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CHAPTER SEVEN

TERUMOT CHAPTER SEVEN

The chapter is in two parts, M. 7:1-4 and M. 7:5-7. Both continue Chapter Six's essay on the penalty paid by non-priests who eat heave-offering. The main point at M. 7:1-4 is that even in a case in which the non-priest is not liable to the added fifth, e.g., if he purposely ate heave-offering (M. 7:1), or if he is a minor and not culpable (M. 7:3), he still must pay the principal. In this way the priest is compensated for his loss in produce. Within the framework of this discussion, of particular interest is M. 7:2's dispute between Meir and sages, over the status of the daughter of a priest who marries an Israelite and afterwards eats heave-offering. At issue is whether the woman is treated like a person of priestly status, such that she is not liable to the added fifth, or as a non-priest, such that she is liable. M. 7:4 offers a general principle which summarizes the rules of M. 6:1-6 and M. 7:1-3.

M. 7:5-7 is a long and repetitive unit on a single problem, the adjudication of cases of doubt concerning the misuse of heave-offering. The point is familiar from elsewhere in Mishnah,¹ that we attribute an impairment in status to that which already is impaired. Thus if it is not clear whether a se'ah of heave-offering fell into a bin of heave-offering or a bin of unconsecrated produce, we assume that it fell into the heave-offering, leaving the other produce free for consumption as unconsecrated food. The substance of this elaborate formal construction is related to what precedes only in that it provides a case in which a non-priest eats the doubtful heave-offering. In principle, however, it is separate from the unit in which it is redacted.

T. consists almost entirely of a long unit of materials, T. 6:11b-19, which coordinates the rules of M. 4:12, on cases of doubt concerning the neutralization of heave-offering, and M. 7:5-7, which also concerns problems of doubt. The material is important as an example of T.'s acting as a redactional commentary to M. Through its sequence of comments on M., T. offers an alternative, and in this case, completely logical, ordering of the issues discussed in M.

M. 7:1-4 bear attributions only in M. 7:2's dispute between Meir and sages. The only attributions at M. 7:5-7 likewise are to
Ushans, specifically, Meir and Yose. The issue of M. 7:5-7 further is attested by Judah and Simeon, T. 6:12.

7:1
A. [A non-priest] who intentionally eats heave-offering pays back the principal, but does not pay the [added] fifth.
B. (Eleven MSS. add: "And") that which is paid as restitution [retains the status of] unconsecrated produce.
C. (Six MSS. add: "And") [therefore] if the priest wished to refuse [it], he may refuse [it].

M. 7:1

What has changed from M. 6:1 is that here the non-priest intentionally eats heave-offering. This is a sin for which he is punishable by death (T. Ker. 1:5). Since he is liable for that punishment, he is not required to pay the fine of the added fifth and to designate heave-offering to replace that which he ate. This would constitute double punishment for a single crime. The non-priest simply compensates the priest from whom he took the heave-offering. He does this by giving that priest a quantity of produce equal to that which was taken. This produce does not take on the status of the heave-offering which was eaten, and, therefore, the priest may refuse to accept it (C), as he can any other gift of unconsecrated produce.2

7:2
A. "The daughter of a priest who married an Israelite and afterwards [unintentionally] ate heave-offering pays the principal, but does not pay the [added] fifth.
B. "And [if she commits adultery] her death is by burning.
C. "[If] she married any person who is ineligible [for marriage to priestly stock, e.g., a bastard (M. Yeb. 6:2), and then unintentionally ate heave-offering],
D. "she pays the principal and the [added] fifth.
E. "And [if she commits adultery] her death is by strangling"--the words of R. Meir.
F. But sages say, "Both of these [women] pay the principal, but do not pay the [added] fifth,
G. "and [if they commit adultery] their death is by burning."

M. 7:2 (Sifra, 'Emor, pereq 6:4)

The concern here is the anomolous status of the daughter of
a priest who marries an Israelite. While such a woman is of priestly lineage, because of the marriage she becomes an outcaste and loses the right she had while living in her father's house to eat holy things. The problem is whether such a woman still is treated as a person of priestly status, or whether she is treated as an ordinary Israelite. The issue is disputed by Meir, A-E, and sages, F-G.

The key to the exegesis of the pericope is in what on the surface appears to be a secondary dispute at B+E vs. G. Meir distinguishes between a priest's daughter who marries an Israelite of unimpaired stock, and one who marries an Israelite who is not fit for marriage to priests. His point is made through the contrast between B and E. Upon divorce or widowhood the woman at B returns to her father's house and regains her previously held priestly rights. It follows for Meir that she is treated like a person of priestly status. If she commits adultery, she is executed by burning, as are all women of priestly caste who commit adultery (Lev. 21:9, M. San. 9:1). This is not the case at E, where the woman has married an Israelite of impaired lineage. Such a woman never may return to her father's house. Meir holds, therefore, that she is treated under the law as an Israelite. If she is unfaithful, her death is by strangulation, as it is for all Israelite women who are unfaithful (M. San. 11:1). On this basis we readily can interpret Meir's view regarding the restitution these women pay if they unintentionally eat heave-offering (A, C). The priest's daughter who marries an Israelite of unimpaired stock is treated like a person of priestly status. If she eats heave-offering she does not pay the added fifth, which is paid only by non-priests. Since she had no right to eat the heave-offering, however, she must replace it, as would any priest who ate heave-offering belonging to some other priest. For this reason she pays the principal. This is not the case at D. Since here the woman is treated like an Israelite, if she eats heave-offering, she must pay both the principal and the added fifth.

Sages reject Meir's distinction. By birth the woman is of priestly stock. This is not changed by her marriage to a non-priest, even one of impaired lineage. After her marriage she does not have the right to eat heave-offering. If she does so anyway, since she is of priestly stock, she need not pay the added fifth required of non-priests. If she commits adultery, her death is by burning, as it is in the case of all unfaithful priestly women.
7:3-4

A. (1) One who gives his minor children or his slaves, whether they are grown or minor, [heave-offering] to eat,

B. (2) one who eats heave-offering [separated from produce grown] outside of the Land [of Israel],

C. (3) and one who eats less than an olive's bulk of heave-offering

D. pays the principal but does not pay the [added] fifth.

E. [That which is given as] restitution [retains the status of] unconsecrated produce.

F. [Therefore] if the priest wished to refuse [it], he may refuse [it].

G. This is the general rule (kille):

H. Anyone who pays the principal and the [added] fifth--[that which is given as] restitution [takes on the status of] heave-offering, and, [therefore, even] if the priest wished to refuse [it], he may not refuse [it].

I. [And] anyone who pays the principal but does not pay the [added] fifth--[that which is given as] restitution [retains the status of] unconsecrated produce, [and, therefore,] if the priest wished to refuse [it], he may refuse [it].

M. 7:3 follows substantively from M. 7:1-2, offering three instances of non-priests who eat heave-offering and pay the principal but not the added fifth. M. 7:4 concludes the unit of materials begun at M. 6:1, offering a general principle which co-ordinates and contrasts the rules of M. 6:1-6 and M. 7:1-3.

M. 7:3 refers to three cases in which a non-priest eats heave-offering in such a manner that he does not incur liability for eating a holy thing. The non-priest is a minor or slave (A), and so is not responsible for his actions (M. B.Q. 8:4); or the heave-offering was separated from produce grown outside of the Land of Israel (B), and therefore does not have the sanctified status of true heave-offering (see above, p. 52); or the non-priest ate less than the quantity of heave-offering the eating of which constitutes a transgression (C; see T. 7:3H). The point is that while in such cases the non-priest need not pay the added fifth, for no liability for the misuse of sanctified produce has
been incurred, he must in all events compensate the priest for his loss of produce. Since the individual was not in the first place liable for eating heave-offering, the produce paid as the principal does not take on the sanctified status of that offering. For this reason, as I explained at M. 7:1, the priest need not accept the compensation.

7:5-7

A. Two bins, one [filled] with heave-offering, and the other [filled] with [less than a hundred se'ahs of] unconsecrated produce,

B. into one of which fell a se'ah of heave-offering,

C. but it is not known into which of them it fell—

D. lo, I say, "Into the [bin filled with] heave-offering it fell" [and so there has been no mixing of heave-offering and unconsecrated produce].

E. [If] it is not known which [of the bins] is [filled] with heave-offering and which is [filled] with unconsecrated produce—

I. F. [if] he ate [the produce in] one of them, he is exempt [from payment of the principal and added fifth, i.e., we assume that he ate unconsecrated produce].

G. And [as for] the second [bin]--

he [thereafter] treats it as heave-offering.

H. "But [dough made from] it is subject to [the separation of] dough offering [since it might be unconsecrated produce]"--the words of R. Meir.

I. R. Yose exempts [it from the separation of dough offering].

J. [If] a different person ate [the produce in] the second [bin],

he is exempt [from payment of the principal and added fifth, i.e., we assume that he ate unconsecrated produce].

K. [If] a different person ate [the produce in] both [of the bins],

he pays restitution in accordance with [the quantity of produce in] the smaller of the two.

M. 7:5

II. L. [If the produce in] one of them [i.e., of the bins] fell into unconsecrated produce,

it does not impart the status of heave-offering [to that produce].
M. And [as for] the second [bin]--
he [thereafter] treats it like heave-offering.
N. "But [dough made from] it is subject to [the sepa-
ration of] dough offering"--the words of R. Meir.
O. R. Yose exempts [it from the separation of dough
offering].
P. [If the produce in the] second [bin] fell into a
different batch [of unconsecrated produce],
it does not impart the status of heave-offering [to that
produce].
Q. [If the produce in] both [of the bins] fell into a
single batch [of unconsecrated produce],
they impart the status of heave-offering [to the pro-
duce] in accordance with [the quantity of produce in] the
smaller of the two [bins].

M. 7:6

III. R. [If] he sowed [as seed the produce in] one of them
[i.e., of the bins, the crop which results] is exempt [from
the laws of heave-offering, i.e., it is not treated as heave-
offering (see M. 9:6)].

S. And [as for] the second [bin]--
he [thereafter] treats it as heave-offering.
T. "But [dough made from] it is subject [to the sepa-
rati on of] dough offering"--the words of R. Meir.
U. But R. Yose exempts [it from the separation of dough
offering].
V. [If] a different person sowed the second [bin], [the
resultant crop] is exempt [from the laws of heave-offering].
W. [If] one person sowed both [bins]--
X. in the case of a kind [of produce] the seed of which
disintegrates, [the crop] is permitted [for consumption as
unconsecrated produce (M. 9:5-6)].
Y. But in the case of a kind [of produce] the seed of
which does not disintegrate, [the crop] is forbidden [for
consumption as unconsecrated produce, i.e., it is treated as
heave-offering].

M. 7:7

The long and formally unitary pericope makes a single point.
In a case in which we need not assume that heave-offering was eaten
by a non-priest or in some other way misused (specifically, mixed
with unconsecrated produce or used as seed), we do not make such
an assumption. The point has its simplest expression at A-D, with E then acting as superscription to the three parallel cases at F-K, L-Q and R-Y, any one of which alone would have been sufficient to make the point that they all make together.

We know that if heave-offering is mixed with less than a hundred times its quantity in unconsecrated produce, it imparts the status of heave-offering to the produce. At A-D it is not certain whether heave-offering was mixed with unconsecrated produce or with other heave-offering. We assume that it was mixed with the heave-offering such that the unconsecrated produce retains its unconsecrated status. This same principle is applied in each of the cases which follow. Now one of two bins contains heave-offering, but it is not known which. If one of the bins is eaten (F), mixed with unconsecrated produce (L), or used as seed (R), the individual involved can declare that he used the bin containing unconsecrated produce. He therefore is not liable for the misuse of a holy thing. For obvious reasons, however, he subsequently must treat the remaining bin of produce as if it contains heave-offering (G, M, S). Meir (H, N, T) holds that since the status of the second bin is in doubt, dough offering must be separated from the produce it contains, as if it were unconsecrated produce. Yose (I, O, U) is consistent in holding that the second bin is treated as heave-offering. For this reason he claims that the produce in this bin is not liable to the separation of dough offering. J, P and V have a different non-priest make use of the second bin. Is he liable for the misappropriation of sanctified produce? We rule that he is not, for like the first person, he may declare that the bin which he used did not contain the heave-offering. Only if the same person makes use of the produce in both of the bins is it certain that he has misappropriated heave-offering (K, Q, W). If he ate the produce, he must make proper restitution. If it was mixed with unconsecrated produce, the rule for mixtures applies. If the heave-offering was used as seed, the resultant crop, as we shall see in a moment, may be in the status of heave-offering. Assuming that the two bins contained different quantities of produce, however, the issue is how to determine the quantity of heave-offering which was misused. Did the larger or smaller bin contain heave-offering? The answer is fully in line with what has preceded. The individual may declare that the bin containing the lesser quantity of produce was the one which contained heave-offering. If he ate the offering, he needs to compensate the priest with a commensurately smaller quantity
of produce (K). If the heave-offering was mixed with unconsecrated produce, there is a greater chance that it will have been neutralized (Q). Only the case in which the individual surely has planted heave-offering has a variation in ruling, signaled at W-Y by a shift in formal patterning and in choice of language (ptwr at R and V; mutr//swr at W and Y). The reason for the shift is that not all seed in the status of heave-offering produces a crop which likewise is deemed to be heave-offering (see below, M. 9:4-6). If the seed is of a type which disintegrates in the soil, it is not deemed integral to the plant which grows from it. The produce yielded by that plant therefore does not have the status of heave-offering. If, on the other hand, the seed remains intact in the soil, the produce yielded by it is deemed to have the status of heave-offering.

O. R. Meir declares the second bin subject to [the separation of] dough offering.

P. R. Yose exempts it [= M. 7:5H-I, M. 7:6N-O, M. 7:7T-U].

Q. But sages say, "Unconsecrated produce which [surely] has been mixed with heave-offering (mdwm°) [and, therefore, has the status of heave-offering] is exempt from the separation of dough offering.

R. "That about which there is a doubt whether or not it was mixed with heave-offering (spq mdwm°) is eaten as heave-offering, but [anyway] is liable to [the separation of] dough offering."

T. 7:8b (T. Hal. 15:, y. Ter. 7:6)

Sages, R, agree with Meir. At M. 7:5-7 it is not certain whether or not the produce in the second bin was mixed with heave-offering. While it is treated as heave-offering, dough offering still must be separated from it, as Meir says. According to Q, Yose's opinion applies only in a case in which it is certain that heave-offering was mixed with unconsecrated produce. The resultant mixture surely has the status of heave-offering, and so is not liable to the separation of dough offering.

T. 6:11b-19, which follow, are presented outside of their redactional context within T., and so require introduction. They treat together the formally and substantively related materials of M. 4:12 and M. 7:5-7, a fine example of T.'s improving upon M.'s ordering of materials through its own sequence of comments on M.'s pericopae. Thus while T. 6:11b-19 occur in T. along with that
document's materials on the neutralization of heave-offering (the topic of M. Chapter Four), I have reserved them for the present context. This allows them to be read with both M. 4:12 and M. 7:5-6 in mind. At this time we need only recall the point of M. 4:12. This is that if heave-offering falls into one of two containers, neither of which holds a hundred se'ahs of unconsecrated produce, the containers are deemed to join together to create the quantity of produce required to neutralize the heave-offering.

H. And so would (Lieberman supplies with ed. princ.: R. Yose say), "Two bins, one [filled] with [less than a hundred se'ahs of] unconsecrated produce, and the other [filled] with heave-offering,

I. "and a se'ah of heave-offering fell into one of them, but it is not known into which of them it fell [= M. 7:5A-C, with minor variations],

J. "both of them are permitted."

T. 6:11b

I can make no sense of J. No matter into which of the two bins we assume that the se'ah of heave-offering falls, the bin which originally contained heave-offering does not become permitted for consumption as unconsecrated produce.

Lieberman, TK, I, p. 389, refers to M.'s version of this rule and states that the point here is the same. He claims that T. 6:11J refers only to the status of the bin which originally contained unconsecrated produce. This simply is not what J says. MB, HD and HY build an interpretation on the claim that the bin of heave-offering mentioned here contains heave-offering separated by mandate of the rabbis, but not required by biblical law. Since neither this pericope nor M. recognizes any such distinction, this interpretation is not viable.

A. [If there were] (1) two bins [each containing less than a hundred se'ahs of unconsecrated produce] in two store-rooms,

(2) two (following Lieberman, TK, I, p. 389:) bins in two attics,

(3) two bins in one attic,

B. lo, these [join together to create the quantity of unconsecrated produce needed to] neutralize [a se'ah of heave-offering which falls into one of them] [see M. 4:12A-B].
C. R. Judah says, "They do not [join together to] neutralize [heave-offering]."

D. R. Simeon says, "Even if they are in two different cities, they neutralize [heave-offering] in conjunction with one another" [= M. 4:12E].

E. [If] this one [of the bins] contains a hundred [se'ahs of unconsecrated produce], and that one (Lieberman supplies from E and ed. princ.: does not) contain a hundred [se'ahs of unconsecrated produce, and a se'ah of heave-offering falls into one of them, but it is not known which,]

F. lo, I say, "Into [the bin which contains] a hundred [se'ahs of unconsecrated produce] it fell [and, therefore, was neutralized]."

G. [If] one [of the bins contained] a mixture of heave-offering and unconsecrated produce, and the other did not contain a mixture of heave-offering and unconsecrated produce,

H. lo, I say, "Into the mixture of heave-offering and unconsecrated produce it fell."

T. 6:12

T. coordinates the principle of M. 4:12 (given here at A-D) with that of M. 7:5-7 (stated at E-H). If neither of the suspect bins alone contains enough unconsecrated produce to neutralize the heave-offering, they are deemed to join together in order to do so (A-B). If, on the other hand, one of the bins contains enough produce to neutralize the heave-offering and the other does not, the householder simply declares the heave-offering to have fallen into the larger of the bins, and to have been neutralized (E-F). The same rule is applied if the produce in one of the doubtful bins already has an impaired status (G-H). The net result in either case is the same as at A-D.

A. Two bins, in this one are forty se'ahs [of unconsecrated produce] and in that one are (follow E in deleting: not) forty se'ahs [of unconsecrated produce]--

B. [if] a se'ah of heave-offering fell into one of them, and it is known into which of them it fell,

C. and afterwards a second [se'ah of heave-offering] fell [into one of them,] but it is not known into which place it fell,

D. lo, I can attribute [the impairment] (ltlw) and say, "Into the place into which the first [se'ah of heave-offering] fell, there did the second fall [as well]."
E. [If] a se'ah of heave-offering fell into one of them [i.e., one of the original two bins,] but it is not known into which of them it fell,

F. and afterwards a second [se'ah of heave-offering] fell [into one of them] (Lieberman follows E in deleting seven words from text of V), and it is known into which of them it fell,

he may not attribute [the impairment] and say, "Into the place into which the second [se'ah of heave-offering] fell, there the first fell [as well]."

T. 6:13 (y. Ter. 4:12, 7:4; see M. Miq. 2:3, T. Miq. 2:3-4)

T.'s two parts, A-D and E-F, once again illustrate the principle that if possible, we attribute an impairment in status to what already is impaired. At A-E we know which of the bins has been mixed with heave-offering and so is in the status of a priestly gift. When a second se'ah of heave-offering falls into one of the bins, but it is not known into which (C), we declare that it fell into the one which already had been mixed with heave-offering (D). This is not the case at E-F. Now it is not known into which of the two bins the first se'ah of heave-offering falls. Since the status of neither of the bins already is impaired, there are no grounds on which to declare that the heave-offering fell into one of the bins and not the other. We must deem both of the bins to be in a status of doubt as to having been mixed with heave-offering. The fact that we know into which of the bins a second se'ah of heave-offering falls does not change matters (F). The bin into which that heave-offering falls, now surely has the status of heave-offering. The other retains its previous status of doubt.

A. [If] before him were two bins, one of [unconsecrated] wheat and one of [unconsecrated] barley,

B. (Supply from E:) and before them were two se'ahs [of produce in separate containers], one of [unconsecrated] wheat and one of barley [in the status of heave-offering]--

C. [If] one of them [i.e., of the se'ahs of produce] fell [into the produce in the bins], (Lieberman supplies following ed. princ.: and one of them was lost),

D. but it is not known which of them fell and which of them was lost,
E. both of them [i.e., both of the bins] are permitted [for consumption as unconsecrated produce, for they retain their original status].

T. 6:14

The case is more complicated, but the principle is the same as before. The householder declares that the se'ah of unconsecrated produce was mixed with the unconsecrated produce in the bins, and that the heave-offering is lost. The produce in both of the bins therefore retains its unconsecrated status.

I. A. Two bins, one of unclean heave-offering and one of clean heave-offering--

B. [if] a se'ah of [unclean] heave-offering fell into one of them, but it is not known into which of them it fell,

C. lo, I say, "Into the clean [heave-offering] it fell."

D. But the clean heave-offering cannot be eaten in cleanness until it will be ascertained that there is not in each lump of dough so much as an egg's bulk.

T. 6:15

II. E. Two bins, one of unclean heave-offering and one of [a hundred se'ahs (MB) of] clean unconsecrated produce--

F. [if] a se'ah of [unclean] heave-offering fell into one of them, but it is not known into which of them it fell,

G. lo, I say, "Into the unclean heave-offering it fell."

H. But the clean unconsecrated produce may not be eaten in cleanness until they will ascertain that there is not in each lump of dough as much as an egg's bulk.

T. 6:16

III. I. [If] one bin [contained] clean heave-offering and one [contained] clean unconsecrated produce,

J. [if] a se'ah of [unclean] heave-offering fell into one of them, but it is not known into which of them it fell,

K. both are forbidden [for whichever way we were to attribute the impairment, one of the bins would have to be deemed forbidden].

L. If there is in them [sufficient produce] to neutralize [the heave-offering] in conjunction with one another, they neutralize [the heave-offering] in conjunction with one another.

M. But they may not be eaten in cleanness until they
will ascertain that there is not in each lump of dough so much as an egg's bulk.

T. 6:17

T. 6:15-17 introduce problems of doubts concerning mixtures of clean and unclean produce. The point, however, remains the same as before. Wherever possible, we attribute an impairment in status to what already is impaired. Unclean heave-offering, therefore, is deemed to have fallen into other unclean heave-offering, and not into clean heave-offering or clean unconsecrated produce (A-C, E-G). Since in either of these cases there is a doubt whether unclean produce actually was mixed with clean, the clean produce is eaten in small amounts, such that, if it is unclean, it does not impart uncleanness to the person who eats it.

The case at I-K is different. It is not known whether unclean heave-offering falls into clean heave-offering or into clean unconsecrated produce. In this case, the heave-offering will render forbidden for consumption whichever bin it falls into. If it falls into the heave-offering, it imparts to it uncleanness. If it falls into the unconsecrated produce, it imparts to it both the status of heave-offering and uncleanness. The householder may not himself declare either of the bins to have been ruined. He therefore must treat both bins as if they have been mixed with unclean heave-offering (K). L-M is difficult, for I do not understand how heave-offering and unconsecrated produce can neutralize heave-offering in conjunction with one another. Lieberman, TK, I, 393, states that the meaning is that if either the bin of heave-offering or the bin of unconsecrated produce contains a hundred se'ahs of produce, we deem the unclean heave-offering to fall there. If it is into the clean heave-offering that it falls, that produce will be sufficient to neutralize the unclean heave-offering (in accordance with the position of the House of Hillel, M. 5:4), and the bin will remain permitted for consumption by a priest. If it is deemed to fall into the unconsecrated produce, both the status of sanctification of the heave-offering, and its uncleanness will be neutralized. In either case, the possibility that unclean produce has been mixed with the clean must be taken into account (M). While Lieberman's interpretation makes sense, it obscures the usual meaning of "neutralize in conjunction with one another" at L (see, e.g., M. 4:12). I therefore offer his exegesis as provisional.
A. [If] there were before him two bins, one of heave-offering and one of unconsecrated produce,

B. and before them were two se'ahs [of produce in separate containers], one of heave-offering and one of unconsecrated produce,

C. and [the produce] fell from each of them [i.e., of the small containers], but it is not known whether it fell from this one into that one, or from that one into this one [i.e., it is not known which produce was mixed with which]--

D. lo, I say, "Heave-offering fell into heave-offering; unconsecrated produce fell into unconsecrated produce."

E. But if it was untithed produce, first tithe or second tithe [in one of the bins, and not heave-offering]--

this [i.e., the bin of unconsecrated produce] is forbidden [for consumption].

F. For they did not declare permitted [for consumption] unconsecrated produce about which there is a doubt whether or not it was mixed with heave-offering, except in a case in which one may attribute the impairment such that the produce in both of the bins is permitted (dbr ṣyā Ṽw mtyrn).

T. 6:18 (A-D: b. Pes. 9b, b. Naz. 36b; E-F: see T. 5:15, T. 8:19)

A-D is no different from what has come before. Only E-F is of interest, offering a case like that of T. 6:17. Into whichever bin we deem the heave-offering to have fallen, that bin must be considered forbidden for consumption. This being the case, neither of the bins may be saved by the declaration that the heave-offering fell into the other. The reason is clear as stated at F, and as I have explained it at T. 6:17.

A. [If] he separated heave-offering, first tithe and second tithe, but does not know which of the offerings is which--

B. lo, this one measures [the quantity of] heave-offering, first tithe, and second [tithe] (read ṣny with E; V reads ṣnyyḥ) [in order to establish on the basis of quantity which of the offerings is which].

T. 6:19

The pericope is related to the foregoing only in that it offers a case in which containers of produce have been confused. It concludes T.'s material on this topic.