person would walk out for a moment, is subject to zizith; but if a child cannot cover with it his head and most of his body, even though a grown-up person might walk out in it for a moment, it is exempt. And so it is, too, in regard to diverse kinds. Now we pondered over this: What does the ruling 'And so it is, too, in regard to

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

diverse kinds' signify? Can it mean: And so it is, too, in regard to the applicability of the prohibition of diverse kinds?¹ Surely we have learnt:² Diverse kinds may not be worn even for a moment! R. Nahman b. Isaac, however, explained, It means, And so it is, too, in regard to the insertion of fringes in a linen garment!³ — We must say that 'a garment exempt from fringes' means, a garment already provided with fringes in which one inserted [another set of fringes].⁴ But has not R. Zera taught this once?⁵ — One was stated as an inference from the other.⁶

Our Rabbis taught: A garment that was folded over is subject to zizith, but R. Simeon declares it to be exempt.⁷ They are agreed, however, that if it was folded over and sewn down, it is subject to the law. Is not this obvious? — It is necessary to be stated where it was only fastened down with pins.⁸

Rabbah son of R. Huna once visited the house of Raba b. R. Nahman and saw that the latter was wearing a garment that was folded over, the fringes being inserted in the folded corners. It happened to become unfolded and the fringes were found to be above⁹ [in the middle of the garment], whereupon Rabbah said to him, 'Surely this is not the corner prescribed by the All-Merciful in the Torah!' He at once cast off this garment and put on another. Thereupon Rabbah said to him, 'Do you think that [the law of zizith] is an obligation incumbent upon the person? It is an obligation attaching to the garment;¹⁰ go, therefore, and insert the fringes in it [in the proper manner]'. Shall we say that the following supports his view?¹¹ [For it was taught]: The pious men of old used to insert the fringes as soon as three fingerbreadths of the garment had been woven?¹² — It is different with those pious men for they imposed upon themselves additional obligations.

His view¹³ is at variance with the angel's view. For an angel once found R. Kattina

wearing a linen wrap,¹⁴ and he exclaimed, 'Kattina, Kattina, a wrap in summer and a cloak¹⁵ in winter, and what is to happen to the law of zizith?' 'And do you punish', asked R. Kattina, 'a person [who omits to perform] a positive precept?' 'In a time of wrath', replied the angel, 'we do'. Now if you hold that the law of zizith is an obligation incumbent upon the person then that is why one would incur guilt for not wearing a garment with fringes; but if you hold that it is an obligation attaching to the garment, then why [is any guilt incurred] seeing that these garments are exempt? What then do you hold? That it is an obligation incumbent upon the person? I grant you that the All — Merciful would punish one who wears [without fringes] a garment that is subject to fringes, but would the All-Merciful punish one who wears [without fringes] a garment that is not subject to it? — This is what [the angel] implied, 'You find every excuse to free yourself from the law of zizith'.

R. Tobi b. Kisna said in the name of Samuel, The garments put away in a chest are subject to zizith.¹⁶ Samuel, however, admits that where an old man made it for his shroud¹⁷ it is exempt, for the Divine Law says, Wherewith thou coverest thyself,¹⁸ and this is not intended for an ordinary covering. Nevertheless, when the time comes for its use we should insert fringes in it, on account of the injunction, Whoso mocketh the poor¹⁹ blasphemeth his Maker.²⁰

Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, If a garment was torn more than three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may be sewn up, but if [torn] within three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may not be sewn up.²¹ It has been taught [in a Baraita] to the same effect, viz., If a garment was torn more than three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may be sewn up, but if [torn] within three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], R. Meir says, It may not be sewn up; but the

MENACHOS – 27a-58b

Sages say, It may be sewn up. And they are agreed that one may not fetch a piece of cloth, even a cubit square, which has fringes to it from another garment and tack it on to this garment.²² And they are also agreed that the fringes may be taken out of another garment and put into this garment,

(1) Namely, that a garment which is too small to cover a child but which might be worn by a grown-up person temporarily is not prohibited, although consisting of diverse kinds, wool and linen.

(2) Kil. IX, 2.

(3) And it is forbidden to insert the fringes in a linen garment that is too small to cover the head and the greater part of the body of a child. It is thus evident that a garment smaller than the prescribed measure, even though provided with fringes, comes within the prohibition of diverse kinds.

(4) The second set of fringes, although unnecessary, does not bring the garment within the prohibition.

(5) Supra 40b. Since each set is regarded as being in pursuance of the precept, it follows that the prohibition of diverse kinds does not apply.

(6) R. Zera stated one ruling only, namely the previous one, and this ruling here was inferred from it (Rashi). According to Tosaf. and Sh. Mek. it is just the reverse, i.e., the previous ruling was inferred from this one.

(7) For the garment might later become unfolded and spread out and the fringes will then be found to be in the middle of the garment, and not in the corner as required by law.

(8) In this case all agree that it is subject to zizith, since the pins fasten the parts firmly together, and there is little likelihood of the garment becoming unfolded.

(9) Lit., 'at his head'.

(10) And every garment of four corners in one's possession must be provided with fringes, and it is not sufficient that the garment one is wearing is provided with fringes.

(11) Of Rabbah b. R. Huna, that the zizith is an obligation attaching to the garment.

(12) Clearly because the obligation rests upon the garment as soon as it is made, for if it were a personal obligation the duty to insert fringes would arise only when the garment was about to be worn.

(13) V. p. 246, n. 8.

(14) Which was without fringes, since it was mainly used as a night wrap.

(15) A garment with rounded corners and so not subject to the law of zizith.

(16) For the obligation rests upon the garments, and as they are intended to be worn, they must be provided with fringes.

(17) Lit., 'for his honor'.

(18) Deut. XXII, 12:

(19) There is none so poor as the dead. So that no indignity be shown to the dead the fringes are inserted in the shroud.

V. Ber. 18a, and Tosaf. Nid. 61b s.v. זבא.

(20) Prov. XVII, 5.

(21) According to Rashi and R. Gershom the garment had as yet no fringes to it. Now if a piece had torn away within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner (the area within which it is proper to insert the fringes, v. infra), it may not be sewn together, for after the sewing a thread may be left hanging and, together with other threads, will be used for the fringe. But such a fringe is invalid since one of the threads was ready made and not inserted for the purpose of the fringe. According to R. Amram, Halakoth Gedoloth, and Nimmuke Joseph this garment had fringes to it but one corner with the fringe had torn off; now if the piece torn off was more than three fingerbreadths' distance on each side from the corner, i.e., the piece was three fingerbreadths square or more, it is still a garment and the fringe retains its character as a fringe, so that it may be sewn to the rest of the garment and the fringes are valid: If, however, the piece was less than three fingerbreadths square, it is no more a garment and the fringe is no more a fringe, consequently it may not be sewn to the rest of the garment so as to serve as a fringe, since the fringe had already lost its character as such.

(22) For the fringe would be ready made, and so invalid.

Menachoth 41b

provided they are not cut.¹ You may well infer from this, may you not, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [for insertion] into another garment?² — Perhaps [it is permitted] only when the first garment was worn out.³

Our Rabbis taught: In a garment that is entirely blue [threads of] any color fulfill [the precept of zizith], except imitation blue.⁴ An objection was raised: Only threads of the same color as the garment fulfill the precept; but in a garment that is entirely blue one

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

should insert blue threads and threads of some other color, except threads of imitation blue;⁵ if, however, these were inserted, it is, nevertheless, valid!⁶ — R. Nahman b. Isaac said, This is no difficulty, for in the one case the garment had fringes, each consisting of four threads, and in the other it had fringes each consisting of eight threads.⁷ You may well infer from this, may you not, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [for insertion] into another garment?⁸ — Perhaps it had been done [in contravention of the law].⁹

It was stated: Rab said, One may not detach [the fringes] from one garment [and insert them] into another; but Samuel said, One may do so. Rab said, One may not kindle one light¹⁰ from another light; but Samuel said, One may do so. Rab said, The halachah is not in accordance with R. Simeon's view concerning the dragging [of an object on the Sabbath]; but Samuel said, It is.

Abaye said, In every case my Master [Rabbah] followed Rab's ruling, save in the above three cases in which he followed Samuel's ruling, namely, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [and insert them] into another, that one may kindle one light from another light, and that the halachah is in accordance with R. Simeon's view concerning the dragging [of an object on the Sabbath], for it was taught: R. Simeon says, A man may drag a bed, a chair or a bench on the Sabbath, provided he has no intention of making a groove.¹¹

Rab Judah used to send [his garment with the fringes] to the fuller.¹² R. Hanina used to roll up the fringes into a ball.¹³ Rabina used to sew them up. Our Rabbis taught: How many threads must one insert? Beth Shammai say, Four;¹⁴ but Beth Hillel say, Three. And how far must they hang down?¹⁵ Beth Shammai say, Four [fingerbreadths]; but Beth Hillel say, Three. And as for the three [fingerbreadths] stated by Beth Hillel

each must measure one fourth part of the handbreadth of an ordinary person. R. Papa said, The handbreadth of the Torah is equal to four times the width of the thumb, or six times the width of the little finger, or five times the width of the middle finger.¹⁶

R. Huna said, Four [threads] must be [inserted in the garment] within [the distance of] four [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for four [fingerbreadths]. Rab Judah said, Three [threads] must be inserted within three [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for three [fingerbreadths]. R. Papa said, The law is: Four [threads] must be inserted within three [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for four [fingerbreadths]. Do we then hold that the fringes have a prescribed length, but I can point out a contradiction. It was taught: Zizith:¹⁷ the word zizith means nothing else than something which hangs over; moreover zizith signifies any length whatsoever. And [this was established] long ago when the elders of Beth Shammai and of Beth Hillel went up into the upper chamber of Johanan b. Bathyra and decided that there was no prescribed length for the zizith; and so, too, that there was no prescribed length for the lulab.¹⁸ Now this means, does it not, that there is no prescribed length at all for it? — No,

(1) I.e., each thread is whole and intact (Rashi). This is too obvious, and Tosaf and Nimmuke Joseph are at a loss to suggest a satisfactory explanation.

(2) But it is a subject of dispute between Rab and Samuel, *infra*.

(3) But it is forbidden to remove the fringes from a garment that is in good condition in order to insert them into another garment, for this would be a disparagement of the precept.

(4) For the fringe must consist of two colors, threads of real blue and threads of another color (usually white). Hence it is not permitted to have a fringe of real blue and imitation blue since they are both the one color.

(5) V. p. 248, n. 6.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(6) Thus in conflict with the Baraita which absolutely excludes imitation blue.

(7) The second Baraita deals with the case where there were four threads already inserted in the garment, two of real blue and two of some other color, and it was desired to insert four more threads of imitation blue. Now this is not permitted in the first instance (though if one did so it is valid), for this garment might be sold and the buyer, believing that all the blue threads are genuine, might remove two of the imitation blue threads and insert them into another garment, relying upon them as genuine blue threads, thus involving the transgression of the law of diverse kinds. (Second interpretation of Rashi.)

(8) Since the apprehension is that the imitation blue threads will be removed from this garment and put into another (v. prec. note), it is obvious that it is permitted to do so.

(9) Although it is not permitted to remove the fringes from one garment for insertion into another, the apprehension is that one might do so and in the circumstances of this case there might arise therefrom the transgression of a grave law.

(10) On the Feast of Hanukkah when lights are kindled for eight days.

(11) Although when dragging a heavy object over soft earth it is inevitable that a groove be made, which act is forbidden on the Sabbath, R. Simeon permits it as long as there was no intention of making the groove. V. Shab. 22a.

(12) And he had no fears lest the fuller damage the real blue threads and replace them with imitation blue threads.

(13) To protect them during washing.

(14) One must insert four threads in the hole at each corner of the garment and double them over in the middle, so that eight threads hang down.

(15) After making the necessary windings and knots in the form of a chain, the threads are left to hang loose; and it is established that the loose threads, called the פתיל or ענף, must be twice as long as the chain-like portion, called the גדיל. The dispute between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel is, according to Rashi, in respect of the length of the פתיל, and according to R. Tam, in respect of the length of the גדיל.

(16) In MS.M.: 'five times and one third the (width of the middle) finger'; so too' R. Gershom, and Sh. Mek.

(17) Num. XV, 38.

(18) The palm-branch, לילב used on the Feast of Tabernacles. V. Lev. XXIII, 40.

Menachoth 42a

there is no prescribed maximum length but there is a prescribed minimum length.¹ For if you will not say so, the ruling 'And so, too, that there was no prescribed length for the lulab' would also have to mean that there is no prescribed length at all for it, but we have learnt: A lulab which is three handbreadths in length, long enough to shake, is valid?² We must therefore say that it means, there is no prescribed maximum length for it but there is a prescribed minimum length; so here too, [with regard to the zizith] it means, there is no prescribed maximum length for it but there is a prescribed minimum length.

Our Rabbis taught: zizith: the word zizith means nothing else than something which hangs loose, for so it says, And took me by a lock [zizith] of mine head.³ Abaye said, One must keep [the threads] separate, like the forelock of the gentiles.⁴

Our Rabbis taught If one attached the fringes to the tip [of the corner] or to the selvedge [of the garment],⁵ it is valid; R. Eliezer b. Jacob declares it invalid in both cases. Whose view is adopted in the following statement of R. Giddal in the name of Rab: The fringes must hang over the corner,⁶ for it is written, Upon the corners of their garments?⁷ It is the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

R. Jacob said in the name of R. Johanan, Its must be removed from the corner the distance of the first joint of the thumb. Now both R. Papa's teaching⁹ and this teaching of R. Jacob are necessary. For from R. Papa's teaching I only know that it must be within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner and not farther away than that, but the nearer it is [to the corner] the better; therefore R. Jacob's teaching was necessary. And from R. Jacob's teaching I only know that it must be away from the corner the distance of the first joint of the thumb and not nearer than that, but the farther away it

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

is [from the corner] the better; therefore [both teachings] are necessary.

Rabina and R. Sama were once sitting before R. Ashi when R. Sama noticed that the [edges around the hole in the] corner of Rabina's garment had frayed and [the fringe] was now less than the distance of the first joint of the thumb away [from the corner], and he said to him, 'Does not my Master accept R. Jacob's teaching?' He replied, 'That rule was intended to apply only at the time when it was first made'. [R. Sama] became embarrassed, whereupon R. Ashi said to him, 'Do not be upset, for one of them¹⁰ is equal to two of us'.

R. Aha b. Jacob used to take four threads, double them over, insert them through the garment, and then make them into a loop;¹¹ he was of the opinion that there must be eight threads in the [hole of the] garment, the same number as the threads which hang loose.¹² R. Jeremiah of Difti used to insert eight threads, which [when hanging down] made sixteen loose threads, but he did not make them into a loop. Mar the son of Rabina used to do it as we do now.¹³

R. Nahman once found R. Adda b. Ahabah inserting the threads [in a garment] and reciting the blessing '[Blessed art thou... and hast commanded us] to make the zizith', whereupon he said, 'What is this zizi that I hear?¹⁴ Thus said Rab: When making the zizith no blessing is to be pronounced'.

After the death of R. Huna, R. Hisda came in [as head of the School] and pointed out the following contradictory teachings of Rab. Did Rab really say that when making the zizith no blessing was to be pronounced? Surely Rab Judah has stated in the name of Rab, Whence do we know that the zizith made by a gentile are invalid? Because it is said, Speak unto the children of Israel and bid them that they make them fringes;¹⁵ the children of Israel shall make [the fringes], but not

gentiles! But where is the contradiction here?—

R. Joseph said, R. Hisda is of the opinion that a precept which may be performed by a gentile does not require a blessing when performed by an Israelite,¹⁶ but a precept which may not be performed by a gentile requires a blessing when performed by an Israelite.¹⁷ Is this a general principle? But take the case of circumcision. This is permitted to be performed by a gentile, for it has been taught: In a town where there is no Israelite physician but there is a Cuthean¹⁸ physician as well as a gentile one, circumcision should be performed by the gentile but not by the Cuthean. This is the opinion of R. Meir. But R. Judah said, It should be performed by the Cuthean but not by the gentile.¹⁹ And yet when performed by an Israelite a blessing must be pronounced, for a Master has said,²⁰ He that performs the circumcision must say, 'Blessed... who hast sanctified us by thy commandments, and hast given us command concerning the circumcision!' — This question [by R. Hisda] concerns Rab, does it not? Surely Rab declares it²¹ invalid! For it has been stated:²² Whence do we know that circumcision performed by a gentile is invalid?

Daru b. Papa said in the name of Rab, From the verse, And as for thee, thou shalt keep my covenant.²³ R. Johanan said, From the words, Must needs be circumcised,²⁴ that is, he who is circumcised shall circumcise. The law concerning the sukkah²⁵ adds support [to R. Hisda's principle] while that concerning the tefillin refutes it. Thus, the sukkah is valid when made by a gentile, for it has been taught: A booth of gentiles, women, cattle, or Cutheans, or any manner of booth, is valid [as a sukkah], provided it was roofed according to law.²⁶ And when made by an Israelite no blessing is necessary, for it has been taught: When a man makes a sukkah for himself he must say, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

kept us in life, and hast preserved us, and enabled us to reach this season'; and when he enters to sit in it he must say, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments, and hast commanded us to dwell in the sukkah'. But one never says, [Blessed... and hast commanded us] to make the sukkah. On the other hand, the law of tefillin is a refutation; for the tefillin are invalid when made by a gentile, for R. Hinena the son of Raba

(1) The fringes may be as long as desired, but they must hang down for at least the length of four fingerbreadths.

(2) But if it is less than three handbreadths in length it is not valid; so that there is a prescribed minimum length for it. V. Suk. 29b.

(3) Ez. VIII, 3. Heb. בציצה.

(4) The forelock after being bound together was left to hang loose in separate strands of hair. So, too, with the fringes, after the necessary windings the threads must hang loose in separate strands.

(5) The closely woven binding at the edge of the garment so as to prevent raveling.

(6) I.e., the fringes must be some distance away from the corner so that the threads hang over and strike the corner; and it is invalid if the fringes were attached to the actual corner, thus in agreement with R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(7) Num. XV, 38.

(8) I.e., the hole in the garment through which the fringes are thread.

(9) Supra 41b, that the fringes must be inserted within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner.

(10) Sc. scholars from Palestine, of whom Rabina was one.

(11) Having doubled over the threads he used to insert the looped end through the hole in the garment an inch or so and then pass the ends of the threads through this loop and pull tight, and in this manner the threads hung from the garment.

(12) So MS.M. and early editions, reading דבעינן גדיל גדילים דליהוי for the same as the number of threads that hang loose suggested by the terms 'twisted cord' and 'twisted cords' (v. supra p. 239).

(13) I.e., insert four threads so that there are eight threads hanging loose.

(14) Mockingly mispronouncing the word.

(15) Num. XV, 38.

(16) For the usual formula 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast

sanctified us by thy commandments and hast commanded us...' does not apply since the commandment may be also performed by a gentile.

(17) And since gentiles may not make the fringes it follows that when an Israelite makes them a blessing must be pronounced; thus contradicting the former statement of Rab.

(18) The Cutheans, often called Samaritans, were one of the peoples settled in Samaria by the Assyrian king after the exile of the ten tribes. They adopted certain Jewish practices, particularly those based upon the written word of the Torah; cf. 2 Kings XVII, 2ff. Later, however, they were found to be worshipping a dove on Mount Gerizim; v. Hul. 6a.

(19) V. A.Z. 26b.

(20) Shab. 137b.

(21) Sc. circumcision by a gentile.

(22) A.Z. 27a.

(23) Gen. XVII, 9. Only one like Abraham, i.e., circumcised, may perform the circumcision.

(24) Ibid. 13. Heb. היול ימול can by a slight alteration of the vowels be rendered המול, 'he who is circumcised may circumcise', thus excluding gentiles.

(25) Heb. סכה, the booth set up at the Feast of Tabernacles in fulfillment of Lev. XXIII, 42.

(26) Suk. 8b.

Menachoth 42b

of Pashrunia taught: A scroll of the Law, tefillin and Mezuzoth written by a min,¹ a Cuthean, a gentile, a slave, a woman, a minor, or an apostate Jew,² are invalid, since it says, And thou shalt bind them... and thou shalt write them,³ which indicates that those who 'bind' may 'write', but those who do not 'bind' may not 'write'. And yet when made by an Israelite no blessing is pronounced; for R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna sent the following decision in the name of R. Johanan: Over the hand-Tefillah one must say, 'Blessed... who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast commanded us to put on the tefillin'. Over the head-Tefillah one must say, 'Blessed... who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast given us command concerning the precept of the tefillin'. But one never says, '[Blessed... and hast commanded us] to make the tefillin!' — Indeed this is the true principle: Wherever a

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

precept is completed by a single act,⁴ e.g., circumcision, although it may be performed by a gentile, when an Israelite performs it he must pronounce a blessing; and wherever a precept is not completed by a single act, e.g., the tefillin,⁵ although it may be made by a gentile, when an Israelite makes it he does not pronounce a blessing. And as regards the zizith they differ⁶ in this: One holds that [the law of zizith] is an obligation resting upon the garment,⁷ whilst the other holds that it is an obligation incumbent upon the person.⁸

R. Mordecai said to R. Ashi, You have had it reported so;⁹ but we had it reported thus: Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Whence do we know that the zizith made by a gentile is valid? Because it is said, Speak unto the children of Israel and bid them that they make them fringes;¹⁰ others may make [the fringes] for them.

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, If a man made [the zizith] from the fringes¹¹ of the cloth, or from sewing threads,¹² or from tufts¹¹ of the cloth, they are invalid;¹³ but if he made them from a ball of thread they are valid.¹⁴ When I repeated this before Samuel he said that even if he made them from a ball of thread they are invalid, because it is necessary that the weaving of the thread be done for this purpose. This, however, is a matter of dispute between Tannaim, for it has been taught:¹⁵ If a man overlaid [the tefillin] with gold or covered them with the skin of an unclean animal, they are invalid;¹⁶ if with the skin of a clean animal, they are valid, even though he did not prepare it for this specific purpose. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, Even if he covered them with the skin of a clean animal they are invalid, unless it had been prepared for this specific purpose.¹⁷

Abaye enquired of R. Samuel b. Rab Judah, How do you dye the blue thread? He replied, We take the blood of hillazon¹⁸ together with other ingredients and put them all in a pot

and boil them together. Then we take out a little in an egg-shell and test it on a piece of wool; and we throw away what remains in the egg-shell and burn the wool. One can infer three things from this: [i] that the dye used for testing is unfit;¹⁹ [ii] that the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept]; and [iii] that the dye used for testing renders the rest unfit.²⁰ Are not the rules that the test quantity is itself unfit and that the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept] identical in meaning? —

R. Ashi answered, One states the reason for the other, as much as to say: Why is the test quantity itself unfit? Because the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept]. This, however, is a matter of dispute between Tannaim, for it has been taught: The test quantity is itself unfit, for it says, All of blue.²¹ So R. Hanina b. Gamaliel. But R. Johanan b. Dahabai says, Even the second dyeing²² is valid, for it says, And scarlet.²³

Our Rabbis taught: There is no manner of testing the blue thread;²⁴ it should therefore be bought only from an expert.²⁵ The tefillin can be tested,²⁶ nevertheless they should only be bought from an expert.²⁷ Scrolls of the Law and Mezuzoth can be tested, and may be bought from anyone.²⁸ Is there then no manner of testing the blue thread? But R. Isaac the son of R. Judah used to test it (mnemonic sign: with Ge Shem)²⁹ thus: He used to mix together liquid alum, juice of fenugreek, and urine

(1) Heb. מִיָּד, a sectarian, or heretic. Idolatrous priests, whether Jews or gentiles (Rashi); v. Glos.

(2) Heb. מְזוּמָר, 'a changed (Israelite)'; a Jew who neglects the practices without discarding the beliefs of Judaism.

(3) Deut. VI, 8, 9.

(4) Lit., 'comes to an end by the doing thereof'.

(5) For the performance of the precept of tefillin is not completed by the making but by the wearing of them.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(6) R. Nahman and R. Hisda as to whether one must pronounce a blessing when making the fringes.

(7) This is R. Hisda's view, and therefore as soon as the fringes are inserted in the garment that is the completion of the precept, so that it is necessary to make a blessing at the time.

(8) R. Nahman holds that the precept is performed only when the garment is worn, and therefore no blessing is pronounced when inserting the fringes.

(9) That fringes made by a gentile are invalid.

(10) Num. XV, 38. 'They' is taken impersonally, not necessarily the children of Israel.

(11) The fringes or tufts of the woven cloth were twisted into zizith, but were not attached to the cloth for this purpose.

(12) That were used in the sewing of the garment and the ends of which were left hanging from the garment.

(13) Since they were not attached to the garment as zizith.

(14) Even though the thread was not woven specifically for zizith.

(15) Git. 45b; Sanh. 48b.

(16) Cf. Shab. 108a: That the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth (Ex. XIII, 9), the tefillin should be made from that which is permissible for food.

(17) Similarly the first Tanna and Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel would differ as to the necessity for weaving the threads specifically for the purpose of zizith.

(18) Heb. חליון, a species of mollusk. V. Lewysohn, Zoologie des Talmuds, 280-285.

(19) For dyeing, and the wool dipped in it must be burnt, since it was not dyed for the purpose of the zizith.

(20) If it is poured back into the vessel with the dye.

(21) Ex. XXVIII, 31. The dyeing of the blue thread for the zizith should be the first use of the dye, i.e. nothing should have been dyed with this dye previously. Hence the quantity of dye used in testing is not valid for the zizith.

(22) I.e., even though something else has already been dyed with this dye.

(23) Lev. XIV, 4. Heb. שני תולע is interpreted as שני תולעת 'the second use of the scarlet dye'. And so it is too with the blue dye.

(24) To ascertain whether it has been dyed with genuine or imitation blue.

(25) One who knows that vegetable blue or any other imitation blue is unfit for the purpose.

(26) To ascertain whether they have been made according to prescribed law and whether the Scriptural portions therein have been correctly written.

(27) One who knows that it is essential to prepare the leather specifically for the tefillin.

(28) Since it is not necessary that the parchment upon which they are written be prepared specially for the purpose.

(29) גשם being the initial letters of the ingredients used in the mixture for testing: ל for גילא (alum), ש for אהליבש (fenugreek) and ז for מי רגלים (urine).

Menachoth 43a

of a forty-day old child,¹ and soak [the blue thread] in it overnight until the morning; if the color faded it is invalid,² but if not, it is valid. Moreover, R. Adda stated the following test before Raba in the name of R. 'Avira: One should take a piece of hard leavened dough of barley meal and bake it with [the blue thread] inside; if the color improved³ it is valid, but if it deteriorated it is invalid; and in order to remember this, think of the phrase 'a false change, a true change!'⁴ —

The statement 'There is no manner of testing the blue thread' refers to the test quantity.⁵ Mar of Moshke once obtained in the time of R. Ahai some blue thread; on testing it by the test submitted by R. Isaac the son of R. Judah its color faded, but on testing it by R. Adda's test its color improved. He was about to declare it invalid when R. Ahai said to him, This is neither genuine blue nor imitation blue! We must therefore say that one test⁶ supplements the other thus: if the test of R. Isaac the son of R. Judah had been applied and the color had not faded it is certainly valid, but if its color had faded we should then test it by R. Adda's test by [baking it in] a hard piece of leavened dough; if its color improved it is valid, but if it deteriorated it is invalid. A message was sent from there [Palestine] saying, The tests supplement each other.

R. Mani was most particular when buying [the blue thread], in accordance with the restrictions of the above Baraitha;⁷ whereupon a certain old man said to him, Those who long preceded you acted so, and they were successful in their business.

MENOSCHOS – 27a-58b

Our Rabbis taught: If a man bought a garment furnished with zizith from an Israelite in the market, the presumption is [that it is valid];⁸ if he bought it from a gentile, who was a merchant, it is valid,⁹ but if he was a private individual it is invalid.¹⁰ And [this is so] notwithstanding that they said, A man may not sell a garment furnished with zizith to a gentile unless he removed the zizith.¹¹ What is the reason for this? — Here it was explained, on account of a harlot.¹² Rab Judah said, It is to be feared that [an Israelite] might join him on the road and he might kill him.¹³

Rab Judah attached fringes to the aprons of [the women of] his household;¹⁴ moreover, he used to say every morning the blessing [‘. . . and hast commanded us] to enwrap ourselves with the fringes’. But since he attached [the fringes to the womens’ garments], obviously he is of the opinion that it is a precept not dependent on a fixed time;¹⁵ why then did he say the blessing every morning?¹⁶ — He follows Rabbi’s view; for it was taught: Whenever a man puts on the tefillin he should make a blessing over them, says Rabbi. But if so, at any time [of the day whenever he puts on the garment he should say the blessing]? —

Rab Judah was a most decorous person and would not take off his cloak the whole day long. Then why [did he say the blessing] in the morning?¹⁷ — That was when he changed from night clothes into day clothes.

Our Rabbis taught: All must observe the law of zizith, priests, Levites, and Israelites, proselytes, women and slaves. R. Simeon declares women exempt, since it is a positive precept dependent on a fixed time,¹⁸ and women are exempt from all positive precepts that are dependent on a fixed time. The Master said, ‘All must observe the law of zizith, priests, Levites, and Israelites’. Is not this obvious? For if priests and Levites and Israelites were exempt, then who would

observe it? — It was stated particularly on account of priests. For I might have argued, since it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together, and [it is followed by,] Thou shalt make thee twisted cords,¹⁹ that only those who are forbidden to wear mingled stuff must observe the law of zizith, and as priests are permitted to wear mingled stuff²⁰ they need not observe [the law of zizith]; we are therefore taught [that they, too, are bound], for although while performing the service [in the Temple] they may wear [mingled stuff] they certainly may not wear it when not performing the service.

R. Simeon declares women exempt’. What is R. Simeon’s reason? — It was taught: That ye may look upon it:²¹ this excludes a night garment. You say it excludes a night garment, but perhaps it is not so, but it excludes rather a blind man’s garment? The verse, when it says, Wherewith thou coverest thyself,²² clearly includes a blind man’s garment; how then must I explain the verse, That ye may look upon it? As excluding a night garment. And why do you choose to include a blind man’s garment and to exclude a night garment?²³ include a blind man’s garment since it is looked upon by others, whilst I exclude a night garment since it cannot be looked upon by others. And the Rabbis,

(1) Or ‘that had been kept for forty days’.

(2) For it is not genuine blue.

(3) Lit., ‘changed for the better’.

(4) Where the change was for the worse, i.e., the color deteriorated, it is spurious and is invalid; but where the change was for the better it is genuine and is valid.

(5) I.e., there is no manner of testing the blue thread so as to ascertain whether it was dyed in the vessel with the dye or in the quantity taken out as a test.

(6) Lit., ‘the teachings’ referring to the teachings of R. Isaac and R. Adda.

(7) That it should be bought only from an expert who knows the law.

(8) I.e., the blue thread in the zizith is deemed to be genuine.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(9) For the merchant would not risk his reputation as an honest dealer by passing off the imitation blue for the genuine.

(10) For the gentile may have dyed the thread himself, in which case it obviously could not have been dyed for the purpose of the precept.

(11) Nevertheless if one bought it from a gentile merchant it is valid, for it is almost certain that a Jew sold it to him.

(12) A gentile harlot, receiving this garment with the fringes from a gentile as hire, might spread an evil report against a Jew, producing the garment in support of her words.

(13) A Jewish wayfarer would unhesitatingly join the gentile on the way, believing him to be a Jew since he is wearing a garment with fringes, and would have no suspicion against him so as to guard himself against attack.

(14) For he held that women are also bound to wear zizith.

(15) For women must observe only those positive precepts that do not depend upon the time of the year or of the day for their performance; therefore by imposing the precept of zizith upon women Rab Judah obviously holds that night as well as day is the proper time for the fringes.

(16) Surely the blessing should be said only once, and that when the garment is put on for the first time.

(17) Which presumably means at dawn; he should, however, have recited the blessing even earlier than dawn, as soon as he rose.

(18) For the night is not the proper time for zizith.

(19) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(20) For the girdle which was part of the Priests' robes consisted of wool and linen.

(21) Num. XV, 39.

(22) Deut. XXII, 12.

(23) The verse surely is not required to include a blind man's garment; since they declare that a night garment is subject to zizith — for according to them the precept is not limited to time, a fortiori a blind man's garment is subject to zizith.

Menachoth 43b

for what purpose do they use the expression 'Wherewith thou coverest thyself'? — They require it for the following Baraitha that was taught: Upon the four corners of thy covering;¹ four, but not three.² You say, 'four but not three', but perhaps it is not so, but rather 'four but not five'? The verse, when it says, 'Wherewith thou coverest thyself', clearly includes a five-cornered garment;

how then must I explain the verse, 'Upon the four corners'? Four, but not three. And why do you choose to include a five-cornered garment and to exclude a three-cornered one? I include a five-cornered garment since five contains four, whilst I exclude a three-cornered garment since three does not contain four. And whence does R. Simeon know this? — He derives it from the word 'wherewith'.³ And the Rabbis? — The word 'wherewith' [they say] does not convey any teaching. And for what purpose do the Rabbis use the expression 'That ye may look upon it'? —

They require it for the following teaching: 'That ye may look upon it, and remember', that is, look upon this precept and remember another precept that is dependent upon it, namely, the reading of the Shema'. As we have learnt: From what time in the morning may the Shema' be read? From the time that one can distinguish between blue and white.⁴ Another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it, and remember', that is, look upon this precept, and remember another precept that is next to it, namely, 'the law concerning mingled stuffs, for it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together'. Thou shalt make thee twisted cords.⁵ And another [Baraitha] taught: That ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord: as soon as a person is bound to observe this precept⁶ he must observe all the precepts. This is in accordance with R. Simeon's view that [the zizith] is a precept dependent on time.⁷ And another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it and remember all the commandments of the Lord': this precept is equal to all the precepts together.⁸ And another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it and remember... and do them': looking [upon it] leads to remembering [the commandments], and remembering leads to doing them.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. Simeon b. Yohai says, Whosoever is scrupulous in the observance of this precept is worthy to receive the Divine presence, for it is written here, 'That ye may look upon it', and there it is written, Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and Him shalt thou serve.⁹

Our Rabbis taught: Beloved are Israel, for the Holy One, blessed be He, surrounded them with precepts: tefillin on their heads, tefillin on their arms, zizith on their garments, and Mezuzoth on their door-posts; concerning these David said, Seven times a day do I praise Thee, because of Thy righteous ordinances.¹⁰ And as David entered the bath and saw himself standing naked, he exclaimed, 'Woe is me that I stand naked without any precepts about me!' But when he reminded himself of the circumcision in his flesh his mind was set at ease. And when he came out he sang a hymn of praise concerning it, as it is written, For the Leader; [with string music;] on the Eighth. A Psalm of David;¹¹ that is, concerning circumcision which was given eighth.¹²

R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, Whosoever has the tefillin on his head, the tefillin on his arm, the zizith on his garment, and the mezuzah on his doorpost, is in absolute security against sinning, for it is written, And a threefold cord is not quickly broken;¹³ and it is also written, The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.¹⁴

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, Why is blue specified from all the other colors [for this precept]? Because blue resembles the color of the sea, and the sea resembles the color of the sky, and the sky resembles the color of [a sapphire, and a sapphire resembles the color of]¹⁵ the Throne of Glory, as it is said, And there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone,¹⁶ and it is also written, The likeness of a throne as the appearance of a sapphire stone.¹⁷

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, Greater is the punishment for the [non-observance of the] white threads than for the [non-observance of the] blue threads [of the fringes].¹⁸ This is to be illustrated by a parable. A king of flesh and blood gave orders to two servants; to one he said, 'Bring me a seal of clay', but to the other he said, 'Bring me a seal of gold'; and they both failed in their duty and did not bring them. Now who is deserving of the greater punishment? Surely it is the one to whom the king said, 'Bring me a seal of clay', and who did not do so.

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, A man is bound to say one hundred blessings daily, as it is written, And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee?¹⁹ On Sabbaths and on Festivals²⁰ R. Hiyya the son of R. Awia endeavored to make up this number by the use of spices and delicacies.²¹

It was taught: R. Judah²² used to say, A man is bound to say the following three blessings daily: '[Blessed art thou...]' who hast not made me a heathen',²³ '... who hast not made me a woman'; and '... who hast not made me a brutish man'. R. Aha b. Jacob once overheard his son saying '[Blessed art thou...]' who hast not made me a brutish man', whereupon he said to him, 'And this too!'²⁴ Said the other, 'Then what blessing should I say instead?' [He replied,]... who hast not made me a slave'. And is not that the same as a woman?²⁵ — A slave

(1) Deut. XXII, 12.

(2) I.e., a three-cornered garment is not subject to zizith.

(3) This word, being superfluous, includes a five-cornered garment within the law.

(4) As soon as one can distinguish the various threads of the zizith one may recite the Shema'; v. Ber. 9b. Thus one precept is made dependent upon the other. For the Shema' v. Authorized P.B. p. 40.

(5) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(6) I.e., at the age of thirteen years and one day; in other words: whosoever is bound to keep the law of zizith must keep all the precepts of the Torah.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Aliter: As soon as one is bound to observe this precept, i.e., at daybreak, one must observe all the other precepts of the day.

(7) And consequently women are exempt. According to the Rabbis, however, this principle does not hold good, for women, although bound to observe the law of zizith, are exempt from many laws.

(8) The numerical value of the letters of the word צִיִּיתָ (90+10+90+10+400) is 600, which together with the eight threads and five knots of each fringe makes 613, which equals the number of precepts in the Torah.

(9) Deut. VI, 13. The word אָתָּה 'him' or 'it' is common to both verses, and as in the latter verse it refers to the Lord, so too in the former; thus the observance of 'it' makes one worthy of looking upon 'Him'.

(10) Psalms CXIX, 164. The reference is to these seven precepts: the four fringes, the two tefillin, and the mezuzah.

(11) Psalms VI,1.

(12) I.e., to be observed on the eighth day. Or, which was given as the eighth commandment in the Torah specifically to Israel, for the first seven commandments were given to the sons of Noah. V. Maharsha.

(13) Eccl. IV, 12. The reference is to the three precepts enumerated.

(14) Psalms XXXIV, 8.

(15) Supplied from Sh. Mek.

(16) Ex. XXIV, 10.

(17) Ezek. I, 26. And as God sits upon His Throne of Glory He is immediately reminded of the blue thread of the zizith worn by the Israelites, and bestows upon them blessings. Moreover, it is a mark of honor for Israel to wear upon their garments a thread which bears the color of the Throne of Glory.

(18) For the white threads are easily obtainable, whereas the blue threads are not only difficult to obtain but very expensive.

(19) Deut. X, 12, The word מָה 'what' is interpreted as though it were מֵאָה 'a hundred'. But see Tosaf. s.v. שְׂוֹאֵל.

(20) When in place of the usual prayer of eighteen benedictions there is a prayer of seven benedictions.

(21) For the enjoyment of which it is necessary to make a blessing.

(22) So in many MSS., in Hal. Ged. and Alfasi, and in the parallel passages in Jer. Ber. IX, 1, and Tosef. Ber. VII. Cur.

edd. 'R. Meir'.

(23) So MS.M., Alfasi and Asheri, and so too in Tosef. Ber. l.c. Cur. edd. '... who hast made me an Israelite'.

(24) This blessing savors somewhat of conceit. Aliter: there is no reason to make this blessing since a brutish man is

also bound by all the precepts.

(25) For with regard to the performance of precepts a woman and a slave are on the same footing; cf. Hag. 4a.

Menachoth 44a

is more contemptible.¹

Our Rabbis taught: The Hillazon resembles the sea in its colour,² and in shape it resembles a fish; it appears³ once in seventy years, and with its blood one dyes the blue thread; and therefore it is so expensive.

It was taught: R. Nathan said, There is not a single precept in the Torah, even the lightest, whose reward is not enjoyed in this world; and as to its reward in the future world I know not how great it is. Go and learn this from the precept of zizith. Once a man, who was very scrupulous about the precept of zizith, heard of a certain harlot in one of the towns by the sea who accepted four hundred gold [denars] for her hire. He sent her four hundred gold [denars] and appointed a day with her. When the day arrived he came and waited at her door, and her maid came and told her, 'That man who sent you four hundred gold [denars] is here and waiting at the door'; to which she replied 'Let him come in'. When he came in she prepared for him seven beds, six of silver and one of gold; and between one bed and the other there were steps of silver, but the last were of gold. She then went up to the top bed and lay down upon it naked. He too went up after her in his desire to sit naked with her, when all of a sudden the four fringes [of his garment] struck him across the face; whereupon he slipped off and sat upon the ground. She also slipped off and sat upon the ground and said, 'By the Roman Capitol,⁴ I will not leave you alone until you tell me what blemish you saw in me. 'By the Temple',⁵ he replied, 'never have I seen a woman as beautiful as you are;

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

but there is one precept which the Lord our God has commanded us, it is called zizith, and with regard to it the expression 'I am the Lord your God' is twice written,⁶ signifying, I am He who will exact punishment in the future, and I am He who will give reward in the future. Now [the zizith] appeared to me as four witnesses [testifying against me]'. She said, 'I will not leave you until you tell me your name, the name of your town, the name of your teacher, the name of your school in which you study the Torah'. He wrote all this down and handed it to her. Thereupon she arose and divided her estate into three parts; one third for the government,⁷ one third to be distributed among the poor, and one third she took with her in her hand; the bed clothes, however, she retained. She then came to the Beth Hamidrash of R. Hiyya, and said to him, 'Master, give instructions about me that they make me a proselyte'. 'My daughter', he replied; 'perhaps you have set your eyes on one of the disciples?' She thereupon took out the script and handed it to him. 'Go', said he 'and enjoy your acquisition'. Those very bed-clothes which she had spread for him for an illicit purpose she now spread out for him lawfully. This is the reward [of the precept] in this world; and as for its reward in the future world I know not how great it is.

Rab Judah said, A borrowed garment is exempt from zizith for the first thirty days, thereafter it is subject to it. So, too, it was taught in a Baraitha: He who stays at an inn in the Land of Israel or who rents a house outside the Land [of Israel] is, for the first thirty days, exempt from mezuzah, thereafter he is subject to it. But he who rents a house within the Land of Israel is bound to affix a mezuzah forthwith, in order to maintain the settlement in the Land of Israel.⁸

THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HAND-TEFILLAH DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE HEAD-TEFILLAH. R. Hisda said, This was taught only when he has [both],⁹ but if he

has not [both, the absence of one will certainly] invalidate the other. They asked him, 'Do you still say this?' 'No', he replied; 'for can it be said that one who has not the wherewithal to perform two precepts should not even perform one?' What was his opinion before? — It was only a precaution lest he become negligent [in the precept].¹⁰

R. Shesheth said, Whosoever does not put on the tefillin transgresses eight precepts;¹¹ and whosoever has not zizith attached to his garment transgresses five precepts;¹² and every priest who does not go up to the platform¹³ transgresses three precepts;¹⁴ and whosoever has not a mezuzah on his door transgresses two precepts, namely, And thou shalt write them,¹⁵ And thou shalt write them.¹⁶

Resh Lakish said, He who puts on the tefillin will live long, for it is written,

(1) Or, 'nevertheless go on (including the blessing concerning the slave)', so as to make up the three blessings.

(2) Or 'its essence', i.e. its blood. V. Lewysohn, op. cit. p. 282.

(3) Lit., 'comes up', i.e., from the sea; so Rashi in San. 91a and Meg. 6a.

(4) A form of oath. According to Rashi: By the head of Rome (referring to the Emperor).

(5) Lit., 'the service' (of the Temple).

(6) Num. XV, 41. The expression is repeated in this verse.

(7) So that they should not hinder her in her purpose of being converted to Judaism.

(8) The rule that the tenant must fix the mezuzah will deter him from leaving the premises since he would not be permitted to remove it on leaving; v. B.M. 102a. Furthermore, even if he were to leave the premises the house would soon be let again because of the advantage of its having Mezuzoth affixed.

(9) I.e., he possesses both tefillin; in that case the wearing of one is not dependent upon the other.

(10) And he will acquire only one Tefillah since the use of one is itself a precept.

(11) For in each of the four Scriptural texts of the tefillin there is a twofold injunction, namely, to place the tefillin upon the hand and upon the head; hence the non-observance of this law

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

involves the transgression of these eight commands. V. Rashi.

(12) The four precepts stated in Num. XV, 38 and 39, and the fifth in Deut. XXII, 12.

(13) To pronounce the priestly benediction.

(14) Cf. Num. VI, 23: On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel; ye shall say to them, which contains two precepts, and the third in v. 27: So shall they put My name upon the children of Israel.

(15) Deut. VI, 9.

(16) Ibid. XI, 20.

Menachoth 44b

The Lord upon them, they shall live, and altogether therein is the life of my spirit; wherefore recover Thou me, and make me to live.¹

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WINE,² NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] WINE INVALIDATE THEM. THE [OMISSION OF ONE OF THE] SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] ON THE OUTER ALTAR DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE REST.³

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,⁴ that is, you must first offer the meal-offering and then the drink-offering.⁵ Rabbi says, It is written, A sacrifice and drink-offerings,⁶ that is, you must first offer the sacrifice and then the drink-offering.⁷ But [against] Rabbi [it will be asked]: Is it not written, ‘And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings’? — That verse he requires for the teaching that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered at night and that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered even on the following day.⁸ And [against] the Rabbis [it will be asked]: Is it not written, ‘A sacrifice and drink-offerings’? —

That verse they require for Ze'iri's teaching; for Ze'iri said, The drink-offerings become hallowed only by the slaughtering of the

animal-offering.⁹ And does not Rabbi also require that verse for Ze'iri's teaching? And do not the Rabbis also require the other verse for the teaching that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered at night and that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered even on the following day?¹⁰ — In truth this is the reason for the Rabbis' view; it is written, A burnt-offering and a meal-offering.¹¹ And [against] Rabbi [then it will be asked]: Is it not written, A burnt-offering and a meal-offering? —

Rather [this is the true position]: When the drink-offerings accompany the sacrifice all are agreed that the meal-offering is offered first and it is followed by the drink-offering, for it is written, ‘A burnt-offering and a meal-offering’. They only differ where they are offered as an offering by themselves; the Rabbis are of the opinion that just as when they accompany the sacrifice the meal-offering is offered first and then the drink-offering, so it is, too, when they are offered by themselves, namely, the meal-offering is offered first and then the drink-offering. Rabbi, however, distinguishes thus: only there [where they accompany the sacrifice does the meal-offering precede the drink-offering] for since the offering began with what is eaten¹² one should continue with what is eaten;¹³ but where they are offered as an offering by themselves the drink-offering takes the first place, since the Psalm is sung [by the Levites] over it.¹⁴

THE [OMISSION OF ONE OF THE] SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] ON THE OUTER ALTAR DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE REST. Our Rabbis taught: Whence do we know that any offering whose blood must be sprinkled on the outer altar effects atonement even if it is sprinkled with but one act of sprinkling? From the verse, And the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord thy God.¹⁵

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF EITHER THE] BULLOCKS OR THE RAMS OR THE LAMBS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE OTHERS.¹⁶ R. SIMEON SAID, IF THEY HAD [MEANS ENOUGH FOR THE] MANY BULLOCKS BUT HAD NOT [MEANS ENOUGH FOR] THE DRINK-OFFERINGS, THEY SHOULD BRING ONE BULLOCK AND ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS AND SHOULD NOT OFFER THEM ALL WITHOUT DRINK-OFFERINGS.

GEMARA. Which bullocks and lambs are meant? Will you say those of the Feast [of Tabernacles]?¹⁷ But there is written of them, After the ordinance,¹⁸ After the ordinance!¹⁸ — We must therefore say that those of the New Moon and of Pentecost are meant, which are ordained in the Book of Numbers.¹⁹

(1) Isa. XXXVIII, 16. The opening of this verse is interpreted in reference to the tefillin thus: They that hear upon them the name of the Lord (i.e. that wear the tefillin) shall live.

(2) The reference is to the drink-offerings which accompanied most important animal sacrifices; v. Num. XV, 4ff. The absence of one component part does not prevent the offering of the other.

(3) I.e., the omission of one sprinkling does not render the ceremony invalid, since the sacrifice is valid if the blood was sprinkled with but one act of sprinkling. V. Zeb. 36b.

(4) Ibid. XXIX, 18.

(5) In this passage 'drink-offering' (in the sing.) refers only to the wine libation.

(6) Lev. XXIII, 37.

(7) Which is to be followed by the meal-offering.

(8) Provided they were not hallowed in a vessel of ministry on the previous day. Cf. Tem. 14a.

(9) But before the slaughtering of the animal the drink-offerings designated for this sacrifice may be used for another.

(10) Since both the verses cited are required for the special teachings, neither can draw any inference therefrom as to the priority of the meal-offering over the drink-offering, or vice versa.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 37. Hence the meal-offering follows immediately after the animal-offering.

(12) Sc. solid food; i.e., the flesh of the sacrifice which is burnt upon the altar.

(13) Sc. the meal-offering, which is also solid food consumed by the altar.

(14) V. 'Ar. 11a.

(15) Deut. XII, 27. The expression 'poured out' suggests one act of sprinkling.

(16) Each may be offered by itself in the absence of the others.

(17) On each day of this Festival bullocks and lambs were offered; v. Num. XXIX, 12ff.

(18) Ibid. 18 and 33. These terms imply precision and the indispensability of every item prescribed.

(19) The reference is to the Musaf or additional offerings of the New Moon and of Pentecost, consisting in each case of two bullocks, one ram and seven lambs; cf. ibid. XXVIII, 11 and 27.

Menachoth 45a

And which rams are meant? Will you say those of the above occasions?¹ But only one ram is spoken of there!² Or will you say those of Pentecost which are ordained in the Book of Leviticus?³ But the expression 'shall be' is used with regard to them!⁴ —

In truth those of Pentecost which are ordained in the Book of Leviticus are meant, and [the Mishnah] teaches that neither the [absence of the] rams which are ordained in Leviticus will invalidate the ram ordained in Numbers nor will [the absence of] the ram ordained in Numbers invalidate the rams ordained in Leviticus. Then [the position is this, is it not], that in regard to the bullocks even [though they are ordained in one passage the absence of] one does not invalidate the other;⁵ whereas in regard to the rams the absence of what is ordained in one passage does not invalidate what is ordained in another passage, but of what is ordained in one passage the absence of one invalidates the other?⁶ —

The Tanna dealt with different conditions in each case.⁷ And in the day of the new moon it shall be a young bullock without blemish; and six lambs and a ram; they shall be without blemish.⁸ Why does the text say, 'A bullock'? It is because in the Torah it says, [Two] bullocks;⁹ but whence do I know that if two are not to be found one must be brought? The text therefore says, 'A bullock'. Again why does the text say, 'Six lambs'? It is because in the Torah it says, Seven lambs;⁹ but whence do I know that if seven are not to

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

be found six must be brought? The text therefore says, Six lambs. And whence do I know that if six are not to be found five are to be brought, and if not five four, and if not four three, and if not three two, or even one? The text therefore says. And lambs according as his means suffice.¹⁰ But since this is so,¹¹ why does the text say, ‘six lambs’? To indicate that we must make every effort to obtain as many as possible. And whence do I know that [the absence of] one invalidates the others?¹² Because the text says. They shall be.¹³ Thus saith the Lord God, In the first month, in the first day of the month thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and thou shalt offer it as a sin-offering in the sanctuary.¹⁴ A sin-offering? But surely it is a burnt-offering?¹⁵ —

R. Johanan said, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future.¹⁶ R. Ashi said, [It refers to] the special consecration-offering [to be] offered in the time of Ezra¹⁷ just as it was offered in the time of Moses.¹⁸ There has also been taught [a Baraitha] to the same effect: R. Judah says, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future. But R. Jose said to him, [It refers to] the consecration-offering [to be] offered in the time of Ezra just as it was offered in the time of Moses. He replied, May your mind be at ease for you have set mine at ease. The priests shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself [nebelah], or is torn [Trefah], whether it be fowl or beast.¹⁹ Is it only the priests that may not eat such but the Israelites may?²⁰ —

R. Johanan said, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future. Rabina said, It was necessary [to repeat this prohibition] for the priests, for I might have thought that since they are permitted [to eat] a bird-offering of which the head had been nipped off at the neck,²¹ they are also permitted to eat nebelah and Trefah; we are therefore told [that it is not so]. And so thou shalt do on the seventh day of the month for every one that erreth, and for him that is

simple; so shall ye make atonement for the house.²² ‘Seven’,²³ says R. Johanan, refers to a sin committed by seven tribes, even though they do not constitute the majority of the community.²⁴ ‘New [moon]’, that is, they decided a new law saying, [e.g.,] that fat is permitted.²⁵ ‘For every one that erreth and for him that is simple’, this teaches that they²⁶ are liable²⁷ only if the ruling [of the Beth din was made] in ignorance and the transgression [of the community] was committed in error.²⁸

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, That man is to be remembered for good, and Hanina b. Hezekiah is his name; for were it not for him the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, since its sayings contradicted the words of the Torah. What did he do? He took up with him three hundred barrels of oil²⁹ and remained there in the upper chamber until he had explained away everything.

R. SIMEON SAID, IF THEY HAD [MEANS ENOUGH FOR] THE MANY BULLOCKS, etc. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And he shall prepare a meal-offering, an ephah for the bullock, and an ephah for the ram, and for the lambs according as his means suffice, and a bin of oil to an ephah.³⁰ R. Simeon asked, Is the quantity [of flour for a meal-offering] the same for bullocks as for rams?³¹ But it signifies that if they had [means enough for] the many bullocks but had not [means enough for] the drink-offerings, they should bring one bullock and its drink-offerings and should not offer them all without drink-offerings. And if they had [means enough for]

(1) As prescribed in the Book of Numbers; v. prec. note.

(2) Whereas our Mishnah speaks of rams in the plural.

(3) Which are offered with the two loaves; v. Lev. XXIII, 18: And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs... and one young bullock and two rams; they shall be for a burnt-offering unto the Lord.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(4) V. prec. note. The expression ‘shall be’ invariably implies indispensability of every item and detail; thus conflicting with our Mishnah.

(5) And if one bullock was lost the other may nevertheless be offered.

(6) I.e., the two rams offered with the two loaves on Pentecost, ordained in Lev. XXIII, 18, are indispensable to each other, and one cannot be offered without the other.

(7) I.e., the position as described is quite correct, and the Tanna of our Mishnah was in no way concerned with the facts that the cases of the bullocks and of the rams were not on all fours.

(8) Ezek. XLVI, 6.

(9) Num. XXVIII, 11.

(10) Ezek. XLVI, 7.

(11) That less than the prescribed number of seven may be brought.

(12) I.e., if there were seven (or any lesser number of) lambs each one is indispensable and the absence of one of them would prevent the offering of the others. So Rashi; but v. Tosaf. s.v. ומנין, and Sh. Mek. n. 3.

(13) Ezek. XLVI, 6. This expression indicates indispensability

(14) Ezek. XLV, 18. The word והטאת rendered in the versions ‘and thou shalt purify’ is understood as though it were read והטאת ‘and a sin-offering’.

(15) The special sacrifices of the New Moon were burnt-offerings, v. Num. XXVIII, 11.

(16) This means that it is beyond our power to reconcile this verse with the ordinance of the Torah and will be explained by Elijah the Prophet, the herald of the Messianic era, who is to make the truth known.

(17) V. Sh. Mek. n. 4.

(18) For on the eighth day of the consecration of the Sanctuary in the time of Moses, which coincided with the New Moon of Nisan, sin-offerings, and not the usual burnt-offerings, were brought. The prophet Ezekiel foretells a similar consecration of the Temple on the New Moon in the future, when in place of the usual burnt-offerings sin-offerings will be offered.

(19) Ezek. XLIV, 31.

(20) Surely not; for nebelah and Trefah are expressly forbidden in the Torah to all Israelites, v. Deut. XIV, 21, and Ex. XXII, 30.

(21) Bird-offerings were not slaughtered in the usual manner but their heads were nipped off at the neck, v. Lev. I, 15. After the application of the blood as prescribed, the priests were allowed to eat the flesh of the bird, although for profane purposes such nipping would render the bird nebelah.

(22) Ezek. XLV, 20.

(23) The expression בשבעה בהדש, ‘on the seventh day of the month’ is interpreted separately, שבעה meaning seven, and הדש the new moon.

(24) The reference is to the special sin-offering of a bullock brought on behalf of the community when the whole community or the greater part thereof or even the majority of the tribes had committed a sin by acting upon the erroneous ruling of the Beth din; v. Lev. IV, 13.

(25) Whereas the fat is forbidden by the Torah on penalty of kareth; v. Lev. VII, 25.

(26) Sc. the community.

(27) To bring the special sin-offering of a bullock.

(28) I.e., the people acted in accordance with the new ruling of the Beth din and actually ate forbidden fat.

(29) To serve him for lighting.

(30) Ezek. XLVI, 7.

(31) Of course not, for the quantity of flour for the meal-offering which accompanied the offering of a bullock was three tenths of an ephah whereas that which accompanied a ram was two tenths. V. Num. XV, 6, 9.

Menachoth 45b

the many rams but had not [means enough for] the meal-offerings,¹ they should bring one ram and its meal-offering and should not offer them all without meal-offerings.

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BULLOCK,² OR THE RAMS, OR THE LAMBS OR THE HE-GOAT DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE BREAD-OFFERING,³ NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATE THEM. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATES THE LAMBS,⁴ BUT THE [ABSENCE OF THE] LAMBS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE BREAD-OFFERING, SO R. AKIBA.

R. SIMEON B. NANOS SAID, IT IS NOT SO, BUT RATHER THE [ABSENCE OF THE] LAMBS INVALIDATES THE BREAD-OFFERING, WHILST THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE LAMBS; FOR SO WE FIND IT WAS THE CASE THAT WHEN THE ISRAELITES WERE IN THE WILDERNESS FOR FORTY YEARS THEY OFFERED THE LAMBS WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING;⁵

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

THEREFORE NOW TOO THEY MAY OFFER THE LAMBS WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING.

R. SIMEON SAID, THE HALACHAH IS ACCORDING TO THE WORDS OF BEN NANOS BUT THE REASON IS NOT AS HE STATED IT; FOR EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS WAS OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS, BUT NOT EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS WAS OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS; HOWEVER, WHEN THEY CAME INTO THE LAND OF ISRAEL THEY OFFERED BOTH KINDS. WHY THEN DO I SAY THAT THE LAMBS MAY BE OFFERED WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING? BECAUSE THE LAMBS RENDER THEMSELVES PERMISSIBLE.⁶ AND [WHY DO I SAY THAT] THE BREAD-OFFERING MAY NOT BE OFFERED WITHOUT THE LAMBS? BECAUSE THERE IS NOTHING THAT RENDERS IT PERMISSIBLE.⁷

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And ye shall present with the bread,⁸ that is, as an obligation with the bread-offering;⁹ seven lambs without blemish,¹⁰ that is, even though there is no bread-offering. Then why does the verse say, ‘With the bread’? To teach that there was no obligation to bring the lambs before there was the obligation to bring the bread-offering.¹¹ This is the view of R. Tarfon.¹² You might think that the lambs stated here¹³ are the identical ones which are stated in the Book of Numbers;¹⁴ but you must say that this is not the case, for when you come to the bullocks and the rams it is evident that they are not the identical ones;¹⁵ but these¹⁶ are brought on their own account, whilst those¹⁷ are brought on account of the bread-offering.¹⁸ It will thus be seen that those offerings stated in the Book of Numbers were offered in the wilderness but those stated in the Book of Leviticus were not offered in the wilderness. Perhaps the bullocks and the rams [of the two Books] are not the identical ones, but the lambs are the

identical ones?¹⁹ — Since those [the former] are certainly different ones,²⁰ these [the latter] too are not the identical ones. And why must one say that the bullocks and the rams are different ones? perhaps the Divine Law meant to say, If it is so desired one bullock and two rams are to be offered or, if preferred, two bullocks and one ram? — Since the order is different²¹ they must be other sacrifices.

THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATES THE LAMBS. What is the reason for R. Akiba's view? — He infers the expression ‘they shall be’ [yiheyu]²² from the other expression ‘they shall be’ [tiheyenah]:²³ as in the latter case it refers to the bread-offering, so in the former it refers to the bread-offering. Ben Nanos, however, infers the expression ‘they shall be’ [yiheyu]²² from the other expression ‘they shall be’ [yiheyu]:²⁴ as in the latter case it refers to the lambs, so in the former it refers to the lambs. And why does not Ben Nanos infer [yiheyu] from tiheyenah, [and say:] as in the latter case it refers to the bread-offering so in the former it refers to the bread-offering? —

One may infer yiheyu from yiheyu²⁵ but one may not infer yiheyu from tiheyenah. But what does this [variation] matter? Was it not taught in the school of R. Ishmael that in the verses, And the priest shall come again,²⁶ and And the priest shall come in,²⁷ ‘coming again’ and ‘coming in’ have the same import [for purposes of inference]? —

That is permissible only where there is no identical expression [on which to base the inference], but where an identical expression exists, the inference must be drawn from the identical expression. And why does not R. Akiba infer yiheyu from yiheyu? —

One should infer that [offering] which provides a gift to the priest from that which provides a gift to the priest.²⁸ but the others²⁹

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

are burnt-offerings. Alternatively I can say that they differ on the interpretation of this very verse: They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest.³⁰ R. Akiba maintains, What is it that is entirely for the priest? I should say, It is the Bread-offering. And Ben Nanos, [what does he say]? Does the verse say, ‘They shall be holy to the priest’? It says, ‘They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest’. What is it that is partly to the Lord and partly for the priest? I should say, It is the lambs. And R. Akiba [what does he say to this]? —

Does the verse say, ‘They shall be holy to the Lord and for the priest’? It says, ‘To the Lord for the priest’. It is as stated by R. Huna, for R. Huna said, God³¹ acquired it and granted it to the priest. R. Johanan said, All agree

- (1) Lit., ‘their ephahs’.
- (2) The animals here enumerated are the special offerings prescribed for Pentecost, cf. Lev. XXIII, 17-19; the bullock, the two rams and the seven lambs for burnt-offerings, and the he-goat for a sin-offering.
- (3) I.e., the two loaves; cf. *ibid.* 17.
- (4) Sc. the two lambs for peace-offerings; *ibid.* 19.
- (5) For only flour from the Land of Israel was to be used for the Bread-offering and the ‘Omer-offering; v. *infra* 83b.
- (6) The sprinkling of the blood of the lambs renders the sacrificial portions permissible for sacrifice and the rest of the flesh permissible to be eaten; thus the validity of the lambs is in no wise dependent on the bread-offering.
- (7) For it is the slaughtering of the lambs that renders the bread-offering permissible to be eaten, so that in the absence of the lambs there is naught to render the bread-offering permissible.
- (8) Lev. XXIII, 18.
- (9) And one may not be offered without the other.
- (10) *Ibid.*
- (11) And this obligation only commenced when they entered the Land of Israel.
- (12) In *cur. edd.* are added the words: ‘R. Akiba says’. They are not found in the parallel passage in the *Sifra* and in all extant MSS., and are struck out by *Sh. Mek. V. Glosses of Strashun a.l.*
- (13) In Lev. *ibid.* where the verse reads: And ye shall present seven lambs... and one young bullock and two rams.
- (14) Num. XXVIII, 27: Two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs.

(15) Since the number of each kind is different in each passage.

(16) Those animals stated in Numbers are offered as additional sacrifices and are not related to the bread-offering.

(17) Mentioned in Leviticus.

(18) And since the bread-offering was not offered in the wilderness the sacrifices stated in connection with it were similarly not offered in the wilderness.

(19) Since the number of lambs is seven in each passage.

(20) For the number of animals of each kind is different in the two texts.

(21) Cf. the verses of Lev. and Num. *supra* p. 274, nn. 8 and 9. The fact that in Lev. the seven lambs are stated in the verse before the bullock and the rams and in Num. after them signifies that they are not the identical ones.

(22) Lev. XXIII, 20: And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the first-fruits for a wave-offering before the Lord, with the two lambs; they shall be holy to the Lord for the priest. Now the expression ‘they shall be’ יהיו implies that the offering cannot be dispensed with, but the doubt is as to which offering is meant, whether the bread-offering or the two lambs.

(23) *Ibid.* 17: סלת תהייה, they shall be of fine flour; this clearly refers to the bread-offering.

(24) *Ibid.* 18: יהיו. This expression clearly refers to the seven lambs and the other burnt-offerings.

(25) Being identical expressions.

(26) *Ibid.* XIV, 39 and 44. The reference is to the treatment of a leprous spot in the walls of a house.

(27) v. p. 275, n. 8.

(28) The two lambs for the peace-offerings provided a gift to the priest, for after the burning of the sacrificial portions

the flesh was eaten by the priests, and so, too, did the two loaves, for they were entirely eaten by the priests.

(29) Sc. the seven lambs, etc.

(30) Lev. XXIII, 20.

(31) Lit., ‘the Name’.

Menachoth 46a

that if they were attached to each other the [absence of] one invalidates the other.¹ And what creates this attachment? — It is the slaughtering.²

‘Ulla reported that in the West [Palestine] the following question was raised: Does the waving³ create any attachment or not? — But surely this can be solved from the foregoing

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

statement of R. Johanan, for since R. Johanan said that the slaughtering creates the attachment, it follows that the waving does not! — That very statement of R. Johanan gave rise to doubts, viz., Was R. Johanan certain that the slaughtering creates an attachment and that the waving does not, or was he certain only about the slaughtering, but about the waving he was in doubt? — This remains undecided.

R. Judah b. Hanina said to R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, Behold, the verse, ‘They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest’, is written after the rite of waving, nevertheless Ben Nanos and R. Akiba differ!⁴ — But according to your view, too, [this same argument can be put forward, for is the verse written] only after the rite of waving and not after the slaughtering?⁵ You have therefore no alternative but to say that [the rule contained in this verse]⁶ applies to the early stage of the offering,⁷ and that the verse, ‘They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest’, is to be understood in the sense that later on they will be for the priest; then one can say the same here, too,⁸ that only later on they will be for the priest. And does the slaughtering create any attachment?

But the following contradicts it, for it was taught: If a cake⁹ broke¹⁰ before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, he¹¹ should bring another cake and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake broke after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled¹² and the flesh may be eaten, but he has not fulfilled his vow; moreover the bread is invalid.¹³ If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake broke], he must give as the priestly offering¹⁴ a whole cake in place of the broken one. If a cake had been taken outside¹⁵ before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, it should be brought in again and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake had been taken outside after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be

sprinkled and the flesh may be eaten, but he has not thereby fulfilled his vow; moreover the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake had been taken outside], he must give as the priestly offering a cake which had remained inside in place of that which had been taken outside.¹⁶ If a cake had become unclean before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, he should bring another cake and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake had become unclean after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled and the flesh may be eaten, and he has also fulfilled his vow,¹⁷ for the [High Priest's] plate renders acceptable the offering which became unclean; but the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake became unclean], he must give as the priestly offering a clean cake in place of that which had become unclean. Now if one were to hold that the slaughtering creates an attachment [between the animal offering and the cakes], then surely when this attachment has already been created by the slaughtering and thereafter the cakes become invalid, the thanks-offering should also be invalid,¹⁸ should it not? —

The thank-offering is a special case, for Holy Writ refers to it as a peace-offering,¹⁹ and as peace-offerings are offered without any bread-offering so the thank-offering too may be offered without the bread-offering. R. Jeremiah said, If you were to say that the waving creates an attachment, then it is clear that if the bread-offering was lost²⁰

(1) I.e., if the two loaves and the two lambs were together in the Sanctuary intended and ready for the Festival-offering, that fact attached them to each other; and therefore if one kind, either the loaves or the lambs, was lost, the remaining kind may not be offered, but must be taken away to be burnt.

(2) I.e., if the loaves were in the Sanctuary at the time of the slaughtering of the lambs they at once become attached to each other, and one may not be offered without the other.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(3) Which is prior to the slaughtering, for the two lambs were waved before the Lord whilst still living together with the two loaves, v. Lev. XXIII, 20.

(4) As to whether it is the lambs that may be offered in the absence of the loaves or vice versa, but one may certainly be offered without the other; it is evident, therefore, that the waving stated at the beginning of the verse in question creates no attachment whatsoever between the lambs and the loaves.

(5) This verse clearly relates to the time after the slaughtering, for only then can they be considered for the priest, and yet they differ as to which is indispensable; hence the argument could be adduced to prove that even the slaughtering does not create any attachment.

(6) Sc. that one may be offered without the other.

(7) Before the slaughtering.

(8) Viz., that the rule that one may be offered without the other relates only to the early stage of the offering, namely, before the waving, for the waving, it may be said, creates an attachment.

(9) For the four kinds of bread which accompanied the thank-offering v. Lev. VII, 22,23.

(10) The disqualifying effect of a broken loaf is derived according to Rashi from the Showbread (v. Rashi).

(11) The offerer of the thank-offering.

(12) As an ordinary peace-offering and not as a thank-offering.

(13) I.e., none of the cakes may be eaten. V. Rashi.

(14) The priestly share of the bread-offering was one out of every ten cakes; moreover what he received had to be whole and not broken; v. infra 77b.

(15) Outside the walls of Jerusalem.

(16) When giving the tenth part to the priest the broken cake or what was taken outside or what was unclean must be included in the total, although these particular cakes may not be given to the priest.

(17) According to MS.M.: 'He has not fulfilled his vow', and omitting 'for the plate... unclean'; so also in Tosef. Men. VIII. This text is preferred by Tosaf. s.v. מִשְׁשֵׁהָטָה, and by Sh. Mek.

(18) And the blood should not be permitted to be sprinkled even as a peace-offering.

(19) Cf. Lev. VII, 15.

(20) After the waving.

where the bread-offering and the lambs had been brought [into the Sanctuary] and after they had been waved together the bread was lost and other bread was brought in its place, the question would arise, must the second bread be waved or not? Of course, if it was the lambs that were lost [and other lambs were brought in their place], there is no question at all that [the second pair of lambs] must be waved.¹ The question can only arise when it was the bread that was lost. And again, according to Ben Nanos, who said that the lambs constitute the main part of the offering, this question cannot arise;² but it can only arise according to R. Akiba, who maintains that the bread constitutes the main part of the offering. And the question is, Shall we say that since the bread constitutes the main part of the offering, it requires to be waved; or perhaps, since it is the lambs which render the bread permissible it does not require to be waved? — This must remain undecided.

Abaye said to Raba, Why is it that the two lambs⁴ hallow the bread and [their absence] renders [the bread] invalid, whereas the seven lambs and the bullock and the rams⁴ do not hallow the bread and [their absence] does not render [the bread] invalid? — He replied, It is because they have become attached to each other by the waving.⁵ But take the case of the thank-offering, where [the animal-offering and the bread] are not attached to each other by any waving, and yet the one hallows the other and the [absence of] one invalidates the other! — Let us indeed compare it with the thank-offering, as the thank-offering is a peace-offering [and that alone hallows the bread] so here too it is the peace-offering [alone which hallows the bread].⁶ But can we make this comparison? In that case⁷ there are no other offerings with it, but here,⁸ since there is another kind of offering that goes with it, both kinds should hallow [the bread]? — We should, however, compare this case with the ram of the Nazirite; as with the ram of the Nazirite,

Menachoth 46b

the lambs must be destroyed, and if the lambs were lost the bread must be destroyed. But if you were to say that the waving does not create an attachment, then in the case

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

although there are other offerings that go with it,⁹ it is the peace-offering only and nothing else that hallows the bread, so it is in this case too. And whence do we know this there? — Because it is written,¹⁰ And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace-offerings unto the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread,¹¹ which teaches us that the basket [of bread] comes as an obligation for the ram, and the slaughtering of the ram hallows it. Therefore, if it was slaughtered under the name of any other offering, the bread is not hallowed thereby.

Our Rabbis taught: If the Two Loaves were brought alone,¹² they must [none the less] be waved, and then their appearance must be spoilt,¹³ and they must be taken away to the place of burning. But say what you will, if they¹⁴ are brought to be eaten then let them be eaten, and if they are brought to be burnt then let them be burnt immediately! Wherefore is it necessary that their appearance be spoilt? —

Rabbah answered, Actually they are brought to be eaten but [they are forbidden to be eaten] as a precautionary measure lest in the following year, when they have the lambs, they¹⁵ might say, ‘Last year did we not eat the loaves without offering the lambs? We can do the same this year’, and they will not appreciate the fact that last year the loaves rendered themselves permissible because there were no lambs, but now that there are lambs it is the lambs that render them permissible.¹⁶

Rabbah said, Whence do I arrive at this view?¹⁷ Because we have learnt:¹⁸ R. Judah said, Ben Bokri testified at Jabneh that a priest who paid the shekel has committed no sin. Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said to him, Not so, but rather a priest who did not pay the shekel has committed a sin. The priests, however, used to expound the following verse to their advantage, And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt, it shall not

be eaten.¹⁹ Since the ‘Omer-offering and the Two Loaves and the Showbread are ours, how can they be eaten?²⁰ Now what are the circumstances with regard to the Two Loaves referred to? If they are offered with the sacrifice then [the question will at once be asked], Do not the priests make a freewill-offering of a thank-offering and its loaves and also eat them?²¹ It must be that they are offered by themselves, yet it says above, ‘How can they be eaten?’ We thus see that [when brought alone] they are brought to be eaten.

But Abaye said to him, I maintain that it is a case when they are offered with the sacrifice, and as to your difficulty raised from the thank-offering and its loaves, [it is no difficulty at all], for the loaves of the thank-offering are nowhere referred to as a meal-offering, whereas the Two Loaves are referred to as a meal-offering,²² for it is written, When you bring a new meal-offering unto the Lord.²³ R. Joseph said, In fact they are brought to be burnt, but the reason why we do not burn them [immediately] is that we must not burn holy things on a Festival.

But Abaye said to him, Where is the comparison? There²⁴ the precept is not to do so,²⁵ but here since it is the precept to do so they should be burnt [on the Festival], as is the case with the bullock and the he-goat offered on the Day of Atonement! — Rather, said R. Joseph, it is to be feared that later on [during the day] they might obtain lambs.²⁶

Said Abaye to him, This is very well [to delay the burning] as long as the time for the offering thereof continues,²⁷ but after that time they should be burnt, should they not? — The expression ‘their appearance must be spoilt’ indeed means that they must be kept as long as the time for the offering thereof continues.

Raba said, I maintain that they are brought to be eaten, [yet they are not eaten] because of the precautionary measure stated by

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Rabbah,²⁸ but [the law]²⁹ is not derived from the passage adduced by him, but from a Scriptural verse. For I derive it, said Raba, from the following verse: Ye shall bring out of your dwellings two wave-loaves... for first-fruits unto the Lord.³⁰ As first-fruits are offered by themselves so the Two Loaves may also be offered by themselves; and it follows also, as the first-fruits are offered to be eaten so the Two Loaves also are offered to be eaten.

(1) Together with the two loaves, for in the first place, it is the lambs which render the two loaves permissible to be eaten, and secondly, the rite of waving is stated primarily of the lambs; cf. Lev. XXIII, 20.

(2) For since the lambs are still here and have once been waved nothing further is required.

(3) Sc. the second bread, brought as a substitute for the first which was lost.

(4) Offered on the Feast of Weeks.

(5) The two lambs must be waved before the Lord together with the two loaves.

(6) Whereas the seven lambs, the bullock, and the rams are burnt-offerings.

(7) Sc. the thank-offering.

(8) With regard to the offerings of the Feast of Weeks.

(9) The Nazirite at the fulfillment of his period of consecration must bring a ram for a peace-offering as well as a male lamb for a burnt-offering and an ewe lamb for sin-offering, v. Num. VI, 14.

(10) So MS.M. and Sh. Mek. In cur. edd. 'For it was taught'.

(11) Ibid. 17.

(12) Where the two lambs were not available the loaves, according to R. Akiba, may be offered by themselves, since they constitute the main part of the Festival-offering.

(13) I.e., they must be kept overnight whereby they become invalid and then are burnt, for it is forbidden to destroy an offering that is still valid.

(14) Sc. the Two Loaves when brought without the lambs.

(15) Sc. the priests.

(16) But since the Two Loaves are in fact a valid offering they must not be destroyed unless they were first made invalid.

(17) That the Two Loaves even when brought by themselves without the lambs, are offered to be eaten.

(18) Shek. I, 4. V. supra p. 139 and the notes thereon.

(19) Lev. VI, 16.

(20) They argued that if they were to contribute the shekel for the public-offerings they would then have a share in the public-offerings, and as the priest's meal-offering must be burnt then it would follow that every meal-offering, e.g. the Showbread, would be forbidden to be eaten, and this would be contrary to Scripture.

(21) And therefore the priests' argument 'How can they be eaten?' cannot apply to this case.

(22) And the meal-offering of priests must be wholly burnt, hence their argument from the Two Loaves.

(23) Num. XXVIII, 26.

(24) In the rule stated that holy things may not be burnt on a Festival. Cf. Shab. 23b.

(25) The holy thing was originally not intended for burning but for eating, but as it became invalid it was condemned to be burnt; that burning may not be carried out on the Festival.

(26) So that it is possible that later during the day the ceremony might be carried out in the manner ordained; it is therefore proper to delay the burning of the loaves as long as possible.

(27) I.e., so long as the evening daily sacrifice has not been offered (Rashi). After this, even if lambs were obtained they would not be offered.

(28) V. supra p. 281.

(29) That the Two Loaves are brought to be eaten even when offered by themselves.

(30) Lev. XXIII, 17.

Menachoth 47a

Our Rabbis taught: The lambs of Pentecost hallow the bread only by their slaughtering. Thus, if they were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name, the bread is hallowed thereby;¹ if they were slaughtered under another name and their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is not hallowed; if they were slaughtered under their own name but their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is hallowed and not hallowed. So Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, [The bread] always remains unhallowed unless [the lambs] were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name. What is the reason for Rabbi's view? —

Because it is written, And the ram he shall offer by slaughtering it as a peace-offering

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

unto the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread,² that is to say, the slaughtering hallows [the bread]. And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — The expression ‘he shall offer’ implies that he must perform all the rites of the offering.³ And Rabbi? Is not the expression ‘he shall offer’ used? — Had the term ‘slaughtering’ been followed by ‘he shall offer’ I agree that the meaning would be as you say;⁴ but now that it is written ‘he shall offer’ and then ‘slaughtering’, it clearly means, he shall offer it by the act of slaughtering. And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? Is not the expression ‘slaughtering’ used? — That is necessary for R. Johanan’s teaching, for R. Johanan said, All⁵ agree that the bread must be there at the time of the slaughtering. What is meant by ‘hallowed and not hallowed’? —

Abaye said, It is hallowed but not completely so. Raba said, It is hallowed but not permitted [to be eaten]. What is the practical difference between them?⁶ — There is a difference between them as to whether redemption is effective; according to Abaye the redemption is effective, according to Raba it is not.⁷ Now according to Raba there is clearly a difference of opinion between Rabbi and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon;⁸ but according to Abaye what difference is there between Rabbi and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon?⁹ — There is a difference between them as to whether it would become invalid if taken out [of the Sanctuary].¹⁰

R. Samuel b. R. Isaac enquired of R. Hiyya b. Abba: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under their own name but their blood was sprinkled under another name, may the bread be eaten or not? According to whose view does this question arise? If [you say] according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, [then there is no question at all for] he holds that it is the sprinkling that hallows the bread.¹¹ And if [you say] according to Rabbi, [then there is also no question about it for] whether one accepts the interpretation of

Abaye or of Raba [the bread] is hallowed but not permitted [to be eaten].¹² The question can arise only according to the view of the following Tanna. For the father of R. Jeremiah b. Abba taught: If the Two Loaves were taken out [of the Sanctuary] between the slaughtering [of the two lambs] and the sprinkling of their blood, and subsequently [the priest] sprinkled the blood of the lambs [and expressed at the time the intention of eating the flesh] outside the prescribed time, R. Eliezer says, The bread is not subject to the law of piggul¹³ but R. Akiba says, The bread is subject to the law of Piggul. And R. Shesheth said, Both these Tannaim agree with Rabbi that the slaughtering hallows the bread,¹⁴ but R. Eliezer maintains his view that the sprinkling has no effect upon what was taken out,¹⁵ and R. Akiba his that the sprinkling has an effect upon what was taken out.¹⁶

(1) The bread, i.e., the Two Loaves, may now be eaten, and if taken out of the Sanctuary would become invalid.

(2) Num. VI, 17, literally translated. The reference is to the sacrifice brought by the Nazirite, but the law is the same for the lambs of Pentecost.

(3) Including the sprinkling of the blood.

(4) I.e., that in addition to the slaughtering there is also another essential act of offering, namely the sprinkling.

(5) Even R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon who maintains that the sprinkling is the principal service.

(6) For according to Abaye too, since it is not completely hallowed it certainly may not be eaten.

(7) The underlying principle is that whatever is consecrated only for its value (קדושת דמים) can be redeemed and its sanctity is thereby transferred to the money set aside for the purpose, whilst the thing itself becomes profane; but whatever is hallowed bodily (קדושת הגוף) cannot be redeemed. Now, dealing with Rabbi’s view, according to Abaye since the bread is not completely hallowed it may be redeemed; according to Raba, however, it is hallowed entirely, and therefore the redemption is of no effect. The text adopted is that which is preferred by Rashi. In cur. edd. the opinions are reversed, thus according to Abaye the redemption is ineffective, etc.

(8) For according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon the redemption is effective and according to Rabbi it is not.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(9) For both are of the opinion that the redemption is effective.

(10) According to Rabbi it would thereby become invalid but not so according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon.

(11) Consequently the bread has not been hallowed at all; obviously then it may not be eaten.

(12) V. supra n. 1.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) R. Akiba and R. Eliezer therefore both agree that the bread becomes invalid by being taken out.

(15) Consequently the bread remains invalid but is not affected by the Piggul intention expressed during the sprinkling.

(16) For in as much as the invalidity of the bread is due to an external cause (it having been taken out of the Sanctuary) and not to any defect inherent in it, the sprinkling can affect it, and as the wrongful intention expressed during the sprinkling renders the offering Piggul, it also renders the bread Piggul.

Menachoth 47b

For we have learnt:¹ If the sacrificial portions of the Less Holy offerings were taken out [of the Sanctuary] before the sprinkling of the blood of the offering, R. Eliezer says, They are not subject to the law of sacrilege,² and one is not liable on account of them for any transgression of the laws of Piggul, nothar,³ and uncleanness.⁴

R. Akiba says, They are subject to the law of sacrilege, and one is also liable on account of them for any transgression of the laws of Piggul, Nothar, and uncleanness.⁵ Now what is the position [in the aforementioned cases according to R. Akiba]? Shall we say that as the sprinkling performed with a Piggul — intention renders the bread⁷ Piggul like the flesh of the offering,⁸ so too, the sprinkling performed under another name will render the bread permissible;⁹ or do we say so only where the result tends to stringency¹⁰ but not where it tends to leniency?¹¹

R. Papa, however, demurred¹² saying, Why do you assume that they differ in the case where [the loaves] were still outside [the Sanctuary]? Perhaps in the case where they were still outside all agree that the sprinkling

can have no effect upon what is outside;¹³ but they differ only in the case where they were brought in again, R. Eliezer adopting Rabbi's view that the slaughtering hallows them, consequently they have become invalid by their having been taken outside, whereas R. Akiba adopts the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon that the slaughtering does not hallow them, consequently they have not become invalid by their having been taken outside! — How can this be? It is well if you say that R. Akiba adopts Rabbi's view that the slaughtering hallows [the loaves], for then the slaughtering hallows them, and having been hallowed by the slaughtering they are rendered Piggul by the sprinkling. But if you say that he adopts the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon that the slaughtering does not hallow them, then [it will be asked,] Can the sprinkling performed with a Piggul-intention hallow them?¹⁴ Has not R. Giddal said in the name of Rab, A sprinkling performed with a Piggul-intention does not bring within the law of Sacrilege nor does it take out of the law of Sacrilege; it does not bring within the law of Sacrilege—that refers to the sacrificial parts of Less Holy offerings;¹⁵ nor does it take out of the law of Sacrilege — that refers to the flesh of Most Holy offerings?¹⁶ — Was not R. Giddal's statement refuted?¹⁷

R. Jeremiah enquired of R. Zera: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under their own name and then the [Two] Loaves were lost, may the blood be sprinkled now under another name¹⁸ so that the flesh be permitted to be eaten?¹⁹ — He replied, Do you know of any offering which if offered under its own name is invalid but under another name is valid? But is there not? What of a Passover-offering offered before midday, which if offered under its own name is invalid²⁰ but under another name¹⁸ is valid? — [He replied,] This is what I mean: Do you know of any offering which was at one time fit to be offered under its own name but was rejected²¹ from being offered under its own name, and now if offered under its

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

own name it is invalid but under another name it is valid? But what of the Passover-offering after midday?²² —

This is what I mean: Do you know of any offering which at one time was fit to be offered under its own name, and indeed was slaughtered under its own name, but was rejected from being offered under its own name, and now if offered under its own name it is invalid but under another name it is valid? But what of the thank-offering?²³ — It is different with the thank-offering for the Divine Law referred to it as a peace-offering.²⁴

Our Rabbis taught: If the two lambs were slaughtered [accompanied] by four loaves,²⁵ two of them should be selected and waved²⁶

(1) Me'il. 6b, Zeb. 89b.

(2) Cf. Lev. V, 15. For the sprinkling, he maintains, has had no effect upon those portions that were taken out, so that they were not consecrated for the altar; consequently no guilt-offering is incurred by the one who derives enjoyment or use therefrom.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) Piggul does not apply to these sacrificial portions since they are already invalid, so that if a man were to eat of them he would not be liable to the penalty of kareth. So, too, if he were to eat of them whilst he was in an unclean state, or after they had been left over beyond the time prescribed for eating, he would not be liable.

(5) For the sprinkling has had an effect upon the sacrificial portions that were taken out of the Sanctuary.

(6) The case put by R. Samuel b. Isaac to R. Hiyya supra, as to the permissibility of the bread where the blood of the lambs was sprinkled under another name.

(7) According to R. Akiba, notwithstanding that the bread is already invalid by having been taken out.

(8) Hence the bread is deemed to be affected in the same way as the flesh of the offering. The text adopted is that of many MSS. and Tosaf., reading בפיגול כבשר, and omitting the word ביוצא.

(9) Since the flesh of the offering is permissible in such circumstances, for all offerings even though slaughtered under another name are permitted to be eaten; v. Zeb. 2a.

(10) As in the case of Piggul.

(11) Whereby the bread is rendered permitted.

(12) To the assumption that both R. Akiba and R. Eliezer accept Rabbi's view.

(13) Even R. Akiba would agree that the sprinkling can have no effect upon the bread that is still outside, for the bread cannot be regarded in the same category as the sacrificial portions of the offering, since these are part of the offering whereas the bread is something distinct and apart from it.

(14) And at the same time render them Piggul! This surely cannot be.

(15) These normally are subject to the law of Sacrilege only after the sprinkling of the blood, but where the sprinkling was not validly performed these sacrificial portions are never subject to the law of Sacrilege.

(16) This is subject to the law of Sacrilege only until the sprinkling of the blood, for after the sprinkling the flesh is permitted to be eaten by the priests, and the principle is well established that whatsoever is permissible to the priests is not subject to the law of Sacrilege (cf. Me'il. 2a). Where, however, the sprinkling was not validly performed the flesh, not being permissible to the priests, remains for all time subject to the law of Sacrilege.

(17) His statement was indeed refuted, v. Me'il. 3b. The position is now that R. Papa's objection stands good, and so it is not known for certain according to whose view did R. Samuel b. Isaac raise his question.

(18) I.e., as an ordinary peace-offering. To sprinkle the blood under their own name as lambs of Pentecost would not render their flesh permitted for the two loaves are absolutely indispensable to the validity of the offering.

(19) For in the absence of the loaves the lambs can be regarded as peace-offerings.

(20) For the proper time to offer the Passover lamb is after midday on the fourteenth of the month of Nisan; cf. Ex. XII, 6.

(21) By reason of the loss of the loaves.

(22) Which was available at the proper time and yet if held over till after the festival and offered under its own name as a Passover-offering is invalid, but if offered as a peace-offering is valid. The text adopted here is that of MS.M., which agrees with that in Rashi and in Sh. Mek.

(23) If one of the cakes of the thank-offering was broken after the slaughtering of the animal, the blood is sprinkled as though it were a peace-offering, and not a thank-offering, and the flesh may be eaten; v. supra p. 278. Here then the thank-offering was slaughtered under its own name, was rejected from being offered under its own name, and yet is valid if offered under another name; contra R. Zera.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(24) Cf. Lev. VII, 15. And as the peace-offering is offered without the accompaniment of loaves, the thank-offering also may be offered under its own name even without the loaves. In other words the offering of the thank-offering as a peace-offering is not regarded as offering it under another name.

(25) Instead of the prescribed two loaves.

(26) It is an essential rite to wave the loaves with the lambs both before and after the slaughtering of the lambs; v. infra 61a.

Menachoth 48a

and the other [two] may be eaten after redemption. The Rabbis who recited this in the presence of R. Hisda said, This surely does not agree with Rabbi's view,¹ for according to Rabbi who holds that the slaughtering hallows [the loaves], where can they be redeemed?² If they are [all taken] outside [the Sanctuary], and redeemed there, they³ become at once invalid for having been taken out, for it is written, Before the Lord;⁴ and if inside,⁵ one is thus bringing unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary! Thereupon R. Hisda said to them, It is indeed in agreement with Rabbi's view and [the loaves] are actually redeemed inside [the Sanctuary], for they became unconsecrated of themselves.⁶

Rabina said to R. Ashi, But it has been taught that when they are redeemed they must be redeemed outside [the Sanctuary] only! — He replied, That [Baraitha] is clearly in agreement with the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon,⁷ for according to Rabbi they would at once become invalid on being taken out.

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Shall we say that [in this Baraitha] we have a refutation of R. Johanan's view? For it was stated: If the thank-offering was slaughtered [accompanied] by eighty cakes,⁸ Hezekiah said, Forty out of the eighty are hallowed; but R. Johanan said, Not even forty out of the eighty are hallowed!⁹ — Was it not also reported thereon that R. Zera said, All agree that where [the slaughterer] declared, 'Let

forty out of the eighty be hallowed', they are hallowed? Then here, too, we will say that he declared, 'Let two out of the four be hallowed'.

R. Hanina of Tirta¹⁰ recited before R. Johanan: If four lambs were slaughtered [on the Pentecost accompanied] by two loaves, two of the lambs should [first] be drawn to one side and their blood sprinkled under another name,¹¹ for if you do not decide to act in this way¹² you forfeit the last [pair of lambs].¹³ Thereupon R. Johanan said to him, Should we bid a man, 'Arise and sin, so that you may thereby obtain a benefit'?¹⁴ Surely we have learnt:¹⁵ If the limbs of a sin-offering¹⁶ were mixed with the limbs of a burnt-offering,¹⁷ R. Eliezer says, Let them all be put above [upon the altar], for I regard the flesh of the sin-offering that is above as wood. But the Sages say, Their appearance must first be spoilt¹⁸ and they must all be taken away to the place of burning. But why?¹⁹ Should we not say, 'Arise and sin, so that you may thereby obtain a benefit'?²⁰ —

We would say, 'Arise and sin with the sin-offering so that you may thereby obtain some benefit in regard to the sin-offering itself',²¹ but we would not say, 'Arise and sin with the sin-offering so that you may thereby obtain a benefit in regard to the burnt-offering'. And do we say it of one subject?²² But it was taught:²³ If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under another name, or if they were slaughtered either before or after the proper time,²⁴ the blood is to be sprinkled²⁵ and the flesh may be eaten. If [the Festival] was on the Sabbath, the blood must not be sprinkled;²⁶ if, however, is valid and may be eaten', v. Zeb.¹³ a; and the second pair of lambs will Serve for the Pentecost-offering together with the two loaves. it was sprinkled, the sacrifice is acceptable, but the sacrificial portions must be burnt after dark. But why? Should we not say, 'Arise and sin, so that you may gain an advantage'?²⁷ —

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

We would say, ‘Arise and sin on the Sabbath so that you may gain an advantage on the Sabbath’,²⁸ but we would not say, ‘Arise and sin on the Sabbath so that you may gain an advantage on a weekday’. And do we not say it of two subjects?²⁹ But we have learnt:³⁰ If a barrel [of wine of terumah] was broken in the upper part of the winepress and in the lower part there was unclean [ordinary wine], R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that if a man can save a quarter [log] of it in cleanness he must save it;³¹ but if not, R. Eliezer says,

(1) But it agrees with the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon who holds that it is the sprinkling that hallows the loaves, accordingly none of the loaves have as yet been hallowed, and therefore any two may be taken for the offering and the other two redeemed like all holy things consecrated for their value only.

(2) Two of these loaves have already been hallowed by the slaughtering of the lambs and two have not, and the latter are therefore to be redeemed. The difficulty, however, is as to the place of the redemption, since the hallowed loaves are not distinguished and separated from the others.

(3) The hallowed loaves.

(4) Lev. XXIII, 20.

(5) I.e., the redemption is to take place inside the Sanctuary and all four loaves are to be eaten inside, since it is not known which are the hallowed and which the redeemed loaves.

(6) There is no transgression committed here, for the loaves only become unconsecrated when already in the Sanctuary.

(7) Who maintains that the slaughtering of the lambs does not hallow the loaves, consequently, at any time before the sprinkling of the blood, two loaves can be selected to be hallowed for the offering, and the remaining two must be redeemed outside the Sanctuary.

(8) Instead of the prescribed forty.

(9) The foregoing Baraitha which states that two out of the four loaves are hallowed thus conflicts with R. Johanan's view.

(10) Obermeyer, *Die Landschaft Babylonian*, p. 185, identifies it with Tirastan in the region of Mahuza.

(11) These lambs may be eaten in accordance with the principle, ‘Every offering offered under another name

(12) But sprinkle the blood of the first pair of lambs for the Pentecost-offering.

(13) The second pair of lambs would now be invalid and would be forbidden to be eaten, for since they were at one time fit to be offered under their own name, and indeed were slaughtered as such, but are now rejected, they cannot be valid if offered under another name. V. supra p. 288.

(14) I.e., in order to save two lambs, that they may be eaten, a sin is deliberately committed by offering a sacrifice under some other name.

(15) Zeb. 77a.

(16) That are consumed by the priests.

(17) That are burnt upon the altar.

(18) I.e., all the limbs must be kept overnight.

(19) Why should everything be burnt?

(20) One should commit the sin of burning the limbs of a sin-offering upon the altar for the sake of the limbs of the burnt-offering, so that the latter be rendered acceptable.

(21) And likewise with the lambs of Pentecost: a sin is committed by sprinkling the blood of the lambs under another name and the advantage is thereby gained that these lambs may be eaten.

(22) I.e., where both the sin committed and advantage gained relate to the same thing.

(23) Bez 20b; Naz. 28b.

(24) Sc. the Festival.

(25) Under another name.

(26) For since the offering is no longer on behalf of the community the services in connection therewith do not supersede the Sabbath laws.

(27) Let the sin of sprinkling the blood on the Sabbath be committed so as to gain the advantage of burning the sacrificial portions upon the altar after the Sabbath and then the flesh would be permitted to be eaten.

(28) I.e., the advantage gained must be enjoyed on the same day as the commission of the sin, as is the case with the lambs of Pentecost, v. supra, p. 290, n. 10.

(29) I.e., to sin in one thing so as to gain an advantage in another.

(30) Ter. VIII, 9; Pes. 15a.

(31) He must endeavor to obtain clean vessels so long as he can save a quarter log of the terumah wine, although in the meantime the terumah wine is flowing down and mixing with the unclean non-terumah wine, thereby rendering the entire mixture absolutely unfit.

Menachoth 48b

Let it run down and become unclean, but he must not render it unclean with his own hands;¹ and R. Joshua says, He may even render it unclean with his own hands!² — In

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

that case it is different, since in any event it will become unclean.³

When R. Isaac came [from Palestine] he recited: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered not according to the prescribed rite,⁴ they are invalid; their appearance must be spoilt⁵ and they must be taken away to the place of burning. R. Nahman said to him, You, Master, who compare [the lambs of Pentecost] with the sin-offerings⁶ recite that they are invalid, but a Tanna of the School of Levi who infers obligatory peace-offerings from freewill peace-offerings⁷ recites that they are valid. For Levi taught:⁸ And so with the peace-offerings of a Nazirite, if they were slaughtered not according to the prescribed rite, they are valid but they do not count in fulfillment of their owner's obligation; they may be eaten the same day and evening [until midnight], and they do not require any cakes nor the offering of the shoulder [to the priest].⁹

An objection was raised: If for the guilt-offering that requires a lamb of the first year¹⁰ a sheep of the second year was offered, or for that which requires a sheep of the second year¹¹ a lamb of the first year was offered, it is invalid; its appearance must be spoilt and it must be taken away to the place of burning. But if the burnt-offering of the Nazirite, or of a woman after childbirth, or of a leper, was a sheep of the second year and it was slaughtered, it is valid.¹² This is the general principle: Whatsoever is valid for a freewill burnt-offering is also valid for an obligatory burnt-offering, and whatsoever is invalid for a sin-offering is also invalid for a guilt-offering except [when the offering was slaughtered] under another name!¹³ — The author of this Baraitha is the Tanna of the School of Levi.

Come and hear from the following which Levi taught: If the guilt-offering of the Nazirite¹⁴ and the guilt-offering of the leper were slaughtered under another name, they are valid, but they do not count in fulfillment

of the owner's obligation. If they were slaughtered before the time had arrived for the owner to offer them,¹⁵ or if they were of the second year, they are invalid. Now if this were so,¹⁶ he should then draw an inference from the peace-offering!¹⁷ — He infers peace-offering from peace-offering but he does not infer guilt-offering from peace-offering. But then if he infers peace-offering from peace-offering he should also infer guilt-offering from guilt-offering, viz., the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper from the guilt-offering for robbery and for sacrilege, and then the guilt-offering for robbery and for sacrilege from the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper!¹⁸ —

R. Shimi b. Ashi answered, We infer what is offered not according to the prescribed rite from what is similarly offered not according to the prescribed rite,¹⁹ but we do not infer what is offered not according to the prescribed rite from what is offered according to the prescribed rite.²⁰ Do we not? Surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that if what had been taken out [of its proper place] was later brought up upon the altar it must not come down again? From the fact that with regard to the high places what was taken out was still valid to be offered!²¹ —

(1) By collecting the whole of the terumah wine in an unclean vessel; he must not deliberately render it unclean, in order to save the unclean non-terumah wine.

(2) Hence, according to R. Joshua, we bid a man to sin in respect of the terumah wine in order to benefit from the non-terumah wine.

(3) Lit., 'it goes to uncleanness'. It is therefore not regarded as a sin to render unclean this terumah.

(4) I.e., under another name, as some other sacrifice. Aliter: instead of lambs of the first year those of the second year were offered.

(5) They should be allowed to remain overnight whereby they become invalid and then burnt, for it is not proper to destroy any sacrificial portions that are still valid.

(6) V. Lev. XXIII, 19; as the sin-offering is invalid if offered under another name (or, if the animal offered was over a year old), so it is with these lambs.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(7) As ordinary peace-offerings are valid even though offered under another name (or, if the animal offered was over the prescribed age), so it is with these obligatory peace-offerings of Pentecost.

(8) Nazir 24b; Tosef. Nazir IV.

(9) As would be the case were the offering accepted in fulfillment of the Nazirite's obligation (cf. Num. VI, 19). Now, although the peace-offering of the Nazirite is mentioned alongside with his sin-offering in verse 14 *ibid.*, and one could conclude therefrom that the former, if offered not according to its prescribed rite, is invalid, Levi prefers to draw the inference between the identical kinds of offerings, namely from the freewill peace-offering to the obligatory peace-offering. Accordingly any obligatory peace-offerings, e.g., the Nazirite's peace-offering or the lambs of Pentecost, are valid even though offered not according to the prescribed rite, as is the case with freewill peace-offerings.

(10) That is, the guilt-offering brought by a Nazirite when rendered unclean, or the guilt-offering of a leper at his purification, in connection with which Holy Writ uses the expression כִּבֶּשֶׁת 'a lamb', i.e., of the first year; v. Parah I, 3.

(11) That is, the guilt-offering for robbery, or the guilt-offering for sacrilege, in connection with which the term אֵילִם a ram' is used, i.e., a sheep of the second year; v. Parah *ibid.*

(12) These obligatory burnt-offerings, although prescribed to be lambs of the first year, are nevertheless valid, for in the case of a freewill burnt-offering, if an older animal was offered in place of a younger one, the offering is valid. V. *infra* 107b.

(13) In which case if the offering was a sin-offering it would be invalid, but if a guilt-offering it would be valid. It will thus be seen that obligatory burnt-offerings are placed on the same footing as freewill burnt-offerings and are not compared with sin-offerings (although these are mentioned in the same verse as the obligatory burnt-offerings, cf. Lev. XIV, 19; Num. VI, 14); likewise obligatory peace-offerings are to be compared with freewill peace-offerings but not with sin-offerings; contra R. Isaac.

(14) Brought by the Nazirite who had been rendered unclean unwittingly during the continuance of his Nazirite vow. Cf. Num. VI, 12.

(15) In the case of the leper, before the period of seven days had elapsed from the beginning of his cleansing rites v. Lev. XIV, 8; and in the case of the Nazirite, before he had rendered himself clean, v. Num. VI, 12.

(16) That the Tanna of the school of Levi draws an inference from the freewill-offering to the obligatory offering.

(17) Thus, as the freewill peace-offering is valid even though a sheep of the second year was offered in place of the lamb of the first year that was vowed, so it should be with the obligatory guilt-offering.

(18) With the result that all guilt-offerings are valid whether the lamb offered was of the first year or of the second year.

(19) Thus the lambs of Pentecost, when offered not according to their prescribed rite but e.g., under another name, are valid by inference drawn from the case of freewill peace-offerings, which are valid even though not offered according to their prescribed rite.

(20) I.e., that the guilt-offering of the Nazirite or of the leper should be valid when offered not according to its prescribed rite (e.g., if a sheep of the second year was offered), by inference from the guilt-offering for robbery or for sacrilege which according to the prescribed law must be a sheep of the second year.

(21) For the law of hallowed things being taken out does not apply to the high places (i.e., private altars) as there were no restrictions of place in regard to the sacrifices offered at the high places. V. *supra* p. 34, nn. 3 and 4. Now here is an instance of an act though not in accordance with the prescribed rite (sc. the offering upon the altar of what was taken outside the Sanctuary) being regarded as valid by inference from the high places where such an act is permitted.

Menachoth 49a

That Tanna in fact relies upon the verse, This is the law of the burnt-offering,¹ which includes [all things that were brought up].

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah recited before Rab: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered as rams,² they are valid, but they do not count to the owners³ in fulfillment of their obligation; whereupon Rab said to him, They certainly count as such. Said R. Hisda, Rab's view is reasonable in the case where [the slaughterer] believing them to be rams slaughtered them as lambs, for then lambs were in fact slaughtered as lambs; but not where he believed them to be rams and slaughtered them as rams, for even a mistaken variation⁴ is considered a variation.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Rabbah, however, says: A mistaken variation is no variation.⁵

Rabbah⁶ said, I raised an objection against my own statement from the following: Priests who rendered the flesh in the Sanctuary Piggul, if they did so deliberately, are liable to pay compensation.⁷ It follows that if they did so unwittingly they are exempt. And in connection therewith it was taught: What they rendered Piggul [although unwittingly] is nevertheless Piggul. Now what were the circumstances [where the priest acted unwittingly]? If the priest knew that [the offering] was a sin-offering and treated it as a peace-offering,⁸ then surely he was not acting unwittingly but deliberately! We must say, therefore, that he believed that it⁹ was a peace-offering and treated it as though it were a peace-offering; and yet it has been taught: ‘What they rendered Piggul [though unwittingly] is nevertheless Piggul’, thus proving that a mistaken variation is considered a variation! —

Abaye answered, I can still say that the priest knew that it was a sin-offering and treated it as a peace-offering, [and yet he was acting unwittingly] for he believed that it was permitted [to change the character of the sacrifice].

R. Zera raised an objection from the following:¹⁰ R. Simeon says, All meal-offerings from which the handful was taken under some other name are valid, and also discharge the owner's obligation, since meal-offerings are unlike animal-offerings; for when the priest takes the handful from a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and refers to it as one prepared in a pan, [his intention is of no consequence], for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that it is a meal-offering prepared on a griddle. Or if he is dealing with a dry¹¹ meal-offering and refers to it as one mixed with oil, [his intention is of no consequence], for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that it is a dry meal-offering. But it is not so with

animal-offerings: the same slaughtering is for all offerings, the same manner of receiving the blood for all, and the same manner of sprinkling for all. Now what are the circumstances? If the priest knows that it is in fact a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and yet when taking the handful refers to it as one prepared in a pan, then what does it matter that the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering? He has deliberately varied the offering, has he not? We must say, therefore, that he believes it¹² to be a meal-offering prepared in a pan and when taking the handful refers to it as such, but he is mistaken; now in this case only [is his intention of no consequence], since the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering, but in all other cases we say that a mistaken variation is considered a variation? —

Abaye answered him, I can still say that the priest knows that it is in fact a meal-offering prepared on a griddle yet when taking the handful refers to it as one prepared in a pan, and as for the question, ‘What does it matter that the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering?’ [I answer that] Rabbah is consistent with his view, for Rabbah has said, only a wrongful intention which is not manifestly [absurd] does the Divine Law declare capable of rendering an offering invalid, but a wrongful intention which is manifestly [absurd] the Divine Law declares incapable of rendering invalid.¹³

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] DAILY OFFERINGS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS,¹⁴ NEITHER DOES [THE ABSENCE OF] THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS INVALIDATE THE DAILY OFFERINGS; MOREOVER OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE OTHER. EVEN THOUGH THEY¹⁵ DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB¹⁶ IN THE MORNING THEY MUST OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING.¹⁷

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. SIMEON SAID, WHEN IS THIS? ONLY WHEN THEY HAD ACTED UNDER CONSTRAINT OR IN ERROR, BUT IF THEY ACTED DELIBERATELY AND DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING THEY MAY NOT OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING. IF THEY DID NOT BURN THE INCENSE IN THE MORNING¹⁸ THEY BURN IT TOWARDS EVENING. R. SIMEON SAID, THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING,¹⁹ FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES,²⁰ THE ALTAR FOR THE BURNT-OFFERING ONLY BY THE DAILY OFFERING OF THE MORNING, THE TABLE ONLY BY THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH, AND THE CANDLESTICK ONLY BY [THE KINDLING OF] SEVEN LAMPS TOWARDS EVENING.

GEMARA. R. Hiyya b. Abin enquired of R. Hisda, If the community had not [means enough] for the Daily Offerings as well as for the Additional Offerings, which take precedence? But what are the circumstances? If you say that the reference is to the Daily Offerings required for to-day and the Additional Offerings also for to-day, then surely it is obvious that the Daily Offerings take precedence, for they are more frequent²¹ and holy!²² We must therefore say, the reference is to the Daily Offerings required for the morrow and the Additional Offerings for to-day. Shall we say that the Daily Offerings take precedence for they are more frequent, or the Additional Offerings, since they are holy?²³ —

He replied, But you have learnt it: THE [ABSENCE OF THE] DAILY OFFERINGS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS NEITHER DOES [THE ABSENCE OF] THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS INVALIDATE THE DAILY OFFERINGS; MOREOVER OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE DOES NOT

INVALIDATE THE OTHER. Now what are the circumstances? if you say that [both kinds of offerings] are available and it is only a question of precedence,²⁴ surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that no offering should be sacrificed prior to the Daily Offering of the morning? Because it is written, And he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it,²⁵ and Raba stated, 'The burnt-offering' implies the first burnt-offering.²⁶

(1) Lev. VI, 2. By interpreting עולה (rendered 'burnt-offering') as whatsoever is brought up' from עלה 'to go up', the rule is established that whatsoever is brought upon the altar, although unfit, must not come down again. Accordingly the rule is not derived by inference from the case of the high places.

(2) The slaughterer believed and expressly declared that he was slaughtering rams (i.e., sheep of the second year).

(3) Sc. the community

(4) For the slaughterer did not know that they were in fact lambs of the first year.

(5) And the owners' obligation is 'thereby fulfilled.

(6) So MS.M. and also B.H. In cur. edd. 'Raba'.

(7) To the owners who, owing to the priests' wrongful intention, must now provide a fresh sacrifice. V. Git. 54b.

(8) By expressly declaring his intention of eating of the flesh of the offering for the next two days, which intention in a sin-offering renders Piggul, for a sin-offering may be eaten the same day and night but no more.

(9) Sc. the sin-offering.

(10) V. supra 2b.

(11) I.e., one that is not mixed with oil, e.g., a sinner's meal-offering; cf. Lev. V, 11.

(12) Sc. the meal-offering prepared on a griddle.

(13) Where the priest's actions belie his expressed intention, obviously his words cannot be taken seriously, and they therefore cannot render the offering invalid.

(14) Offered on Sabbaths and on Festivals; cf. Num. XXVIII.

(15) Sc. the priests.

(16) Of the Daily Offering.

(17) I.e., the lamb for the evening Daily Offering is nevertheless to be offered.

(18) Cf. Ex. XXX, 7, 8; one half-maneh of incense was offered every morning and the other half-maneh every evening.

(19) I.e., the whole maneh.

(20) Consisting of one whole maneh offered towards evening; v. Gemara infra.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(21) For the one was offered daily whereas the other only on Sabbaths and Festivals.

(22) I.e., more holy. For on Sabbaths and Festivals the Daily Offering is offered prior to the Additional Offering. Aliter: 'holy' in that they are offered on a holy day.

(23) For these are to be offered on a holy day whereas the Daily Offerings are for the morrow, a weekday. Or, according to the first interpretation given on p. 297, n. 8: the Additional Offerings in this case are sacrificed prior to the Daily Offerings, since the former are offered to-day and the latter on the morrow.

(24) And by stating that one does not invalidate the other the Mishnah teaches us that any one may be offered first.

(25) Lev. VI, 5.

(26) The definite article, העולה emphasizes the importance of this burnt-offering.

Menachoth 49b

Obviously then there are not sufficient means [for the two kinds of offerings]; now if both are required for to-day how [can it be said that either the one or the other may be offered]? Surely what is more frequent and holy takes precedence!¹ We must say, therefore, [that one is required] for the morrow, and yet it states, that [the absence of] one does invalidate the other, thus proving that they are on a par. Thereupon Abaye said to him, I can still say that [both kinds of offerings] are available and it is only a question of precedence and as for your objection that nothing should be offered prior to [the Daily Offering, I say that] that is only a recommendation.²

Come and hear: We have learnt:³ There must never be less than six inspected⁴ lambs in the chamber of lambs, sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year.⁵ Now what are the circumstances? Shall I say that [lambs] are available, then surely many more are required for the Daily Offerings and the Additional Offerings!⁶ Obviously there are not sufficient lambs; we thus see that the Daily Offerings take precedence!⁷ — This is not so, for actually lambs are available [for all the offerings], but this is

what [that Mishnah] says: There must never be less than six lambs, inspected four days before the slaughtering,⁸ in the chamber of lambs. And the author [of that Mishnah] is Ben Bag Bag.

For Ben Bag Bag says, Whence do we know that the lamb for the Daily Offering must be inspected four days before the slaughtering? Because it is written here, Ye shall observe to offer unto Me in its due season⁹, and there it is written, And ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month;¹⁰ as in the latter case the lamb was inspected four days before the slaughtering,¹¹ so in the former case the lamb must be inspected four days before the slaughtering.

Rabina said to R. Ashi, Why six? Surely seven are necessary, for one must reckon also the lamb for the morning [Daily Offering] on Tuesday!¹² And according to your argument, [retorted the other], are not eight necessary? For one must also reckon the lamb for the evening Daily Offering on Friday!¹³ — This is no difficulty, for [the Tanna] assumed that [the Friday evening Daily Offering] had been offered.

(1) And that is the Daily Offering.

(2) But in fact offerings may be sacrificed before the morning Daily Offering.

(3) 'Ar. 13a.

(4) I.e., examined and found free from all physical blemishes.

(5) When the three fall on consecutive days six lambs would be required for the Daily Offerings; v. 'Ar. 13a.

(6) Actually twenty two lambs would be required for these three days, six for the Daily Offerings and sixteen for the Additional Offerings.

(7) Since all the six lambs are reserved for the Daily Offerings in preference to the Additional Offerings.

(8) This requirement was essential for the Daily Offerings only.

(9) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(10) Ex. XII, 6. In both these verses a form of the root שמר 'to keep' 'observe' is used.

(11) For the lamb was taken on the tenth of the month of Nisan and slaughtered on the fourteenth of the same month. Cf. *ibid.* 3,6.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(12) When the New Year falls on Sunday and Monday, the six inspected lambs would, it is true, serve for the Daily Offerings of the three days, namely the Sabbath, Sunday and Monday, but surely another lamb must be had in readiness for the morning Daily Offering on Tuesday, since there is no opportunity to obtain one during the preceding three days. There is another reading: ‘for the morning Daily Offering on Sunday’. The interpretation is similar but the assumption is that the New Year preceded the Sabbath and fell on Thursday and Friday.

(13) It being assumed that the evening offering on Friday had not yet been offered, consequently the number of lambs stated by the Tanna would have to include this lamb too.

Menachoth 50a

At all events seven are necessary! — We must say that the Tanna [of that Mishnah] speaks in general,¹ and the expression ‘sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year’ serves merely as a mnemonic. This can indeed be proved [from the wording]; for it reads, ‘Sufficient for a Sabbath’, and not ‘For the Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year’. This is conclusive.

EVEN THOUGH THEY DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING... R. SIMEON SAID THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING, FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES. Who speaks of dedication here? — A clause has been omitted and it really should read as follows: **EVEN THOUGH THEY DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING,** they must not offer the lamb towards evening. This is the rule only if the altar had not been dedicated,² but if the altar had once been dedicated, **THEY MUST OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING.**³ **R. SIMEON SAID, WHEN IS THIS? ONLY WHEN THEY HAD ACTED UNDER CONSTRAINT OR IN ERROR, BUT IF THEY ACTED DELIBERATELY AND DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING THEY MAY NOT OFFER**

[THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING. IF THEY DID NOT BURN THE INCENSE IN THE MORNING THEY BURN IT TOWARDS EVENING.

Whence is this derived? From the following which our Rabbis taught: It is written, **And the second lamb thou shalt offer towards evening;**⁴ the second is to be offered towards evening but the first may not be offered towards evening. This is so only if the altar had not been dedicated, but if the altar had once been dedicated, even the first lamb may be offered towards evening. **R. Simeon said, When is this? Only when they had acted under constraint or in error, but if they acted deliberately and did not offer the lamb in the morning they must not offer the lamb towards evening; if they did not burn the incense in the morning they burn it towards evening. [‘If they did not offer the lamb in the morning, they must not offer the lamb towards evening’].**⁵ Is the altar to be idle because the priests have been remiss? —

Raba explained, It means, **They**⁶ must not offer it, but other priests should offer it. ‘If they did not burn the incense in the morning, they burn it towards evening’. For since it is not so frequent,⁷ and moreover it enriches,⁸ it is therefore most dear to them and they would not be remiss about it.⁹

R. SIMEON SAID, THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING, FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES OFFERED TOWARDS EVENING, etc. But it has been taught: **Only by the incense of spices offered in the morning!** — Tannaim differ on this point. Abaye said, It is more logical to accept the view of him who says, ‘Only by the incense of spices offered towards evening’, for it is written, **Every morning when he dresseth the lamps he shall burn it,**¹⁰ and how can he dress [the lamps] in the morning if they were not kindled the previous evening?¹¹ But he who says, ‘Only

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

by the incense of spices offered in the morning', infers it from the altar for burnt-offering: as that was dedicated by the morning Daily Offering so the golden altar was dedicated by the incense of spices offered in the morning.

THE TABLE ONLY BY THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH. Does this mean to say that [the table] was not dedicated thereby,¹² but that it nevertheless hallowed it?¹³ — It really teaches us that the dedication of the table and the hallowing [of the bread] was only on the Sabbath, as it reads in the last clause: **AND THE CANDLESTICK ONLY BY [THE KINDLING OF] ITS SEVEN LAMPS TOWARDS EVENING.**¹⁴

Our Rabbis taught: That was [the only case of] an offering of incense which was offered by an individual upon the outer altar, and it was a special ruling.¹⁵ To what [does it refer]? — R. Papa said, [To incense-offering] by the princes [of the tribes].¹⁶ Does this mean then that an individual may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar but he may upon the inner altar? And furthermore, that an individual may not offer incense upon the outer altar but the community may? Behold it was taught: One might think that an individual may make a freewill-offering [of incense] in the same manner¹⁷ and offer it, for I would apply the verse, That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do,¹⁸ Holy Writ therefore says, Ye shall not offer strange incense thereon.¹⁹ One might further think that an individual may not offer it since he does not offer the like as an obligation,

(1) I.e., at all times of the year there must be six lambs in readiness, each inspected four days previously, so that whatever the circumstances there would always be sufficient lambs to last for three days. The expression used by the Tanna 'sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year' is merely a mnemonic suggesting the number six. To ensure that every day there would be at least six lambs inspected four days

previously it was necessary at the dedication of the Temple, when sacrifices commenced, to have twelve lambs each inspected free from blemish four days previously. On the following day two lambs were taken from the twelve for the Daily Offering and two other lambs, inspected on this day, were added; and so regularly on subsequent days. After four days the lambs added on the first day belonged to the category of lambs inspected four days previously, and on the fifth day two more were added to this class and so on. So Rashi; but v. com. of R. Gershom and also Rashi's interpretation in 'Ar. 13a and b.

(2) The altar had only recently been erected and sacrifices had not yet been offered thereon.

(3) Even though the morning offering had been omitted.

(4) Ex. XXIX, 39.

(5) V. Glosses of Bah, n. 1.

(6) Sc. those priests who had been negligent and had omitted to offer the morning offering.

(7) Incense was offered only twice daily whereas burnt-offerings were frequent all the day.

(8) Sc. the priest that offered the incense; v. Yoma 26a.

(9) And therefore even though it did happen that the priest had omitted to offer the morning incense, he may nevertheless offer the incense in the evening.

(10) Ibid. XXX, 7.

(11) Obviously then the candlestick was dedicated and inaugurated for use in the evening, and so it was too with the inauguration of the incense offering, for it is written (ibid. 8): And when Aaron lighteth the lamps towards evening he shall burn it.

(12) If the Showbread was placed on the table on a weekday.

(13) But this is not correct for we have learnt (infra 100a) that the placing of the Showbread on the table on a weekday

does in no wise hallow the bread.

(14) And as the entire service of the Candlestick, i.e., the kindling of its lamps, was to be at its dedication in the evening, so the entire service in connection with the table, i.e., the hallowing of the bread, must be at its dedication on the Sabbath.

(15) Lit., 'a decision for the hour'.

(16) Cf. Num. VII, 12ff.

(17) As the princes of the tribes did at the dedication of the altar.

(18) Deut. XXIII, 24.

(19) Ex. XXX, 9.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Menachoth 50b

but the community may offer [incense as a freewill-offering] since it offers the like as an obligation,¹ Holy Writ therefore says, Ye shall not offer.² One might further think that [the community] may not offer it upon the inner altar but it may [offer it] upon the outer altar, Holy Writ therefore states, And the anointing oil and the incense of sweet spices for the holy place; according to all that I have commanded thee shall they do;³ thus there is only offered that which is stated in the context! —

R. Papa said, It is a case of ‘it goes without saying’; thus, it goes without saying that a community may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar, for we find no such case; similarly that an individual may not offer [incense] upon the inner altar, for we find no such case. But even an individual may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar, although we find that this was the case with the princes, for that was a special ruling.

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST'S GRIDDLE-CAKES⁴ MUST NOT BE BROUGHT IN [TWO SEPARATE] HALVES, BUT HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH AND THEN DIVIDE IT, OFFERING A HALF IN THE MORNING AND A HALF TOWARDS EVENING. IF THE [HIGH] PRIEST THAT OFFERED THE HALF IN THE MORNING DIED AND THEY APPOINTED ANOTHER PRIEST IN HIS STEAD, [THE SUCCESSOR] MAY NOT BRING A HALF-TENTH FROM HIS HOUSE, NEITHER [MAY HE USE] THE REMAINING HALF-TENTH OF THE FIRST [HIGH PRIEST], BUT HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH AND DIVIDE IT, OFFERING ONE HALF AND LEAVING THE OTHER HALF TO PERISH. THUS THE RESULT IS THAT TWO HALVES ARE OFFERED AND TWO HALVES ARE LEFT TO PERISH.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Had Scripture stated, ‘For a meal-offering a half’,

I should then have thought that he must bring a half-tenth from his house in the morning and offer it and a half-tenth from his house in the evening and offer it; but Scripture states, Half of it in the morning,⁵ that is, he must offer a half of the whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring a whole tenth and divide it, offering a half in the morning and a half towards evening. Where the half that was to be offered towards evening became unclean or was lost, I might say that he should bring a half-tenth from his house and offer it, Scriptures therefore states, And half thereof in the evening,⁶ that is, he must offer a half of a whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring [another] whole tenth and divide it, offering one half and leaving the other half to perish; and so the result is that two halves are offered and two halves are left to perish. Where the High Priest that offered the half in the morning died and they appointed another High Priest in his place, I might say that he may bring a half-tenth from his house or that he may use the remaining half-tenth of the first [High Priest]. Scripture therefore states, ‘And half thereof in the evening’; he must offer a half of a whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring [another] whole tenth and divide it, offering one half and leaving the other half to perish; and so the result is that two halves are offered and two halves are left to perish.

A Tanna⁷ recited before R. Nahman: As for the half left by the first [High Priest] and the half left by the second, their appearance must first be spoiled⁸ and they are then taken away to the place of burning. Whereupon R. Nahman said to him, I grant you that the first⁹ should be treated so, since it was once valid for offering;¹⁰ but as for the second, why must its appearance first be spoiled? From the very outset it was intended for destruction, was it not?¹¹ He who told you this rule must be a Tanna of the School of Rabbah b. Abbuha who has said that even piggul¹² must have its appearance spoiled [before it is destroyed].

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

R. Ashi said, This rule may be even in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, for each half was valid for offering inasmuch as at the time when it was divided either the one half or the other half could have been offered.

It was stated: How did they prepare the High Priest's griddlecakes? — R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, They were first to be baked [in an oven] and then fried;¹³ R. Assi said in the name of R. Hanina, They were first to be fried and then baked. R. Hiyya b. Abba said, My view is more probable, for 'tufine'¹⁴ signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive'.¹⁵ But R. Assi said, My view is more probable, for 'tufine' signifies 'to be baked when already half-done'.¹⁶ Indeed Tannaim differ with regard to it, for it was taught: 'Tufine' signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive'. Rabbi says, It signifies 'to be baked when already half-done'. R. Dosa¹⁷ says, It signifies 'to be baked several times'.¹⁸ He accepts the interpretation 'half-done' as well as the interpretation 'attractive'.

We learnt elsewhere:¹⁹ The kneading, the shaping and the baking of the High Priest's griddle-cakes were performed within [the Temple Court],²⁰ and they overrode the Sabbath. Whence is this derived?²¹ — R. Huna said, Since tufine signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive', if they were baked on the day before [the Sabbath] they would lose their freshness. R. Joseph demurred, Surely they could be preserved in herbs!²² In the School of R. Ishmael it was taught: It shall be prepared,²³ even on the Sabbath; 'it shall be prepared', even in uncleanness.

Abaye said, The verse says, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily,²⁴

(1) Sc. the daily incense-offering on behalf of the community.

(2) Ex. XXX, 9. The plural of the verb is used so as to refer to the whole community too.

(3) Ibid. XXXI, II.

(4) I.e., the *חבית* *כהן גדול* or *מנחת חביתין*, a meal-offering prepared on a griddle offered by the High Priest daily, consisting of a tenth of an ephah of fine flour, half of which was offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. Cf. Lev. VI, 12ff.

(5) Lev. VI, 13. 'Of it' signifies that there is before us a whole tenth but that only a half of it is to be offered.

(6) Ibid. The inference is derived from the *waw*, 'and' at the beginning of this phrase, which is regarded as superfluous.

(7) V. Glos. (s. v. b).

(8) I.e., they should be kept overnight.

(9) I.e., the half left over by the first High Priest.

(10) It therefore may not be burnt until it becomes invalid by being left overnight when 'its appearance becomes spoiled'.

(11) It should accordingly be destroyed at once.

(12) Which is invalid by the law of the Torah. For *Piggul v. Glos.*

(13) On a griddle after being smeared with oil.

(14) Lev. VI, 14. *תפיני* is explained as a composite word.

(15) *תאפינה נאה* they must look fine at the time of baking, hence they must not be fried first for then they would be blackened somewhat by reason of the open griddle and the oil, and would not be so attractive.

(16) *תאפינה נא*: they must be half-done, i.e., fried in a griddle, before being baked.

(17) So in all MSS. and in the parallel passages and in R. Gershom; in cur. edd. 'R. Jose'.

(18) *תאפינה רבה נאה*. They must be baked once before the frying so that they should look attractive (*נאה*) at the time of baking, and also after the frying so that they should be half-done (*נא*) at the second baking. Var. lec. *רבה*. V. Rashi for other interpretations.

(19) *Infra* 96a.

(20) For the half-tenth measure, whereby the tenth of flour was divided, was anointed as a vessel of ministry, so that whatsoever was put into it was immediately hallowed and liable to be rendered invalid if taken out of the Temple Court.

(21) That the kneading, etc. overrode the Sabbath.

(22) So as to retain their freshness.

(23) Lev. VI, 14.

(24) Ibid. 13.

Menachoth 51a

they are thus like the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.¹ Raba said, The expression 'on a griddle' implies that they require the use of a vessel of ministry,

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

and [that being so] if they were baked on the day before [the Sabbath] they would be invalid by being kept overnight.² There has been taught a Baraitha which coincides with Raba's view. The expression 'on a griddle' implies that it requires the use of a vessel of ministry. 'With oil' signifies that it must have much oil; yet I know not how much, argue therefore as follows: here it is written oil, and there in connection with the meal-offering accompanying the lambs⁴ [of the Daily Offering] it is also written oil,⁵ as there it has three logs [of oil] to the tenth so here it must have three logs to the tenth. Or perhaps I should argue thus: here it is written oil and there in connection with the freewill meal-offering it is also written oil,⁶ as there it has only one log so here it should have only one log!

Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer a meal-offering which is characterized by T.B.Sh.T.⁷ — it is offered daily, is an obligation, and overrides the Sabbath and uncleanness — from another meal-offering which is also characterized by T.B.Sh.T, but we may not infer a meal-offering which is T.B.Sh.T. from another which is not T.B.Sh.T. Or perhaps I should argue thus: we may infer a meal-offering which is characterized by Y.G.L.⁸ — it is an individual offering, brought on its own account, and requires frankincense — from another which is also characterized by Y.G.L., but we may not infer a meal-offering which is Y.G.L. from another which is not Y.G.L.!

R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka [therefore] said, It is written, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily;⁹ it is to be similar to the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering; as that meal-offering has three logs of oil to the tenth, this too must have three logs to the tenth.

R. Simeon says, Here much oil is required and there also in connection with the meal-

offering accompanying the lambs [of the Daily Offering] much oil is required; as there it has three logs to the tenth so here too it must have three logs to the tenth. Or perhaps I should argue thus: here much oil is required, and there also in connection with the meal-offering accompanying the offering of bullocks and rams much oil is required,¹⁰ as there it has two logs [of oil] to the tenth so here too it must have two logs to the tenth! Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer a meal-offering consisting of one tenth from another meal-offering also consisting of one tenth,¹¹ but we may not infer a meal-offering consisting of one tenth from a meal-offering consisting of two or three tenths. Is not the above passage self-contradictory? It states at first, "'With oil'" signifies that it must have much oil', and then it states, 'Here it is written, "'oil"', and there in connection with the freewill meal-offering it is also written, "'oil'"!¹² —

Abaye answered,¹³ The Tanna of the clause, "'With oil'" signifies that it must have much oil', is R. Simeon, whilst he that argues otherwise by inference [from the freewill meal-offering] is R. Ishmael.

R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said, The whole [of the anonymous part of the Baraitha] is by R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, and he argues thus: 'With oil' signifies that it must have much oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil no verse would be necessary, since the expression 'on a griddle' indicates that it shall be like any meal-offering prepared on a griddle. But perhaps it is not so, but that ['with oil'] signifies merely that it requires oil, for had not Holy Writ stated 'with oil' I might have said that it shall be like the sinner's meal-offering!¹⁴ And then he said, Be it even so, that it signifies merely that it requires oil, but surely it can be argued by an inference¹⁵ [that three logs are required]. He then argued by the inference¹⁵ but could not prove his case;¹⁶

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

whereupon he had to resort to the verse, 'Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily', as is expressly stated by R. Ishmael in his concluding remarks.

Rabbah said, The whole [of the anonymous part of the Baraitha] is by R. Simeon and he argues thus: 'With oil' signifies that it must have much oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil no verse would be necessary since the expression 'on a griddle' indicates that it shall be like any meal-offering prepared on a griddle. But even without the expression 'with oil' I can arrive at the same conclusion by means of an inference. He thereupon argued by the inference but could not prove his case, so that he had to resort to the expression 'with oil'. He then said, Let it be similar to the meal-offering accompanying the offering of bullocks or of rams;¹⁷ but he rebutted this by saying, We may infer

- (1) Which certainly overrides the Sabbath.
- (2) For whatsoever has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry becomes invalid if kept overnight.
- (3) Sc. the High Priest's meal-offering.
- (4) So MS.M. and Rashi; in cur. edd. 'the drink-offering', which was also part of the Daily Offering.
- (5) Ex. XXIX, 40. The quantity of oil prescribed is a 'fourth part of a hin', i.e., three logs.
- (6) Lev. II, 1. The quantity of oil is fixed at one log, v. infra 88a.
- (7) תבשׂוּת. These are the initial letters of the features characterizing the High Priest's meal-offering, viz., תדיר-ת, a regular daily offering', באה 'is obligatory', שבת-ש and טומאה-ט 'it overrides the Sabbath and the law of uncleanness'. The meal-offering accompanying the Daily Offering is also characterized in this manner; these features, however, are absent from the freewill meal-offering.
- (8) יגיל. So according to Sh. Mek.; cur. edd. יגיל. The High Priest's meal-offering can be characterized by the following features: יחיד-י 'an individual offering', גלל עצמה-ג 'brought on its own account' i.e., not accompanying another offering, and לבונה-ל 'requires frankincense'. These features are present in the freewill meal-offering but are absent from the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.
- (9) Lev. VI, 13.
- (10) Cf. Num. XV, 4ff. The meal-offering which accompanied the offering of a ram consisted of

two tenths of fine flour mingled with the third part of a hin (i.e., four logs) of oil, and that which accompanied the offering of a bullock of three tenths of flour mingled with half a hin (i.e., six logs) of oil.

(11) The meal-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering consisted of one tenth of fine flour which is not the case with the bullocks and rams; v. prec. n.

(12) The purpose of the inference, namely to establish that not more than the normal quantity of oil (i.e., a log) is required, is contradicted by the verse which indicates the requirement of much oil, i.e., more than the usual quantity.

(13) From here to the end of the passage until the next Mishnah the text is in a doubtful state and the MSS. vary considerably from the present text. V. Sh. Mek. where the text is extensively altered. The above translation is based entirely upon the text as in cur. edd. For the variants v. D.S. a.l.

(14) Which had no oil at all; cf. Lev. V, 11.

(15) From the meal-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering.

(16) By reason of the counter argument, namely, let the inference be drawn from the freewill meal-offering.

(17) I.e., granted that it must have more oil than the ordinary meal-offering, it might nevertheless be compared with the meal-offering which accompanied bullocks or rams where only two logs to the tenth are required.

Menachoth 51b

a meal-offering consisting of one tenth, etc.

MISHNAH. IF THEY DID NOT APPOINT ANOTHER PRIEST IN HIS STEAD, AT WHOSE EXPENSE WAS IT¹ OFFERED? R. SIMEON SAYS, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE COMMUNITY; BUT R. JUDAH SAYS, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE HEIRS; MOREOVER A WHOLE [TENTH] WAS OFFERED.²

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead, whence do we know that his meal-offering must be offered at the expense of his heirs? Because it is written, And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons shall offer it.³ I might think that they offer it a half-[tenth] at a time,⁴ Scripture therefore stated 'it',

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

implying the whole [tenth] but not half of it. So R. Judah.

R. Simeon says, It is a statute for ever,³ this implies that it is offered at the expense of the community.⁵ It shall be wholly burnt,³ that is, the whole of it shall be burnt.⁶ Does then the verse, ‘And the anointed priest, etc.’ serve the above purpose? Surely it is required for the teaching of the following Baraitha: It is written, This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer unto the Lord in the day when he is anointed.⁷ Now I might think that Aaron and his sons shall together offer one offering,⁸ the text therefore states, ‘Which they shall offer unto the Lord’, Aaron shall offer his separately and his sons theirs separately.⁹ [The expression] ‘his sons’ refers to the ordinary priests.¹⁰ You say ‘the ordinary priests’: but perhaps it refers only to the High Priests?¹¹ When it says, ‘And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons’, it has already spoken of the High Priest; how then must I interpret ‘his sons’? It must refer to the ordinary priests! — If so,¹² the verse should read, ‘And [if] the anointed priest [died], his sons in his stead shall offer’; why does the verse read ‘from among his sons’? You may thus infer both teachings.¹³

For what purpose does R. Simeon utilize the expression ‘it’?—He requires it for the following teaching: If the High Priest died¹⁴ and they appointed another in his stead, [the successor] may not bring a half-tenth from his house neither [may he use] the remaining half-tenth of the first [High Priest].¹⁵ But was not this rule derived from the expression ‘And half thereof’?¹⁶ He bases no exposition upon the letter waw [‘and’].

And for what purpose does R. Judah utilize the expression a statute for ever’? — It means, a statute binding for all time. And what is the purpose of the expression, ‘It shall be wholly burnt’? — He requires it for the following which was taught: I only know

that the former,¹⁷ namely the High Priest's meal-offering, must be wholly burnt, and that the latter, namely the ordinary priest's meal-offering, must not be eaten; but whence do I know that what is said of the former applies also to the latter and what is said of the latter applies also to the former? The text therefore stated ‘wholly’ in each case for the purposes of analogy; thus, it is written here ‘wholly’ and it is written there ‘wholly’,¹⁸ as the former must be wholly burnt so the latter must be wholly burnt, and as in the latter case there is a prohibition against eating it, so in the former case there is a prohibition against eating it.

Is then R. Simeon of the opinion that by the law of the Torah it¹⁹ must be offered at the expense of the community? Surely we have learnt:²⁰ The Beth din ordained seven things and this was one of them.²¹ [They also ordained that] if a gentile sent his burnt-offering from a land beyond the sea and also sent with it the drink-offerings,²² they [the drink-offerings] are to be offered of his own means; but if he did not [send the drink-offerings], they are to be offered at the expense of the community. Similarly, if a proselyte died and left animal-offerings, if he also left the drink-offerings,²² they are offered of his own means; but if he did not [send the drink-offerings], they are to be offered at the expense of the community.²³ It was also a condition laid down by the Beth din that if the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead, his meal-offering shall be offered at the expense of the community!²⁴ —

R. Abbahu explained, There were two ordinances. By the law of the Torah it should be offered at the expense of the community; but when they²⁵ saw that the funds in the Chamber were being depleted²⁶ they ordained that it should be a charge upon the heirs. When they saw, however, that [the heirs] were neglectful about it, they reverted to the law of the Torah. ‘And concerning the

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Red Cow [they ordained] that the law of sacrilege does not apply to its ashes'.²⁷ Is not this the law of the Torah? For it was taught: It is a sin-offering:²⁸ this teaches that it is subject to the law of sacrilege; and 'it' implies that only it [the cow] is subject to the law of sacrilege

- (1) This daily meal-offering of the High Priest, during the interregnum.
- (2) In the morning and also in the evening. This is the opinion of R. Simeon too, v. infra n. 7.
- (3) Lev VI, 15.
- (4) As their father the High Priest had done during his lifetime.
- (5) The Heb. עולם 'for ever' is interpreted in the later Heb. sense of 'world', 'people', 'the whole community'.
- (6) None of it shall be left over to be eaten. Or better: a whole tenth shall be offered both morning and evening, thus agreeing with R. Judah's view in the Mishnah, v. supra n. 3.
- (7) Lev. VI, 13.
- (8) At their ordination.
- (9) The sons offer their meal-offering at their ordination only, this is known as מנחת היגוד 'the meal-offering of initiation'; whereas the High Priest must offer his daily, from the day that he is anointed and onwards.
- (10) I.e., every priest at the commencement of his ministry must offer a meal-offering of initiation.
- (11) I.e., the descendants of Aaron, those anointed High Priest.
- (12) That the verse in question (And the anointed priest, etc.) only serves to teach that the heirs of the High Priest must continue at their expense their father's daily meal-offering until the appointment of a successor.
- (13) The rule given in the prec. note and also the rule that ordinary priests at their ordination shall offer a meal-offering.
- (14) After he had offered the half-tenth for the morning meal-offering.
- (15) But must bring a whole tenth from his house; this being derived from the term 'it'.
- (16) V. supra p. 304, n. 2, where this rule is derived from the letter waw which stands at the head of the phrase ומקדשתה בערב.
- (17) Cf. Lev. VI, 15.
- (18) Cf. ibid. 16. In this verse as also in the preceding verse the expression כליל 'wholly' is used.
- (19) Sc. the meal-offering of the High Priest.
- (20) Shek. VII, 6.
- (21) The law stated in the earlier Mishnah Shek. VII, 5.

(22) I.e., the money for the drink-offerings.

(23) Since a proselyte has no heirs.

(24) Evidently it was only an ordinance of the Beth din and not the law of the Torah.

(25) The Beth din.

(26) By reason of the frequent changes in the office of the High Priest, v. Yoma 9a.

(27) This too is one of the seven things ordained by the Beth din. Shek. VII, 7. For the law of sacrilege. i.e., the

unintentional appropriation of the property of the Sanctuary, v. Lev. V, 15.

(28) Num. XIX, 9.

Menachoth 52a

but its ashes are not subject to the law of sacrilege! —

Said R. Ashi: There were two ordinances. By the law of the Torah only it [the cow] is subject to the law of sacrilege but not its ashes; but when they saw that people treated [the ashes] lightly and applied them to wounds, they ordained they should be subject to the law of sacrilege. When they saw, however, that people in doubtful cases of uncleanness would avoid the sprinkling,¹ they reverted to the law of the Torah.

Our Rabbis taught: The [money for the] bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error or for the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry must be collected for the purpose.² So R. Judah. R. Simeon says, It must be taken from the funds³ of the [Shekel] Chamber. But the reverse has been taught!⁴ Which of these was taught last?⁵ Now the scholars argued before R. Ashi: Surely the former version was taught last for we already know that R. Simeon is concerned about possible neglect.⁶ Whereupon R. Ashi said to them, You may even say that the latter version was taught last, because R. Simeon is concerned about possible neglect only in that case where they themselves receive no atonement by it, but where they themselves receive atonement thereby R. Simeon is not apprehensive about neglect.⁷ What is the decision? —

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Rabbah the Younger said to R. Ashi, Come and hear [the following teaching]: The verse, My food which is presented unto Me for offerings made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Me, shall ye observe to offer unto Me in its due season,⁸ includes the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error and the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry, that these too are offered from the funds of the [Shekel] Chamber;⁹ so R. Simeon.¹⁰

MOREOVER A WHOLE [TENTH] WAS OFFERED. R. Hiyya b. Abba said that R. Johanan had raised the question: Does it mean a whole tenth in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening, or a whole tenth in the morning and in the evening it was dispensed with? —

Come and hear, said Raba, for we have learnt: The eighth bore the [High Priest's] meal-offering.¹¹ Now if it were so, that it was dispensed with in the evening, then it would sometimes happen that the eighth did not bear the [High Priest's] meal-offering, for example, at the time when the High Priest died and they did not appoint another in his stead. When the scholars repeated this in the presence of R. Jeremiah he exclaimed, These foolish Babylonians! because they dwell in a dark country they must say dark sayings!¹² That Mishnah also states: The seventh bore the fine flour;¹³ the ninth bore the wine.¹² Now were these never omitted? Surely it has been taught: Their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,¹⁴ even at night; their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,¹⁴ even on the following day.¹⁵ We must say that the Tanna of that Mishnah is not concerned with the exception,¹⁶ so here too he is not concerned with the exception.¹⁷ When this was reported back again to Raba he remarked, They always report to them¹⁸ any indiscreet saying of ours, our wise sayings they never report to them. Later Raba said, This too is one of our wise sayings, for the

verse says, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily,¹⁹ it is like the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.²⁰ What is the decision then?²¹

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, Come and hear; for it was taught: A whole tenth was offered in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening. R. Johanan said, There is a difference of opinion between Abba Jose b. Dosehai and the Rabbis. Abba Jose b. Dosehai says, He²² must set aside for [his meal-offering] two handfuls of frankincense, one handful to be offered in the morning and the other in the evening. But the Rabbis say, He must set aside for it one handful, half to be offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. On what principle do they differ? —

Abba Jose b. Dosehai maintains that we know of no case when half a handful was offered; but the Rabbis maintain that we know of no case when a tenth required two handfuls.²³

R. Johanan raised the following question: If the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead,

- (1) For fear that they might be making unnecessary use of the ashes and would be liable to bring a guilt-offering for their sacrilege.
- (2) Lit., 'in the beginning they collect them'. I.e., when the occasion arises it must be collected from the members of the community.
- (3) I.e., from the funds of the community accumulated in the Temple treasury.
- (4) In Hor. 3b, where R. Simeon's opinion here is ascribed to R. Judah, and vice versa.
- (5) The later version of a statement is regarded as the more reliable since the author may have reconsidered and changed his view. Moreover it is necessary to arrive at the correct version in order to establish the halachah which would follow R. Judah's view.
- (6) V. Mishnah supra where R. Simeon maintains that the High Priest's meal-offering is offered out of the funds of the community and not left to be offered by the heirs at their expense for fear of neglect. Accordingly here the more reliable view of R. Simeon would be that these offerings are also

MENACHOS – 27a-58b

taken out of the funds of the community, which view agrees with the former version.

(7) The heirs of the High Priest in as much as they receive no atonement from the meal-offering might conceivably be neglectful about it, but there is no such fear of neglect by the members of the community where the offering is to effect atonement on their behalf.

(8) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(9) This is derived from the use of the plural 'for offerings' which includes other offerings to be offered like the Daily Offering from the funds of the Temple Treasury.

(10) This view of R. Simeon, derived from the verse, is undoubtedly the correct one and, as it corresponds with the former version, that version must have been taught last.

(11) Tamid 31b, where it is stated that thirteen priests were engaged in the sacrifice of the Daily Offering and all that accompanied it in the morning, and likewise in the evening.

(12) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., P 158, n. 1.

(13) The fine flour for the meal-offering and the wine for the drink-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering.

(14) Num. XXIX, 18.

(15) V. supra 44b. It can thus happen that the meal-offering and the drink-offerings were, for some reason, not offered during the day, in which case the seventh and ninth priest would not be required. And yet these are included in the list.

(16) Lit., 'if', i.e., with the exceptional case when part of the service was omitted. The Tanna merely states the number of priests engaged in the service and the function of each when in normal circumstances everything was in accordance with the manner prescribed.

(17) Although in fact the High Priest's meal-offering might very well be dispensed with in the evening in the circumstances of our Mishnah.

(18) To the Palestinian Rabbis.

(19) Lev. VI, 13.

(20) Which under no circumstances may be dispensed with; so it is, too, with the High Priest's meal-offering.

(21) Whose opinion is to prevail? Raba's or R. Jeremiah's?

(22) The High Priest in bringing daily for his meal-offering a tenth of fine flour which he divided and offered half in the morning and half in the evening.

(23) With the one meal-offering, notwithstanding the handfuls are offered one at a time.

Menachoth 52b

must the quantity of frankincense, according to the view of the Rabbis,¹ be doubled or not? Should we say that since the quantity of flour has been doubled² the quantity of frankincense must also be doubled, or perhaps this is so only where it has been expressly stated³ and not where it has not been expressly stated? And this question is also to be asked with regard to the quantity of oil,⁴ both according to the view of the Rabbis and of Abba Jose b. Doseithai.

Come and hear: for we have learnt: The handful is specified in five cases.⁵ Now if that were so,⁶ there would sometimes be seven!⁷ — The Tanna is not concerned with the exception.⁸ R. Papa was sitting and reciting the above when R. Joseph b. Shemaiah said to him, 'Is not the case of a man offering the handful outside the Sanctuary an exceptional case',⁹ and yet he reckoned it? What is the decision then? —

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, Come and hear: For it has been taught: If the High Priest died and they did not appoint another in his stead a whole tenth must be offered in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening. Two handfuls [of frankincense] must be set aside, one to be offered in the morning and one in the evening; and three logs of oil must be set aside, one log and a half to be offered in the morning and one log and a half in the evening. Now who is the author of this Baraitha? If you say it is the Rabbis, then it will be asked, Why is it that the quantity of frankincense is doubled and the quantity of oil is not? It must therefore be Abba Jose b. Doseithai who maintains that at all times the High Priest's meal-offering requires two handfuls of frankincense, so that neither the quantity of frankincense nor the quantity of oil has been doubled. And since according to Abba Jose b. Doseithai the quantity of oil is not doubled,¹⁰ likewise according to the

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

Rabbis the quantities of frankincense and of oil are not doubled.¹¹

R. Johanan said, The halachah follows Abba Jose b. Dosehai.¹² But could R. Johanan have said so? Did not R. Johanan say that the halachah always follows the anonymous opinion of a Mishnah, and we have learnt: 'The handful is specified in five cases'?¹³ — Different Amoraim report R. Johanan's opinion differently.¹⁴

CHAPTER V

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS MUST BE OFFERED UNLEAVENED, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE LEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING¹⁵ AND THE TWO LOAVES [OF PENTECOST].¹⁶ WHICH ARE OFFERED LEAVENED. R. MEIR SAYS, THE LEAVEN MUST BE TAKEN FROM [THE MEAL-OFFERINGS] THEMSELVES AND WITH THIS THEY ARE LEAVENED.¹⁷ R. JUDAH SAYS, THAT IS NOT THE BEST WAY,¹⁸ BUT [FIRST OF ALL] LEAVEN MUST BE BROUGHT AND PUT INTO THE MEASURING VESSEL AND THEN THE MEASURING VESSEL IS FILLED UP [WITH FLOUR]. BUT THEY SAID TO HIM, EVEN SO [IT IS NOT SATISFACTORY]; FOR IT WOULD BE SOMETIMES TOO LITTLE AND SOMETIMES TOO MUCH.¹⁹

GEMARA. R. Perida enquired of R. Ammi, Whence is it derived that all meal-offerings must be offered unleavened? — 'Whence?' you ask, [R. Ammi replied] but surely where this²⁰ is expressly stated²¹ it is expressly stated, and where it is not expressly stated there is the general statement,

- (1) According to Abba Jose there is no doubt at all, for one never offers two handfuls at one time with one meal-offering.
- (2) For a whole tenth of fine flour must be brought both in the morning and in the evening. Likewise a whole handful of frankincense must be brought morning and evening.
- (3) In connection with the flour, v. supra 51b.

(4) The High Priest used to bring from his own house daily a tenth of fine flour and three logs of oil, which he divided and offered, half (i.e., a half-tenth of flour and one log and a half of oil) in the morning and half in the evening. During an interregnum, however, since the quantity of flour is doubled it might well be that the oil must also be doubled.

(5) V. infra 106b. The handful of frankincense which accompanied the High Priest's meal-offering is not included in that list since it was offered a half-handful at a time.

(6) That even the Rabbis hold that during an interregnum a whole handful was to be offered morning as well as evening.

(7) For although the two handfuls belong to the one offering, they should nevertheless be reckoned as two in the list; cf. the two handfuls of frankincense offered with the Showbread which are reckoned as two in the list.

(8) I.e., with the case when the High Priest died. The Tanna merely listed five normal cases that happen daily or regularly.

(9) Likewise he should reckon the handful of frankincense offered morning and evening during an interregnum.

(10) The reason being no doubt that only that is doubled which is expressly so indicated in the Torah.

(11) For the same reason as given by Abba Jose, v. prec. note; thus solving the problem raised by R. Johanan.

(12) That the High Priest must offer with his meal-offering one handful of frankincense in the morning and another in the evening.

(13) V. p. 315, n. 6. But according to Abba Jose the number should be seven so as to include the two handfuls of the High Priest's meal-offering.

(14) Obviously R. Johanan could not have made both statements; some scholars report that he made only the former statement, namely, that the halachah follows Abba Jose, others that he made only the latter statement, that the halachah follows the anonymous Mishnah.

(15) The thank-offering was accompanied by an offering of forty cakes, thirty being unleavened and ten leavened, cf. Lev. VII, 12,13.

(16) V. ibid. XXIII, 17.

(17) I.e. a little flour is taken from the meal-offering, is mixed with water and is allowed to stand for some time until it becomes leavened, and this serves as yeast for leavening the rest of the meal-offering.

(18) For the yeast is too fresh and not sufficiently potent to leaven well the rest of the meal-offering.

(19) For if the yeast used was hard and compressed and of small bulk, there would be more than the usual quantity of flour in this meal-

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

offering, and if, on the other hand, the yeast was of a thin consistency, taking up much space in the vessel, there would be less than the usual quantity of flour, and in either case the meal-offering would be invalid.

(20) That the meal-offering shall be unleavened.

(21) Cf. *ibid.* II, 4 and 5.

Menachoth 53a

And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord in front of the altar... And that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat; it shall be eaten as unleavened bread!¹ — He [R. Perida] said to him, As to the proper performance of the precept I have no doubt at all, I ask only whether it is indispensable.² But, said the other, even with regard to the question of indispensability there is written, It shall not be baked leavened,³ but only unleavened.⁴

R. Hisda demurred, perhaps it means, 'It shall not be baked leavened', but only *si'ur*!⁵ — What *si'ur* is meant? If as defined by R. Meir, it is absolutely unleavened according to R. Judah. If as defined by R. Judah, it is absolutely leavened according to R. Meir. If as defined by R. Meir and following R. Meir's ruling. It is absolutely leavened, since one incurs stripes for [eating] it [on the Passover]! — What is meant is that [*si'ur*] as defined by R. Judah and following R. Judah's ruling.⁶

R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred, Perhaps it means, 'It shall not be baked leavened', but only *halut*!⁷ -What does *halut* mean? Soaked [in hot water]. But surely if [the meal-offering] must be offered soaked, it is expressly stated so,⁸ and this⁹ is not prescribed to be soaked! — Perhaps the meaning is: whatsoever is prescribed to be soaked must be offered soaked, but whatsoever is not prescribed to be soaked may be offered either soaked or unleavened!

Rabina demurred, Perhaps the verse, 'It shall not be baked leavened', merely imposes a prohibition upon the person, but [the meal-offering] does not become invalid thereby? Whence then is it derived?¹⁰ — From the following teaching: One might think that 'unleavened'¹¹ was only a recommendation, Holy Writ therefore stated, It shall be;¹¹ the verse thus laid it down as an obligation.

R. Perida enquired of R. Ammi, Whence is it derived that all meal-offerings, seeing that they were kneaded in lukewarm water,¹² must be specially watched lest they become leavened?¹³ Shall we infer it from the Passover concerning which it is written, And ye shall watch the unleavened bread!¹⁴ — He replied. In that very passage¹⁵ It is written, it shall be unleavened,¹¹ that is, keep it so.¹⁶ But have you not utilized this verse to indicate indispensability? — If for that alone Scripture would have used the expression 'It is to be unleavened'; why 'It shall be'? You may thus infer two things.

The Rabbis said to R. Perida, 'R. Ezra, the grandson of R. Abtolos, who is the tenth generation from R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, who is the tenth generation from Ezra, is standing at the door' — Said he to them, 'Why all this [pedigree]? If he is a learned man, it is well; if he is a learned man and also a scion of noble ancestors, it is all the better; but if he is a scion of noble ancestors and not a learned man may fire consume him'. They told him that he was a learned man, whereupon he said, 'Let him come in'. He at once saw that his [R. Ezra's] mind was troubled, so he began his discourse and said, I said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord; my gratefulness is not with thee.¹⁷ The congregation of Israel said to the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Lord of the universe, Show Thy gratefulness unto me for making Thee known in the world'. He replied. 'My gratefulness is not with thee, but with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who first made Me known in the world, as it is said,

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

With the holy that are in the earth; they are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight.’¹⁸

As soon as he [R. Ezra] heard the expression mighty’,¹⁹ he began his discourse, saying, Let the Mighty One come and take vengeance for the sake of the mighty from the mighty by means of the mighty. ‘Let the Mighty One come’ — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, The Lord on high is mighty.²⁰ ‘And take vengeance for the sake of the mighty’ — that is, Israel, as it is written, They are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight. ‘From the mighty’ — that is, the Egyptians, as it is written, The mighty sank like lead in the waters.²¹ ‘By means of the mighty’ — that is, the water, as it is written, Above the voices of many waters, mighty waters, breakers of the sea.²² Let the beloved²³ the son of the beloved come and build the beloved for the Beloved in the portion of the beloved that the beloved may receive atonement therein. ‘Let the beloved come’ — that is King Solomon, as it is written, And He sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah [beloved of the Lord], for the Lord's sake.²³

(1) Lev. VI, 7, 9.

(2) That the meal-offering must be unleavened, and otherwise it would be invalid.

(3) Ibid. 10.

(4) R. Perida's question is therefore superfluous.

(5) שיאור ‘dough in the early stage of fermentation’. There is, however, a difference of opinion as to what stage is meant. According to R. Meir it is that stage when the surface of the dough has become pale; after that it is regarded as absolutely leavened. According to R. Judah it is the advanced stage when the surface of the dough has become wrinkled; before that it is regarded as unleavened. V. Pes. 48b.

(6) According to R. Judah he who eats si'ur (as defined by him) is not liable to any punishment. Consequently it could be said that the meal-offering may be si'ur and not necessarily absolutely unleavened, hence R. Perida's question.

(7) חלוט ‘soaked or saturated with hot water’. The suggestion is that the meal-offering may be leavened provided it is not baked but only scalded in water.

(8) As in the case of the High Priest's meal-offering which is expressly prescribed to be soaked; cf. *ibid.* 14.

(9) Sc. the ordinary meal-offering. The verse therefore can only imply that a meal-offering must be unleavened.

(10) That meal-offerings must be unleavened or else they are invalid.

(11) Lev. II, 5.

(12) *Infra* 55a.

(13) They must be continually kneaded till the time of baking (Rashi).

(14) Ex. XII, 17; so according to Rabbinic interpretation. E.VV.: And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread.

(15) In connection with the meal-offering itself.

(16) I.e., guard it against its becoming leavened; v. Pes. 48b.

(17) Ps., XVI, 2.

(18) Ps. XVI, 3.

(19) Heb. אָדִיר, which word is used in all the following verses quoted.

(20) *Ibid.* XCIII, 4.

(21) Ex. XV, 10.

(22) Heb. יָדִד, which word is used in all the verses quoted.

(23) II Sam. XII, 25.

Menachoth 53b

‘The son of the beloved’ — that is, the son of Abraham, as it is written, What hath My beloved to do in My house?¹ ‘And build the beloved’ — that is, the Temple, as it is written, How lovely are Thy tabernacles!² ‘For the Beloved’ — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, Let me sing of my Beloved.³ ‘In the portion of the beloved’ — that is, Benjamin, as it is said, Of Benjamin he said, The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety by Him.⁴ ‘That the beloved may receive atonement therein’ — that is, Israel, as it is written, I have given the dearly beloved of My soul into the hand of her enemies.⁵ Let the good come and receive the good from the Good for the good. ‘Let the good come’ — that is, Moses, as it is written, And she saw that he was good.⁶ ‘And receive the good’ — that is, the Torah, as it is written, For I give you good doctrine.⁷ ‘From the Good’ — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, The Lord is good to all.⁸ ‘For the good’ — that is, Israel, as it is

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

written, Do good, O Lord, unto the good.⁹ Let this come and receive this from This for this people. ‘Let this come’ — that is, Moses, as it is written, For as for this Moses, the man.¹⁰ ‘And receive this’ — that is, the Torah, as it is written, And this is the Torah which Moses set.¹¹ ‘From This’ — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, This is my God and I will glorify Him.¹² ‘For this people’ — that is, Israel, as it is written, This people that Thou hast gotten.¹³

R. Isaac said, At the time of the destruction of the Temple the Holy One, blessed be He, found Abraham standing in the Temple. Said He, ‘What hath My beloved to do in My house?’¹⁴ Abraham replied, ‘I have come concerning the fate of my children’... Said He, ‘Thy children sinned and have gone into exile’. ‘Perhaps’, said Abraham, ‘they only sinned in error?’ And He answered, ‘She hath wrought lewdness’.¹⁵ ‘Perhaps only a few sinned?’ ‘With many’,¹⁵ came the reply. ‘Still’, he pleaded, ‘Thou shouldst have remembered unto them the covenant of circumcision’. And He replied, ‘The hallowed flesh is passed from thee.’¹⁶ ‘Perhaps hadst Thou waited for them they would have repented’, he pleaded. And He replied, ‘When thou doest evil, then thou rejoicest!’¹⁴ Thereupon he put his hands on his head and wept bitterly, and cried, ‘Perhaps, Heaven forefend, there is no hope for them’. Then came forth a Heavenly Voice and said, The Lord called thy name a leafy olive-tree, fair with goodly fruit:¹⁷ as the olive-tree produces its best only at the very end,¹⁸ so Israel will flourish at the end of time. Because of the noise of the great tumult He hath kindled fire upon it, and its branches are broken.¹⁷

Said R. Hinena b. Papa, Because of the noise of the words of the spies the branches¹⁹ of Israel were broken; for R. Hinena b. Papa said, A grievous statement did the spies make at that moment when they said, For they are stronger than we.²⁰ Read not ‘than we’, but ‘than He’;²¹ as it were, even the Master of the

House cannot remove His furniture from there.²²

R. Hiyya b. Hinena demurred, Then why does the verse read ‘Because of the noise of the great tumult’? It should read, ‘Because of the noise of the great word’.²³ Rather [it must be interpreted thus]: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Abraham, ‘I heard thy voice and will have compassion upon them.’²⁴ I had said that they shall be subjected to four successive Empires,²⁵ each to endure the length of time that the four Empires together [actually lasted], but now each shall endure only the time allotted to it’. Another version: ‘I had said [that they shall be subjected to the four Empires] in succession, but now [they shall be subjected to the four] concurrently’.²⁶

R. Joshua b. Levi said, Why is Israel likened to an olive-tree? To tell you that as the olive-tree loses not its leaves either in summer or in winter, so Israel shall never be lost either in this world or in the world to come. R. Johanan said, Why is Israel likened to an olive-tree? To tell you that just as the olive produces its oil only after pounding, so Israel returns to the right way only after suffering.

R. MEIR SAYS, THE LEAVEN MUST BE TAKEN FROM [THE MEAL-OFFERINGS] THEMSELVES AND WITH THIS THEY ARE LEAVENED, etc. What is meant by SOMETIMES TOO LITTLE AND SOMETIMES TOO MUCH? — R. Hisda explained, If the yeast [used] was of a thick consistency, then there would be too much [flour in the meal-offering], and if it was thin, there would be too little.²⁷ But in any event only a tenth is measured!²⁸ —

Rabbah and R. Joseph both said that we must measure it according to its former state.²⁹ But one can surely take a little of the flour³⁰ and have it leavened outside, and then it can be brought back and kneaded with the

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

rest [of the flour]! — It is to be feared that one might bring leaven from elsewhere.³¹

Our Rabbis taught: One may not leaven [the meal-offering]³²

- (1) Jer. XI, 15. Beloved here refers to Abraham, v. infra.
- (2) Ps. LXXXIV, 2.
- (3) Isa. V, 1.
- (4) Deut. XXXIII, 12. The Temple was built in the territory of Benjamin.
- (5) Jer. XII, 7.
- (6) Ex. II, 2.
- (7) Prov. IV, 2.
- (8) Ps. CXLV, 9.
- (9) Ibid. CXXV, 4.
- (10) Ex. XXXII, 1.
- (11) Deut. IV, 44.
- (12) Ex. XV, 2.
- (13) Ibid. 16.
- (14) Jer. XI, 15.
- (15) Ibid. The word *המסמטה* implies premeditated wickedness; cf. Ps. CXXXIX, 20.
- (16) Jer. *ibid.* They attempted to disguise their circumcision.
- (17) Ibid. 16.
- (18) It is only after many years that the olive-tree bears fruit.
- (19) I.e., the strength and glory of Israel.
- (20) Num. XIII, 31.
- (21) *ממנו* 'than He' instead of *ממנו* 'than we', a difference of pronunciation in the Oriental or Babylonian Masorah in order to distinguish between the third person masc. sing. and the first person plur.; v. Sot., Sonc. ed., p. 172, n. 1.
- (22) Even God is powerless against them.
- (23) I.e., *מלה* 'word' instead of *המולה* 'tumult'.
- (24) Interpreting *המולה* as *המלה* 'compassion'.
- (25) The Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman Empires.
- (26) Some under one Empire and others under another.
- (27) V. *supra* p. 317, n. 5.
- (28) For when the measure is filled up with flour there is already yeast in the vessel; it is therefore immaterial how much is taken up by the yeast, so long as the measure is full.
- (29) I.e., when it was flour. In measuring we must have regard to the amount of flour used in the yeast. From this standpoint there would be either too much or too little flour according to the consistency of the leaven.
- (30) After a full tenth has been measured for the meal-offering.

(31) And not take it from the flour of the meal-offering, so that an onlooker might be led to believe that one may add to the meal-offering.

(32) I.e., the two loaves of Pentecost and the ten loaves of the Thank-offering, which must be leavened.

Menachoth 54a

with apples. In the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel they said, One may do so. R. Kahana reports this in the name of R. Hanina b. Teradion. With whom will the following agree? For we have learnt:¹ If an apple [of *terumah*] was chopped up and put into dough so that it leavened it, the dough is forbidden.² Now with whom does this agree? Shall we say with R. Hanina b. Gamaliel and not with the Rabbis?³ — You may even say that this agrees with the Rabbis too, for although it is not the finest leaven it is, however, an inferior leaven.⁴

R. Ela said, From no meal-offering is it more difficult to take out the handful than from the sinner's meal-offering.⁵ R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, The sinner's meal-offering may be mixed with water⁶ and it is valid. Shall we say that they differ in this: one⁷ holds that we must measure [the handful] according to its present state,⁸ and the other⁹ holds that we must measure it according to its former state?¹⁰ — No, both agree that we must measure it according to its present state, but they differ in this: one⁷ holds that dry¹¹ means, dry without oil, and the other⁹ holds that dry means, dry without any kind [of liquid]. We have learnt there:¹² Calf's flesh¹³ that had swelled¹⁴ and the flesh¹⁵ of an old beast that had shrivelled,¹⁶ must be measured¹⁷ according to their present state. Rab, R. Hiyya and R. Johanan read: 'according to their present state'; whereas Samuel, R. Simeon b. Rabbi and Resh Lakish read: 'according to their former state'.

An objection was raised: If a piece of calf's flesh which was not of the prescribed size¹⁵ swelled so that it is now of the prescribed size until now it has been clean but from now

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

onwards it is unclean!¹⁸ — It is only so Rabbinically. If so, consider the next clause: And so it is, too, with regard to the flesh of an offering that was Piggul or nothar.¹⁹ Now if you hold that this rule²⁰ is Scriptural then it can well apply to Piggul and to Nothar; but if you hold that it is only Rabbinical, it will be asked: Is one liable [to kareth] for [eating] what is regarded as Piggul or Nothar Rabbinically?²¹ — Render: And so it is, too, with regard to the uncleanness of what is Piggul or nothar.²² For I might have said that since the uncleanness attaching to what is Piggul or Nothar is only a Rabbinic ordinance, the Rabbis would certainly not apply this rule²³ to that which is only a Rabbinic ordinance; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

Come and hear: If the flesh of an old beast which was of the prescribed size had shriveled up so that it is now less than the prescribed size, until now it could have been unclean but from now onwards it remains clean!²⁴ — Rabbah explained the position thus: If a [forbidden] thing was of the prescribed size but now it is not so, then it is not so;²⁵ and if at first it was not of the prescribed size and now it is, then it is so Rabbinically.²⁶

- (1) Ter. X, 2.
- (2) To be eaten by any but a priest, since the dough which was hullin and not terumah was leavened by an apple which was of terumah.
- (3) For the Rabbis, i.e., the first Tanna of the Baraitha, hold that apples cannot leaven.
- (4) It is spoilt or hard leaven, and although it is not the best thing to use for leavening the meal-offering, it certainly has a leavening effect upon the substance into which it has been put.
- (5) Since it was without oil, the taking of the handful was a difficult operation indeed, for when taking out the handful of dry flour and then smoothing away the flour that is bursting between the fingers, much skill would be required in preventing the flour from slipping out of the hand.
- (6) So as to make the taking out of the handful easier. The Torah prohibited only the application of oil.
- (7) R. Isaac.

(8) The handful is to be taken out after the flour has been mixed with water, when it is easy to do so.

(9) R. Ela.

(10) The measure is to be a handful of flour only, and therefore if taken out after the flour has been mixed with water, it would contain either too much or too little flour according to the consistency of the mixture.

(11) Lev. VII, 10.

(12) 'Uk. II, 8.

(13) Less than an egg's bulk.

(14) To an egg's bulk.

(15) An egg's bulk.

(16) To less than an egg's bulk.

(17) With regard to the laws of uncleanness. Foodstuffs, if of an egg's bulk in quantity, can become unclean and can convey uncleanness.

(18) I.e., it can become unclean since it is now the size of an egg; contra Resh Lakish and the others.

(19) This means, presumably, that if a piece of flesh that was Piggul or Nothar, and which was less than an olive's bulk (which is the minimum in regard to forbidden food), had swelled to the size of an olive's bulk and one ate it, the penalty of kareth would thereby be incurred, for we estimate a thing according to its present size. For Piggul and Nothar v. Glos.

(20) That we must consider everything according to its present size.

(21) Surely there is no penalty incurred, since by the law of the Torah there was not the prescribed bulk.

(22) It is a Rabbinical ordinance that consecrated flesh that was rendered Piggul or Nothar is unclean and conveys uncleanness to the hands; v. Pes. 85a. We are now taught that if Piggul or Nothar less than an egg's bulk had swelled to the size of an egg, it will render the hands unclean.

(23) V. p. 324, n. 14.

(24) Thus contrary to Resh Lakish and the others who maintain that we must measure everything in the condition in which it was before.

(25) I.e., it is no longer a forbidden thing since it is not of the prescribed size. The term 'forbidden' is used here in an extended sense to include 'defilement'.

(26) By Rabbinical ordinance it is regarded as a forbidden thing.

Menachoth 54b

They differ only in the case where it was at first of the prescribed size but it shriveled up and then it swelled up again. One is of the opinion that with forbidden things there can

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

be an absolute rejection of the prohibition,¹ but the other maintains that there can be no such absolute rejection.² Is there anyone who maintains that with forbidden things there can be an absolute rejection of the prohibition? But we have learnt:³ If an egg's bulk of foodstuff was left in the sun and shrank, likewise if an olive's bulk of a corpse, an olive's bulk of nebelah,⁴ a lentil's bulk of a [dead] reptile, an olive's bulk of [consecrated flesh that was] piggul⁴ or nothar,⁴ and an olive's bulk of forbidden fat [shrank], they⁵ are now clean, and one is not liable thereby⁶ [to the penalties] for [eating] Piggul or Nothar or forbidden fat. If later they were left in the rain and swelled, they⁵ become unclean and one is liable thereby⁶ [to the penalties] for [eating] Piggul or Nothar or forbidden fat. This clearly refutes the view of him who says that with forbidden things there can be an absolute rejection of the prohibition! It is indeed a refutation.

Come and hear: One may give by number fresh figs [as tithe] in respect of pressed figs.⁷ Now if you hold that we measure a thing in the condition in which it was before, it is well;⁸ but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it is now, then too much is given as tithe,⁹ and it has been taught: If one gave too much tithe the produce is duly tithed but the tithe is unfit!¹⁰ — What then shall we say? That we measure in the condition in which it was before? But read the next clause: And [one may give] pressed figs by measure [as tithe] in respect of fresh figs.¹¹ Now if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it is now, then it is well;¹² but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it was before, then too much is given as tithe?¹³ —

We are dealing here with the 'great terumah',¹⁴ and the first clause as well as the second deals with the case of a man that is liberal.¹⁵ If so, read the final clause: R. Eleazar son of R. Jose said, My father used to take ten pressed figs from the cake in respect

of the ninety [fresh figs] in the basket. Now if we are dealing with the 'great terumah', why is 'ten' mentioned?¹⁶ —

We are really dealing here with the terumah of the tithe,¹⁷ and it is in accordance with the teaching of Abba Eleazar b. Gomel. For it was taught: Abba Eleazar b. Gomel¹⁸ says, It is written, And your heave-offering shall be reckoned unto you.¹⁹ Scripture speaks of two heave-offerings,²⁰ one the 'great terumah' and the other the terumah from the tithe. Just as the 'great terumah' is set aside by estimate²¹ and by intention,²² so the terumah of the tithe is set aside by estimate

(1) Resh Lakish and his colleagues maintain that when the forbidden thing shrank up to less than the prescribed quantity the prohibition thereof vanished completely, and, by the law of the Torah, cannot return even though the substance later swelled up to the prescribed size.

(2) R. Johanan and his colleagues hold that the prohibition has only been suspended temporarily.

(3) Toh. III, 4.

(4) V. Glos.

(5) The first four cases mentioned which relate to uncleanness.

(6) If one ate this shrunken olive's bulk of Piggul or Nothar or of forbidden fat.

(7) Thus ten fresh figs may be given as tithe in respect of ninety pressed figs.

(8) Accordingly the pressed figs are considered in the condition in which they were before, namely fresh; and therefore ten fresh figs would be the exact quantity for the tithe, whether we reckon the tithe by number or by capacity.

(9) For reckoning by capacity ten fresh figs would probably take up as much as one fifth of the capacity of ninety pressed figs.

(10) For the tenth part only is the tithe, the excess being untithed produce (tebel), and as the two are inextricably mixed up the whole is forbidden, even to Levite or priest, until it has been made fit by the proper separation.

(11) Thus one kab of pressed figs may be given as tithe in respect of nine kabs of fresh figs.

(12) For reckoning by capacity or weight one measure of dried figs is given in respect of the remaining nine measures of fresh figs.

(13) For one kab of dried figs would very likely be as much as two kabs when fresh.

(14) The first levy of the produce of the field given to the priest. V. Glos.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(15) Lit. ‘with a kindly eye’. A generous owner would give one-fortieth, one less generous one-fiftieth, and a mean person one-sixtieth of his produce as terumah. The clauses of the Baraita apply to a generous owner, accordingly the objection that too much is given cannot stand.

(16) The use of the numbers ten and ninety suggests that the offering is the tithe and not the terumah.

(17) The heave-offering of one tenth given to the priest by the Levite form the tithe he receives. V. Num. XVIII, 25ff.

(18) Var. lec. ‘Gimel’, ‘Gamala’ (so Git. 30b), and ‘Gamaliel’ (Aruch).

(19) Num. XVIII, 27.

(20) For the verse continues, As though it (the terumah of the tithe) were the corn of the threshing-floor (the ‘great terumah’); thus the verse speaks of two terumoth.

(21) It was not necessary to measure out exactly the fiftieth part usually given for the terumah (Rashi). According to Tosaf. (s.v. גיטלת) it was not right to measure out the terumah but it should be given by estimate only.

(22) A man could mentally set aside one portion of a heap of produce as terumah and immediately eat of the rest.

Menachoth 55a

and by intention; and just as the ‘great terumah’ should be given generously so the terumah of the tithe should be given generously.¹ But [there is yet a difficulty] from here, for R. Eleazar son of R. Jose said, My father used to take ten pressed figs from the cake in respect of the ninety [fresh figs] in the basket. Now if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it was before, it is well; but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it is now, then too little is given [as tithe]!²

When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported in the name of R. Eleazar that the case of the pressed figs is different since they can be boiled and so restored to their former condition.

Our Rabbis taught: One may give fresh figs³ as terumah in respect of pressed figs in that place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed; but one may not give pressed figs as

terumah in respect of fresh figs even in the place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed. The Master stated: ‘One may give fresh figs as terumah in respect of pressed figs in that place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed’. This is so, then, only where there is this custom, but not where there is no such custom. But what are the facts of the case? If there is a priest present, then why is this not allowed even where there is no such custom? Have we not learnt that wherever there is a priest present one must give the terumah from the choicest kind?⁴ Obviously then there is no priest present.⁵ Now read the next clause: ‘But one may not give pressed figs as terumah in respect of fresh figs even in the place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed’. But if there is no priest present why is one not allowed to do so? Have we not learnt that where there is no priest one must give the terumah from that which is most durable?⁶ Obviously then there is a priest present.⁷ Must we then say that in the case of the first clause there is no priest present whilst in the case of the second clause there is a priest present? — Yes. In the case of the first clause there is no priest present but in the case of the second clause there is a priest present. Said R. Papa, You may infer from this that we endeavor to interpret [two clauses of] a passage by suggesting two sets of facts rather than suggest that they represent the views of two Tannaim.⁸

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS MUST BE KNEADED WITH LUKEWARM WATER AND MUST BE WATCHED LEST THEY BECOME LEAVENED. IF ONE ALLOWED THE REMAINDER⁹ TO BECOME LEAVENED ONE TRANSGRESSES A PROHIBITION, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, NO MEAL-OFFERING WHICH YE SHALL BRING UNTO THE LORD SHALL BE MADE LEAVENED.¹⁰ ONE IS LIABLE FOR THE KNEADING AS WELL AS FOR THE SHAPING AND FOR THE BAKING.

GEMARA. Whence is this derived?¹¹ — Resh Lakish said, It is written, It shall not be

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

baked leavened: their position,¹² that is, even their portion must not be baked leavened. And is this verse required for this purpose? But it is required for the following which was taught: Wherefore does the text say, It shall not

(1) I.e., even more than a tenth, accordingly the previous objection that too much is given cannot stand.

(2) For when reckoning by weight the quantity set aside, sc. ten pressed figs, would be much less than a tenth.

(3) By number.

(4) V. Ter. II, 4. Accordingly the best (i.e., fresh figs) must be given to the priest, irrespective of custom.

(5) And therefore only dried figs which last longer should be set aside for the priest.

(6) In this case pressed figs.

(7) And therefore dried figs may not be given to the priest but only fresh ones, even though the priest will press them later on, for it is the custom to do so.

(8) For one could have answered that in each case no priest was available and the reason why in the second clause one is not allowed to set aside dried figs is that the Tanna of this Baraitha is of the opinion that in every case the best must be given as terumah, even in the absence of a priest. This indeed is the opinion of R. Judah; v. Ter. loc. cit

(9) I.e., what is left of the meal-offering after the handful has been taken out.

(10) Lev. II, 11. The prohibition of this verse refers to the meal-offering as a whole, i.e., before the taking out of the handful. That the remainder must not be leavened is derived from another verse; v. Gemara, infra.

(11) That the remainder must not be leavened. V. prec. note.

(12) Ibid. VI, 10. The Heb. may be translated: 'their portion shall not be baked leavened'.

Menachoth 55b

be baked leavened? Has it not already stated, It shall not be made leavened?¹ From the verse, It shall not be made leavened, I might have said that one is liable only once for all [the works involved], Scripture therefore says, It shall not be baked leavened. Now baking was included in the general prohibition; why was it specifically mentioned? So that every other work shall be

like it; thus as the work of baking is described as a specific work and one is liable solely on account of it, so I will include the work of kneading and of shaping and every other specific work, including also the work of smoothing² which is also a specific work, that one is liable on account of each alone! —

We derive our rule from the expression 'their portion'.³ Perhaps then the whole verse refers to this only!⁴ — If so [the prohibition] should have been, 'Their portion shall not be baked leavened'; why does Scripture say, It shall not be baked leavened: their portion? You can therefore infer both [prohibitions]. But perhaps the interpretation should be thus: for the baking which is expressly prohibited by the Divine Law one is liable once, but as for the other works one is only liable once for all of them! — This is a case of a subject which though included in a general proposition is specifically mentioned in order to teach us something concerning it, in which case what is specifically mentioned is not stated only for its own sake but to teach that the same affects the whole general proposition.⁵ But perhaps I should say that the verse 'it shall not be made leavened' is a general [prohibition] and the verse 'It shall not be baked leavened' is a particular [prohibition]; we thus have a general rule followed by a specific particular, in which case the general rule is limited to the particular specified, so that only the baking is prohibited but no other work! — R. Aporiki explained, Here the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other,⁶ and in every case where the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular does not apply.⁷

R. Adda b. Ahabah (some say, Kadi) objected, Do you say that where the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

does not apply? Surely it has been taught: It is written, And he shall slaughter it in the place where they slaughter the burnt-offering before the Lord; it is a sin-offering.⁸ Now where is the burnt-offering slaughtered? On the north side;⁹ this too is slaughtered on the north side. But do we derive it from here?¹⁰ Is it not written, In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered shall the sin-offering be slaughtered?¹¹ Why then is the former verses necessary? It serves to make the rule absolute,¹² namely, that if it was not slaughtered on the north side it is invalid. You say that it serves to make this rule absolute, but perhaps it is not so but teaches rather that this [sin-offering] must be [slaughtered] on the north side but no other¹³ requires the north side! The text therefore states, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering;¹⁴ this establishes the rule that all sin-offerings must be slaughtered on the north side. Now this is the conclusion because the Divine Law has also written, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering, but without this verse I would have held that only this [sin-offering] requires the north side but no other requires the north side. And why? Is it not because this would be a case of a general rule followed by a specific particular, which would be governed by the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular, notwithstanding that the two are far away from each other?¹⁵

Thereupon R. Ashi demurred, Is this an instance of a general rule followed by a specific particular? It is an instance of a specific particular followed by a general rule,¹⁶ in which case the general rule extends beyond the scope of the specific particular, and includes every [sin-offering]¹⁷ Rather the fact is that the Tanna's counter-argument was based upon the expression 'it';¹⁸ and he argued thus: 'perhaps it is not so but teaches rather that this [sin-offering] must be [slaughtered] on the north side but no other requires the north side', since the Divine Law

stated 'it'. Now that the general rule¹⁹ is derived from the verse, 'And he shall slaughter the sin-offering', what does the term 'it' exclude? —

(Mnemonic: *Nahshon, the slaughterer, a bird, the Passover-offering.*)

It teaches that it must be on the north side, but Nahshon's he-goat²⁰ 'was not [slaughtered] on the north side. For I might have thought that since the latter was included under the law of laying on of hands it was also included under the law requiring the north side; we are therefore taught [that it was not so]. And whence do we know that this was so concerning the laying on of hands?²¹ — For it was taught: The verse, And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the he-goat,²² includes also Nahshon's he-goat, for the requirement of the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says,

- (1) Ibid. II, 11.
- (2) Sc. the surface of the dough with moist hands (Rashi). Others: cutting away a lump of dough sufficient for each loaf (R. Gershom); or, shaping the loaf (Maim.).
- (3) Which expression, following immediately upon the prohibition 'It shall not be baked leavened', signifies that even the remainder shall not be baked leavened.
- (4) I.e., that the remainder shall not be leavened. Whence then do we know that the meal-offering as a whole, before the taking out of the handful, is subject to this prohibition?
- (5) The general prohibition 'It shall not be made leavened' includes every work in connection with the meal-offering, and certainly the baking, but the latter was specifically prohibited to teach that for the baking alone, as well as for any single work in connection with the meal-offering, one is liable.
- (6) The former is stated in Lev. II, 11, whilst the latter in VI, 10.
- (7) V. Pes. 6b.
- (8) Lev. IV, 24, with reference to the sin-offering brought by a ruler.
- (9) Cf. *ibid.* I, 11.
- (10) That the sin-offering must be slaughtered on the north side of the altar.
- (11) *Ibid.* VI, 18.
- (12) The repetition of this rule establishes it as an obligation and absolutely indispensable.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(13) E.g., the communal sin-offerings offered on the Festivals. V. Sh. Mek. n. 3.

(14) Ibid. IV, 29.

(15) In VI, 18 the rule is stated with regard to sin-offerings generally whilst in IV, 24 it is stated with regard to the special case of a sin-offering of a ruler.

(16) For the specific case is stated before the general rule, v. prec. note.

(17) Accordingly the verse, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering (ibid. IV, 29), is rendered superfluous.

(18) Heb. אורו, 'it' to the exclusion of others. The third verse (Lev. IV, 29) was therefore necessary to extend the rule generally so as to include all sin-offerings.

(19) That all sin-offerings must be slaughtered on the north side.

(20) The he-goat offered as a sin-offering by Nahshon, the prince of the tribe of Judah, (and likewise by each of the princes of the other tribes, v. Num. VII, 12ff) at the dedication of the altar. This sin-offering was peculiar in that it was offered not in expiation of any sin committed.

(21) That Nahshon's he-goat required the laying on of hands before slaughtering.

(22) Lev. IV, 24, with reference to the sin-offering brought by a ruler. Other offerings of a he-goat are included in this verse by reason of the fact that 'he-goat' is expressly mentioned here instead of the more usual expression 'upon its head'.

Menachoth 56a

It includes the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry for the requirement of the laying on of hands.¹

Rabina demurred, [saying], It is well according to R. Judah's view,² but what is to be said if R. Simeon's view is followed?³ Thereupon Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari said to Rabina, But even according to R. Judah should we not say that that which is expressly included⁴ is included, and that which is not included⁵ is not included? And if you retort that without a verse to exclude its you would have included it by virtue of the general principle,⁶ then with regard to the requirement of laying on of hands Scripture should have been silent concerning it since it would have been included by virtue of the general principle. But [you would answer

that] we may not derive [the regulations applicable, to] a temporary enactment⁷ from a permanent law, then with regard to this,⁵ too, we may not derive a temporary enactment from a permanent law!⁸ —

This then is the interpretation: 'It' must be [slaughtered] on the north side but the slaughterer need not stand at the north side.⁹ But is not this to be derived from R. Ahiyah's teaching? For it was taught: R. Ahiyah says, Wherefore does the text state, And he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward?¹⁰ It is because concerning the receiving [of the blood] we know that [the priest] must stand on the north side and receive [the blood] on the north side, and if he stood on the south side and received [the blood] on the north side the offering is invalid;¹¹ now I might have thought that it is the same here [with regard to the slaughtering], Scripture therefore stated 'it', signifying that 'it' must be on the north side but the slaughterer need not stand on the north side!¹² —

Rather [then interpret it thus]: 'It' must be on the north side but [the killing of] a bird-offering need not be on the north side. For I might have argued [that this was essential] by an a fortiori argument from a lamb-offering thus: if [the slaughtering of] a lamb-offering, which does not require the services of a priest, must be performed on the north side, is it not right that [the killing of] a bird-offering, which requires the services of a priest, shall be performed on the north side? But surely [one can retort,] this is so¹³ with a lamb-offering because it requires an instrument [for the slaughtering]!¹⁴ —

Rather than [we must interpret it as follows]: 'It' must be on the north side, but the slaughtering of the Passover-offering need not be on the north side. But is not the [exclusion of the] Passover-offering derived from the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? For it was taught: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, One

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

might think that the Passover-offering requires slaughtering on the north side by reason of this a fortiori argument: if the slaughtering of a burnt-offering, which has no fixed time for the slaughtering, must be performed on the north side, is it not right that the slaughtering of the Passover-offering, which has a fixed time for the slaughtering thereof,¹⁵ shall be performed on the north side? But surely [one can retort,] this is so¹³ with a burnt-offering because it is wholly burnt! —

One can argue the case from the sin-offering. But surely [one can retort that] this is so with the sin-offering because it effects atonement for those that are liable to the penalty of kareth! — One can argue the case from the guilt-offering. But surely this is so with the guilt-offering because it is a Most Holy offering.¹⁶ And if one were to argue the case from all these offerings, [one could retort that] this is so with all these mentioned because they are all Most Holy offerings! —

Rather [we must say that the interpretation] is indeed as stated previously: ‘It’ must be on the north side but the slaughterer need not be on the north side; and as for your objection ‘Is not this to be derived from R. Ahiyah’s teaching?’ [I say that] R. Ahiyah comes [not to teach] that the slaughterer need not be on the north side; he teaches rather that, in contradistinction from the slaughterer who need not be on the north side,¹⁷ the receiver of the blood must be on the north side. But is not this rule regarding the receiver of the blood derived from [the fact that Scripture states], ‘And he shall take’¹⁸ and not ‘he shall take’?¹⁹ — He [R. Ahiyah] does not base any exposition on the fact that Scripture states ‘And he shall take’ and not ‘he shall take’.

ONE IS LIABLE FOR THE KNEADING AS WELL AS FOR THE SHAPING AND FOR THE BAKING. R. Papa said, If a man baked [the meal-offering leavened], he has incurred stripes on two counts, once for shaping it

[while leavened] and again for baking it.²⁰ But have you not said above²¹ ‘As the baking is described as a specific work and one is liable solely on account of it’? — This is no difficulty, for in the one case he shaped it and also baked it,²² but in the other case another shaped it and he baked it.²³

Our Rabbis taught: If a firstling²⁴ was attacked with congestion, it may be bled in a place where no blemish would result, but it may not be bled in a place where a blemish would result.²⁵ So R. Meir. The Sages say, It may be bled even in a place where a blemish would result, provided that it is not slaughtered by reason of that blemish.²⁶ R. Simeon says,

(1) V. infra 92b.

(2) For since he maintains that Nahshon's he-goat required laying on of hands just like an ordinary sin-offering, it would also have required slaughtering on the north side; therefore an express term was necessary in order to exclude the latter requirement.

(3) For according to him Nahshon's he-goat was different from ordinary sin-offerings, since it did not require laying on of hands, and presumably it did not require slaughtering on the north side; hence no term was necessary to exclude this.

(4) The rite of laying on of hands.

(5) The requirement of slaughtering on the north side.

(6) I.e., as all sin-offerings required slaughtering on the north side so this offering also required it.

(7) Sc. the offering of Nahshon's he-goat at the dedication of the altar.

(8) So that even according to R. Judah only that rite which was expressly stated as applying to Nahshon's he-goat did apply, but none other; hence slaughtering on the north side was not required for it; accordingly the term ‘it’ must be otherwise interpreted.

(9) He may stand on the south side and slaughter the animal which is on the north side by using a long knife for the purpose.

(10) Lev. I, 11.

(11) V. Zeb. 48a.

(12) So that the term ‘it’, stated in Lev. IV, 24, has not been satisfactorily interpreted.

(13) That slaughtering on the north side is essential.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(14) Whereas the killing of a bird sacrifice is performed by the priest nipping off the head with his thumb; cf. Lev. I, 15.

(15) It must be slaughtered on the eve of the Passover Festival on the fourteenth day of Nisan in the afternoon.

(16) Whereas the Passover-offering is of the Less Holy offerings.

(17) This is derived from the term 'it' (Lev. IV, 24) stated in connection with the sin-offering of a ruler.

(18) Ibid. IV, 25.

(19) The rule is derived from the superfluous waw 'and' (R. Gershom). According to Sh. Mek. the text should read: 'From (the fact that Scripture states), And he shall take, which signifies, and he shall take himself'. I.e., the receiver of the blood shall betake himself to the place where he is about to receive the blood, namely, the north side. V. Zeb. 48a.

(20) The baking is regarded as a twofold work, as the completion of the work of shaping and as the baking proper.

(21) Supra p. 329.

(22) In this case he would not be liable on two counts for the baking, since he has already incurred liability for the shaping as a separate work. Only in this sense can the baking be described as a single and specific work.

(23) The other would then be liable for the shaping, whilst he would be liable for the baking which involves two counts, the baking proper and the completion of the shaping. V. however, Tosaf. s.v. תפוח, and com. of R. Gershom.

(24) The firstling, after Temple times, since it can no longer be offered, is given to the priest, but he is forbidden to slaughter it unless it is blemished. It is, however, forbidden to blemish a firstling or any consecrated beast.

(25) E.g., to bleed the firstling at the ear or lip would leave a scar or blemish.

(26) For otherwise it is to be feared that the owner would bleed it deliberately, although it was not suffering from congestion, in order to be allowed to slaughter it.

Menachoth 56b

It may even be slaughtered by reason of that blemish.¹ R. Judah says, It may not be bled² even though it would otherwise die.³

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, All agree⁴ that whosoever leavens [the meal-offering] after it was already leavened⁵ is liable, for it is written, It shall

not be made leavened,⁶ and it is also written, It shall not be baked leavened.⁷ And that whosoever castrates a beast after it was already castrated⁸ is liable, for it is written, That which hath its stones bruised or crushed or torn off or cut, [. . . neither shall ye do thus in your land].⁹ Now if one is liable for cutting how much more so for tearing off! [Wherefore is the latter mentioned?] To teach that one is also liable if one tears them away after they were already cut. They⁴ only differ as to whether one may blemish a blemished animal.

R. Meir says, It is written, There shall be no blemish at all therein;¹⁰ but the Rabbis say, It is written, It shall be perfect to be accepted.¹¹ Against R. Meir [it will be objected], is there not written, 'It shall be perfect to be accepted'? — That would only exclude what was born blemished.¹² But what was born blemished is no better than a tree! — It excludes rather consecrated animals that have been rendered unfit [by reason of a blemish] and have been redeemed; for I might have argued that since these may not be sheared of their wool nor put to any labor it is also forbidden to inflict any further blemish upon them, we are therefore taught [that it is not so]. And against the Rabbis [it will be objected], is it not written, 'There shall be no blemish at all therein'? — That verse is necessary for the following teaching: It is written, 'There shall be no blemish at all therein': I gather from this that one may not inflict any blemish upon it, but whence do I know that one may not cause it to suffer a blemish indirectly,¹³ [e.g.] that one may not place a lump of dough or a pressed fig upon its ear so as to tempt a dog to take it?¹⁴ The text therefore says, 'No blemish at all'; not only does it say 'no blemish' but also 'no blemish at all'.¹⁵

R. Ammi said, If a man placed leaven upon the dough [of a meal-offering] and went and sat him down, and the dough became leavened of its own, he is liable for it, just as

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

it is an act of work on the Sabbath.¹⁶ But would one be liable for doing such an act of work as this on the Sabbath? Has not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said

(1) Since the bleeding was not intended to blemish the beast but merely to relieve it from its congestion, the blemish that results is regarded as accidental and the beast may be slaughtered on account of it; this being in accordance with R. Simeon's view that a result not intended is ignored; v. Shab. 133a.

(2) Even in a place from which no physical blemish would result for it is to be feared that in his anxiety to save the beast the owner would not be careful as to the place where he bleeds it and might do so even in a place from which a blemish would certainly result.

(3) V. Bek. 33b.

(4) I.e., R. Meir and the above Rabbis who differ concerning the propriety of blemishing a beast which is already blemished, for here the firstling is indeed blemished by reason of its congestion which would prove fatal if it were not bled.

(5) I.e., if one shaped or baked the dough of the meal-offering which had been made leavened by another person.

(6) Lev. II, 11.

(7) Ibid. VI, 10. Hence it is clear that for baking it leavened even after it had already been 'made' leavened one is liable.

(8) I.e., one man had wrenched the testicles away from the body and left them in the scrotum, and another came and cut them away entirely.

(9) Ibid. XXII, 24. The latter part of this verse is understood as a general prohibition against castration.

(10) Ibid. 21. Even though the beast is blemished there shall be no further blemish therein.

(11) Ibid. Only such as are fit for offering may not be blemished.

(12) And therefore was at no time holy. This certainly may be blemished.

(13) Lit., 'by other means'.

(14) And to bite its ear at the same time, thus causing a blemish.

(15) Including blemishes indirectly caused.

(16) E. g., if one placed meat on the coals on the Sabbath one would be liable for roasting, although the roasting was done of its own accord.

turn it over he is not liable? — Raba answered; He meant to say, He is liable for it just as the act of roasting on the Sabbath.¹

The text [above stated]: 'Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, If a man placed meat on coals [on the Sabbath] and also turned it over, he is liable, but if he did not turn it over he is not liable'. How is this to be understood? If I say that the meat would not have been roasted if he had not turned it over, then obviously [he is not liable if he did not turn it over]; and if it would have been roasted even though he had not turned it over, why then is he not liable [where he did not turn it over]? — It is necessary to be stated only for the circumstance where, had he not turned it over, it would have been roasted on one side only to the extent of that which was eaten by Ben Drusai,² but with turning it over it would have been roasted on both sides to that extent. Now we are here taught that whatsoever is done on one side only to the extent of that which was eaten by Ben Drusai is insignificant.

Raba said, If it had been [well] roasted³ in one place the size of a dried fig, one would be liable.⁴ Rabina said to R. Ashi, Is it then that only [if roasted] in one place [to the size of a dried fig] one is [liable], but not [if roasted] in two or three places?⁵ But we have learnt: He who bores a hole, however small, is liable.⁶ Now what can this mean? Will you say it means [a hole] in one place? But of what use can a tiny hole be? Obviously then it means [holes] in two or three places, [no matter how small], since they can be joined together.⁷ — No, I still say it means a hole in one place, for it can serve as a keyhole.

Another version states: Raba said, Even if it had been roasted in two or three places [together making up the size of a dried fig, one would be liable]. Rabina said to R. Ashi, We have learnt in a Mishnah to the same effect: He who bores a hole, however small, is

Menachoth 57a

in the name of R. Johanan, If a man placed meat on coals [on the Sabbath] and also turned it over, he is liable, but if he did not

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

liable. Now what can this mean? Will you say it means a hole in one place? But of what use can a tiny hole be? It must mean [holes] in two or three places, [no matter how small,] since they can be joined together! — No, I still say it means a hole in one place, for it can serve as a keyhole.

Our Rabbis taught: Had Scripture only stated, Which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall not be made leavened,⁸ I should have said that only the handful shall not be made leavened, but whence would I know [that this prohibition applies to] the whole meal-offering?⁹ The text therefore added, ‘Meal-offering’.⁸ And whence would I know that this applies to other meal-offerings too?¹⁰ The text therefore stated, ‘Every meal-offering’.⁸ ‘Which ye shall bring unto the Lord’ signifies what is valid, but not what is invalid;¹¹ hence they said, He who leavens a valid meal-offering is liable, but he who leavens what is invalid is not liable.

R. Papa enquired, What is the law if a man leavened the meal-offering and it was then taken out [of the Sanctuary], and afterwards he again leavened it?¹² [Shall I say,] since it has been taken out it has thereby become invalid, and consequently by leavening it thereafter he cannot be held liable for leavening what was already leavened; or perhaps I should say, since it has been leavened it cannot be affected by being taken out, and consequently by leavening it again he would be liable for leavening what was already leavened? This question remains undecided.

R. Mari enquired, What is the law if he leavened [the handful] at the head of the altar? Does not the Divine Law say, ‘Which ye shall bring’, and this has already been brought up;¹³ or perhaps I should say, since it still requires to be burnt it is as though the act [of bringing] has not been completed? This question remains undecided. And now that the general prohibition has been derived

from ‘every meal-offering’, wherefore is the expression ‘which ye shall bring’¹⁴ stated? — It is required for the following which was taught: Which ye shall bring includes the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening.¹⁵ So R. Jose the Galilean.

R. Akiba says, It includes the Showbread, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening.¹⁶ But is not the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings prepared with fruit juice,¹⁷

(1) I.e., the placing of leaven on dough, which is the whole act of leavening, is equivalent to placing meat on coals and turning it over for the other side to roast, which two acts together constitute the act of roasting.

(2) The name of a bandit who used to eat his food slightly done; gen. a third done.

(3) Cur. edd. add here: ‘on one side’. This is not found in MS.M. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(4) Even though it had not been turned over.

(5) Which together make up the size of a dried fig.

(6) Shab. 102b.

(7) To make one large hole. Similarly here, the parts roasted should be reckoned together so as to make up the size of a dried fig.

(8) Lev. II, 11.

(9) I.e., before the handful was taken out.

(10) For the prohibition is expressly stated in connection with a meal-offering prepared in a pan.

(11) E.g., if the meal-offering was taken out of the Sanctuary and thereby had become invalid or if it had become unclean.

(12) I.e., he performed another work with this dough which had already been leavened, e.g. he baked it.

(13) To the head of the altar before it was leavened.

(14) Which refers specifically to the handful only.

(15) For this meal-offering is different in that no part thereof is eaten but it is wholly burnt upon the altar; it was therefore necessary for this to be expressly included within the prohibition of leavening. On the other hand, the Showbread does not come within this prohibition according to R. Jose, for he is of the opinion that the Showbread was hallowed only when set upon the table and not before when the flour was measured out, for the measuring vessels for dry goods were not consecrated as vessels of ministry.

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

(16) R. Akiba maintains that the measuring vessels for dry goods were consecrated and so the flour was hallowed for a meal-offering (for such is the Showbread) as soon as it was measured out; hence it comes within the prohibition of leavening.

(17) The meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings required a large quantity of oil, three logs to the tenth, and presumably no water was added to it; accordingly it cannot possibly become leavened.

Menachoth 57b

and fruit juice cannot render aught leaven? — Resh Lakish answered that R. Jose the Galilean was of the opinion that it was permitted to mix the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings with water.¹ But was not the [flour for the] Showbread put into a measuring vessel for dry goods, and we know that R. Akiba is of the opinion that the measuring vessel for dry goods was not consecrated?² —

Rabins sent the following answer in the name of R. Johanan: That is, indeed, the proper construction of the teaching, but the authorities must be reversed: ‘Which ye shall bring’ includes the Showbread, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening. So R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba says, It includes the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening. R. Johanan is indeed consistent in his view, for R. Johanan has said that R. Jose the Galilean and one of the disciples of R. Ishmael — namely, R. Josiah — both hold the same view, For it was taught: It is written, And had anointed them and sanctified them.⁴

R. Josiah says, The liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside, while the dry-measures were anointed inside but not outside. R. Jonathan says, The liquid-measures were anointed inside but not outside, while the dry-measures were not anointed at all. This can be proved from the fact that they do not hallow [what was put into them], for it is written, Ye shall bring out

of your dwellings two wave-loaves of two tenth parts of an ephah; they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven, for first-fruits unto the Lord;⁵ when are they appointed unto the Lord? Only after they have been baked.⁶ Wherein do they differ? In the interpretation of the word ‘them’.⁷ R. Josiah maintains that the word ‘them’ excludes the outside of the dry-measure; but R. Jonathan holds that the dry-measure was not holy at all and no verse is necessary to exclude it; the word ‘them’ can thus serve to exclude only the outside of the liquid-measure. And why did not [R. Johanan] say that R. Akiba and one of the disciples of R. Ishmael — namely R. Jonathan — both said the same thing?⁸ — Because they do not agree entirely about the liquid-measures.⁹

R. Papa said to Abaye, Was not a bowl used [for the kneading of the Showbread], and that was [a measuring vessel] for liquids?¹⁰ — He replied, It might have been kneaded on a slab.¹¹ But if so, when R. Jonathan said ‘This can be proved from the fact that they do not hallow [what was put into them]’, [his colleague] could have retorted that it might have been measured out in an unconsecrated tenth measure!¹² — [The two cases] cannot be compared; for with regard to the bowl, since the Divine Law did not expressly prescribe a bowl for the kneading, if it was kneaded on a slab it did not matter in the least; but with regard to the tenth measure, since the Divine Law directed that a tenth measure be made wherewith the flour might be measured, would one reject the consecrated tenth measure and measure with an unconsecrated tenth measure?

Our Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that whosoever offers of the flesh of a sin-offering or of a guilt-offering, of the flesh of a Most Holy¹³ or of a Less Holy offering, of the residue of the ‘Omer-offering, of the residue of the Two Loaves, of the Showbread, or of the remainder of meal-offerings, transgresses a negative precept? Because the text states,

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

For any leaven or any honey ye shall not burn of it as an offering made by fire unto the Lord,¹⁴ signifying that any offering, if only a portion of it is offered upon the fire, comes under the prohibition of ye shall not burn.¹⁵ But is any part of the Two Loaves or of the Showbread offered upon the fire? Surely it has been taught: Thus the Two Loaves and the Showbread are excluded¹⁶ since no part of them is offered upon the fire! — R. Shesheth answered, It meant there that no part of them is actually offered upon the fire.¹⁷

It was reported: If a person brought up any of the abovementioned parts upon the ascent,¹⁸ R. Johanan said, He is liable;¹⁹ but R. Eleazar said, He is not liable. ‘R. Johanan said, He is liable’, for it was taught: The verse says, The altar:²⁰ I know this²¹ only of the altar, whence do I know it of the ascent too? The text states: But they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar.²⁰ ‘R. Eleazar said, He is not liable’, because the verse says, Leaven and honey... as an offering of first-fruits ye may bring them unto the Lord;²⁰ only with regard to these²² is it implied that the ascent is on a par with the altar, but with no other offering is it so.

- (1) It can therefore become leavened.
- (2) V. infra 90a. Hence it cannot be subject to the prohibition of leavening since it was not hallowed as a meal-offering until set upon the table, for even the kneading need not have been in a vessel of ministry.
- (3) So MSS., Rashi, and Sh.Mek. Cur. edd.: ‘R. Reuben’.
- (4) Num. VII, 1. The reference is to the anointing of the altar vessels which were vessels for liquids.
- (5) Lev. XXIII, 17.
- (6) So that, although the flour must have been measured out in a measuring vessel, it was not hallowed ‘unto the Lord’ until after the baking in the oven of the Sanctuary.
- (7) Heb. אִיִּתָּהּ. The suggestion is that this word signifies the essential part of the vessel, namely the inside only.
- (8) Since R. Akiba and R. Jonathan both hold that the dry-measures were not consecrated.
- (9) For R. Akiba maintains that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside so

as to hallow whatsoever was put inside them as well as what was on the outside; v. infra 90a.

(10) The kneading bowl, being a vessel of ministry, would assuredly have hallowed the loaves before they were put into the oven.

(11) Which was of leather and was not consecrated as a vessel of ministry.

(12) Just as the kneading was not done in the usual vessel of ministry, one can also say that the flour was measured out in an unconsecrated measure, and on that account the loaves were only hallowed at the baking and not before. Had they, however, been measured out in a consecrated measure they would have become hallowed forthwith.

(13) E.g., the two lambs offered on the Pentecost as peace-offerings. They would not include burnt-offerings which are wholly offered on the altar.

(14) Lev. II, 11. ‘It is apparent that the expression ‘of it’, Heb. מִמֶּנּוּ, is superfluous in the verse, and is interpreted therefore as the basis for the rule, that once the prescribed portion of an offering has been duly offered up on the altar the rest may not under any circumstances be burnt upon the altar.

(15) Accordingly each offering enumerated in this Baraitha is subject to the prohibition of ‘ye shall not burn’, since a portion of each has already been offered as an offering by fire on the altar. Thus, of the animal sacrifices the fat parts have been offered, of the meal-offerings the handfuls, of the Two Loaves the fat parts of the two lambs which accompanied them, and of the Showbread the two dishes of frankincense.

(16) They are not to be ‘presented’ or brought near to the altar. V. infra 60b.

(17) In contradistinction from other offerings from which a handful is offered. Nevertheless since the offering consisted of the Loaves and the lambs or of the Showbread and the frankincense, it is also true to say that part of the offering is offered upon the fire.

(18) The slope which leads to the altar.

(19) Just as if he had offered the part upon the altar.

(20) Lev. II, 12.

(21) That it is prohibited to burn the remainder of an offering whereof a part has been duly offered up.

(22) Limited by the pronoun ‘them’, אֵוֶלָם. The verse applies only to those offerings which are described as ‘an offering of first-fruits’, namely, the Two Loaves and the First-fruits.

Menachoth 58a

And to what purpose does R. Johanan employ the term ‘them’? — He requires it for

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

the following which was taught: One might think that an individual may make a freewill-offering [of two loaves] in the same manner and offer it; for I would apply the verse, That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do,¹ the text therefore states, As an offering of first-fruits ye may bring, meaning only the community may bring them but not an individual.² One might further think that an individual may not offer them since he does not offer the like as an obligation, but the community may offer them [as a freewill-offering] since it must offer the like as an obligation, the text therefore states ‘them’; only these are to be offered, namely, the Two Loaves which are with leaven and the offering of first-fruits which includes honey. But was it then not permissible to offer the Two Loaves as a freewill-offering? Surely it has been taught: Since Scripture has stated any leaven,³ why has it also stated any honey?³ Or since it has stated any honey, why has it also stated any leaven?

It is because there is a condition which applies to leaven but not to honey, and there is also a condition which applies to honey but not to leaven. Leaven admits of an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple but honey does not admit of any exception in the Temple. Honey is permitted to be used in the remainder of a meal-offering⁴ but leaven is not permitted to be used in the remainder of a meal-offering. Therefore, since there is a condition which applies to leaven but not to honey, and there is a condition which applies to honey but not to leaven, Scripture had to state ‘any leaven’ and also ‘any honey’. Now to what did it refer when it said ‘Leaven admits of an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple’? No doubt to the Two Loaves, which may be offered as a freewill-offering!⁵ — No, said R. ‘Amram; it referred to what was offered with them.⁶ But then it is the same with the first-fruits, is it not?⁷ For we have learnt: The pigeons that were upon the baskets [of first-fruits] were sacrificed as

burnt-offerings, but those which the people carried in their hands they gave to the priests!⁸ — Those were only for adorning the firstfruits.⁹

Rami b. Hama enquired of R. Hisda, What is the law if one offered upon the altar the flesh of a sin-offering of a bird? Does the Scriptural rule¹⁰ refer only to that offering of which a portion has been offered upon the fire, and of this no portion has been offered upon the fire; or [does it refer] to everything that is called an offering, and this too is called an offering? — He answered, [It refers to] everything that is called an offering and this too is called an offering.¹¹

Tannaim differ on this point. R. Eliezer says, [The prohibition¹² refers only to] that offering of which a portion has been offered upon the fire; but R. Akiba says, [It refers to] everything that is called an offering. Wherein lies the difference between them? — R. Hisda said, In regard to the flesh of the sin-offering of a bird.¹³ Rab said, In regard to the log of oil of a leper.¹³ (For Levi taught: The expression ‘every offering of theirs’¹⁴ includes the log of oil of the leper.)¹⁵

Our Rabbis taught: Leaven... ye shall not burn.¹⁶ From this I only know the rule¹⁷ for the whole, but whence do I know it for a part thereof? Because the text states, Any leaven.¹⁶ And whence do I know it for the mixture? Because the text states, For any leaven.¹⁶ What does this mean?¹⁸ —

Abaye said, It means this: ‘Leaven... ye shall not burn’. From this I only know the rule for an olive's bulk,¹⁹ but whence do I know it for a half-olive's bulk?²⁰ Because the text states, ‘Any leaven’. And whence do I know it for the mixture?²¹ Because the text states, For any leaven’. Raba said, It means this: ‘Leaven... ye shall not burn’. From this I only know the rule for the [whole] handful, but whence do I know it for half of the handful? Because the text states, ‘Any leaven’. And

MENOCHOS – 27a-58b

whence do I know it for the mixture? Because the text states, 'For any leaven. Wherein do they differ? — Abaye maintains that the handful may be less than two olives' bulk

- (1) Deut. XXIII, 24.
- (2) For the verb תקריבו 'ye may bring', is in the plural.
- (3) 'Any', Heb. כל need not have been stated in both cases, since whatever rule is derived from one (v. infra) would equally apply to the other.
- (4) Cf. Hul. 132b.
- (5) Upon the altar. For the Two Loaves which were brought as an obligation were not offered on the altar.
- (6) I.e., the two lambs which were offered as an obligation together with the Two Loaves may also be offered as a freewill-offering upon the altar.
- (7) For pigeons which were offered with the first-fruits may also be offered as a freewill-offering; hence it cannot be said that the rules concerning leaven do not apply to honey.
- (8) Bik. III,5
- (9) But were not offered as an obligation with the first-fruits.
- (10) That what remains of the offering may not be burnt upon the altar.
- (11) Cf. Lev. I, 14.
- (12) That what remains of the offering may not be burnt upon the altar.
- (13) Which is referred to as an offering (cf. Lev. I, 14 and XIV, 12) although none of it is burnt upon the altar.
- (14) Num. XVIII, 9.
- (15) This teaching of Levi is omitted in all MSS. and apparently was not in the text before Rashi. It is struck out here by Sh. Mek.
- (16) Lev. II, 11.
- (17) That it must not be burnt upon the altar leavened.
- (18) What is meant by 'the whole' and 'the part'?
- (19) Since this may be the whole handful.
- (20) That this quantity is nevertheless reckoned as a 'burning' and therefore comes under the prohibition of 'ye shall not burn'.
- (21) I.e., if the handful consisted of what was partly leavened and partly unleavened and the one was not distinguishable from the other.

the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk does not count as an offering. It was stated: If a man offered leaven and honey² upon the altar, he has incurred stripes, said Raba, once for offering leaven, again for offering honey, again for offering leaven in a mixture, and yet again for offering honey in a mixture. But Abaye said, He does not suffer stripes for the breach of a negative precept which includes a number of prohibitions.³ Some say that he suffers stripes but once;⁴ but others say that he does not suffer stripes at all,⁵ since the negative precept is not as specific as that of 'muzzling'.⁶

- (1) Hence one is liable for burning a half-olive's bulk of leaven upon the altar.
- (2) In one mixture (Rashi). According to Tosaf. he offered some leaven, some honey, and a mixture of leaven and honey. Hence he suffers stripes four times.
- (3) Accordingly he does not suffer stripes for offering the mixture, since the negative precept of the mixture (implied in the term 'for any' v. supra) includes prohibitions for the mixture of leaven and the mixture of honey. V. Tosaf. s.v. המעלה ואין.
- (4) For the inclusive negative precept. In the case in question, therefore, he would suffer stripes three times, once for offering the leaven, again for the honey, and a third time for the mixtures.
- (5) For the inclusive negative precept; so that he would suffer stripes but twice.
- (6) Sc. the ox when treading the corn, Deut. XXV, 4. This is given as an example of a specific negative precept because it follows immediately upon the law concerning stripes, Deut. XXV, 1ff.

Menachoth 58b

and that the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk counts as an offering;¹ whereas Raba maintains that the handful may not be less than two olives' bulk and that