

גַּסְטָרָא שֶׁל בֵּית פְּעוֹר: הֲרֵאָנוּ הֵיכָן מוֹשֶׁה
 קָבֹוּר. עֲמָדוּ לְמַעְלָה – נִדְמָה לָהֶם לְמַטָּה;
 לְמַטָּה – נִדְמָה לָהֶם לְמַעְלָה. נִחְלָקוּ
 לְשֵׁתֵי בֵיתוֹת, אוֹתָן שְׁעוֹמְדִים לְמַעְלָה –
 נִדְמָה לָהֶן לְמַטָּה, לְמַטָּה – נִדְמָה לָהֶן
 לְמַעְלָה. לְקַיִּים מָה שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: “וְלֹא יָדַע
 אִישׁ אֶת קְבֻרָתוֹ”.

the garrison [*gastera*]¹ of Beth Peor and said to them: **Show us where Moses is buried.** As the men **stood above** on the upper section of the mountain, **it appeared to them** as if the grave was **below** in the lower section. As they stood **below**, **it appeared to them** to be above. **They divided into two groups**, one above and one below. To **those who were standing above**, the grave **appeared to them** to be below; to those who were standing **below**, the grave **appeared to them** to be above, **to fulfill that which is stated:** “And no man knows of his grave to this day” (Deuteronomy 34:6).

LANGUAGE

Garrison [*gastera*] – גַּסְטָרָא: A form of the Latin castra, which means military camp. In the broader sense it is used to refer to military personnel, or soldiers that are assigned to a particular stronghold.

Other than to receive a reward – אֵלֵא לְקַבֵּל שָׂכָר – The Maharsha writes that although generally it is improper for one to perform mitzvot for the sake of a reward, if he expends effort to perform a mitzva that he was not commanded to do it is acceptable to request a reward.

The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to him: Do you seek to enter the land to perform these mitzvot for any reason other than to receive a reward?²¹ I will ascribe you credit as if you had performed them and you will receive your reward, as it is stated: “Therefore will I divide him a portion among the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the mighty; because he bared his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors” (Isaiah 53:12).

Rabbi Samlai proceeds to expound the verse “Therefore will I divide him a portion among the great” to mean that he will receive reward. One might have thought that he will receive reward like the later ones and not like the earlier ones, so the verse states: “And he shall divide the spoil with the mighty,” meaning like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who were mighty in Torah and in mitzvot. “Because he bared his soul unto death,” meaning he gave himself over to death on behalf of the Jewish people, as it is stated: “Yet now, if You will forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray You, out of Your book that You have written” (Exodus 32:32).

“And was numbered with the transgressors,” meaning that he was counted among those who died in the desert, for, just like them, he did not enter Eretz Yisrael. “Yet he bore the sin of many,” as he atoned for the incident of the Golden Calf. “And made intercession [yafgia] for the transgressors,” as he requested mercy for the sinners of Israel so that they should engage in repentance. And the word *pegia* means nothing other than prayer, as it is stated: “Therefore pray not you for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession [tifga] to Me; for I will not hear you” (Jeremiah 7:16).

אָמַר לוֹ הַקָּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא: כְּלוּם אַתָּה מִבְקֵשׁ אֵלֵא לְקַבֵּל שָׂכָר, מֵעֵלָה אֲנִי עֹלֶיךָ כְּאִילוֹ עֲשִׂיתָם, שְׁנֹאֲמַר: “לָכֵן אֲחַלֵּק לוֹ בְּרַבִּים וְאֶת עֲצוּמִים יַחַלֵּק שְׁלַל תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הָעֵרָה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ וְאֶת פּוֹשְׁעִים נִמְנָה הוּא חֲטָא רַבִּים נָשָׂא וְלַפְשָׁעִים יִפְגְּעֵ.”

“לָכֵן אֲחַלֵּק לוֹ בְּרַבִּים” – יָכוֹל כְּאַחֲרוֹנִים וְלֹא כְּרֵאשׁוֹנִים? תִּלְמוּד לֹאֲמַר: “וְאֶת עֲצוּמִים יַחַלֵּק שְׁלַל”, כְּאַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב שֶׁהֵן עֲצוּמִים בְּתוֹרָה וּבְמִצְוֹת; “תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הָעֵרָה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ” – שְׁמַסֵּר עֲצֻמוֹ לְמִיתָה, שְׁנֹאֲמַר: “וְאִם אֵין מַחְנֵי נָא” וְגו’;

“וְאֶת פּוֹשְׁעִים נִמְנָה” – שְׁנִמְנָה עִם מֵתֵי מִדְבָּר; “וְהוּא חֲטָא רַבִּים נָשָׂא” – שְׁכִיפָר עַל מַעֲשֵׂה הָעֵגֹל; “וְלַפְשָׁעִים יִפְגְּעֵ” – שְׁכִיבֵי שְׂרָמִים עַל פּוֹשְׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שִׁיחֲזוּ בְּתַשׁוּבָה, וְאֵין פְּגִיעָה אֵלֵא תַפְלָה, שְׁנֹאֲמַר: “וְאֶתָה אֵל תַּתְפַּלֵּל בְּעַד הָעָם הַזֶּה וְאֵל תִּשָּׂא בְּעַדֵם וְנָה וְתַפְלָה וְאֵל תִּפְגַּע בִּי”.

הדרן עלך המקנא לאשתו

MISHNA The husband of the *sota* would bring^N his wife's meal-offering to the priest in an Egyptian wicker basket^{HB} made of palm branches, and he would place^N the meal-offering in her hands for her to hold throughout the ritual in order to fatigue her. This might lead her to confess her guilt and not drink the water of a *sota* unnecessarily.

The mishna lists differences between this meal-offering and other meal-offerings. Generally, all meal-offerings, from their beginnings, i.e., the moment they are consecrated, and until their ends, i.e., the moment they are sacrificed, must be in a service vessel. But in the case of this one, its beginning is in a wicker basket and only at its end, immediately before it is offered, is it placed in a service vessel.

All other meal-offerings require oil^I and frankincense, and this one requires neither oil nor frankincense. Furthermore, all other meal-offerings are brought from wheat,^H and this one is brought from barley. Although in fact the *omer* meal-offering^{HB} is also brought from barley, it is still different in that it was brought as groats, i.e., high-quality meal. The meal-offering of the *sota*, however, is brought as unsifted barley flour. Rabban Gamliel says: This hints that just as her actions of seclusion with another man were the actions of an animal, so too her offering is animal food, i.e., barley and not wheat.

GEMARA It is taught in a *baraita* that Abba Hanin says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: And why is so much done to her? It is in order to fatigue her, so that she will retract and confess her guilt and be spared death. And if the Torah is so protective of those who transgress His will, i.e., the *sota*, who secluded herself with the man she was warned against, then by a *fortiori* inference He is protective of those who do His will.

The Gemara asks: And from where is it derived that they attempt to induce her to confess because the Torah is protective of the *sota*? Perhaps it is in order that the scroll of the *sota*, containing the name of God, will not be erased. The Gemara responds: Rabbi Eliezer holds

The husband would bring – הָיָה מְבִיא: The Jerusalem Talmud states explicitly that the husband must bring this meal-offering from his own funds. The reason is that the husband has a personal need for this offering, as he must clarify for himself the innocence or guilt of his wife (*Kerem Nata*).

Would bring...and he would place – הָיָה מְבִיא...וְנָתַתָּה: *Tosafot* point out that the order of the *sota* procedure recorded in the mishna does not match the order as recorded in the Torah (see Numbers 5:11–31). In a comment on 17b, *Tosafot* conclude that the order in the Torah is authoritative, rather than the order in the mishna. However, the Rambam in the *Mishne Torah* appears to present a different order than the one presented by *Tosafot*.

HALAKHA

In an Egyptian wicker basket – בְּתוֹךְ כַּפִּיפָה מִצְרִית: The priest brings a tenth of an ephah of barley flour belonging to the husband, puts it in a basket made of palm branches, and then puts this basket in the hands of the *sota* in order to exhaust her (Rambam *Sefer Nashim*, *Hilkhot Sota* 3:12).

All meal-offerings require oil, etc. – כָּל הַמִּנְחוֹת טְעוּנוֹת שֶׁמֶן וְרוּי: All meal-offerings placed on the altar require oil and frankincense: A *log* of oil for each tenth of an ephah of flour and a handful of frankincense for every meal-offering. The exceptions are the meal-offerings of a sinner and a *sota* (Rambam *Sefer Nashim*, *Hilkhot Sota* 3:13 and *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 12:7).

BACKGROUND

Egyptian wicker basket – כַּפִּיפָה מִצְרִית: These baskets are made by bending thin willow branches into a bowl shape.

The *omer* meal-offering – מִנְחַת הָעוֹמֵר: The *omer* meal-offering, which consisted of one tenth of an ephah of barley flour, was sacrificed in the Temple on the sixteenth of Nisan, the second day of the festival of Passover. The *omer* was harvested from newly ripe barley on the second night of Passover and was prepared as roasted flour. A handful was burned on the altar, while

כל המנחות באות – מִן הַחֲטִיף: All meal-offerings are brought from fine wheat flour except for the *omer* meal-offering and the meal-offering of the *sota*, which are brought from barley (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 12:2).

The *omer* meal-offering – מִנְחַת הָעוֹמֵר: The *omer* meal-offering brought from the choicest barley flour, sifted thirteen times, while the meal-offering of the *sota* is brought from ordinary barley flour (Rambam *Sefer Nashim*, *Hilkhot Sota* 3:13 and *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 7:11–12).

the rest was eaten by the priests. In addition to the *omer* offering, a male sheep was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, together with a wine libation and two-tenths of an ephah of wheat flour as a meal-offering. Once the *omer* offering was sacrificed, the general populace was permitted to eat grain from the new harvest. It is a mitzva by Torah law to count the days from the sixteenth of Nisan, the day the *omer* meal-offering was brought, until the festival of *Shavuot*. This mitzva is known as *sefirat haomer*, the counting of the *omer*.

NOTES

It was already erased – **היא אימתיקא לה**: *Tosafot* note that the Gemara previously stated (7a) that after the scroll is erased the *sota* is encouraged to drink the water of the *sota*. However, according to the Gemara here she is encouraged to confess even after the scroll has been erased. The *Sefat Emet* explains that prior to the erasing of the scroll, the woman is discouraged from drinking even if she is innocent, so that the scroll with the name of God need not be erased. After the scroll has been erased, she is encouraged to drink if she is innocent, but if she is guilty she should confess her guilt instead (see *Minhat Kenaot*).

HALAKHA

What is the procedure for meal-offerings – **קדר מנחות** – **כיצד**: The procedure for the sacrifice of meal-offerings is as follows: One who brings a meal-offering brings fine flour from his home in a vessel of silver or gold, suitable to be a service vessel. If it is a meal-offering of fine flour, he places it in a service vessel and sanctifies it in the Temple. Baked meal-offerings are baked in the Temple and broken into pieces. Oil and frankincense are placed upon the flour, and it is brought to the priest, who carries it to the altar. The priest brings it opposite the corner of the horn of the altar. He removes the frankincense to one side, removes a handful of the meal-offering from the place where the oil has accumulated, puts it into a service vessel, and sanctifies it there. He then gathers all the frankincense and places it on top of the handful in the vessel, brings the handful up to the altar, salts it, and places it on the fire (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 13:12).

After the handful is sacrificed – **קרב הקומץ**: After the priest places the handful on the fire of the altar and most of it has ignited, the remainder of the meal-offering may be eaten by the priests. However, the meal-offering brought by a priest is not eaten at all (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 12:9, 13).

The priests are permitted, etc. – **רשאים הבהנים וכו'**: The priests are permitted to eat meal-offerings together with other foods and are even permitted to place honey on them. However, they are prohibited by Torah law from eating them in leavened form (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 12:14).

Service vessels that were made of wood – **כלי שרת** – **שעשעאן של עץ**: Service vessels may be fashioned only of metallic substances; if they are made of wood or glass they are invalid. This ruling is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion, as the *halakha* is generally ruled in his favor in disputes with his colleagues (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 1:18).

LANGUAGE

Baskets [*kelatot*] – **קלתות**: From the Greek κάλαθος, *kalathos*, a basket with a narrow base used primarily by women for holding wool and work utensils.

מִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּךְ מְקַרֵּיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ, דָּאֵי מְשׁוּם מְגִילָהּ, הָאֵי אִימְתִּיקָא לָהּ.

”כָּל הַמִּנְחָוֹת וְכוּ׳. וְרַמְיָנָהּ: סֵדֵר מִנְחָוֹת מֵיֵצֵד? אָדָם מְבִיא מִנְחָה מֵתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ בְּקֵלָתוֹת שֶׁל כֶּסֶף וְשֶׁל זָהָב, וְנוֹתְנָהּ לְתוֹךְ כְּלֵי שֵׁרֶת וּמְקַדְּשָׁהּ בְּכָלֵי שֵׁרֶת, וְנוֹתֵן עָלֶיהָ שְׁמֵנָה וְלִבְנָתָהּ וּמוֹלִיכָהּ אֶצֶל כַּהֵן, וְכֹהֵן מוֹלִיכָהּ אֶצֶל מוֹזֵבֵחַ וּמְגִישָׁהּ בְּקֶרֶן דְּרוּמִית מֵעֵרְבִית כְּנֶגֶד חוּדָה שֶׁל קֶרֶן יְדִיָּו.

וּמְסַלֵּק אֶת הַלְּבֹנָה לְצֵד אֶחָד, וְקוֹמֵץ מִמָּקוֹם שֶׁנִּתְרַבָּה שְׁמֵנָה, וְנוֹתֵן לְתוֹךְ כְּלֵי שֵׁרֶת וּמְקַדְּשׁוֹ בְּכָלֵי שֵׁרֶת, וּמְלַקֵּט אֶת לְבֹנָתָהּ וְנוֹתְנָהּ עַל גְּבִיּוֹ וּמַעֲלָהּ אוֹתוֹ לְגַבֵּי מוֹזֵבֵחַ, וּמַעֲלָהּ וּמְקַטִּירוֹ בְּכָלֵי שֵׁרֶת, וּמוֹלְחָהּ וְנוֹתְנָהּ עַל גְּבֵי הָאִישִׁים.

קָרַב הַקּוֹמֵץ – שְׁיִרְיָה נְאֻכְלִין, וְרִשְׁאִין הַבְּהֵמִים לֵיתָן לְתוֹכָהּ יַיִן וְשֶׁמֶן וְדָבַשׁ, וְאִין אֶסוּרִין אֶלָּא מִלְחֻמֵּץ.

קָתְנִי מֵיְהֵא: בְּקֵלָתוֹת שֶׁל כֶּסֶף וּבְקֵלָתוֹת שֶׁל זָהָב! אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא, אִימָא: בְּכֵלִים הָרְאוּיִין לְכָלֵי שֵׁרֶת.

מְכַלְל דְּכַפִּיפָה מְצִרִית לֹא חֵוִיא, כְּמֵאן? דְּלֹא כְּרַבֵּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה! דְּתַנְיָא: כְּלֵי שֵׁרֶת שְׁעֵשְׂאָן שֶׁל עֵץ – רַבִּי פּוֹסֵל, וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְכַשֵּׁיר!

אֶפִּילוּ תִימָא רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, אִימַר דְּאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה – בַּחֲשׂוֹבוֹן, בְּפַחְוִתִּין מִי אָמַר? לֵית לֵיהּ לְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה “הַקְּרִיבָהוּ נָא לְפַחְתָּךְ”!

that the priest would first give her the water of the *sota* to drink, and only afterward would he sacrifice her meal-offering. Therefore, if the concern were due to the scroll, it would no longer be applicable, as it was already erased^N in the water of the *sota* before the meal-offering was brought. The efforts to fatigue her by making her hold the meal-offering must indicate that the Torah is protective of her.

It was taught in the mishna: All meal-offerings, from their beginning until their end, are placed in service vessels and remain there. The Gemara raises a contradiction from the *Tosefta* (*Menahot* 1:16): What is the procedure for meal-offerings?^H A person brings his meal-offering from his property in baskets [*kelatot*]^L of silver and of gold, and when he reaches the Temple he places it in a service vessel and sanctifies it in the service vessel, and he puts its oil and frankincense on it, and he carries it to the priest. And the priest then carries it to the altar and brings it near to the southwest horn of the altar, opposite the corner of the horn of the altar. And this is sufficient.

The *baraita* continues: And the priest then removes the frankincense to one side, and he removes a handful from the place where its oil has accumulated and mixed with the flour, and he puts the handful into a service vessel and consecrates it in the service vessel. And he then gathers its frankincense and puts it on top of the handful and brings it up onto the altar. And he brings it up and burns it in the service vessel; and he salts it and places it upon the fires.

The *baraita* continues: After the handful is sacrificed,^H the remainders of the meal-offering are eaten. And the priests are permitted^H to put wine and oil and honey in it, even though it is prohibited to offer honey on the altar. And they are prohibited only from allowing the meal-offering to become leavened.

The Gemara asks: In any event, the *baraita* teaches that the meal-offering is first placed in baskets of silver and baskets of gold brought from one's home. This seems to contradict the mishna's statement that all other meal-offerings are initially in service vessels. Rav Pappa said: The mishna means to say that meal-offerings are placed in vessels of silver and gold, as these are suitable to be service vessels if consecrated.

The Gemara notes: Since the mishna distinguishes in this regard between the meal-offering of the *sota* and all other meal-offerings, one may learn by inference that an Egyptian wicker basket is not suitable to be a service vessel even if it is consecrated. In accordance with whose opinion is this the case? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, as it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to service vessels that were made of wood,^H Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi deems them unfit, and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, deems them fit.

The Gemara responds: You can even say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda. Say that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says that wooden vessels are deemed fit with regard to those of superior quality; but does he say likewise with regard to vessels of lesser quality, e.g., a basket made of palm branches? Doesn't Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, hold to the principle articulated in the verse: “And when you offer the blind for a sacrifice, is it not evil! ... If you would present it now unto your governor, will he be pleased with you or show you favor?” (Malachi 1:8)? Nothing that is unfit for presentation to a ruler may be brought to the Temple. Therefore, even Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, must agree that a basket made of palm branches cannot be a service vessel.

Service vessels can sanctify only with intention – כְּלֵי שֵׁרֵת אֵין מְקַדְּשִׁין אֶלֶּא מִדַּעַת: *Tosefot HaRosh* cites a textual variant entertaining the possibility that placing an item in a service vessel can render it sanctified even without intention. Although the Rambam rules that intention is necessary for a service vessel to sanctify that which is placed in it, the Meiri disagrees.

HALAKHA

Service vessels can sanctify only with intention – אֵין מְקַדְּשִׁין אֶלֶּא מִדַּעַת: Service vessels sanctify items placed in them only if one placed the items there with that intention (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 3:20).

§ The *baraita* states: He places it in a service vessel and sanctifies it in the service vessel. The Gemara asks: Can one learn from the unnecessary repetition of the term service vessel, that service vessels can sanctify their contents only with intention?^{NH} Must one place the meal-offering in the service vessel with express intent to sanctify it? The Gemara answers: Say: He simply places it in the service vessel in order to sanctify it in the service vessel. He need not intend to sanctify it.

§ The *baraita* teaches: The owner of the meal-offering puts its oil and frankincense on it. The Gemara cites the source of this *halakha*: As it is stated: “And when anyone brings a meal-offering unto the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon” (Leviticus 2:1).

The *baraita* states: And he carries it to the priest. The Gemara cites the source: As it is written: “And he shall bring it to Aaron’s sons, the priests” (Leviticus 2:2).

The *baraita* states: And the priest then carries it to the altar. The Gemara cites the source: As it is written: “And you shall bring the meal-offering that is made of these things unto the Lord; and it shall be presented unto the priest, and he shall bring it unto the altar” (Leviticus 2:8).

The *baraita* states: The priest brings it near to the southwest horn of the altar, opposite the corner of the horn. And this is sufficient. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this?

The Gemara responds: As it is written: “And this is the law of the meal-offering: The sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord in front of the altar” (Leviticus 6:7). And it is taught in a *baraita*: When the verse states: “Before the Lord,” one might have understood this to mean on the western side of the altar, opposite the Holy of Holies. Therefore, the verse states: “In front of the altar.” This must be the south of the altar, where the ramp is located. If the verse had stated only: In front of the altar, one might have understood it to mean specifically on the southern side. Therefore, the verse states: “Before the Lord,” indicating the western side. How can these texts be reconciled? The priest brings it near to the southwest corner of the altar, opposite the corner of the horn. And this is sufficient.

Rabbi Elazar says another interpretation: One might have thought that he offers it up on the western side of the corner or on the southern side of the corner. Say: Anywhere you find two verses, one of which fulfills itself and fulfills the statement of the other, and one of which fulfills itself and nullifies the statement of the other, leave the verse that fulfills itself and nullifies the other, and seize the one that fulfills itself and fulfills the other. The principle is applied as follows: When you say: “Before the Lord,” on the western side, you have nullified the other part of the verse: “In front of the altar,” on the southern side. But when you say: “In front of the altar,” on the southern side, you have also fulfilled: “Before the Lord,” on the western side. How so? He brings it near to the southern side of the corner.

The Gemara asks: But where have you fulfilled the phrase “before the Lord”? Rav Ashi said: This *tanna* holds that the entire altar stands in the north of the Temple courtyard. Therefore, the entire southern side of the altar stood opposite the Holy of Holies in the west, and it can therefore be called: Before the Lord.

The Gemara asks: What is taught by the phrase: And this is sufficient? Rav Ashi said: This phrase was necessary, as otherwise it might enter your mind to say: Require the priest to bring the meal-offering itself near to the corner of the altar without the use of a vessel. The *baraita* teaches us that this is not so, and one can bring it to the altar in its service vessel.

“וְנוֹתְנָהּ לְכֹלֵי שֵׁרֵת וּמְקַדְּשָׁהּ בְּכֵלֵי שֵׁרֵת.” שְׁמֵינֵת מִיָּנָה: כְּלֵי שֵׁרֵת אֵין מְקַדְּשִׁין אֶלֶּא מִדַּעַת! אֵימָא: נוֹתְנָהּ בְּכֵלֵי שֵׁרֵת לְקַדְּשָׁהּ בְּכֵלֵי שֵׁרֵת.

“וְנוֹתְנָהּ עֲלֶיהָ שְׁמֵנָה וְלִבְנוֹתָהּ,” שְׁנֵאמַר: “וְיִצֵּק עֲלֶיהָ שְׁמוֹן וְנָתַן עֲלֶיהָ לְבָנָהּ.”

“וּמוֹלִיכָהּ אֶצֶל בְּהֵן,” דְּכֹתֵיב: “וְהִבִּיֵּאָה אֶל בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן” וְגו’.

“וְכֹהֵן מוֹלִיכָהּ אֶצֶל מִזְבֵּחַ,” דְּכֹתֵיב: “וְהִגִּישָׁהּ אֶצֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ.”

“מִגִּישָׁהּ בְּקֶרֶן דְּרוּמִית מִמַּעֲרֵבִית כְּנֶגֶד חוּדָה שֶׁל קֶרֶן וְדִיּוֹ” מִנְלֵן?

דְּכֹתֵיב: “וְזֹאת תוֹרַת הַמִּנְחָה הַקְּרֹב אוֹתָהּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן לִפְנֵי ה’ אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” וְתֵינֵא: “לִפְנֵי ה’” יְכוּל בַּמַּעֲרֵב? תְּלַמּוּד לֹאמַר: “אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” אֵי “אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” יְכוּל בְּדָרוֹם? תְּלַמּוּד לֹאמַר: “לִפְנֵי ה’” הֵא כִּיצַד? מִגִּישָׁהּ בְּקֶרֶן דְּרוּמִית מִמַּעֲרֵבִית כְּנֶגֶד חוּדָה שֶׁל קֶרֶן וְדִיּוֹ.

רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמַר: יְכוּל יְגִישְׁנָהּ בַּמַּעֲרֵבִית שֶׁל קֶרֶן אוֹ לְדָרוּמָה שֶׁל קֶרֶן? אֲמַרְתָּ: כֹּל מְקוֹם שֶׁאֵתָּה מוֹצֵא שְׁנֵי מְקָרְאוֹת, אֶחָד מְקַיֵּים עֲצָמוֹ וּמְקַיֵּים דְּבָרֵי חִבְרוֹ, וְאֶחָד מְקַיֵּים עֲצָמוֹ וּמְבַטֵּל דְּבָרֵי חִבְרוֹ, מִנְחִין אֶת שְׁמֵקַיֵּים עֲצָמוֹ וּמְבַטֵּל חִבְרוֹ וְתוֹפְסִין אֶת שְׁמֵקַיֵּים עֲצָמוֹ וּמְקַיֵּים חִבְרוֹ. כְּשֶׁאֵתָּה אוֹמַר “לִפְנֵי ה’” בַּמַּעֲרֵב – בְּטִלְתָּה “אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” בְּדָרוֹם, וּכְשֶׁאֵתָּה אוֹמַר “אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” בְּדָרוֹם – קִיַּמְתָּה “לִפְנֵי ה’” בַּמַּעֲרֵב. הֵא כִּיצַד? מִגִּישָׁהּ לְדָרוּמָה שֶׁל קֶרֶן.

וְהֵיכָן קִיַּמְתָּהּ? אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי קֶסֶר הָאֵי תֵנָּא: כּוּלֵיהּ מוֹבַח בְּצַפּוֹן קֵאֵי.

מֵאי וְדִיּוֹ? אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: אֵי צְטוּרִין, סֵלְקָא דַּעֲתָךְ אֲמִינָא תִיבְעֵי הַגְּשֵׁת מִנְחָה גּוֹפָה. קַמְשִׁמַּע לָן.

In order that it not be removed along with the meal-offering – דָּלָא תִּקְמוּץ בְּהַרְי מְנַחֵה: The verse states: “He shall take from there his handful” (Leviticus 2:2). If anything else is in his hand when he removes the handful, the handful will not be whole (Rashi; *Tosefot HaRash*).

Although the knife sanctifies blood – אַף עַל גַּב – דְּקַדְוֵי שְׁתֵּי סַכִּין: The Gemara apparently indicates that the slaughtering knives in the Temple must be consecrated as service vessels. According to Rabbeinu Efrayim, however, other statements in the Gemara prove that the knife need not be a service vessel. The *Tosefot HaRash* and the *Tosefot HaRosh* discuss this issue, and both note that there is no conclusive proof for either opinion. It is possible that the knife must be consecrated as a service vessel *ab initio*, but if one slaughtered with an unconsecrated knife the offering would be valid after the fact.

Here too it is not different – הֵכָא נִמְי לָא שְׁנָא: Animal offerings and meal-offerings are comparable in many ways. There are four sacrificial rites involved in animal offerings: Slaughter, receiving the blood, carrying it to the altar, and sprinkling it on the altar. There are likewise four sacrificial rites involved in the meal-offering: Removing the handful from the vessel, placing it in a service vessel, carrying it to the altar, and burning it on the altar. The initial placement of the entire meal-offering in a service vessel is not considered a true part of its service. The structure of tractate *Menahot*, which deals with meal-offerings, is parallel to that of tractate *Zevachim*, which deals with animal offerings.

LANGUAGE

Crumb [*koret*] – קוֹרֵט: This word refers to a small item or fraction, similar to the Greek κεράτιον, *keration*. The word carat, a measurement used for the weight of diamonds, may be derived from this Greek word. However, both may derive originally from older Semitic words. Some sources assert that *koret* is a variation of the word *keretz*, meaning slice or small piece.

HALAKHA

Came out in his hand – עָלָה בְּיָדוֹ: If the priest removed the handful, and a pebble, a grain of salt, or a crumb of frankincense came up with it, it is invalid (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 11:3).

וְאֵימָא הָכִי נִמְי! אָמַר קָרָא: “וְהִקְרִיבָה אֶל הַבֵּיתִן וְגו' וְהִגִּישָׁה אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ”, מִהַ הִקְרִיבָה אֶצֶל כַּהֵן בְּכֹלֵי אֵף הַגִּישָׁה אֶצֶל מִזְבֵּחַ בְּכֹלֵי.

וּמְסַלֵּק אֶת לְבוֹנְתָהּ לְצַד אֶחָד, כִּי הֵיכֵי דְלָא תִּקְמוּץ בְּהַרְי מְנַחֵה, בְּדַתְנָן: קִמְץ, וְעָלָה בְּיָדוֹ צָרוּר אוֹ גִּרְגֹר מִלַּח אוֹ קוֹרֵט לְבוֹנָה – פְּסוּל.

”וְקוֹמֵץ מִמְקוֹם שְׁנַתְרַבָּה שְׁמֵנָה”. מִנְלֵן? דְּכָתִיב: “מִסְלֹתָהּ וּמִשְׁמֵנָה... מִגְרֵשָׁהּ וּמִשְׁמֵנָה”.

”וְנוֹתְנוּ לְתוֹךְ כְּלֵי שְׁרֵת וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ בְּכֹלֵי שְׁרֵת.” לָמָּה לִּי? הֲאֵהָ קִדְּשָׁה חֲדָא וְיִמְנָא! מִיָּדֵי דְהָהּ אָדָם, דָּם אֵף עַל גַּב דְּקַדְוֵי שְׁתֵּי סַכִּין בְּצִוְאוֹר בְּהִמָּה, הָדָר מִקְדִּישׁ לֵיהָ בְּכֹלֵי שְׁרֵת, הֲכָא נִמְי לָא שְׁנָא.

”וּמִלְקֵט אֶת לְבוֹנְתָהּ וְנוֹתְנָהּ עַל גַּבְיוֹ”, דְּכָתִיב: ”וְיָאֵת כָּל הַלְּבוֹנָה אֲשֶׁר עַל הַמִּנְחָה”.

”וּמְעָלָהּ”

The Gemara asks: **And why not say that this is indeed so?** The Gemara responds: **The verse states:** “And you shall bring the meal-offering that is made of these things unto the Lord; and it shall be presented unto the priest, and he shall bring it unto the altar” (Leviticus 2:8); **just as presentation to the priest is in a vessel, so too bringing it to the altar must be in a vessel.**

The *baraita* states: **And he removes its frankincense to one side.** The Gemara explains: This is done **in order that the frankincense not be removed along with the meal-offering^N** when the priest removes a handful. **As we learned in a mishna (*Menahot* 6a):** *If he removed the handful and a pebble, or a grain of salt, or a crumb [*koret*]^L of frankincense came out in his hand,^H it is invalid.* The handful must be entirely fine flour.

The *baraita* continues: **And he removes a handful from the place where its oil has accumulated.** The Gemara asks: **From where do we derive this? As it is written:** “And he shall take from there his handful of the fine flour thereof, and of the oil thereof” (Leviticus 2:2). The Torah also states: “And the priest shall make the memorial part of it smoke, even of the groats thereof, and of the oil thereof” (Leviticus 2:16). The handful should be taken from the area where there is an abundance of oil.

The *baraita* continues: **And he puts the handful into a service vessel and sanctifies it in the service vessel.** The Gemara asks: **Why do I need this sanctification? He has already sanctified it once,** when he initially brought it to the Temple. The Gemara responds: The sanctification here is **just as with the blood** of the offerings. **Although the knife sanctifies blood^N** by contact with **the neck of the animal,** since the knife itself is a service vessel, the priest sanctifies it again when he collects it **in the service vessel. Here too, it is not different;^N** the meal-offering must be sanctified twice.

The *baraita* continues: **And he gathers its frankincense and puts it on top of the handful.** The Gemara cites the source: **As it is written:** “And he shall take up from his handful, of the fine flour of the meal-offering, and of the oil thereof, **and all the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering**” (Leviticus 6:8).

The *baraita* continues: **And he then brings it up**