

priest removed the handful with his left hand the meal offering is unfit. Ben Beteira says: He must return the handful to the vessel that contains the meal offering and again remove the handful, this time with his right hand. If a priest removed the handful of flour, and a stone, a grain of salt, or a pinch [koret] of frankincense emerged in his hand, the meal offering is unfit due to the fact that the Sages said: The handful that is outsized or that is lacking is unfit. The existence of one of these foreign items in the handful means that the requisite measure of flour is lacking. And which is the outsized handful? It is one where he removed the handful overflowing [mevoratz] in a manner in which his fingers do not hold the flour. And which is the lacking handful? It is one where he removed the handful with the tips of his fingers. How does the priest perform the removal of a handful? He extends his fingers onto the palm of his hand.

1:3 If one increased its oil, decreased its oil, or decreased its frankincense, beyond the appropriate measures, the meal offering is unfit. With regard to one who removes a handful from the meal offering with the intent to partake of its remainder outside the Temple courtyard or to partake of an olive-bulk of its remainder outside the Temple courtyard, to burn its handful outside the Temple courtyard or to burn an olive-bulk of its handful outside the Temple courtyard, or to burn its frankincense outside the Temple courtyard, in all these cases the offering is unfit, but there is no liability for karet for one who partakes of it. If one had the intent to partake of its remainder on the next day or to partake of an olive-bulk of its remainder on the next day, to burn its handful on the next day or to burn an olive-bulk of its handful on the next day, or to burn its frankincense on the next day, the offering is piggul, and one is liable to receive karet for partaking of the remainder of that meal offering. This is the principle: In the case of anyone who removes the handful, or places the handful in the vessel, or who conveys the vessel with the handful to the altar, or who burns the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of an item whose typical manner is such that one partakes of it, e.g., the remainder, or to burn an item whose typical manner is such that one burns it on the altar, e.g., the handful or the frankincense, outside its designated area, the meal offering is unfit but there is no liability for karet. If his intent was to do so beyond its designated time, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet on account of it, provided that the permitting factor, i.e., the handful, was sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. If the permitting factor was not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva, although the meal offering is unfit, the prohibition of piggul does not apply to it. How is the permitting factor considered to have been sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva? If one removed the handful in silence, i.e., with no specific intent, and placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder beyond its designated time; or if one removed the handful with the intent to partake of the or burn the handful or frankincense beyond its designated time, and placed it in the vessel, and conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar in silence, with no specific intent; or if one removed the handful and placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder beyond its

designated time, that is the case of an offering whose permitting factor was sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva, and one is liable to receive karet for partaking of it due to piggul.

1:4 How is the permitting factor not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva?

If one removed the handful with the intent to partake of the remainder or burn the handful or frankincense outside its designated area, or placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder beyond its designated time; or if one removed the handful with the intent to partake of the remainder or burn the handful or frankincense beyond its designated time, and placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder outside its designated area; or if one removed the handful and placed it in the vessel, and conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder outside its designated area, that is the case of an offering whose permitting factor was not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. The meal offering of a sinner and the meal offering of jealousy brought by a sota that one removed their handful not for their sake and placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, with the intent to partake of the remainder or burn the handful beyond its designated time; or that one removed the handful with the intent to partake of the remainder or burn the handful beyond its designated time or placed it in the vessel, conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, not for their sake; or that one removed the handful, and placed it in the vessel, and conveyed it, and burned the handful on the altar, not for their sake, that is the case of an offering whose permitting factor was not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. If one performed one of these rites with the intent to partake of an olive-bulk outside its designated area and an olive-bulk the next day, or an olive-bulk the next day and an olive-bulk outside its designated area, or half an olive-bulk outside its designated area and half an olive-bulk the next day, or half an olive-bulk the next day and half an olive-bulk outside its designated area, the offering is unfit but there is no liability for karet. Rabbi Yehuda says that this is the principle: If the intent with regard to the time preceded the intent with regard to the area, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet on account of it. If the intent with regard to the area preceded the intent with regard to the time, the offering is unfit but there is no liability for karet. And the Rabbis say: In both this case, where the intent with regard to time was first, and that case, where the intent with regard to area came first, the offering is unfit but there is no liability for karet. If one's intent was to partake of half an olive-bulk of the remainder and to burn half an olive-bulk of it not at the appropriate time or not in the appropriate area, the offering is fit, because eating and burning do not join together.

2:1 In the case of a priest who removes a handful from the meal offering with the intent to partake of its remainder or to burn its handful on the next day, Rabbi Yosei concedes in this instance that it is a case of piggul and he is liable to receive karet for partaking of it. But if the priest's intent was to burn its frankincense the next day, Rabbi Yosei says: The meal offering is

unfit but partaking of it does not include liability to receive karet. And the Rabbis say: It is a case of piggul and he is liable to receive karet for partaking of the meal offering. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yosei: In what manner does this differ from an animal offering, where if one slaughtered it with the intent to sacrifice the portions consumed on the altar the next day, it is piggul? Rabbi Yosei said to the Rabbis: There is a difference, as in the case of an animal offering, its blood, and its flesh, and its portions consumed on the altar are all one entity. Consequently, intent with regard to any one of them renders the entire offering piggul. But the frankincense is not part of the meal offering.

2:2 If one slaughtered the two lambs that accompany the two meal offering loaves sacrificed on Shavuot with the intent to partake of one of the two loaves the next day, or if one burned the two bowls of frankincense accompanying the shewbread with the intent to partake of one of the arrangements of the shewbread the next day, Rabbi Yosei says: That loaf and that arrangement of which he intended to partake the next day are piggul and one is liable to receive karet for their consumption, and the second loaf and arrangement are unfit, but there is no liability to receive karet for their consumption. And the Rabbis say: This loaf and arrangement and that loaf and arrangement are both piggul and one is liable to receive karet for their consumption. If one of the two loaves of Shavuot or one of the two arrangements of the shewbread became ritually impure, Rabbi Yehuda says: Both must be taken to the place of burning like any other disqualified offering, as no communal offering is divided. That is, it is either fit in its entirety or unfit in its entirety. And the Rabbis say: The impure one remains in its state of impurity and the pure one shall be eaten.

2:3 The thanks offering renders the accompanying loaves piggul but the loaves do not render the thanks offering piggul. How so? If one slaughtered the thanks offering, which may be consumed only during the day it is slaughtered and the night thereafter, with the intent to partake of it the next day, the offering and the accompanying loaves are rendered piggul. If he slaughtered it with the intent to partake of the loaves the next day, the loaves are rendered piggul and the thanks offering is not piggul. Likewise, the lambs sacrificed with the two loaves meal offering on Shavuot render the accompanying loaves piggul, but the loaves do not render the lambs piggul. How so? If one slaughtered the lambs, which may be consumed only during the day they are slaughtered and the night thereafter, with the intent to partake of them the next day, the lambs and the accompanying loaves are rendered piggul. If he did so with the intent to partake of the loaves the next day, the loaves are rendered piggul and the lambs are not piggul.

2:4 The animal offering renders the accompanying libations and meal offerings piggul from the moment that they were consecrated in the vessel, but not before; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. The libations do not render the animal offering piggul. How so? In the case of one who slaughters the offering with the intent to partake of it the next day, the offering and its libations are rendered piggul. But if one slaughters the offering with the intent to sacrifice its libations the next day, the libations are rendered piggul, while

the offering is not piggul.

2:5 With regard to the burning of the handful of a meal offering and the frankincense, both of which render the meal offering permitted for consumption:

If the priest had an intention that can render the offering piggul during the burning of the handful but not during the burning of the frankincense, or during the burning of the frankincense but not during the burning of the handful, i.e., he burned one of them with the intention to eat the remainder of the offering beyond its designated time, Rabbi Meir says: The offering is piggul and one who eats it is liable to receive karet for its consumption. And the Rabbis say: There is no liability to receive karet in this case unless he renders the offering piggul during the sacrifice of the entire permitting factor, i.e., the burning of both the handful and the frankincense. And the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Meir in the case of a meal offering of a sinner and in the case of a meal offering of jealousy of a sota that if one had intent of piggul during the burning of the handful, that the meal offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for its consumption, as here the handful is the sole permitting factor. If one slaughtered one of the two lambs sacrificed with the two loaves on Shavuot with the intent to partake of the two loaves the next day, or if one burned one of the bowls of frankincense with the intent to partake of two arrangements of shewbread the next day, Rabbi Meir says: The meal offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for its consumption, and the Rabbis say: There is no liability to receive karet unless he has intent of piggul during the sacrifice of the entire permitting factor. If one slaughtered one of the lambs with the intent to partake of it the next day, that lamb is piggul and the other is a fit offering. If he slaughtered one lamb with the intent to partake of the other the next day, both lambs are fit offerings, as one permitting factor does not render another permitting factor piggul.

3:1 In the case of one who removes a handful from the meal offering with the intent to consume, beyond its designated time, an item whose typical manner is such that one does not consume it, i.e., the handful, or to burn, beyond its designated time, an item whose typical manner is such that one does not burn it on the altar, i.e., the remainder of the meal offering, the meal offering is fit. Rabbi Eliezer deems it unfit, although it is not piggul, and consuming it is therefore not punishable by excision from the World-to-Come [karet]. In the case of one who removes a handful from the meal offering with the intent to consume, beyond its designated time, an item whose typical manner is such that one does consume it, or to burn, beyond its designated time, an item whose typical manner is such that one does burn it on the altar, but his intent was to consume or burn improperly less than an olive-bulk, the offering is fit. If his intent was both to consume half an olive-bulk and to burn half an olive-bulk beyond its designated time, the meal offering is nevertheless fit, because eating and burning do not join together.

3:2 If one did not pour the oil onto the meal offering, or did not mix the oil into the meal offering, or did not break the loaves into pieces, or did not add salt, or did not wave the omer meal offering or the meal offering of a sota, or did not bring the meal offering to the altar, or if it happened that the priest

broke the meal offerings that require breaking into greater pieces than appropriate, or did not smear oil on the wafers requiring this (see Leviticus 2:4), in all these cases the meal offering is fit. If a handful of one meal offering, which is to be burned on the altar, was intermingled with a handful of another meal offering, or with the meal offering of priests, or with the meal offering of the anointed priest, i.e., the High Priest, or with the meal offering of libations accompanying burnt offerings and peace offerings, all of which are burned in their entirety on the altar, it is fit for sacrifice, and the mixture is burned on the altar. Rabbi Yehuda says: If the handful was intermingled with the meal offering of the anointed priest, or with the meal offering of libations, the mixture is unfit because with regard to this, the handful from the standard meal offering, its mixture is thick, one log of oil mixed with a tenth of an ephah of flour, and with regard to that, the meal offering of the anointed priest and the meal offering of libations, its mixture is loose, three log of oil mixed with a tenth of an ephah of flour. And the mixtures, which are not identical, absorb from each other, increasing the amount of oil in the handful and decreasing the amount of oil in the meal offering of the anointed priest or the meal offering of libations, thereby invalidating both.

3:3 In the case of two meal offerings from which a handful was not removed and that were intermingled with each other, if the priest can remove a handful from this meal offering by itself and from that meal offering by itself, they are fit meal offerings, but if not, they are unfit, as the handful of each meal offering must be taken from its original source. In the case of a handful that was intermingled with a meal offering from which a handful was not removed, the priest should not burn the mixture on the altar. And if he burned it, this meal offering from which the handful was taken satisfies the obligation of the owner and that meal offering from which the handful was not taken does not satisfy the obligation of the owner. If, after it was removed, its handful was intermingled with its remainder or with the remainder of another meal offering, the priest should not burn the mixture on the altar, but if he burned it, it satisfies the obligation of the owner. If the handful became ritually impure and despite this the priest sacrificed it, the frontplate worn by the High Priest effects acceptance of the meal offering, and the remainder is eaten by the priests. If the handful left its designated area and despite this the priest then sacrificed it, the frontplate does not effect acceptance. The reason is that the frontplate effects acceptance for offerings sacrificed when ritually impure and does not effect acceptance for offerings that leave their designated areas.

3:4 If after the handful was removed the remainder of the meal offering became ritually impure, or if the remainder of the meal offering was burned, or if the remainder of the meal offering was lost, according to the principle of Rabbi Eliezer, who says that with regard to an animal offering the blood is fit for sprinkling even if there is no meat that can be eaten, the meal offering is fit, and the priest burns the handful. But according to the principle of Rabbi Yehoshua, who says that with regard to an animal offering the blood is fit for sprinkling only if there is meat that can be eaten, it is unfit and the priest

does not burn the handful, as the handful serves to render permitted the remainder. A handful of a meal offering that was not sanctified in a service vessel is unfit, and Rabbi Shimon deems it fit. If the priest burned the handful of a meal offering twice, i.e., in two increments, it is fit.

3:5 With regard to the handful, failure to sacrifice the minority of it prevents the majority of it, which was sacrificed, from rendering it permitted for the priests to consume the remainder of the meal offering. With regard to a tenth of an ephah of flour brought as a meal offering, failure to sacrifice the minority of it prevents the majority of it, which was sacrificed, from qualifying as a proper meal offering. With regard to the wine poured as a libation, failure to pour the minority of it prevents the majority of it, which was poured, from qualifying as a proper libation. With regard to the log of oil that is required for the meal offering, failure to add the minority of it prevents the majority of it, which was added, from being a sufficient measure of oil. With regard to the fine flour and the oil, failure to bring each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the handful and the frankincense, failure to burn each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other.

3:6 With regard to the two goats of Yom Kippur, the absence of each goat prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the two sheep brought together with the meal offering of the two loaves on Shavuot, failure to bring each of the sheep prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the two loaves brought on Shavuot, failure to bring each of the loaves prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the two arrangements of the shewbread, failure to place each of the arrangements prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the two bowls of frankincense that accompany the shewbread, failure to place each of the bowls prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the arrangements of the shewbread and the bowls of frankincense, failure to bring each of them prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. With regard to the two types of loaves that accompany the offerings of a nazirite: The bread and wafers (see Numbers 6:15); the three species that are part of the rite of the red heifer: The cedar, hyssop, and scarlet wool (see Numbers 19:6); and the four types of loaves that accompany the thanks offering: The loaves, wafers, loaves soaked in hot water, and leavened bread (see Leviticus 7:12); and the four species of the lulav: The lulav, etrog, myrtle, and willow (see Leviticus 23:40); and the four species that are used in the purification process of the leper: The cedar, hyssop, scarlet wool, and birds (see Leviticus 14:4), failure to bring each of the components prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others. With regard to the seven sprinklings of the blood of the red heifer that the priest sprinkles opposite the entrance to the Sanctuary (see Numbers 19:4), failure to sprinkle each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others. With regard to the seven sprinklings of the blood of the bull and goat of Yom Kippur that are sprinkled on the Ark between the staves (see Leviticus 16:14–15), the seven sprinklings that are sprinkled on the Curtain separating the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and the sprinklings that are sprinkled on the golden altar on Yom Kippur, and from all other inner sin offerings, failure to

sprinkle each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others.

3:7 With regard to the seven branches of the Candelabrum (see Exodus 25:32), the absence of each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others. With regard to its seven lamps atop the branches, the absence of each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others. With regard to the two passages that are in the mezuzah, which are the first (Deuteronomy 6:1–9) and second (Deuteronomy 11:13–21) paragraphs of Shema, the absence of each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the other. Furthermore, the absence of even one letter prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the rest of them. With regard to the four passages that are in the phylacteries, which are the two passages in the mezuzah and two additional passages (Exodus 13:1–10, 11–16), the absence of each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others. Furthermore, the absence of even one letter prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the rest of them. With regard to the four ritual fringes on a garment, the absence of each prevents fulfillment of the mitzva with the others, as the four of them constitute one mitzva. Rabbi Yishmael says: The four of them are four discrete mitzvot, and the absence of one does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva with the rest.

4:1 The absence of the sky-blue [tekhelet] strings does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva of ritual fringes with the white strings, and the absence of white strings does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva with the sky-blue strings. If one has only one, he wears it without the other. Absence of the phylacteries of the arm does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva of the phylacteries of the head, and absence of the phylacteries of the head does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva of the phylacteries of the arm. If one has only one, he dons it without the other. The mishna returns to discussing the halakhot of meal offerings, which are the central theme of this tractate. The absence of the fine flour and the oil for the meal offering accompanying burnt offerings and peace offerings does not prevent libation of the wine, and the absence of the wine for libation does not prevent sacrifice of the flour and the oil. Failure to perform some of the placements of blood on the external altar does not prevent fulfillment of the mitzva with the other placements, as even if the priest performed only one placement of blood, the offering effects atonement after the fact.

4:2 Failure to sacrifice one of the bulls, the rams, the sheep, or the goats of the additional offerings brought on Festivals does not prevent the sacrifice of the others. Rabbi Shimon says: If the Temple treasurers had sufficient funds for the numerous bulls that are required to be sacrificed on that day but they did not also have sufficient funds for the accompanying libations, they should rather bring one bull and its libations, and they should not sacrifice all of them without libations.

4:3 On Shavuot there is an obligation to sacrifice burnt offerings, a sin offering, and peace offerings together with the offering of the two loaves. The burnt offerings consists of a bull, two rams, and seven sheep. A goat is brought for the sin offering. Two sheep are brought as peace offerings and waved together with the two loaves. Failure to sacrifice the bull, the rams, and the sheep, which are all brought as burnt offerings, and the goat that is

brought as a sin offering, does not prevent the bringing of the two loaves, and they are sacrificed nevertheless. Failure to bring the two loaves does not prevent sacrifice of the accompanying animal offerings. Failure to bring the two loaves prevents sacrifice of the accompanying peace offering of two sheep, but failure to sacrifice the two sheep does not prevent the bringing of the two loaves; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas says: No, rather the opposite is true. Failure to sacrifice the peace offering of two sheep prevents the bringing of the two loaves, but failure to bring the two loaves does not prevent sacrifice of the accompanying peace offering of two sheep. As we found that when the Jewish people were in the wilderness for forty years after the exodus from Egypt, they sacrificed the two sheep as a peace offering on Shavuot without the two loaves, as the two loaves may be brought only from wheat grown in Eretz Yisrael after the Jewish people entered the land. Here too, whenever wheat is unavailable, they should sacrifice the two sheep without the two loaves. However, the two loaves are not sacrificed without the peace offering of two sheep. Rabbi Shimon says: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas that failure to sacrifice the two sheep prevents the bringing of the two loaves but failure to bring the two loaves does not prevent sacrifice of the accompanying peace offering of two sheep, but the reason for that ruling is not in accordance with his statement. As all the offerings that must be sacrificed on Shavuot that are stated in the book of Numbers (see 28:27), i.e., two bulls, one ram, and seven sheep as additional offerings and a goat as a sin offering, were sacrificed when the Jewish people were in the wilderness. But all the offerings stated in Leviticus (see 23:18–20), i.e., the offerings accompanying the two loaves, were not sacrificed when the Jewish people were in the wilderness. Not only were the two loaves not sacrificed, but the accompanying offerings, including the peace offering of the two sheep, were also not sacrificed, because it was only when they arrived in Eretz Yisrael that these additional offerings and those offerings accompanying the two loaves were sacrificed. Neither the additional offerings of Shavuot nor the two loaves, and the offerings that accompany them, were sacrificed in the wilderness, contrary to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas. Rather, for what reason do I nevertheless say that the sheep should be sacrificed without the loaves, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas? It is due to the fact that the sheep permit themselves, as the sprinkling of their blood and the burning of the portions consumed on the altar renders it permitted to partake of their meat. And why are the loaves not sacrificed without the sheep? It is because there is no item to permit the loaves, as the loaves are permitted only after the sheep are sacrificed.

4:4 Failure to sacrifice the daily offerings does not prevent sacrifice of the additional offerings, and likewise, failure to sacrifice the additional offerings does not prevent sacrifice of the daily offerings. And failure to sacrifice some of the additional offerings on a day when more than one is sacrificed, e.g., if it was both Shabbat and the New Moon, does not prevent sacrifice of the other additional offerings. If the priests did not sacrifice a lamb in the morning as the daily offering, nevertheless, they should sacrifice

a lamb in the afternoon as the daily offering, as failure to sacrifice one daily offering does not prevent sacrifice of the other. In all of these cases, if they failed to sacrifice one offering, they should still sacrifice the other. Rabbi Shimon said: When does this halakha apply? It applies at a time when the failure to sacrifice the daily morning offering was because they were prevented from sacrificing it due to circumstances beyond their control or they failed to sacrifice it unwittingly. But if the priests acted intentionally and did not sacrifice a lamb in the morning as the daily offering, they should not sacrifice a lamb in the afternoon as the daily offering. Incense was burned twice a day, half a measure in the morning and half a measure in the afternoon. If they did not burn the half-measure of incense in the morning, they should burn the half-measure in the afternoon. Rabbi Shimon said: And in such a case, the entire measure was sacrificed in the afternoon. The reason for the difference between the daily offerings and the incense is that the daily service on a new golden altar is initiated only with the burning of the incense of the spices in the afternoon, at which time they would burn a full measure. And the daily service on a new altar of the burnt offering, on which the daily offerings were sacrificed, is initiated only with the daily morning offering. And use of a new Table was initiated only with the arrangement of the shewbread on Shabbat, and use of a new Candelabrum was initiated only with the kindling of its seven lamps in the afternoon.

4:5 The twelve loaves of matza prepared from a tenth of an ephah of flour of the griddle-cake offering of the High Priest did not come from the house of the High Priest in halves. Rather, the High Priest brings from his house a complete tenth of an ephah of flour (see Leviticus 6:13) and divides it in half, and he sacrifices half in the morning and half in the afternoon. In the case of a High Priest who brings and sacrifices half in the morning and dies, and they appointed another High Priest in his stead, the replacement High Priest should neither bring half of a tenth of an ephah of flour from his house nor sacrifice the remaining half of the tenth of an ephah of his predecessor. Rather, he brings from his house an entire tenth of an ephah and divides it in half, sacrifices half, and the other half is not sacrificed and is lost.

Consequently, two halves of a tenth of an ephah are sacrificed, one-half of what was brought by each priest, and the other two halves are lost. If they did not appoint another High Priest in his stead, from whose property was the griddle-cake offering brought and sacrificed? Rabbi Shimon says: It is brought and sacrificed from the property of the community. Rabbi Yehuda says: It is brought and sacrificed from the property of the heirs of the High Priest. And for the duration of the period until a new High Priest was appointed, the griddle-cake offering was sacrificed as a complete tenth of an ephah of fine flour.

5:1 All the meal offerings come to be offered as matza, with care taken to prevent leavening, except for ten loaves of leavened bread among the forty loaves that accompany the thanks offering, and the meal offering of the two loaves that are brought on the festival of Shavuot, as they come to be offered as leavened bread. The Sages disagree as to the manner in which those meal offerings are leavened. Rabbi Meir says: With regard to the leaven added to the

dough to facilitate leavening, one separates [bodeh] part of the flour for the meal offerings from within the flour of the meal offerings themselves, causes it to become leaven, and leavens the meal offerings with it. Rabbi Yehuda says: That is also not the optimal manner in which to fulfill the mitzva, as aged leaven is a more effective leavening agent. Rather, one brings the leaven from another, aged, dough and places it into the measuring vessel, and then he adds flour until he fills the measuring vessel, to ensure the appropriate measure of a tenth of an ephah of flour. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: That too is inappropriate, as in that manner the meal offering will either be lacking the requisite measure or be greater than the required measure, as the Gemara will explain.

5:2 All the meal-offerings that come as matza are to be kneaded with lukewarm water so that the dough will bake well, as only a small amount of oil is added. And one must watch over them to ensure that they do not become leaven while kneading and shaping them, and if a meal offering or even only its remainder becomes leaven, one violates a prohibition, as it is stated: “No meal offering that you shall bring to the Lord shall be made with leaven; as you shall burn no leaven nor any honey as an offering made by fire to the Lord” (Leviticus 2:11). And one is liable to be flogged for kneading the meal offering, and for shaping it, and for baking it, if the meal offering becomes leaven.

5:3 There are four types of meal offerings: Those that require both oil and frankincense, those that require oil but not frankincense, those that require frankincense but not oil, and those that require neither frankincense nor oil. The mishna elaborates: And these are the meal offerings that require both oil and frankincense: The fine-flour meal offering, as it is stated: “And he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon” (Leviticus 2:1); the meal offering prepared in a pan (see Leviticus 2:5–6); the meal offering prepared in a deep pan (see Leviticus 2:7–10); and the meal offering baked in an oven, which can be brought in the form of loaves or in the form of wafers (see Leviticus 2:4). Additional meal offerings that require both oil and frankincense are the meal offering of priests; the meal offering of the anointed priest, i.e., the griddle-cake offering brought by the High Priest every day, half in the morning and half in the evening; the meal offering of a gentile; a meal offering brought by women; and the omer meal offering (see Leviticus 23:15). The meal offering brought with libations that accompany burnt offerings and peace offerings requires oil but does not require frankincense. The shewbread requires frankincense but does not require oil. The two loaves brought on the festival of Shavuot (see Leviticus 23:17), the meal offering of a sinner, and the meal offering of jealousy brought by a sota require neither oil nor frankincense. The two loaves do not require oil or frankincense because these additions are not mentioned with regard to it. The meal offering of a sinner does not require them, as it is written: “He shall not put oil upon it, neither shall he give any frankincense upon it; for it is a sin offering” (Leviticus 5:11). With regard to the meal offering brought by a sota, it is similarly written: “He shall pour no oil upon it, nor give frankincense upon it, for it is a meal offering of jealousy, a meal offering of memorial,

bringing iniquity to remembrance” (Numbers 5:15).

5:4 And if one places oil or frankincense on the meal offering of a sinner or on the meal offering of jealousy brought by a sota, he is liable to be flogged for violating the prohibition against placing the oil by itself, and he is liable to be flogged for violating the prohibition against placing the frankincense by itself, as these are two separate prohibitions. If one placed oil upon the meal offering he has disqualified it, but if one placed frankincense upon the meal offering he should gather the frankincense and remove it. In this manner, the meal offering can be salvaged. Furthermore, one violates the prohibition only by placing oil on the meal offering prior to the removal of the handful; if he placed oil on its remainder he does not violate a prohibition. If one placed a vessel with oil on top of a vessel that contains a meal offering of a sinner or a meal offering brought by a sota he did not disqualify the meal offering, as the oil was not placed on the meal offering itself.

5:5 There are four categories of meal offerings: Those that require bringing near, a rite that requires the priests to carry the offering in their hands and bring it near the southwest corner of the altar, but do not require waving; those that require both bringing near and waving; those that require waving but not bringing near; and those that require neither waving nor bringing near. The mishna elaborates: And these are the meal offerings that require bringing near but do not require waving: The fine-flour meal offering; the meal offering prepared in a pan; the meal offering prepared in a deep pan; the meal offering baked in an oven, which can be brought in the form of loaves or in the form of wafers; the meal offering of priests; the meal offering of the anointed priest; the meal offering of gentiles; a meal offering brought by women; and the meal offering of a sinner. Rabbi Shimon says: The meal offering of priests and the meal offering of the anointed priest do not require bringing of the meal offering near to the altar, due to the fact that there is no removal of a handful in their sacrifice, and there is a principle that with regard to any meal offering where there is no removal of a handful in their sacrifice, there is also no bringing near.

5:6 These are the items that require waving and do not require bringing near to the altar: The log of oil that accompanies the guilt offering of a recovered leper and his guilt offering itself, as it is written: “And the priest shall take one of the lambs and sacrifice it for a guilt offering, and the log of oil, and wave them for a wave offering before the Lord” (Leviticus 14:12); and the first fruits, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov; and the sacrificial portions of the peace offerings of an individual and their breast and thigh, as it is written: “The thigh of heaving and the breast of waving shall they bring with the offerings of the portions consumed by fire, to wave it for a wave offering before the Lord” (Leviticus 10:15). This requirement applies to peace offerings belonging both to men and to women, by male Jews and not by others. The Gemara will explain this seemingly contradictory statement on 61b. In addition, the two loaves and the accompanying peace offering of two lambs brought on Shavuot also do not require bringing near but do require waving, as it is written: “And the priest shall

wave them with the bread of the first fruits for a wave offering before the Lord, with the two lambs” (Leviticus 23:20). How does one perform this waving? He places the two loaves on top of the two lambs and places his two hands below the loaves and the lambs, extends the offerings to each of the four directions and brings them back, then raises and lowers them, as it is stated with regard to the waving of the ram of the inauguration of the priests: “Which is waved, and which is heaved up” (Exodus 29:27); i.e., waved back and forth, and heaved up and down. Waving was able to be performed to the east of the altar, but the bringing near of meal offerings had to be done to the west, i.e., the southwest corner of the altar. Also, with regard to all meal offerings, the wavings precede the actions of bringing near. The omer meal offering and the meal offering of jealousy brought by a sota require both bringing near and waving. The meal offering of the omer requires waving, as it is written: “And he shall wave the omer before the Lord” (Leviticus 23:11), and likewise with regard to the meal offering brought by a sota it is written: “And the priest shall take the meal offering of jealousy out of the woman’s hand and shall wave the meal offering before the Lord” (Numbers 5:25). The requirement of bringing near is derived as explained earlier. The shewbread and the meal offering brought with libations require neither bringing near nor waving.

5:7 Rabbi Shimon says: There are three types of offerings that require performance of three mitzvot. Two mitzvot are performed on each and every one of them, but the third mitzva is not performed in their sacrifice, meaning that each of these offerings requires two out of the same three mitzvot, but not necessarily the same two as the others. And these are the three offerings: Peace offerings brought as gift offerings by an individual, communal peace offerings, i.e., the two lambs brought with the two loaves on Shavuot, and the guilt offering of a leper (see Leviticus 14:12–14). Peace offerings brought by individuals require placing hands on the head of the animals while the animals are still alive, and waving when they are slaughtered, but there is no obligation of waving them while they are alive. Communal peace offerings require waving both while the animals are still alive and after they are slaughtered, but there is no obligation of placing hands on them. And the guilt offering of a leper requires placing hands and waving while the animal is still alive, but there is no obligation of waving it after it is slaughtered.

5:8 One who takes a vow to bring a meal offering to the Temple and says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering prepared in a mahavat, may not bring one prepared in a marheshet. Similarly, if he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering prepared in a marheshet, he may not bring one prepared in a mahavat. The mishna clarifies: What is the difference between a mahavat and a marheshet? A marheshet has a cover, whereas a mahavat does not have a cover; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili. Rabbi Hanina ben Gamliel says: A marheshet is deep, and due to the large amount of oil, its product is soft because it moves about [rohashin] in the oil. A mahavat is flat, as the sides of the pan are level with the pan, and due to the small amount of oil, its product is hard.

5:9 If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering baked in an

oven, he may not bring a meal offering baked on a small oven [kupah], nor a meal offering baked on roofing tiles, nor a meal offering baked in the baking pits of the Arabs. Rabbi Yehuda says: If he so wishes, he may bring a meal offering baked on a kupah. If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a baked meal offering, without specifying loaves or wafers, he may not bring half the required offering in the form of loaves and the other half in the form of wafers; rather, they must all be of one form or the other. Rabbi Shimon deems this permitted, due to the fact that both loaves and wafers are written with regard to this meal offering, which indicates that it is one offering of two possible forms.

6:1 And these are the meal offerings from which a handful is removed and the remainder of the offering is eaten by the priests: The meal offering of fine flour; and the meal offering prepared in a pan; and the meal offering prepared in a deep pan; and the meal offering baked in an oven that is brought entirely of loaves; and the meal offering baked in an oven that is brought entirely of wafers; the meal offering of gentiles; and the meal offering of women; and the omer meal offering, i.e., the measure of barley brought as a communal offering on the sixteenth of Nisan; and the meal offering of a sinner; and the meal offering of jealousy, brought by a sota. Rabbi Shimon says: Although its remainder is not eaten by priests, as meal offerings of priests are burned in their entirety, as it is written: “And every meal offering of the priest shall be offered in its entirety; it shall not be eaten” (Leviticus 6:16), nevertheless, with regard to the meal offering of a sinner brought by one of the priests, a handful is removed. And the handful is sacrificed on the altar by itself, and the remainder is sacrificed on the altar by itself.

6:2 The meal offering of priests, the meal offering of the anointed priest, i.e., the High Priest, and the meal offering brought with libations that accompany burnt offerings and peace offerings are burned in their entirety on the altar, and there is no part of them for the priests. And in the case of those offerings, the power of the altar is greater than the power of the priests. The two loaves, i.e., the public offering on Shavuot of two loaves baked from new wheat, and the shewbread, i.e., the twelve loaves that were placed on the sacred Table in the Sanctuary each Shabbat, are eaten by the priests, and there is no part of them burned on the altar. And in the case of those offerings, the power of the priests is greater than the power of the altar.

6:3 All the meal offerings that are prepared in a vessel, e.g., the offerings prepared in a pan or deep pan, require three placements of oil, listed here in the reverse order of their placement: Pouring oil on the cakes after they have been cooked, and mixing oil into the flour, and placement of oil into the vessel prior to preparation of the meal offerings. In the meal offerings that come as loaves, it is after the flour has been baked into loaves that one breaks them into pieces and mixes them with oil; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: It is with fine flour that one mixes the oil. Although the loaves of the meal offering baked in an oven require mixing of their flour with oil, wafers do not require mixing, but rather a smearing of oil on them after baking. How does one smear oil on them? He does so in a shape

similar to the Greek letter chi, χ , and the rest of the oil remaining after smearing is eaten by priests.

6:4 All the meal offerings that are prepared in a vessel require breaking into pieces. In breaking the meal offering of an Israelite into pieces, the priest folds [kofel] one into two and two into four and separates it at the folds. In breaking into pieces the meal offering of priests, the priest folds one into two and two into four and does not separate it at the folds. Because no handful is removed, separation is unnecessary. In the case of the griddle-cake meal offering of the anointed priest, he would not fold it. Rabbi Shimon says: In neither the meal offering of priests nor the meal offering of the anointed priest is there breaking into pieces, because in those meal offerings there is no removal of a handful. And any meal offering in which there is no removal of a handful there is no breaking into pieces. And in all meal offerings that are broken into pieces, the priest breaks them into olive-bulk-sized pieces.

6:5 All the meal offerings require rubbing three hundred times and striking five hundred times with one's fist or palm. Rubbing and striking are performed on the wheat kernels to remove their husks prior to grinding them into flour. And Rabbi Yosei says: They are performed on the dough to ensure a smooth product. All of the meal offerings come as ten loaves or ten wafers from each one tenth of an ephah of flour, except for the shewbread and the griddle-cake offering of the High Priest, which come as twelve loaves or wafers; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Meir says: They all come as twelve loaves except for the four types of loaves that accompany the thanks offering and the two types of loaves that accompany the peace offering of naziriteship, which come as ten each.

6:6 The omer offering, i.e., the measure of barley brought as a communal offering on the sixteenth of Nisan, would come from a tenth of an ephah of flour sifted from three se'a of barley. The two loaves would come from two-tenths of an ephah of flour sifted from three se'a of wheat. The shewbread would come from twenty-four tenths of an ephah of flour sifted from twenty-four se'a of wheat.

6:7 The flour of the omer was sifted with thirteen sifters, each finer than its predecessor, and the flour that emerged from the final sifter was sacrificed. The flour of the two loaves was sifted with twelve sifters, and the flour of the shewbread was sifted with eleven sifters. Rabbi Shimon says: They have no fixed number of sifters; rather, it was fine flour that was completely sifted that one would bring for all of these offerings, as it is stated: "And you shall take fine flour and bake it" (Leviticus 24:5), indicating that one does not fulfill his obligation until the flour will be completely sifted.

7:1 The flour for the loaves accompanying the thanks offering would come from a measure of five Jerusalem se'a offering, which are equivalent to six wilderness se'a. The se'a referred to in the Bible when the Jewish people were in the wilderness is smaller than the se'a used later in Jerusalem. This is equivalent to two ephahs, each ephah being three wilderness se'a. These two ephahs are twenty measures of a tenth of an ephah. Ten of these tenths were used to make leavened loaves and ten of these tenths were used to make unleavened loaves, i.e., matza. The mishna elaborates: There are ten tenths for

the loaves of leavened bread, a tenth of an ephah per loaf. And there are ten tenths for the loaves of matza. And among the loaves of matza there are three types: Loaves, wafers, and those poached in water, ten loaves of each type. Consequently, there are three-and-one-third tenths of an ephah for each and every type, three loaves per tenth of an ephah. And in the Jerusalem measure there were thirty kav, fifteen kav for the loaves of leavened bread and fifteen for the loaves of matza. The mishna elaborates: There are fifteen kav for the loaves of leavened bread, one and one-half kav per loaf. And there are fifteen kav for the loaves of matza. And among the loaves of matza there are three types: Loaves, wafers, and those poached in water. Consequently, there are five kav for each and every type, two loaves per kav.

7:2 The loaves that accompanied the ram of the inauguration of the Tabernacle would come parallel to the three types of matza that accompany the thanks offering: Loaves, wafers, and loaves poached in water and made with oil (see Leviticus 8:26). The loaves of leavened bread that accompany the thanks offering were not brought with the ram of inauguration. The loaves that accompany the offering that the nazirite brings upon completion of his period of naziriteship would come with only two parts of the three types of matza that accompany the thanks offering, namely, loaves and wafers, but there is no matza poached in water (see Numbers 6:15). Consequently, the loaves of the offering of a nazirite are from ten kav of fine flour according to the Jerusalem measure, as taught in the previous mishna that each type of the loaves of matza comes from five kav of flour, which equal six-and-two-thirds tenths of an ephah according to the wilderness measure, as each type of the loaves of matza comes from three-and-one-third tenths of an ephah. From all of the four types of loaves accompanying the thanks offering, one takes one loaf from each set of ten as teruma, to be given to a priest, as it is stated: "And he shall present from it one of each offering as a teruma unto the Lord; to the priest that sprinkles the blood of the peace offerings against the altar it shall be given" (Leviticus 7:14). The verse is analyzed: "One" indicates that one should not take a sliced loaf; "of each offering" indicates that all the offerings should be equal, i.e., that one should not take a loaf from one type of offering for another type; "to the priest that sprinkles the blood of the peace offerings against the altar it shall be given," and the rest of the loaves are eaten by the owner.

7:3 In the case of one who slaughters the thanks offering in its proper place inside the Temple courtyard, and at that time its forty loaves were outside the wall, the loaves were not consecrated. Likewise, if he slaughtered the thanks offering before the surface of the loaves formed a crust in the oven, and even if the surface of all the loaves formed a crust except for one of them, the loaves were not consecrated. If one slaughtered the thanks offering with the intent to partake of it or to burn the sacrificial portions beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, and the offering was rendered piggul or was disqualified, respectively, the loaves were consecrated and either rendered piggul or disqualified. If one slaughtered the thanks offering and it was discovered that it was an animal with a wound that would have caused it to die within twelve months [tereifa], the loaves were not consecrated, as

the cause of the animal's disqualification preceded its slaughter. If one slaughtered the thanks offering and it was discovered that it is a blemished animal that may not be sacrificed ab initio but if it ascended the altar it may be sacrificed, Rabbi Eliezer says: He has consecrated the loaves, since if the offering ascends the altar it is sacrificed. And the Rabbis say: He has not consecrated the loaves, since it may not be sacrificed ab initio. If one slaughtered the thanks offering not for its sake but for the sake of another offering, and likewise, if one slaughtered the ram of inauguration not for its sake, and likewise, if one slaughtered the communal peace offering of two sheep that accompany the two loaves on Shavuot not for their sake, the loaves were not consecrated.

7:4 In a case where the libations that accompany the offerings were sanctified in a service vessel when the animal was slaughtered and the offering was discovered to be unfit, if there is another offering that was slaughtered and requires libations, the libations should be sacrificed with that offering; and if not, they should be disqualified by being left overnight, and then burned. With regard to the offspring of an animal designated as a thanks offering, or an animal that is its substitute; or in a case where one separated an animal as a thanks offering and it was lost and he separated another in its stead, and the first animal was then found, in all three cases, the second animal, i.e., the offspring, the substitute, or the replacement, is sacrificed, but it does not require the bringing of accompanying loaves. This is as it is stated: "If he sacrifices it for a thanks offering, then he shall sacrifice with the thanks offering unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour poached" (Leviticus 7:12). The verse indicates that the initial thanks offering requires loaves, but neither its offspring, nor its replacement, nor its substitute requires loaves.

7:5 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering, must bring it and its loaves from non-sacred money in his possession and not second-tithe money. Since he said: It is incumbent upon me, bringing the offering is an obligation, and one may not fulfill an obligation with second-tithe money. If one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering from non-sacred money and its loaves from second-tithe money, he must bring the thanks offering and its loaves from non-sacred money. If one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering from second-tithe money and its loaves from non-sacred money, he may bring it in that manner. Likewise, if one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering and its loaves from second-tithe money, he may bring it in that manner. And he may not bring the loaves from second-tithe wheat; rather, he purchases the flour with second-tithe money.

7:6 From where is it derived with regard to one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering, that he may bring it only from non-sacred money? It is derived from a verse, as the verse states: "And you shall sacrifice the Paschal offering to the Lord your God, of the flock and the herd" (Deuteronomy 16:2). The verse is difficult: Doesn't the Paschal offering come only from lambs and goats? If so, why does the verse state: "The flock and the herd"? It is to juxtapose all offerings that come from the flock and from

the herd to the Paschal offering, teaching that just as the Paschal offering is a matter of obligation and comes only from non-sacred money, so too any matter of obligation comes only from non-sacred money. Therefore, in the case of one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering, or: It is incumbent upon me to bring a peace offering, since these offerings come as an obligation due to his vow, they may be brought only from non-sacred money. And libations, in any case, may be brought only from non-sacred money, and not from second-tithe money, because second-tithe money must be used to purchase items eaten by people, while libations are poured out next to the altar.

8:1 All communal and individual meal offerings may come from produce grown in Eretz Yisrael and from outside Eretz Yisrael, from the new crop, i.e., the current year's crop, and from the old crop from previous years. This is the halakha of all meal offerings except for the omer, i.e., the measure of barley brought as a communal offering on the sixteenth of Nisan, and the two loaves, i.e., the communal offering brought on the festival of Shavuot, as they come only from the new crop and from Eretz Yisrael. And all meal offerings come only from the optimal-quality grain. And which places have the optimal grain for them? Fields in Makhnis and Zateha are the primary [alfa] source for fine flour. Secondary to them is Aforayim in the valley. All the regions were valid as the source of the grain, but it is from here, the primary and secondary places, that they would bring grain, because it was of optimal quality.

8:2 Even when selecting grain for meal offerings from the locations mentioned in the previous mishna, one may not bring as a meal offering grain from a fertilized field, nor from an irrigated field, nor from a field of trees, as such fields do not produce grain of optimal quality. But if one did bring a meal offering of grain from such fields, it is fit. How does one produce optimal-quality grain? He plows the field during the first year, but he does not sow it, and in the second year, he sows it seventy days before Passover, and in that manner it produces grain that will provide an abundance of fine, high-quality, flour. How does the Temple treasurer inspect the flour to determine whether it is of sufficiently high quality? The treasurer inserts his hand into the flour. If, when he removes his hand, flour powder covers it, the flour is unfit, until one sifts it with a fine sifter, so that no powder will remain. And if the flour became wormy, it is unfit for use in a meal offering.

8:3 Olive trees in Tekoa are the primary source of oil to be used in meal offerings. Abba Shaul says: Secondary to Tekoa is Regev on the east bank of the Jordan River. All the regions were valid for oil to be brought from them, but it was from here that they would bring it. One may not bring a meal offering containing oil from olives taken from a fertilized olive grove, nor from olives taken from an irrigated olive grove, nor from olives taken from an olive grove where grain was sown between the trees. But if one did bring a meal offering containing oil from such groves, it is valid. One may not bring a meal offering containing oil from unripe olives [anpiktan], but if one did bring it, it is not valid. One may not bring a meal offering containing oil from olives that were soaked in water, nor from pickled olives, nor from boiled olives, and even if one did bring it, it is not valid.

8:4 There are three harvests of olives each year, and in each of them, three

different grades of oils are produced. How is the first olive harvest processed? One picks the ripe olives at the top of the olive tree, as those are the first to ripen, and crushes them in a mortar and places them inside the bottom of a wicker basket that has many small holes in it. The oil will then drip from the olives through those holes into a vessel placed underneath the basket. Rabbi Yehuda says: One positions the olives on the walls, surrounding the basket. This produces more refined oil, as the dregs stick to the walls of the basket. This is the first grade of oil produced from the first harvest. After the oil ceases to seep from the crushed olives, one then presses down with a wooden beam upon them, causing additional oil to flow from the basket into the vessel. Rabbi Yehuda says: The excessive pressure produced by pressing down with a beam would cause some of the flesh of the olives to get mixed in with the oil, compromising its quality. Rather, one applies pressure by placing stones upon the olives. This is the second grade of oil. One then ground the olives with a millstone and pressed down with a beam on those olives to extract any remaining oil; this is the third grade of oil. The first grade is fit for kindling the Candelabrum, which requires: "Refined olive oil" (Leviticus 24:2), and the rest are fit for use in meal offerings. How is the second olive harvest processed? One picks the crop of olives that is accessible while one is standing on the rooftop. This was the second lot of olives to ripen. And one crushes it in a mortar and places those olives into a wicker basket, allowing the oil to drip through the holes into a vessel underneath. Rabbi Yehuda says: One positions the olives on the walls, surrounding the basket. This is the first grade of oil from the second harvest. One then presses down upon those olives with a wooden beam, thereby producing more oil. And Rabbi Yehuda says: One applies pressure only by placing stones upon them. This is the second grade of oil. One then ground the olives with a millstone and pressed down upon them with a beam, thereby extracting any remaining oil; this is the third grade of oil. The first grade is fit for kindling the Candelabrum, and the rest are fit for use in meal offerings. How is the third olive harvest processed? This harvest consists of all the olives that still remain on trees. One packs it into a vat [oteno] in the building that houses the olive press [beit habbad] where it remains until it softens, and then one raises it up to the roof and dries it on the rooftop to remove the foul-smelling liquid secreted from the olives while in the vat. Then, one crushes the olives in a mortar and places them into a wicker basket, allowing the oil to drip through the holes into a vessel underneath. Rabbi Yehuda says: One positions them on the walls, surrounding the basket. This is the first grade of oil. One then presses down on those olives with a wooden beam, thereby producing more oil. And Rabbi Yehuda says: One applies pressure only by placing stones upon them. This is the second grade of oil. One would then grind the olives with a millstone and press down upon them with a beam, thereby extracting any remaining oil; this is the third grade of oil. The first grade is fit for kindling the Candelabrum, and the rest are fit for use in meal offerings.

8:5 Having enumerated the nine grades of oils in the previous mishna, this mishna proceeds to rank them by their quality: As for the first grade of oil that is produced from the first harvest, there is none superior to it. The

second grade of oil that is produced from the first harvest and the first grade of oil that is produced from the second harvest are of equal quality; there is no reason to choose one over the other. The third grade of oil that is produced from the first harvest and the second grade of oil that is produced from the second harvest and the first grade of oil that is produced from the third harvest are of equal quality. The third grade of oil that is produced from the second harvest and the second grade of oil that is produced from the third harvest are of equal quality. As for the third grade of oil that is produced from the third harvest, there is none inferior to it. Also, with regard to all the meal offerings, it was logical that they should require the highest quality of refined olive oil, just like the Candelabrum. Because if the Candelabrum, whose oil is not to be consumed on the altar, requires refined olive oil, then meal offerings, which are to be consumed on the altar, is it not logical that they should require refined olive oil? To dispel this notion, the verse states: "Refined pounded olive oil for illumination" (Leviticus 24:2), which indicates that the high-quality, refined, pounded oil is required for the Candelabrum, but there is no need for refined pounded olive oil for meal offerings.

8:6 From where would they bring the wine for libations? Keduhim and Attulin are the primary sources for wine. Secondary to them is Beit Rima and Beit Lavan, located in the mountain, and the village of Signa, located in the valley. All the regions were valid sources for wine; but it was from here, i.e., the aforementioned locations, that they would bring the wine. One may not bring libations of wine that come from a fertilized vineyard, or from an irrigated vineyard, or from a vineyard in which grain was sown between the vines. But if one did bring a libation from such wine, it is valid. One may not bring libations from sweet wine made from sun-dried grapes [hilyasteyon], but if one did bring a libation from such wine, it is valid. One may not bring wine aged for one year; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, but the Rabbis deem it valid. One may not bring libations from sweet wine, nor from wine produced from smoked grapes, nor libations from boiled wine, and if one did bring a libation from such wine, it is not valid. And one may not bring wine produced from grapes suspended on stakes or trees; rather, one brings it from grapes at foot height, i.e., that rest on the ground, which are superior-quality grapes, and from vineyards that are cultivated, i.e., where one hoes beneath the vines twice a year.

8:7 And when producing wine for libations, one should not collect the wine into large barrels, as it causes the wine to spoil; rather, it should be placed in small casks. And one does not fill up the cask until its mouth; rather, one leaves some empty space so that its fragrance will collect there and diffuse when the lid is opened. One should not bring libations from wine that rests at the mouth of the cask due to the flour-like white scum that floats on the surface, nor from the wine at bottom of the cask due to the sediment that collects there. Rather, one brings from the wine in its middle third. How does the Temple treasurer inspect the wine to determine that it is from the middle of the cask? The treasurer sits alongside the cask and has the measuring reed in his hand. The spigot is opened and the wine begins to flow. When he sees

that the wine emerging draws with it chalk-like scum [hagir], he immediately knocks with the reed to indicate that the spigot should be closed. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: Wine in which there is flour-like white scum is unfit for libations, as it is stated with regard to animal offerings:

“Unblemished they shall be for you...and their meal offering shall be fine flour mixed with oil...unblemished they shall be for you, and their libations” (Numbers 28:19–20, 31). This indicates that animal offerings, meal offerings, and libations must all be brought from flawless products. Therefore, the presence of flour-like white scum in wine renders it unfit.

9:1 Two sizes of measuring vessels for dry substances were used in the Temple for measuring flour for the meal offerings. One held a tenth of an ephah and the other held one-half of a tenth of an ephah. Rabbi Meir says: There were three measuring vessels; one that held a tenth of an ephah, another one that also held a tenth of an ephah, and a third one that held one-half of a tenth of an ephah. What purpose did the tenth of an ephah measuring vessel serve? It was the vessel with which one would measure flour for all the meal offerings. One would not measure the flour by using a measuring vessel of a size that held the entire volume of flour required at once, i.e., neither with a vessel of three-tenths of an ephah for the meal offering accompanying the sacrifice of a bull, nor with a vessel of two-tenths of an ephah for the meal offering accompanying the sacrifice of a ram. Rather, one measures the flour for them by repeatedly using the tenth of an ephah measuring vessel to measure the required number of tenths. What purpose did the one-half of a tenth of an ephah measuring vessel serve? It was the vessel with which one would measure the flour for the High Priest’s griddle-cake offering. A tenth of an ephah was required each day; he sacrificed half of it in the morning and the other half of it in the afternoon.

9:2 There were seven measuring vessels for liquids in the Temple. There was a vessel of one hin, i.e., twelve log. Three vessels were used to measure the oil and wine for the meal offerings and libations that accompanied the sacrifice of an animal. For a bull there was a vessel of one-half of a hin, i.e., six log; and for a ram there was one of one-third of a hin, i.e., four log; and for a lamb there was one of one-quarter of a hin, i.e., three log. In addition, there was a vessel that held one log to measure the oil for all standard meal offerings; and another one that held one-half of a log for measuring the water used in the rite of a woman suspected by her husband of having been unfaithful [sota] and also for the oil used in the loaves accompanying the thanks offering (see 88a); and another one that held one-quarter of a log for measuring the water used in the purification of a leper and also for the oil used in the wafers and loaves that the nazirite brings on the day that his term of naziriteship ends. Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Tzadok, says: It was not necessary to have several vessels of different sizes; rather, there were graduations [shenatot] on the vessel that held one hin indicating that until here is the quantity needed for the bull, and until here is the quantity needed for the ram, and until here is the quantity needed for the lamb. Rabbi Shimon says: There was no vessel there in the Temple that held one hin, as what purpose could a one-hin vessel serve? That volume of liquid was never used in

an offering. Rather, there was an additional measuring vessel of one and a half log there, in the Temple, which completed the tally of seven vessels, with which one would measure the oil used for the griddle-cake meal offering of the High Priest; one and a half log were used in the morning and one and a half log in the afternoon.

9:3 What purpose did the quarter-log measuring vessel serve? It was used to measure a quarter-log of water for the purification of the leper, and a quarter-log of oil for the wafers and loaves that the nazirite brings on the day that his term of naziriteship ends. What purpose did the half-log measuring vessel serve? It was used to measure a half-log of water for the rite of the sota and a half-log of oil for the three types of loaves of matza accompanying the thanks offering. And with the vessel of one log, one would measure the oil for all the standard meal offerings. Each tenth of an ephah of flour requires one log of oil. Accordingly, even if one brings a meal offering of sixty tenths of an ephah of flour, one adds to it sixty log of oil. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: Each meal offering, irrespective of its volume, even a meal offering of sixty tenths of an ephah of flour, requires only its single log of oil, as it is stated with regard to the offering brought by a poor leper on the day of his purification: "And a tenth of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil for a meal offering, and a log of oil" (Leviticus 14:21). The juxtaposition of "a meal offering" with "a log of oil" teaches a principle for all meal offerings: Each offering requires only one log of oil. The mishna lists the quantities of oil and wine that were required for the meal offerings and libations that accompanied the sacrifice of an animal. Six log, i.e., one-half of a hin, for those of a bull; and four log, i.e., one-third of a hin, for those of a ram; and three log, i.e., one-quarter of a hin, for those of a lamb. In addition, three and a half log of oil were required for the Candelabrum, as there were seven lamps and a half-log was required for each lamp.

9:4 Many animal offerings are brought together with a meal offering and a wine libation. These additions are collectively referred to as libations. One may mix together the libations of bulls with the libations of rams; the meal offerings may be mixed as they both share the same ratio of flour to oil, i.e., two log of oil for each tenth of an ephah of flour. Likewise, one may mix together the libations of lambs with the libations of other lambs, as the meal offerings both share the same ratio of three log of oil for each tenth of an ephah of flour. And one may mix together the libations of the offering of an individual with those of a communal offering. And one may mix together the libations of an offering brought on one day with those of the day before, if the meal offerings have the same ratio of oil to flour. But one may not mix together the libations of lambs with the libations of bulls or the libations of rams, as the meal offerings have different ratios of oil to flour. And nevertheless, if one intermingled the flour and oil of these lamb offerings by themselves and the flour and oil of these bull or ram offerings by themselves, and only then were they mixed together, then they remain fit to be sacrificed. If they were mixed together before the oil and flour of each offering were independently intermingled to form the meal offering, then they are

disqualified. With regard to the lamb offering that comes with the omer meal offering, which is accompanied by another meal offering and a wine libation, even though the quantity of flour used in its meal offering is doubled, i.e., one uses twice the amount that is generally used for meal offerings that accompany the sacrifice of a lamb, its oil and wine libations were not doubled; rather, three log of oil and three log of wine were used, per the standard quantities used for a lamb.

9:5 All measuring vessels that were in the Temple were such that they held the volume that they measured when their contents were heaped above the rim, except for the measuring vessel used to measure the flour for the griddle-cake offering of the High Priest, as its heaped measure, i.e., the quantity of flour held by a tenth of an ephah measuring vessel when heaped, was contained within its walls when the flour was leveled with the rim. This was due to the fact that the measuring vessel for the griddle-cake offering was slightly larger than the tenth of an ephah measuring vessel. With regard to measuring vessels for liquids, their overflows, i.e., that which flows onto the outside of vessel's walls, are sacred, but with regard to measuring vessels for dry substances, their overflows are non-sacred. Rabbi Akiva says that the reason for this difference is that since the measuring vessels for liquids are themselves sacred, therefore their overflows are sacred, and since the measuring vessels for dry substances are non-sacred, therefore their overflows are non-sacred. Rabbi Yosei says: The difference is not due to that factor. Rather, it is because the overflow of liquid was originally inside the vessel, where it became consecrated, and was then displaced, whereas the overflow of a dry substance was not displaced from inside the vessel, so it had not become consecrated.

9:6 All offerings, whether communal or individual, require libations, i.e., a meal offering and a wine libation, except for the firstborn offering, the animal tithe offering, the Paschal offering, the sin offering, and the guilt offering, with which libations are not brought. But the exception to this exception is that the sin offering of a leper and his guilt offering do require libations.

9:7 For all communal offerings there is no mitzva of placing hands on the head of the offering, except for the bull that comes to atone for a community-wide violation of any one of the mitzvot that was perpetrated due to an erroneous ruling of the Sanhedrin, where the judges of the Sanhedrin are required to place their hands upon its head (see Leviticus 4:13–21); and the scapegoat brought on Yom Kippur, upon which the High Priest places his hands (see Leviticus, chapter 16). Rabbi Shimon says: Also in the case of the goat that comes to atone for a community-wide perpetration of idol worship that occurred due to an erroneous ruling of the Sanhedrin, the judges of the Sanhedrin are required to place their hands upon its head (see Numbers 15:22–26). All offerings of an individual require placing hands, except for the firstborn offering, the animal tithe offering, and the Paschal offering. The mitzva of placing hands is performed by the owner of the offering. The mishna adds: And if the owner died, then the heir is regarded as the offering's owner and so he places his hands on the offering and brings the accompanying libations. And

furthermore, he can substitute a non-sacred animal for it. Although it is prohibited to perform an act of substitution, if the owner of an offering does this, his attempt is successful to the extent that the non-sacred animal is thereby consecrated, even though the original offering also remains sacred.

9:8 Everyone who brings an animal offering places hands upon its head, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, a minor, a blind person, a gentile, a Canaanite slave, the agent of the owner of the offering who brings the offering on the owner's behalf, and a woman. And the requirement of placing hands is a non-essential mitzva; therefore, failure to place hands does not prevent the owner from achieving atonement. The rite of placing hands is performed by leaning on the head of the offering with two hands. And in the same location in the Temple that one places hands, one slaughters the animal. And immediately following the rite of placing hands, the slaughter is performed.

9:9 There is an aspect of greater stringency with regard to placing hands than there is with regard to waving, and there is an aspect of greater stringency with regard to waving than there is with regard to placing hands. The stringency with regard to placing hands is that if several people are partners in bringing an offering, one of them waves the offering on behalf of all the other partners, but one cannot fulfill the requirement of placing hands if he alone places hands on behalf of all the other partners; rather, each member must place hands himself. The stringency with regard to waving is that waving is practiced in the cases of both offerings of an individual, e.g., peace offerings, where the breast and thigh and sacrificial portions are waved, and in the cases of communal offerings, e.g., the two lambs sacrificed on Shavuot, which are waved together with the two loaves; and it is practiced both in the cases of offerings when they are alive, e.g., the guilt offering of a leper and the lambs of Shavuot, and in the cases of offerings after they are slaughtered, e.g., the breast and thigh. By contrast, placing hands is practiced with a live animal. A further stringency is that waving is practiced both in the case of an item in which there is a living spirit, i.e., an animal offering, and in the case of an item in which there is not a living spirit, e.g., the omer offering, the sota meal offering, and the loaves accompanying a thanks offering and the ram of the nazirite, whereas placing hands is only ever performed upon living beings.

10:1 Rabbi Yishmael says: When the day of the sacrifice of the omer meal offering would occur on Shabbat, the labors performed that would otherwise be prohibited were kept to a minimum, and the one-tenth of an ephah of flour that was brought as an offering was processed from three se'a of reaped barley. And if it occurred during the week, the flour was processed from five se'a of reaped barley. And the Rabbis say: Both on Shabbat and during the week, the omer offering would come from three se'a of reaped barley. Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, says: On Shabbat the barley was reaped by an individual and with one sickle and with one basket into which the barley was placed; and during the week, it was reaped by three people with three baskets and three sickles. And the Rabbis say: Both on Shabbat and during the week, it was reaped by three people with three baskets and with three sickles.

10:2 The mitzva of the omer is to bring the barley reaped for the meal offering

from fields proximate to Jerusalem. If the barley did not ripen in the fields proximate to Jerusalem, one brings it from any place in Eretz Yisrael. There was an incident where the omer came from Gaggot Tzerifin and the wheat for the two loaves on Shavuot came from the valley of Ein Sokher.

10:3 How would they perform the rite of the harvest of the omer? Emissaries of the court would emerge on the eve of the festival of Passover and fashion the stalks of barley into sheaves while the stalks were still attached to the ground, so that it would be convenient to reap them. The residents of all the towns adjacent to the site of the harvest would assemble there, so that it would be harvested with great fanfare. Once it grew dark, the court emissary says to those assembled: Did the sun set? The assembly says in response: Yes. The emissary repeats: Did the sun set? They again say: Yes. The court emissary next says to those assembled: Shall I reap the sheaves with this sickle? The assembly says in response: Yes. The emissary repeats: With this sickle? The assembly says: Yes. The court emissary then says to those assembled: Shall I place the gathered sheaves in this basket? The assembly says in response: Yes. The emissary repeats: In this basket? The assembly says: Yes. If the sixteenth of Nisan occurs on Shabbat, the court emissary says to the assembled: Shall I cut the sheaves on this Shabbat? The assembly says in response: Yes. The emissary repeats: On this Shabbat? The assembly says: Yes. The court emissary says to those assembled: Shall I cut the sheaves? And they say to him in response: Cut. The emissary repeats: Shall I cut the sheaves? And they say to him: Cut. The emissary asks three times with regard to each and every matter, and the assembly says to him: Yes, yes, yes. The mishna asks: Why do I need those involved to publicize each stage of the rite to that extent? The mishna answers: It is due to the Boethusians, as they deny the validity of the Oral Law and would say: There is no harvest of the omer at the conclusion of the first Festival day of Passover unless it occurs at the conclusion of Shabbat. The publicity was to underscore that the sixteenth of Nisan was the proper time for the omer harvest.

10:4 After they harvested the omer and placed it in the baskets, they brought it to the Temple courtyard. And they would singe in the fire the kernels of barley while they were still on the stalks, in order to fulfill the mitzva of parched grain, as it is written: "And if you bring a meal offering of first fruits to the Lord, you shall bring for the meal offering of your first fruits grain in the ear parched with fire" (Leviticus 2:14). This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: Prior to parching the kernels, they would remove them from the stalks by beating them with soft, moist reeds and with cabbage stalks, not with sticks, so that the kernels would not be crushed. They then placed the grain into a hollow vessel [le'abuv], and this vessel was perforated so that the fire would take hold of the grain in its entirety. After parching the kernels, they would spread the kernels in the Temple courtyard and the wind would blow upon the kernels, cooling and drying them. They then placed the kernels in a mill used to grind grits, so that the barley would not be ground so fine that the shell would be mixed with the grain. And they produced from the ground barley a tenth of an ephah of barley flour that was sifted through thirteen sifters, and the rest is redeemed and may be eaten by any

person. And dough from this barley flour is obligated in the separation of halla, and the grain is exempt from the separation of tithe. Rabbi Akiva deems this flour obligated in having halla and tithes separated from it.

After daybreak, the priest sacrificing the omer came to the sifted tenth of an ephah, placed in the vessel in his hand some of its log of oil, and placed its frankincense on the side of the vessel. He then poured some more oil from the log onto the high-quality flour and mixed them together, waved and brought the meal offering to the corner of the altar, and removed the handful and burned it on the altar. And the rest of the meal offering is eaten by the priests.

10:5 Once the omer was sacrificed people would emerge and find the marketplace of Jerusalem full of the flour from the parched grain of the new crop that was permitted by the waving and the sacrifice of the omer offering. That filling of the marketplace with the new crop was performed not with the approval of the Sages; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: They would do so with the approval of the Sages. From the moment that the omer offering was sacrificed, the produce of the new crop was permitted immediately. For those distant from Jerusalem, the new crop is permitted from midday and beyond. From the time that the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai instituted that the day of waving the omer, the sixteenth of Nisan, is entirely prohibited, i.e., one may partake of the new crop only the next day. Rabbi Yehuda said: But isn't it forbidden by Torah law, as it is stated: "And you shall eat neither bread, nor parched grain, nor fresh grain, until this selfsame day, until you have brought the offering of your God" (Leviticus 23:14)? This means that the new crop is prohibited on the day of the waving unless permitted by sacrifice of the offering. And if so, for what reason is it permitted for those distant to eat the new crop from midday and beyond, when the Temple is standing? It is due to the fact that they know that the members of the court are not indolent in its sacrifice, and certainly by midday the sacrifice of the omer offering has been completed.

10:6 Sacrifice of the omer offering would permit consumption of the new crop in the rest of the country outside the Temple, and the two loaves offering would permit the sacrifice of the new crop in the Temple. One may not bring meal offerings, or first fruits, or the meal offering brought with libations accompanying animal offerings, from the new crop prior to the sacrifice of the omer, and if he brought them from the new crop they are unfit. After the omer but prior to the two loaves one may not bring these offerings from the new crop, but if he brought them from the new crop, they are fit.

10:7 Wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye; these are obligated in the separation of halla, and each one of them joins together with the othersto constitute the measure that obligates one to separate halla. And they are prohibited due to the prohibition of partaking of the new crop prior to the Passover Festival, and likewise it is prohibited to reap them prior to the omer offering. If these grains took root prior the omer offering, the omer permits their consumption; and if not, they are prohibited until the next omer is brought and sacrificed the following year.

10:8 Even before the omer offering is brought, one may reap a crop that grows in an irrigated field in the valleys, but one may not arrange the reaped stalks

in a pile. The residents of Jericho, whose fields were categorized as irrigated fields in a valley, reaped the crops with the approval of the Sages and arranged the crops in a pile without the approval of the Sages, but the Sages did not reprimand them. One may reap crops in any field for fodder and feed it to an animal. Rabbi Yehuda said: When may one do so? At a time when he begins reaping before the crop reaches one-third of its potential growth. Rabbi Shimon says: One may reap and feed the crops to animals even after they reached one-third of their potential growth.

10:9 And one may reap crops prior to the omer due to potential damage to saplings growing alongside the crops; and due to the place of mourning, i.e., to create room for those consoling mourners, who would bless them upon their return from the cemetery; and due to the need to create room for students to study, as failure to do so would lead to dereliction of Torah study in the study hall. After reaping the crops for any of these reasons, one may not fashion them into sheaves, but he leaves them unbound. The mitzva of the omer is for the barley to come from standing grain. If one did not find standing grain, he brings from sheaves. Its mitzva is for it to come from fresh, moist grain. If one did not find moist grain, he brings from dry grain. Its mitzva is for one to reap the grain at night, but if it was reaped during the day, it is fit. And reaping the grain for the omer overrides Shabbat.

11:1 The two loaves that are brought on the festival of Shavuot from the new wheat are each made from a tenth of an ephah of fine flour. They are kneaded one by one and they are baked one by one, i.e., each loaf is placed separately in the oven. The loaves of the shewbread are kneaded one by one and baked two by two, i.e., two loaves are placed in the oven at the same time. And the baker would prepare the shewbread in a mold [defus] when he made the dough. When he removes the shewbread from the oven he again places the loaves in a mold so that their shape will not be ruined.

11:2 In the case of both the two loaves and the shewbread, the kneading of their dough and the forming of their loaves take place outside the Temple courtyard, but their baking takes place inside the Temple courtyard. And their preparation does not override Shabbat. Rabbi Yehuda says: All of the procedures involved in their preparation take place inside the courtyard. Rabbi Shimon says: One should always be accustomed to say that the two loaves and the shewbread are fit if they were prepared in the Temple courtyard and they are also fit if they were prepared in Beit Pagei, outside the Temple Mount, as he maintains that they may be baked outside the Temple courtyard.

11:3 With regard to the twelve loaves of the High Priest's griddle-cake offering, of which six are offered in the morning and six in the evening, their kneading, the forming of their loaves, and their baking take place inside the Temple courtyard, and all types of labor involved in those actions override Shabbat. These labors cannot be performed prior to Shabbat, as once the loaves are consecrated in a service vessel they are disqualified if they are left overnight. Grinding their flour and sifting their flour do not override Shabbat. Rabbi Akiva stated a principle: Any labor that can be performed on Shabbat eve does not override Shabbat, but one that cannot be performed on Shabbat eve overrides Shabbat.

11:4 All preparatory procedures of the meal offerings that take place inside the Temple courtyard, e.g., kneading and forming the High Priest's griddle cakes, involve the use of a service vessel that consecrates the offerings. But any preparatory procedures that take place outside the Temple courtyard, e.g., kneading and forming the two loaves and the shewbread, do not involve the use of a service vessel. With regard to the two loaves, their length is seven handbreadths, their width is four handbreadths, and they have hornlike protrusions made of dough that is attached to each of their corners, which are four fingerbreadths high. With regard to the loaves of shewbread, their length is ten handbreadths, their width is five handbreadths, and each loaf's hornlike protrusions is seven fingerbreadths high. Rabbi Yehuda says: The following letters are a mnemonic so that you will not err and forget the dimensions of the two loaves: Zayin, dalet, dalet. The numerical value of the letter zayin is seven and the numerical value of the letter dalet is four. The mnemonic therefore represents the length of seven handbreadths, the width of four handbreadths, and the height of four fingerbreadths, respectively. The following letters are a mnemonic for the dimensions of the shewbread: Yod, heh, zayin, which stand for the length of ten handbreadths, the width of five handbreadths, and the height of seven fingerbreadths, respectively. Ben Zoma says that it is written: "And you shall set upon the Table shewbread [lehem panim] before Me always" (Exodus 25:30). The term lehem panim indicates that it should have vertical sides [panim] rather than a rounded shape.

11:5 As for the Table, its length is ten handbreadths and its width is five handbreadths, as the Torah states that the Table is two cubits long and one cubit wide (see Exodus 25:23), and Rabbi Yehuda holds that the cubit used as the unit of measurement for the construction of the Temple vessels was equal to five handbreadths. With regard to the shewbread, its length is ten handbreadths and its width is five handbreadths. The priest places the length of the two shewbread arrangements across the width of the Table, which leaves five handbreadths of each loaf protruding from the Table. And he folds the protruding two and a half handbreadths upward on this side of the Table, and the protruding two and a half handbreadths upward on that side of the Table. One finds, therefore, that the length of the shewbread covers the width of the Table. Similarly, since the width of each loaf is five handbreadths, the width of the two loaves filled the entire length of the Table. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Meir says: With regard to the Table, its length is twelve handbreadths and its width is six handbreadths, as the measure of a cubit used in the construction of the Temple vessels was equal to six handbreadths. Concerning the shewbread, its length is ten handbreadths and its width is five handbreadths. Rabbi Meir continues: The priest places the length of the shewbread across the width of the Table, which leaves four handbreadths of each loaf protruding from the Table. He folds the protruding two handbreadths upward on this side of the Table, and the protruding two handbreadths upward on that side of the Table. The width of the two arrangements of shewbread occupies only ten of the twelve handbreadths of the length of the Table, and this leaves a space of two handbreadths in the middle, between the two arrangements, so that the wind will blow between them and

prevent the loaves from becoming moldy. Abba Shaul says: There, in the space between the two arrangements, the priests would place the two bowls of frankincense that accompany the shewbread. The Sages said to him: But isn't it already stated: "And you shall place pure frankincense upon [al] each arrangement, that it may be for the bread as a memorial part, an offering made by fire to the Lord" (Leviticus 24:7)? The verse indicates that the frankincense is placed upon the shewbread and not next to it. Abba Shaul said to the Sages in response: Isn't it already stated: "And next to him [alav] shall be the tribe of Manasseh" (Numbers 2:20)? Just as the preposition "alav" in this verse means that the tribe of Manasseh pitched camp next to the tribe of Ephraim and not upon it, so too, the preposition "al" means that the frankincense was placed next to the arrangements of the shewbread.

11:6 The mishna continues to describe the shewbread Table: And there were four panels of gold there, which stood on the ground and rose above the height of the Table, and they split up at their upper ends, above the Table, so that the rods upon which the shewbread was placed could rest upon the panels. In this manner the panels would support the shewbread. There were two panels for this arrangement and two panels for that arrangement, and there were twenty-eight rods, each of which was shaped like half of a hollow reed. There were fourteen rods for this arrangement and fourteen rods for that arrangement. Neither the arranging of the rods for the new shewbread, nor their removal from the arrangement of the old shewbread, overrides Shabbat. Rather, a priest enters the Sanctuary on Shabbat eve, i.e., Friday before sundown, and removes each of the rods from between the loaves. And according to Rabbi Meir he then places each rod in the space between the two arrangements, along the length of the Table. Then, on Shabbat, he places the new shewbread on the Table without the rods, and he inserts the rods between the loaves at the conclusion of Shabbat. The mishna concludes: All the vessels that were in the Temple, including the Table, were placed so that their length was from east to west, along the length of the Temple.

11:7 There were two tables in the Entrance Hall, on the inside of the Entrance Hall, next to the entrance to the Temple, i.e., next to the entrance to the Sanctuary. One was of marble and one was of gold. On the table of marble, the priests place the new shewbread that has been baked, before its entrance into the Sanctuary, so that the loaves may cool a little from the heat of the oven and not spoil. And when the old shewbread is removed from the shewbread Table it is placed on the table of gold upon its exit from the Sanctuary, where it remains until the frankincense is burned on the altar. The reason the shewbread is placed on a gold table when it is removed, rather than on a marble or silver table, is that one elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade. Since it is set on the gold shewbread Table all week, it cannot be downgraded to a marble or silver table upon its removal. And there was one Table of gold within the Sanctuary, upon which the shewbread is always found. The mishna describes the manner in which it is ensured that the shewbread is constantly on the Table: And four priests enter, two with the two arrangements of the new shewbread in their hands and two with the two bowls of frankincense in their hands. And four priests precede them, entering the

Sanctuary before them, two to take the two arrangements of the old shewbread from the Table, and two to take the two bowls of frankincense. Those bringing the new shewbread into the Sanctuary stand in the north and their faces are to the south, and those removing the old shewbread stand in the south and their faces are to the north. These priests draw the old shewbread from the Table and those priests place the new shewbread on the Table, and for each handbreadth of this old shewbread that is removed from the Table a handbreadth of that new shewbread is placed upon the Table, so that the Table is never without loaves upon it, as it is stated: "And you shall set upon the Table shewbread before Me always" (Exodus 25:30). Rabbi Yosei says: Even if these priests were to remove the shewbread from the Table entirely, and only afterward those priests were to place the new shewbread upon the Table, this too would fulfill the requirement that the shewbread always be on the Table. It is unnecessary to ensure the uninterrupted presence of the shewbread upon the Table, as long as it does not remain a single night without shewbread upon it. The mishna describes the manner in which the shewbread is distributed: The priests who carried the old shewbread loaves came out of the Sanctuary and placed them on the table of gold that was in the Entrance Hall. The priests then burned on the altar the frankincense that was in the bowls. And the loaves were subsequently distributed to the priests. This occurred on Shabbat, the day that the priestly watch that served in the Temple during the preceding week was replaced by the priestly watch that would serve during the following week. The shewbread was distributed to the priests of both watches. If Yom Kippur occurs on Shabbat, the loaves are distributed at night, at the conclusion of the fast, since they may not be eaten during the day. If Yom Kippur occurs on Friday, i.e., when the holy day begins on Thursday evening, the goat sin offering of Yom Kippur is eaten by the priests at night, i.e., on Friday night, as it may be eaten only on the day that it is sacrificed or during the following night, until midnight. And since there is no possibility of cooking the meat, as one may not cook on Yom Kippur or Shabbat, the Babylonians, i.e., priests who had emigrated from Babylonia, eat it when it is raw, due to the fact that they are broad-minded with regard to their food, i.e., they are not particular and will eat meat even when it is not cooked.

11:8 If one arranged the bread on the Table on Shabbat but arranged the bowls of frankincense only after Shabbat, then if he subsequently burned the frankincense placed in the bowls on the following Shabbat, the loaves are unfit for consumption, since the frankincense had not been on the Table for the entire week. Since the burning of the frankincense did not render the loaves permitted for consumption, one is not ever liable for eating them due to violation of the prohibitions of piggul or notar, or for partaking of the shewbread when one is ritually impure. One violates these prohibitions only if the frankincense is burned in a manner that permits consumption of the shewbread. If one arranged the bread and the bowls of frankincense on Shabbat but then burned the frankincense that was in the bowls after the following Shabbat, that burning of the frankincense is not valid and the shewbread is unfit for consumption. And since the frankincense was not burned in a manner that permits consumption of the shewbread, one is not ever liable for eating

them due to violation of the prohibitions of piggul or notar, or for partaking of the shewbread when one is ritually impure. If one arranged the bread and the bowls of frankincense after Shabbat and burned the frankincense that was in the bowls on the subsequent Shabbat, the burning of the frankincense is not valid and the shewbread is unfit for consumption. How should one act to prevent the shewbread from being rendered unfit? One should not remove the shewbread and frankincense from the Table on the subsequent Shabbat. Rather, he should leave it on the Table until the following Shabbat, so that it remains on the Table for a full week from Shabbat to Shabbat. It is permitted to leave the bread and frankincense on the Table beyond seven days, as even if it is on the Table for many days there is nothing wrong with that, i.e., it is not rendered unfit.

11:9 The two loaves that are brought on Shavuot are eaten by the priests no less than two days and no more than three days after they were baked. How so? They are generally baked on the eve of the festival of Shavuot and they are eaten on the day of the Festival, which is on the second day. If the Festival occurs after Shabbat, on Sunday, the loaves are baked on Friday, in which case they are eaten on the third day. The shewbread is eaten no less than nine days and no more than eleven days after it is baked. How so? It is generally baked on Shabbat eve and eaten on the following Shabbat, which is on the ninth day. If a Festival occurs on Shabbat eve the shewbread is baked on the eve of the Festival, on Thursday, in which case it is eaten on the tenth day. If the two festival days of Rosh HaShana occur on Thursday and Friday, the shewbread is baked on Wednesday, in which case it is eaten on the eleventh day. And this is because the preparation of the two loaves and the shewbread overrides neither Shabbat nor a Festival. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says in the name of Rabbi Shimon, son of the deputy High Priest: Their preparation overrides a Festival but does not override the fast day of Yom Kippur.

12:1 With regard to the fine flour for meal offerings or the wine for libations that became ritually impure, as long as they have not yet been consecrated in a service vessel and assumed inherent sanctity, their redemption is possible. If they are redeemed, their sanctity will be transferred to the redemption money. Once they have been consecrated in a service vessel and have assumed inherent sanctity, their redemption is no longer possible, and they are burned like any other offerings that became ritually impure. With regard to consecrated birds, wood for the altar, frankincense, and service vessels, once they became ritually impure they have no possibility of redemption, as redemption of items consecrated for the altar was stated only with regard to a consecrated animal that developed a blemish, not with regard to other consecrated items.

12:2 In the case of one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering prepared in a shallow pan, and he brought a meal offering prepared in a deep pan instead; or if he said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering prepared in a deep pan, and he brought a meal offering prepared in a shallow pan instead, the meal offering that he brought, he brought as a voluntary meal offering, but he has not fulfilled his obligation that he undertook with his vow and he must therefore bring another meal offering. If he said: This tenth of an ephah of flour is a meal offering to bring in a shallow pan, and he brought it prepared in a deep pan instead; or if he said: This

tenth of an ephah of flour is a meal offering to bring in a deep pan, and he brought a meal offering prepared in a shallow pan, this offering is not valid, because he did not fulfill what he had stated concerning that tenth of an ephah of flour. In the case of one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring one meal offering of two tenths of an ephah in one vessel, and he divided it and brought it in two vessels, removing a handful from each; or if he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring two tenths of an ephah for two meal offerings in two vessels, and he brought one meal offering of two tenths of an ephah in one vessel and removed one handful from it, then the meal offering that he brought, he brought as a voluntary meal offering, but he has not fulfilled his obligation. If he says: These two tenths of an ephah before me are a meal offering in one vessel, and he divided them and brought them in two vessels, removing a handful from each; or if he says: These tenths of an ephah are two meal offerings in two vessels, and he brought them in one vessel, both of these offerings are not valid, because in both cases he deviated from the number of handfuls that he vowed to remove. In the case of one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering of two tenths of an ephah in one vessel, and he divided them and brought them in two vessels, and others said to him: You vowed to bring a meal offering in one vessel, then if he sacrificed the two tenths of an ephah in two vessels they are not valid even as voluntary meal offerings, and he must bring another meal offering to fulfill his obligation. His failure to respond and explain that it was not his intention to fulfill his vow with this offering indicates that he does intend to fulfill his vow with it. Since he deviated from his vow, the offering is not valid. If he sacrificed the two tenths of an ephah in one vessel after he was reminded, it is valid, as he fulfilled his vow. Likewise, in a case where one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring two meal offerings totaling two tenths of an ephah in two vessels, and he brought it all in one vessel, and others said to him: You vowed to bring meal offerings in two vessels, then if he sacrificed the two tenths of an ephah in two vessels as he had originally vowed, they are valid. If he placed it all in one vessel, its halakhic status is like that of two meal offerings that were intermingled prior to removal of the handfuls. Therefore, if one can remove a handful from each meal offering in and of itself, they are valid. If not, they are not valid, as the Gemara explained on 23a.

12:3 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering from barley, should bring the meal offering from wheat, as voluntary meal offerings are brought exclusively from wheat. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering from flour, should bring the meal offering from fine flour, as it is written: "His offering shall be of fine flour" (Leviticus 2:1). If one vows to bring a meal offering without oil and without frankincense, he should bring it with oil and frankincense, as voluntary meal offerings require oil and frankincense. If one vows to bring as a meal offering half a tenth of an ephah, he should bring a complete tenth of an ephah, the minimum measure of a voluntary meal offering. If one vows to bring a meal offering of a tenth and a half an ephah, he should bring two tenths, as there are no partial tenths of an ephah brought in meal offerings. Rabbi Shimon deems one exempt from bringing a meal offering in all these cases. This is because

the vow does not take effect, as he did not pledge in the manner of those who pledge.

12:4 A person may pledge a meal offering of sixty tenths of an ephah of fine flour, and bring all sixty tenths in one vessel. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring sixty tenths of an ephah, he brings it in one vessel. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring sixty-one tenths of an ephah, he brings sixty tenths in one vessel and one tenth in another vessel, as the greatest number of tenths of an ephah that the community brings as meal offerings in one day is on the first festival day of Sukkot when it occurs on Shabbat, when sixty-one tenths of an ephah of fine flour are brought. It is sufficient for an individual that the maximum amount he can bring at once is one tenth of an ephah less than that of the community. When the first day of Sukkot occurs on Shabbat, thirteen bulls, two goats, and fourteen lambs are sacrificed as the additional offerings of Sukkot, two lambs are sacrificed as the daily offerings, and two lambs are sacrificed as the additional offering of Shabbat. Three tenths of an ephah are brought for each bull, two tenths for each goat, and a tenth for each lamb. Altogether, that is sixty-one tenths of an ephah. Rabbi Shimon says: What is the relevance of the tenths of an ephah sacrificed on Sukkot that occurs on Shabbat? Aren't these meal offerings for bulls and those for lambs, and they are not mixed with each other (see 89a)? Rather, the reason that one may not bring more than sixty tenths of an ephah in one vessel is because up to sixty tenths of fine flour can be mixed with one log of oil. The Rabbis said to him: Is it so that sixty tenths of flour can be mixed with a log of oil, but sixty-one tenths cannot be mixed? Rabbi Shimon said to them: All the measures of the Sages are so: For example, in a ritual bath containing forty se'a of water, one immerses for purification, and in a ritual bath with forty se'a less the small measure of a kortov, one cannot immerse in it for purification. One does not pledge a libation of one log, two log, or five log of wine, because there are no existing libations with those measures of wine. But one pledges a libation of three log, which is the measure of wine brought with a lamb, or four log, which is the measure of wine brought with a ram, or six log, which is the measure of wine brought with a bull. And one may pledge a libation of six log and beyond, as any greater amount can be composed of combinations of these three.

12:5 One may pledge to bring independent libations of wine, but one may not pledge oil alone; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Tarfon says: One may pledge oil as well. Rabbi Tarfon said: Just as we found that wine comes as an obligation and comes as a gift offering independent of any offering, so too, we find that oil comes as an obligation and comes as a gift offering. Rabbi Akiva said to him: No, if you said that this is true with regard to wine, as it is sacrificed with its obligatory offering by itself, shall you also say that this is also the case with regard to oil, which is never sacrificed with its obligatory offering by itself but only mixed with the flour? The mishna concludes with a ruling concerning a voluntary meal offering: Two people do not pledge a meal offering of a tenth of an ephah as partners, but they may pledge a burnt offering and a peace offering. And they may pledge to bring even an individual bird, not only a pair.

13:1 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a tenth of an ephah for a meal offering, must bring a meal offering of one-tenth. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring tenths of an ephah, he must bring two-tenths, as that is the minimum plural amount. If he says: I specified several tenths of an ephah but I do not know which number I specified, he must bring sixty-tenths, as that is the maximum amount of a meal offering. The flour beyond the amount that he actually specified is rendered a voluntary meal offering. If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering, he may bring whichever meal offering that he wishes, i.e., the fine-flour meal offering, the shallow-pan or deep-pan meal offering, or the meal offering baked in an oven in the form of loaves or wafers. Rabbi Yehuda says: He must bring the fine-flour meal offering, as it is the most notable of the meal offerings.

13:2 If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal offering, or: It is incumbent upon me to bring a type of meal offering, he must bring one meal offering. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring meal offerings, or: It is incumbent upon me to bring meal offerings of a certain type, he must bring two. If he says: I specified a meal offering but I do not know which meal offering I specified, he must bring all five types of meal offerings. If one says: I specified a meal offering of tenths of an ephah but I do not know how many tenths I specified, he must bring a meal offering of sixty-tenths of an ephah. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: His obligation is satisfied only when he brings meal offerings of all sizes, in increments of tenths of an ephah, ranging from one-tenth of an ephah to sixty-tenths, for a total of sixty meal offerings with a total volume of 1,830 tenths of an ephah, or 183 ephahs. He fulfills his vow with one of the meal offerings, and the rest are rendered voluntary meal offerings.

13:3 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate pieces of wood as fuel for the altar, must donate no fewer than two logs. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring frankincense, must bring no less than a handful. The mishna states tangentially: There are five halakhot pertaining to handfuls. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring an offering of frankincense, may not bring less than a handful. One who pledges to bring a meal offering must bring with it a handful of frankincense. One who intentionally offers up a handful of a meal offering outside the Temple courtyard is liable to receive excision from the World-to-Come [karet]. The two bowls of frankincense that accompany the shewbread are required to have two handfuls of frankincense.

13:4 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate gold to the Temple treasury, must give no less than a gold dinar. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate silver to the Temple treasury, must give no less than the value of a silver dinar. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate copper to the Temple maintenance, must give no less than the value of a silver ma'a. One who says: I specified the amount of gold, silver, or copper, but I do not know what I specified, must bring the maximum amount of gold, silver, or copper, until it reaches an amount where he says: I am certain that I did not intend to donate that much.

13:5 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a libation of wine, must bring no less than three log, as that is the minimum amount of wine brought as

a libation accompanying an animal offering. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring oil, must bring no less than a log, as the smallest meal offering includes one log of oil. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: He must bring no less than three log, as that is the amount of oil in the meal offering that accompanies the sacrifice of a lamb, which is the smallest amount in any of the meal offerings that accompany the sacrifice of an animal. One who says: I specified how many log I vowed to bring but I do not know what amount I specified, must bring an amount of oil equivalent to the amount brought on the day that the largest amount of oil is sacrificed in the Temple.

13:6 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a burnt offering, must bring a lamb, which is the least expensive land animal sacrificed as an offering. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: He may bring either a dove or a pigeon, as a bird burnt offering. One who says: I vowed to bring a burnt offering, and I specified that it would be from the herd, but I do not know what animal I specified, must bring a bull and a male calf, as a burnt offering is brought only from male animals. One who says: I vowed to bring a burnt offering and I specified that it would be from the animals but I do not know what animal I specified, must bring a bull and a male calf, a ram, a large male goat, a small male goat, and a male lamb. One who says: I vowed to bring a burnt offering, and I specified what type of burnt offering it would be, but I do not know what I specified, adds a dove and a pigeon to the previous list.

13:7 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks offering and a peace offering, must bring a lamb, which is the least expensive land animal sacrificed as an offering. One who says: I vowed to bring a peace offering and I specified that it would be from the herd but I do not know what animal I specified, must bring a bull and a cow, and a male calf and a female calf. One who says: I vowed to bring a burnt offering and specified that it would be from the animals, but I do not know what animal I specified, must bring a bull and a cow, a male calf and a female calf, a ram and a ewe, a large, i.e., adult, male goat and a large female goat, a small, i.e., young, male goat and a small female goat, and a male lamb and a female lamb.

13:8 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a bull as a burnt offering or peace offering, must bring the bull, its accompanying meal offering, and its libations, with the total value of one hundred dinars. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a calf, must bring the calf, its accompanying meal offering, and its libations, with the total value of five sela, which equal twenty dinars. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a ram, must bring the ram, its accompanying meal offering, and its libations, with the value of two sela, which equal eight dinars. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a lamb, must bring the lamb, its accompanying meal offering, and its libations, with the value of one sela, which equals four dinars. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a bull with the value of one hundred dinars as a burnt offering or peace offering, must bring the bull with the value of one hundred dinars excluding its accompanying meal offering and libations. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a calf with the value of five sela as a burnt offering or peace offering, must bring the calf with the value of five sela excluding its accompanying meal offering and libations. One who says: It

is incumbent upon me to bring a ram with the value of two sela as a burnt offering or peace offering, must bring the ram with the value of two sela excluding its accompanying meal offering and libations. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a lamb with the value of one sela as a burnt offering or peace offering, must bring the lamb with the value of one sela excluding its accompanying meal offering and libations. If one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a bull with the value of one hundred dinars as a burnt offering or peace offering, and he brought two bulls with a combined value of one hundred dinars, he has not fulfilled his obligation. And that is the halakha even if this bull has the value of one hundred dinars less one dinar and that bull has the value of one hundred dinars less one dinar. If one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a black bull, and he brought a white bull; or said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a white bull, and he brought a black bull; or said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a large bull, and he brought a small bull, in all these cases he has not fulfilled his obligation. But if he said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a small bull, and he brought a large bull, he has fulfilled his obligation, as the value of a small bull is included in the value of a large bull. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: He has not fulfilled his obligation, as the offering that he brought did not correspond to his vow.

13:9 With regard to one who said: This bull is hereby a burnt offering, and subsequently it became blemished [venista'ev] and was disqualified from sacrifice, he should redeem the bull and with that money purchase another bull as an offering in its stead. If he wishes, he may bring two bulls with its redemption money instead of one. If one says: These two bulls are hereby a burnt offering, and subsequently they became blemished, if he wishes he may bring one bull with their redemption money. And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi deems this prohibited, and holds that he must bring two bulls. In a case where one said: This ram is hereby a burnt offering, and it became blemished, if he wishes he may bring a lamb with its redemption money. In a case where one said: This lamb is hereby a burnt offering, and it became blemished, if he wishes he may bring a ram with its redemption money. And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi deems it prohibited for one to bring one type of animal with redemption money from another type of animal. With regard to one who says: One of my lambs is consecrated, or: One of my bulls is consecrated, and he has two lambs or bulls, the larger of them is consecrated. If he has three lambs or bulls, the middle-sized animal among them is consecrated. If one says: I specified the lamb or bull that is to be consecrated but I do not know what animal I specified in my vow, or he says that: My father said to me before his death that he consecrated one of the lambs or the bulls, but I do not know what animal he consecrated, the largest of them is consecrated.

13:10 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a burnt offering, must sacrifice it in the Temple in Jerusalem. And if he sacrificed it in the temple of Onias in Egypt, he has not fulfilled his obligation. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a burnt offering that I will sacrifice in the temple of Onias, must sacrifice it in the Temple in Jerusalem, but if he sacrificed it in the temple of Onias, he has fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Shimon says that

if one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a burnt offering that I will sacrifice in the temple of Onias, it is not consecrated as a burnt offering; such a statement does not consecrate the animal at all. If one says: I am hereby a nazirite, then when his term of naziriteship is completed he must shave the hair of his head and bring the requisite offerings in the Temple in Jerusalem; and if he shaved in the temple of Onias, he has not fulfilled his obligation. If one says: I am hereby a nazirite provided that I will shave in the temple of Onias, he must shave in the Temple in Jerusalem; but if he shaved in the temple of Onias, he has fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Shimon says that one who says: I am hereby a nazirite provided that I will shave in the temple of Onias, is not a nazirite at all, as his vow does not take effect. The priests who served in the temple of Onias may not serve in the Temple in Jerusalem; and needless to say, if they served for something else, a euphemism for idolatry, they are disqualified from service in the Temple. As it is stated: “Nevertheless the priests of the private altars did not come up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat matza among their brethren” (II Kings 23:9). The halakhic status of these priests is like that of blemished priests in that they receive a share in the distribution of the meat of the offerings and partake of that meat, but they do not sacrifice offerings or perform any of the sacrificial rites.

13:11 It is stated with regard to an animal burnt offering: “A fire offering, an aroma pleasing to the Lord” (Leviticus 1:9), and with regard to a bird burnt offering: “A fire offering, an aroma pleasing to the Lord” (Leviticus 1:17), and with regard to a meal offering: “A fire offering, an aroma pleasing to the Lord” (Leviticus 2:2). The repetitive language employed concerning all of these different offerings is to say to you that one who brings a substantial offering and one who brings a meager offering have equal merit, provided that he directs his heart toward Heaven.