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The chapter raises a fresh problem related to cases in which heave-offering is mishandled. Now the offering is cooked, or in some other way prepared with unconsecrated produce. At issue are the conditions under which the unconsecrated produce is deemed to take on the status of the heave-offering with which it is prepared. A single principle of law is introduced, M. 10:1, and applied to a series of diverse cases, M. 10:2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-10 and 11-12. This principle states that permitted food takes on a forbidden status if it is flavored by prohibited produce. If, for instance, produce in the status of heave-offering is cooked or otherwise prepared with unconsecrated food, and imparts its flavor to the dish as a whole, the unconsecrated food is deemed to take on the status of heave-offering. Even if the householder later removes the prohibited produce from the mixture, the other food remains forbidden, for in a concrete way it has benefitted from the heave-offering.

Once the chapter's central proposition has been stated at M. 10:1, it easily can be applied to cases involving various types of forbidden produce. Alongside heave-offering, we discuss problems involving unclean produce and produce subject to other agricultural restrictions. What is of greater interest to M., however, is the application of its principle to cases describing diverse methods of preparing food. That is to say, we want to know what happens when dough is raised with forbidden leaven (M. 10:2), when permitted food absorbs forbidden vapors (M. 10:3-4), when water is flavored with heave-offering (M. 10:5+6), and when permitted food is pickled (M. 10:7-10), boiled or cooked (M. 10:11-12), with forbidden produce. These discrete units do not develop the principle stated at the outset, but simply employ it. Nor do they build on one another. Judah alone transcends this otherwise uninteresting context. He supplies his usual position, that all matters of law are judged in light of the intention of the person involved, and that intention is determined on the basis of action. He thus holds that the status of unconsecrated produce cooked with heave-offering is not determined simply on the basis of whether or not the heave-offering has flavored that unconsecrated food. The further condition required by Judah is that the householder intended to use the heave-offering to flavor his food, and that this intention be indicated by the fact that the householder purposely added the
heave-offering to the unconsecrated dish for its flavor. This view is instantiated at M. 10:1H, M. 10:3 and T. 8:9a.

Only one other view in the chapter is worthy of note. This view is expressed anonymously at M. 10:1A-D (see my comment to that pericope) and is clearly represented in the position of Aqiba, M. 10:8E+F, explained at T. 9:4b. It disagrees with the chapter's central notion that permitted food takes on a forbidden status when it is flavored by that which is prohibited. This view holds, rather, that unconsecrated food becomes forbidden when it is made into a single, homogeneous dish with prohibited produce. This occurs when the prohibited produce is cut up and then cooked with the permitted produce. In this view, thus, what is determinative is not the flavoring-power of the forbidden food, but the fact that it is inextricably mixed with the other produce. Besides this position, assigned to Aqiba, all of the attributions in this chapter are to Ushans. It appears therefore that while the discussion of cases in which unconsecrated food is prepared with heave-offering may have begun at Yavneh, whatever was there accomplished was rejected at Usha and replaced with conceptions distinctive to that age.

10:1

A. [As regards] an onion [in the status of heave-offering] which one placed [i.e., cooked] among [unconsecrated] lentils--

B. if [the onion] is whole, it is permitted [to eat the lentils as unconsecrated food].

C. But (C, L, O, K lack: ν) if one cut up [the onion and then placed it among unconsecrated lentils]--

D. [it is forbidden to eat the lentils as unconsecrated food] if [the onion] imparts [to them its] flavor.

E. And [as regards] all other cooked foods (tbsyl)--

F. whether [the onion in the status of heave-offering] is whole or cut up,

G. [it renders forbidden the unconsecrated food with which it is cooked] if it imparts [its] flavor [to that food].

H. R. Judah permits [for the consumption of a non-priest] a pickled-fish [which was cooked with an onion in the status of heave-offering],

I. for the purpose [of the onion] is only to absorb the stench [of the fish, and not to flavor the brine].

Unconsecrated produce which is cooked with heave-offering, like that which in other ways is mixed with a priestly gift (M. 4:7-5:9), itself may become forbidden for consumption by a non-priest. At issue here are the specific conditions under which this takes place. The formal unity of the pericope belies the fact that in it are juxtaposed two different theories of these conditions (A-D, E-G+H-I). The first, expressed at A-D, is that the essential factor is whether or not the heave-offering has been cut up into the other food, and so made an integral part of the dish as a whole. The second conception, at E-G+H-I, is that the decisive factor is whether or not the heave-offering has imparted its own flavor to the unconsecrated produce. Matters are confused by the fact that the juxtaposition at the redactional level of these two distinct notions has led to a reformulation of D to read "if it imparts flavor," instead of the simple "it is forbidden" which B+C leads us to expect. Let us, then, examine the pericope in order to understand the point made by each of its parts, and the way in which these two parts have been read concurrently at the redactional level.

The point of A-E is made through the contrast between B and C, which distinguish between cases in which a piece of produce in the status of heave-offering is cooked whole with unconsecrated produce, and cases in which the heave-offering is cut up. On the basis of this distinction, we easily can determine what A-D deems the decisive factor for the status of the unconsecrated food. This is whether or not the heave-offering has been made an integral part of the dish in which it is cooked. If the heave-offering is placed whole into that dish, it remains separate from the unconsecrated food, and therefore, that food remains permitted to non-priests (B). Both the unconsecrated food and the heave-offering have retained their own integrity. If, on the other hand, the householder cuts the heave-offering up into the unconsecrated produce, he makes a single dish of the priestly gift and the other food. It should follow that even if he later attempts to remove the heave-offering from the dish, his initial act is decisive, and the unconsecrated food is forbidden for consumption by non-priests. In light of this, D is problematic. It claims that if heave-offering is cut up into unconsecrated food, the essential factor in determining the status of that food is whether or not it has been flavored by the priestly gift. This consideration is out of phase with, and indeed contradicts, the principle of B-C. If, as B-C claims, the issue is whether or not the heave-offering has been
cut up into the unconsecrated food, then taste should be of no concern. Conversely, if, as D states, what is important is whether or not the heave-offering imparts its flavor to the other food, it should make no difference whether the heave-offering is whole or cut up. It thus is clear that D introduces into A-C a second and distinct legal conception. The source of this second conception is obvious when we turn to E-G.

According to E-G, all that is important in determining the status of food which is cooked with heave-offering is whether or not the heave-offering has flavored that food. If it has, then even if the heave-offering is removed, the unconsecrated produce may not be eaten by a non-priest, who, by eating it, would benefit from the consecrated produce. If it is not, however, the heave-offering may be removed, and the unconsecrated dish, upon which it has had no effect, may be eaten by a non-priest. It is in light of this conception that D was formulated as we presently have it. F, likewise, is irrelevant to the case of E-I, and simply takes account of the consideration of A-D.

This brings us to Judah's qualification, H-I. Judah claims that in a case in which the heave-offering is not intended to add flavor to the unconsecrated food, it does not render that food forbidden to non-priests. For Judah what is important is not the actual effect the heave-offering has upon the unconsecrated dish, but the intention of the householder who created the mixture. As long as the householder did not intend to benefit from the heave-offering as a food substance, we take no account of the fact that it may in all events have flavored his unconsecrated dish. As we shall see, Judah holds this same position at M. 10:3.

10:2

A. [As regards] an apple [in the status of heave-offering] which one chopped up and placed in dough,

B. and [as a result the dough] was leavened--

C. lo, this [i.e., the dough] is forbidden [for consumption by a non-priest].

D. [As regards] barley [in the status of heave-offering] which fell into a well of water--

E. even though the water [in the well] was tainted [by the barley],

F. (Fourteen MSS. add: the water) is permitted [for consumption by a non-priest].

M. 10:2 (y. Pes. 2:4; A-C: b. Men. 54a, y. Hal. 1:1, y. Shab. 3:3, see M. Or. 2:4; C-E: y. Or. 2:4)
The pericope is composed of two autonomous cases, A-C and D-F, illustrating the same issue as M. 10:1. A-C depends on the rule of M. Or. 2:4, that unconsecrated produce which is leavened by produce in the status of heave-offering is deemed to take on that same status. Here the dough, which has benefitted from the leavening action of the apple in the status of heave-offering, is deemed forbidden to non-priests. At D-F the barley in the status of heave-offering ruins the flavor of water. The water remains permitted to a non-priest, since the individual who drinks it in no way benefits from the heave-offering with which it is mixed. This radical interpretation of M. 10:1's theory is that of Judah, 10:1H-I and, as we shall see, M. 10:3C. It claims that heave-offering imparts its own status to unconsecrated food it flavors only if the householder desires that flavor.

G. [As regards] an apple [in the status of heave-offering] which one chopped up and placed in dough, and [as a result the dough was leavened [= M. 10:2A-B]--

H. R. Yose says, "That which is leavened [by the apple] is not deemed [truly] leavened [and therefore the law of M. Or. 2:4 does not apply; the dough remains permitted to non-priests]."

I. "It is all the same whether [heave-offering] imparts flavor [so as] to improve [the taste of food], or spoil [it].

J. "In either case (E reads: Lo, this) [the food to which the heave-offering imparted flavor] is forbidden [for consumption by a non-priest]"--the words of R. Meir.

K. R. Simeon says, "[If the heave-offering] improves [the taste of unconsecrated food, that food] is forbidden.

L. "[But if the heave-offering] spoils [its taste], it [remains] permitted [for consumption by a non-priest],

M. "as in the case of vinegar [in the status of heave-offering] which fell into [unconsecrated] beans."


A. (1) Beans [in the status of heave-offering] which fell into a well of water,

B. (2) [or] dates upon which fell wine [in the status of heave-offering],
C. (3) or dried figs upon which fell oil [in the status of heave-offering], 9
D. 10, this [i.e., the water, dates or dried figs] is forbidden [for consumption by non-priests].
E. But R. Simeon permits.

T. 8:10

M. 8-9G-H cites M. 10:2A-B and adds Yose's disputing opinion. Yose claims that the leavening action of the apple is not comparable to that of normal leaven, and therefore the rule of M. Or. 2:4 does not apply. Although it does not directly refer to M., I-M must be read as supplementary to the case of M. 10:2, in which barley in the status of heave-offering imparts to water a tainted flavor. M. has the position of Simeon, against Meir, that if the heave-offering ruins the flavor of food, that food is not deemed forbidden. T. 8:10 9 follows with a triplet of cases exemplifying the positions of Meir and Simeon. The anonymous view of A-D is that of Meir. He deems the unconsecrated produce forbidden for consumption by non-priests, for it was flavored by heave-offering. Simeon (E), we must assume, holds that the heave-offering spoiled the taste of the unconsecrated produce. He therefore deems that produce still permissible for consumption by non-priests (MB, HY).

I. A. [As regards one part of] leaven in the status of heave-offering which fell into [more than a hundred parts of unconsecrated] dough and one lifted it [i.e., the leaven] out [of the mixture; see M. 5:2-3, 5, 7-8 and T. 5:9], but afterwards [the dough anyway] was leavened--

B. [the dough] is permitted [for consumption as unconsecrated food].

T. 8:11 (y. Or. 2:3)

II. C. [As regards one part of] leaven made from produce of the seventh year [of the sabbatical cycle] which fell into [more than a hundred parts of] dough [of any other year of that cycle]--

D. [if] he knew about it [i.e., that forbidden leaven had been mixed with permitted dough, such that the leaven is neutralized; see T. 6:5, 8-9] and afterwards it [i.e., the dough] was leavened--

E. [the dough] is forbidden [on account of the laws of the seventh year]. 10

T. 8:12 (y. Or. 2:9)
III. F. [As regards] leaven in the status of heave-offering and leaven of the seventh year which [together] fell into dough,

G. neither of them [alone] sufficient in quantity to leaven [that dough] (ו' בשת ...ו' בשת)--

H. if (ω) they joined together and leavened [the dough]--

I. [the dough] is forbidden to non-priests [but permitted to priests; M. Or. 2:14].

J. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon (y. Or. 2:9, followed by HD and Lieberman, reads: R. Simeon) declares it permitted to non-priests [and also to priests; M. Or. 2:14].

K. [If] each [alone] was of sufficient quantity to leaven [the dough],

L. but together they leavened [the dough]--

M. [the dough] is forbidden [even] to priests.

N. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon declares [it] permitted to priests [but not to non-priests].

T. 8:13 (y. Or. 2:9; F-J: M. Or. 2:14)

T.'s triplet of cases supplements M. 10:2 with an extended essay on the leavening of unconsecrated dough by leaven in a forbidden status. Since T. 8:11-12 together make a single point, and T. 8:13 makes a separate one, I deal independently with these two parts of the pericope.

T. 8:11-12 coordinates the rule of M. 10:2 with the law of neutralization, given in M. Chapters Four and Five. T. asks which rule takes precedence in a case in which leaven in the status of heave-offering or of the seventh year is neutralized in unconsecrated dough, yet leavens that dough. If the law of neutralization applies, the batch will be deemed permitted for consumption as unconsecrated food. If the law of M. 10:2 applies, the unconsecrated dough must in all events be deemed forbidden, for it was leavened by forbidden produce. The point made here is that the rule of M. 10:2 is operative. If the dough's being leavened can be attributed to the heave-offering or leaven of the seventh year, that dough is forbidden for consumption. This principle emerges in the contrast between the cases at T. 8:11 and 12, the details of which must now be explained. We recall that in the case in which heave-offering is neutralized, the householder is required to take from the batch for a priest the heave-offering
which originally fell in (just as here at T. 8:11A; see Eliezer, M. 5:2). In this way the priest does not lose his share. In the present case, the leaven in the status of heave-offering thus is not present in the batch at the time the dough is leavened. The leavening therefore need not be attributed to the heave-offering, and the dough remains permitted for consumption by non-priests. The facts for the neutralization of produce of the seventh year are different and, it follows, so is the rule at T. 8:12. The neutralization of produce of the seventh year is completed as soon as the householder discovers that a mixture has been created (just as here at T. 8:12D; see T. 6:8-9 and HD). Since the produce which is neutralized does not belong to any particular individual, the householder does not remove it from the batch in which it was neutralized. In the present case, therefore, the forbidden produce certainly accounts for the leavening of the dough and, for this reason, that dough is deemed forbidden.

The problem at T. 8:13 is separate. Now two different categories of forbidden leaven are mixed with dough. The one category, heave-offering, renders the dough forbidden for consumption by non-priests, but not by priests. The other, leaven subject to the restrictions of the seventh year, renders the dough forbidden to non-priest and priest alike. We have two different cases, F-J, which has neither of the categories of leaven alone sufficient to leaven the dough, and K-N, where the two categories of leaven do together what either could have done alone. In each case we must determine which of the restrictions applies. According to I, if neither of the types of leaven alone could have leavened the dough, but together they do so, the dough can be eaten by priests, but not by non-priests. This is because as regards non-priests, we must take into account the restrictions pertinent to both categories of leaven. From the point of view of the non-priest, the dough was leavened by forbidden leaven, and so is prohibited. This is not the case for priests. Since the heave-offering does not render the dough forbidden to them, we do not take account of its leavening action. This leaves the leaven in the status of the seventh year alone to be considered. Since this leaven alone was not of sufficient quantity to leaven the dough, that dough is not rendered forbidden. Eleazar B. Simeon's view, J, is that even as regards non-priests, each of the prohibitions must be considered separately. Since neither of the categories of leaven was sufficient to leaven the dough, that dough is liable neither to the restrictions of the seventh year nor of heave-offering.
L-N has each of the categories of leaven sufficient to raise the dough. M holds that the dough therefore is prohibited both to priests and to non-priests, for it has the status of produce of the seventh year, as well as that of heave-offering. Eleazar again disagrees, declaring that the dough is permitted for the consumption of priests. His view is that we deem the leaven in the status of heave-offering alone to account for the dough's being leavened. Since the leaven of the seventh year thus is irrelevant to the dough's being leavened, the dough is not subject to the restrictions of the seventh year and is permitted to priests.

10:3-4

A. One who scrapes hot bread [from the side of an oven] and places it on top of a jug of wine in the status of heave-offering--

B. R. Meir deems [the bread] forbidden [for consumption by non-priests].

C. But R. Judah deems [it] permitted.

D. R. Yose deems [it] permitted in [the case of] bread made from wheat,

E. but deems [it] forbidden in [the case of] bread made from barley,

F. for barley absorbs [the wine vapor].

M. 10:3 (b. Pes. 76b, b. A.Z. 66b; see M. Mak. 3:3)

G. [As regards] an oven which one fired with cumin in the status of heave-offering and baked (seventeen MSS. add: bread) in it--

H. the bread is permitted [for consumption by a non-priest].

I. For the flavor of cumin is not [imparted to the bread,] but [only] the smell of cumin.

M. 10:4 (b. A.Z. 66b)

The two pericopae share a common issue, whether or not the bread is deemed to absorb the vapor of the wine or cumin, such that it is rendered forbidden for consumption by non-priests. They are, however, formally autonomous and, as we shall see, do not make the same point. We must, therefore, treat each separately.

On the surface the point of M. 10:3 is quite simple. As is clear from F, the issue is whether or not the bread absorbs the wine vapor. Meir, B, holds that it does, and therefore declares the bread forbidden for consumption by non-priests. Judah, C,
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holds that it does not, and so deems the bread permitted. Yose, D-F, offers the expected mediating position. Matters are complicated, however, when we examine these three positions more closely. We note that in his theory, Yose agrees with Meir alone. He states that if the bread absorbs, it is forbidden. Judah's view clearly is out of phase with the others, for as I have explained it, Judah simply rejects the fact assumed by Meir, that the bread in question absorbs. The alternative, and I believe more likely, interpretation of Judah's view is that Judah accepts the fact that the bread absorbs the vapor of the wine, but rejects the contention that this renders the bread forbidden for consumption by non-priests. 

Judah's view here thus is consistent with a position which occurs throughout Judah's rulings in M. This is that matters are to be judged in accordance with the intention of the individual, and that intention is determined on the basis of deed. In the present case, if the man wished to put wine in the bread, he would have done so in a more direct manner than by placing the warm bread on top of a wine jug. Since he did nothing more than this, we must assume that he did not want the wine in the bread. We therefore deem the effect of the vapor upon the bread to be null. This is to say that for Judah, what is decisive is not whether or not some of the wine has entered the bread, but whether or not the householder intentionally placed that wine in the bread. On the basis of the deed of the householder, we must declare that he did not, and therefore deem the bread to have retained its un-consecrated status. This is, of course, the same position which Judah holds at M. 10:1H-1.

M. 10:4 is separate from the foregoing. It rules that bread baked in an oven fired with cumin in the status of heave-offering is permitted for consumption by a non-priest. The point is as stated at I. The burning cumin does not impart flavor to the bread, but only gives it the aroma of cumin. This ruling is not representative of any of the three position at M. 10:3.

10:5-6

A. [As regards] fenugreek which fell into a vat of [unconsecrated] wine—

B. in [the case of fenugreek which is] heave-offering (follow nine MSS. which add: or) second tithe,

C. if the seed [without the stalk] is sufficient to impart flavor [to the wine, that wine is subject to the law of heave-offering or second tithe].
D. But not [if the seed is not sufficient to impart flavor to the wine without] the stalk.

E. In [the case of fenugreek which is produce of] (1) the seventh year [of the sabbatical cycle], (2) of a vineyard in which were sown diverse kinds, or (3) [if it] is dedicated [to the Temple]--

F. if the seed and stalk [together] are sufficient to impart flavor [to the wine, that wine is subject to the law of produce of the seventh year, diverse kinds, or that which is dedicated to the Temple].

M. 10:5 (E-F: y. Sheb. 9:5)

G. One who had bundles of fenugreek grown in a vineyard in which were sown diverse kinds--

let them be burned.

H. [If] he had bundles of fenugreek which were liable to the separation of tithes (šl tbl)---

I. he crushes [some of the stalks] and determines the quantity of seed which [all of the stalks together] contain

J. and separates [the tithes required] for [this quantity of] seed.

K. But he does not need to separate tithes for the stalks.

L. (Seven MSS. add: And) if he separated tithes [for the stalks],

M. he may not say, "I shall crush [all of the stalks] and shall take [the stalks for myself] and give the seed [to its proper recipients, priest and Levite]."

N. Rather, he must give [to priest and Levite] the stalks along with the seed.

M. 10:6 (G: M. Or. 3:6; H-K: b. Bes. 13a)

M. takes up the special case of fenugreek, a type of produce the seed of which is a food, but the stalk of which, while edible, generally is not eaten. The special nature of this plant is problematic in cases in which the fenugreek is in the status of heave-offering and is mixed with unconsecrated food (A-D), is subject to other agricultural restrictions (E-F+G), or is liable to the separation of tithes (H-N). In each case we must determine whether the seed alone is subject to the pertinent restrictions, or whether these restrictions apply as well to the stalk, which, as I just have said, may in certain circumstances be used.
as a food. As we shall see, the status of the stalk is determined on the basis of the nature of the restriction, on the one hand, and by the express designation of the householder, on the other. The stalks are not deemed to be liable to designation as, or to have the status of, tithes. This is because the householder normally does not eat them. Yet if he designates them to be tithes, the designation is valid, for by doing this he expresses his intent to use the stalks as food. The stalks, however, automatically are subject to restrictions (e.g., that of diverse kinds) which apply to a field as a whole. This is because the householder may in no event benefit from such produce. Whether or not he specifically designated the stalks to be food is irrelevant in this case.

The point of M. 10:5 is made through the contrast between A-D and E-F. The former presents cases in which the fenugreek has the status of heave-offering or second tithe, the latter, cases in which the fenugreek is subject to restrictions which apply to a field as a whole, or in which the fenugreek has been dedicated to the Temple. In the former case, the stalks are not deemed to have the status of the agricultural offering, for they are not considered food. In determining the status of unconsecrated food with which the fenugreek has been mixed, we therefore do not take into account the flavoring-power of the stalks. This is not the case for the types of restrictions listed at E. Here the stalks are deemed subject to the restrictions imposed upon the field as a whole, or are consecrated, having been dedicated along with the seed to the Temple. If this fenugreek is mixed with unconsecrated food, we must take into account the flavoring capacity of the stalks, which, like the seed, have a restricted status.

The same contrast which is operative at A-D+E-F is found at G and H-K. G simply repeats in its own terms what we know from E-F. The restriction pertinent to produce from a field in which were grown diverse kinds of seed applies to the whole of the fenugreek plant. The stalks, as well as the seed, therefore must be burned. As regards the separation of tithes, H-K, only the seed is liable, for this is the part which the householder normally eats. He therefore calculates the quantity of tithe to be separated from the seed alone, using the method outlined at I-J. L-N makes the next logical point. If the householder himself designates tithes for both the seed and stalks, his designation is valid. Having indicated that he deems the stalks to be food, he
must give to the proper recipients the required quantity of them, as well as of the seed.

A. One who separates bundles of fenugreek as (follow E in adding: second) tithe (see Lieberman, TK, I, p. 429, HD and HY) [for other produce]--

B. lo, this one must redeem both the stalks and the seed (E reads: the seed and the stalks) [see M. 10:H-N].

T. 8:8a

T. clarifies the point of M. 10:5A-D in light of M. 10:6L-N. Stalks of fenugreek are not liable to the separation of second tithe, and therefore are not normally deemed to have a consecrated status (M. 10:5A-D). If, however, a householder purposely separates the stalks as second tithe, they are deemed to have that status and must be treated as sanctified offerings, just as M. 10:6L-N states.

A. [As regards] fenugreek [in the status of heave-offering] which fell into a well of water [= M. 10:5A]--

B. R. Meir deems [the water] forbidden [for consumption by non-priests].

C. But R. Judah permits.

D. Said R. Simeon, "To what case does [the opinion of R. Meir] apply?"

E. "To a case in which the fenugreek sank [into the water]."

F. "But if it did not sink, lo, this [i.e., the water] is permitted [for consumption by non-priests]."

T. 8:9a

T. 8:9a applies to the case of M. 10:5 (cited at A) the principles of Meir and Judah, M. 10:3. Meir, as we would expect from M. 10:3B, assumes the fenugreek to have flavored the water in the well. He therefore deems that water forbidden to non-priests. Just as at M. 10:3C, Judah holds the effect of the fenugreek upon the water to be null. On the one hand, the householder did not intentionally place the fenugreek in the water; on the other, he does not desire the water, which now has the flavor of fenugreek. Simeon, D-F, seems to assume that if the fenugreek does not sink in the water, it does not impart flavor to the water. This qualification of Meir's view does not mitigate the basic disagreement between Meir and Judah.
A. (1) [As regards] wine in the status of heave-offering which fell upon pieces of [unconsecrated] fruit—
   B. let one wipe them off, and they are permitted [for consumption as unconsecrated produce].
   C. (Lieberman follows ed. princ. in deleting four words from the text of V. See TR, I, p. 433, for other problems of reading.)
   D. (2) And so [in the case of] oil in the status of heave-offering which fell upon pieces of [unconsecrated] fruit—
   E. let one wipe them off, and they are permitted.
   F. (3) And so [if the oil in the status of heave-offering fell] into [unconsecrated ] wine—
   G. let one skim it off, and the wine is permitted.
   H. (4) [If] it fell into brine—
   I. let one skim off [enough unconsecrated oil] to remove the flavor of oil which is in it [i.e., in the brine; thereafter, that brine is permitted].

T. 8:14 (T. Miq. 1:4)

The pericope is not related specifically to M. 10:5-6, but complements in a general way the discussion of the laws of Chapter Ten. The point of each of the four rules is the same. The householder may rinse or skim the unwanted heave-offering off of his unconsecrated food, and that heave-offering is not deemed to have rendered the food forbidden. The householder did not cause the heave-offering to fall on the food in the first place, and his later actions in wiping off the heave-offering indicate he does not wish to benefit from it. This view, which takes no account of whether or not the heave-offering actually imparted flavor to the unconsecrated produce, self-evidently is that already offered by Judah, M. 10:1H-I, M. 10:3C and T. 8:9C.

A. [As regards leather] garments [such as sandals, MB, HY] which one lubricated [first] with unclean [olive-]oil and then with clean oil,
   B. or which one lubricated [first] with clean oil and then with unclean oil—
   C. R. Eliezer says, "I rule [on the cleanness of the garments] in accordance with [the status of cleanness of] the first [oil which was used]."
   D. But sages say, "The last" [=M. Or. 2:13].
E. For Eliezer says, "Let a man lubricate his garments [first] with (read:) clean oil (all MSS.: unclean) and then with (read:) unclean oil (all MSS.: clean). (Supply with E: For) when they exude [oil from the other side of the leather], they will exude the first, [clean, oil]."

F. But sages say, "Let a man lubricate his garments [first] with (read:) unclean oil (all MSS.: clean) and then with (read:) clean oil (all MSS.: unclean). (Supply with E: For) when they exude [oil from the other side of the leather], they exude the latter, [clean, oil]."

G. [As regards] garments which one lubricated with unclean oil and then wiped off—

H. he uses them in [cases requiring preservation of] cleanness.  

I. [If] liquids then exuded from them [i.e., the garments]—

[the garments] are unclean.

T. 8:15 (A-D: M. Or. 2:13)

The pericope belongs with M. Or. 2:13 and is unrelated to the present discussion. I cannot account for its placement in this context.23 Its rule, however, is as follows. Olive-oil is used to soften leather. Presumably individuals prefer to use for this purpose unclean oil, which may not be eaten by people who wish to eat their food in cleanness (Lieberman, TK, I, p. 434). At issue between Eliezer and sages is how such unclean oil may be used, without its rendering unclean the person who later wears the garment. I have corrected the positions of each authority, at E and F, to be in line with the rulings at C and D. Eliezer, C, holds that the status of cleanness of the garment is determined on the basis of the first oil that is used. Thus one should use some clean oil first, and then apply the unclean. His view, as I have corrected E to read, is that what goes into the leather first is also that which comes out first. The clean oil thus coats the leather and prevents the unclean oil from rendering unclean the person who wears the garment. Sages, D, have the opposite view, that the cleanness of the garment is judged on the basis of the status of cleanness of the last oil that is used. As I have corrected F, their view is that this second oil permeates the leather and seeps out to the surface, where it, and not the first oil which was used, will come into contact with the person wearing the garment.
Contrary to my interpretation, Lieberman, TK, I, p. 434, upholds the reading of the MSS. of T. Eliezer (E), he says, holds that the individual first uses unclean oil and then clean. His view is that the clean oil forces the unclean out of the leather, so that it can be wiped off. Sages, on the other hand, hold that the individual first uses sufficient clean oil to permeate the leather. When afterwards he uses unclean oil, this oil will exude from the leather, and so can be wiped off. The problem is that according to this reading and interpretation, E and F contradict the positions ascribed to Eliezer and sages at C and D. According to Lieberman's exegesis, Eliezer, C, should state that the cleanliness of the garment depends on the second oil which is applied, and sages, D, should take the opposite view. I find it very unlikely that T. would so blatantly contradict what is stated in M., and in particular in the context of materials which are intended to give the reasons for views cited by M.'s authorities.

G-I offers a different method by which an individual may use unclean oil to soften leather. It states that he simply should wipe the unclean oil off of the surface of the leather. He must, of course, be careful that more oil does not subsequently seep out of the leather (I).

A. (1) [As regards] a pot in which one cooked meat—
he should not [thereafter] cook in it dairy.
B. (2) [If he cooked in it] dairy, he should not [thereafter] cook in it meat.
C. (Follow E in deleting: [If he cooked in it] unconsecrated produce, he should not [thereafter] cook in it heave-offering.)
D. (3) [If he cooked in it] heave-offering, he should not [thereafter] cook in it unconsecrated produce.
E. But if one cooked [food in any of these forbidden ways]--
F. lo, this [i.e., what has been cooked second] is forbidden if [the food which was cooked first] imparted to it flavor.

T. 8:16 (b. Zeb. 96b, b. Hul. 97a, 111b)

The triplet makes a single point, relevant at E-F to the rules of M. 10:1-6. Food should not be cooked in a pot which may impart to it the flavor of something which is forbidden. One therefore does not cook meat in a dish used for dairy, or *vice versa*, and
does not cook unconsecrated food in a pot which had been used for heave-offering. If this restriction is not followed, E-F, we apply the criterion of whether or not the food has been flavored by what previously was cooked in the pot. This is just as M. 10:1-6 would lead us to expect.

I. A. [If] there were before him two pots, one [filled] with heave-offering and one [filled] with unconsecrated produce,

B. and before him [also] was a mortar [filled] with heave-offering--

C. [if] he placed [the heave-offering in the mortar] in one of them [i.e., of the pots], but it is not known in which of them he placed [it],

D. lo, I say, "In the [pot of] (read with MB, HY:) heave-offering (MSS.: unconsecrated produce) he placed [it]."

II. E. [If] there were before him two mortars, one [filled] with unconsecrated produce and the other [filled] with heave-offering,

F. and before him [also] was a pot [filled] with unconsecrated produce--

G. [if] he placed [in the pot at F produce] from one of them [i.e., of E's two mortars], but it is not known from which of them he placed [it],

H. lo, I say "From the [mortar filled with] unconsecrated produce he placed [it]."

T. 8:17 (see M. 7:5A-C, and T. 6:11b)

III. I. [If] there were before him two pots, one [filled] with unconsecrated produce and one [filled] with heave-offering,

J. and before them were two mortars, one [filled] with heave-offering and one [filled] with unconsecrated produce--

K. [if] he placed [in the pots produce] from the two of them [i.e., put the contents of each of the mortars in one of the pots], but it is not known whether he placed this in that, or that in this [i.e., whether he mixed heave-offering with heave-offering or with unconsecrated produce]--

L. lo, I say, "He placed heave-offering with heave-offering, and unconsecrated produce with unconsecrated produce."

T. 8:18 (see T. 6:14-17)
M. If [the produce in one of the pots mentioned at I was not heave-offering, but rather] was liable to the separation of tithes, [or had the status of] first tithe or second tithe, [and it was mixed with either heave-offering or unexceptioned produce, but it is not known which,]--

N. lo, this is forbidden [i.e., none of the produce may be eaten by a non-priest].

O. For they did not deem permitted [for consumption by non-priests] produce which might have been mixed with heave-offering (ṣpq mdwm) except in a case which can be adjudicated such that all of the produce retains its original status.

T. 8:19 (O: T. 6:18f; see T. 6:18)

On the surface this discussion is not related to the present context. At issue is not heave-offering's flavoring unexceptioned produce, but whether we may declare that heave-offering and unexceptioned produce have not been mixed at all. As we shall see clearly at T. 8:20-22, however, what T. wishes to do by placing this discussion in the present context is to treat as a unit the materials on the problem of mixtures of heave-offering and unexceptioned food which M. covers in diverse chapters. This is a fine example of T.'s acting as a redactional commentary by reorganizing M.'s materials in accordance with its own concept of theme.

The point of cases like these already has been stated above at T. 6:11-18. This is that in a case in which we can rule that the heave-offering was mixed with other heave-offering and not with unexceptioned produce, we do so. In this way we uphold the prevailing status both of the priestly gift and of the unexceptioned produce (A-L).29 If the doubt cannot be adjudicated in such a way that none of the produce involved is deemed to take on a forbidden status, we must deem all of the produce to be forbidden. This is exemplified at M-0, where a mixture occurs between either heave-offering and unexceptioned produce, or heave-offering and some different agricultural offering. As O states, in such cases, neither of the pots of produce may be saved by the declaration that the heave-offering fell into the other.

A. A forbidden (E lacks: forbidden)30 piece [of meat] which was mixed with [other] pieces,

B. even if they are a thousand [in number]--

C. all of them are forbidden.
D. [In the case of forbidden] broth [which was mixed with pieces of permitted meat]---
   [the meat is prohibited if the broth] imparts [to it its] flavor [= M. Hul. 7:5C].
E. If [the piece of meat at A] was dissolved, lo, this [i.e., all of the meat] is [prohibited if] it imparts flavor [just like at D].
   T. 8:20 (T. Hul. 7:7)
F. A piece [of meat] from a sin offering which was mixed with a hundred pieces of unconsecrated [meat],
   G. and so a piece of show-bread which was mixed with a hundred pieces of unconsecrated [bread],
   H. lo, these are neutralized [such that all of the meat or bread may be eaten as unconsecrated food].
   I. R. Judah says, "They are not neutralized."
   T. 8:21 (y. Or. 2:1; see b. Yeb. 81b)
   J. A piece of unclean sin offering which was mixed with a hundred pieces of clean sin-offering,
   K. and so a piece of unclean show-bread which was mixed with a hundred pieces of clean show-bread,
   L. lo, these are neutralized [such that all of the sin offering or show-bread is deemed clean].
   M. R. Judah says, "They are not neutralized."
   N. And so in the case of meal-offerings,
   O. and so in the case of cakes of thank-offering.
   P. Produce which is liable to the separation of tithes or wine used for libations [either of which is mixed with permitted, unconsecrated produce]---
   Q. [if all of the produce in the mixture is] of the same type [the mixture is forbidden] no matter how little [forbidden substance it contains].
   R. But [if the produce in the mixture is] not of the same type [the mixture is forbidden if the prohibited food] imparts flavor [to that mixture].
   S. And [as to] all other forbidden foods,
   T. whether [the mixture is of foods] of the same kind or of different kinds,
   U. [it is forbidden if the forbidden food] imparts [its] flavor [to the mixture].
   T. 8:22 (P-U: see M. A.Z. 5:8, b. A.Z. 73b)
At issue are the conditions under which the rules of neutralization apply and those under which the probative factor is whether or not forbidden food has imparted flavor to permitted food. This problem is stated in terms of cases involving the mixture of meat permitted for consumption by non-priests and forbidden meat. While the unit thus is autonomous of the topic of heave-offering, it ties together the two different types of problems of mixtures discussed in M. Terumot. This material therefore is both pertinent and aptly placed in its context in T.

The point is that in cases in which the forbidden food is of a type different from that with which it is mixed, the other food is rendered prohibited if it is flavored by the forbidden food (D, E, R, S-U). When this happens, even if the forbidden substance is removed from the mixture, the other food remains forbidden, having received the benefit of that which is forbidden. This is not the case if the forbidden and permitted foods are of the same type. In such a case there can be no consideration of whether or not the forbidden food has flavored the permitted. The laws of neutralization therefore are applied, and if the forbidden food is an insignificant proportion of the mixture as a whole, that mixture is deemed permitted (F-H, J-L).

Matters are confused by the view of Judah (I, M), echoed in the anonymous laws of A-C and Q. This view is that the laws of neutralization do not apply in cases in which meat from sacrifices, or show-bread, is involved. The theory here apparently is that these things are of such importance that they never may be disregarded and so never are neutralized (b. Hul. 100a). This is exactly the view attributed to Judah at T. 5:10A-I (pp. 153-154) regarding certain types of produce in the status of heave-offering. S-U is a further source of confusion. It claims a distinction between the types of produce listed at P and all other food. This distinction is contradicted by A-O. I cannot account for it.

10:7

A. [As regards] unconsecrated olives which one pickled with olives in the status of heave-offering--

B. [if it was] (1) crushed, unconsecrated [olives which were pickled] with crushed [olives] in the status of heave-offering,

C. [or] (2) crushed, unconsecrated [olives which were pickled] with whole [olives] in the status of heave-offering,
D. (3) [or if they were pickled] in brine in the status of heave-offering (my trwmh)—

E. it is forbidden [i.e., the unconsecrated olives are rendered forbidden for consumption by a non-priest].

F. But [if] whole unconsecrated [olives are pickled] with crushed [olives] in the status of heave-offering—it is permitted.

M. 10:7

The issue is the circumstances under which unconsecrated olives are deemed to be flavored by olives in the status of heave-offering with which they are pickled. If they are so flavored, they will themselves be deemed to have the status of heave-offering (M. 10:1). According to M. the operative consideration is whether the unconsecrated olives are crushed or whole at the time they are pickled with the heave-offering. If they are crushed, they are assumed to be capable of receiving the flavor of the other olives. They therefore are deemed forbidden for consumption by a non-priest (B, C). If they are whole, they are considered impervious to the flavor of the olives in the status of heave-offering, and so retain their unconsecrated status (F). This distinction is not applied in the case in which the brine itself is in the status of heave-offering (D). In such a case whether the unconsecrated olives are whole or crushed, they will be flavored by the forbidden brine.

There is formal evidence that the pericope has undergone a stage in development beyond the simplest expression of its law. This simplest statement would consist of the superscription, A, plus the perfectly balanced, contrasting cases at B+E vs. F. Together these cases make the point of the pericope. C and D appear to be appended, forming a triplet of cases at B-D. The reason for the addition of C-D is clear on substantive grounds. I already have stated the point of D. C stresses that it is irrelevant whether the olives in the status of heave-offering are crushed or whole. In either case they are assumed capable of imparting flavor to the unconsecrated olives.

10:8

A. [As regards] unclean fish which one pickled with clean fish--

B. [in the case of fish pickled in] any keg which holds two se'ahs [= 9600 sus, weight of brine,]
C. if [in that two se'ahs] it contains unclean fish of a weight of ten sus in Judean measure,
D. which equals five sela's in Galilean measure,
E. the brine (gyru) is forbidden [i.e., unclean].
F. R. Judah says, "[It is forbidden if there is] a quarter [50, i.e., fifty sus, of unclean fish] in two se'ahs."
G. R. Yose says, "[It is forbidden if the unclean fish is] one sixteenth [of the whole, i.e., 600 sus]."

M. 10:8 (Sifra, Shemini, parashah 3:9; B: y. R.H. 1:8; see b. Hul. 99b)

The pericope carries forward the issue of M. 10:7, problems of the status of permitted food which is pickled with forbidden food. The question now is the minimum quantity of forbidden food--here, unclean fish--which will flavor, and thereby render prohibited, the food with which it is pickled. We have a tripartite dispute on the matter. The anonymous law of A-E is disputed by Judah, F, and Yose, G. As indicated in the translation, the three positions define progressively greater quantities of unclean fish to be present in the brine before that brine is rendered unclean.35 I find no particular significance in the specific figures given.

The form of the pericope requires no comment. Of interest only is the superscription, A, which is misleading. Unlike what A claims, the issue of the pericope is not the status of the clean fish which is pickled with the unclean, but of the brine.36 E makes this clear.37 The reason for this discontinuity is probably that the superscription here is on the model of M. 10:7A, to which it is an exact linguistic parallel. This is a fine example of the use of a single syntactic pattern for the presentation of materials which, while on diverse topics, are intended to illustrate a single underlying problem of law.

A. [As regards] unclean fish which one pickled with clean fish,
B. and so a keg [in which one pickled fish] which contains two se'ahs [= 9600 sus, of brine]
C. in which there is unclean fish of a weight of ten sus in Judean measure, which equals five sela's in Galilean measure,
D. the brine is forbidden [i.e., unclean].
E. R. Judah says, "(It is forbidden if there is) a quarter [-log, i.e., fifty sus, of unclean fish] in the two se'ahs."

F. R. Yose says, "(It is forbidden if the unclean fish is] one sixteenth [of the whole, i.e., 600 sus] [= M. 10:8].

G. Said R. Simeon b. Menasia', "You do not find a keg which holds two se'ahs in which there is (read šyōn bw; all MSS.: š'yn bw; see Lieberman, TK, I, p. 441) unclean fish of a weight of ten sus in Judean measure, which is five selā's in Galilean measure, which does not contain a quarter [-log of brine]."

H. Said R. Yose b. R. Judah, "To what case does this apply [i.e., the rule that brine in which is pickled unclean fish may itself be rendered unclean]?

I. "To the case in which one removes [the fish from the brine] and places it before him and finds it to be of the specified measure.

J. "But if he takes [pieces of fish from the brine] and tosses [them into a pile] one at a time (r'swn r'swn),

K. "even though he [ultimately] found there more than the specified amount--

L. "[the brine is] permitted."

M. (Delete the following, which is a marginal gloss that has been copied into the text of T.; see Lieberman, TK, I, p. 442; His father and his mother did not know that it was from the lord; for he was seeking an occasion against the Philistines (Jud. 14:4).)

T. 9:1 (I-M: see y. Ter. 10:7)

Important here is the use of "and so" at B, and "in which" at C. Through these interpolations T. reads M.'s pericope as referring to two different problems. These are, first, the status of clean fish which is pickled with unclean (A), and, second, the status of the brine in which unclean fish is pickled (B) (Lieberman, TK, I, p. 439). In T.'s version, these two statements of case share the same ruling, at D. T. thus resolves the problem of the misleading superscription at M. 10:8A.

G and H-L continue matters by supplementing M.'s rule. Simeon b. Menasia', G, reads B-F as the continuation of A. The problem for him, thus, is the minimum proportion of unclean brine, derived from the unclean fish in the mixture, which will render unclean the clean fish which is pickled with it. Thus Judah's
statement, E, of the quantity of unclean fish, is understood to refer to the quantity of brine derived from that fish. Simeon's point is that Judah and the anonymous rule are in essential agreement. He says that if the quantity of unclean fish mentioned at B-D is present, so will there be the quantity of unclean brine defined by Judah (Lieberman, TK, I, p. 441). I already have indicated (n. 34) why this reading of matters is not supported by the language of M. 10:8.

H-L offers a qualification of M.'s rule, separate from G. Yose b. R. Judah's position is that if the householder removes the unclean fish a piece at a time, the individual pieces of unclean fish do not join together to constitute the minimum quantity which renders the brine unclean. They are, rather, considered separately from each other (Lieberman, TK, I, p. 442).

I. A. [As regards] unclean fish which one pickled with clean fish [= M. 10:8A]---
   B. he wipes off [the clean fish], and it is permitted [i.e., clean].
II. C. [As regards] a salted, unclean fish [which one pickled] with unsalted, clean fish, [the clean fish] is forbidden.
   III. D. [As regards] salted clean fish [which one pickled] with unsalted, unclean fish, [the clean fish is] permitted.
   E. [As regards] unclean fish which one cooked with clean fish---
   F. they consider the matter as if [the unclean fish] is a leek or an onion.
   G. If it is of sufficient quantity ('m yā bāv) to impart flavor to the clean fish, [that fish] is forbidden.
   H. But if not, it is permitted.

T. 9:2 (A-D: see y. Ter. 10:8)

T. is in two parts, the triplet at A-B+C+D, and E-H. Both supplement M. 10:8. The first rule of the triplet, A-B, is familiar (see T. 8:14). It states that if the householder wipes the forbidden brine off of clean fish, that fish is considered unaffected by the brine and therefore remains clean. The contrasting cases at C+D explain why this is the case. The point is that salted fish imparts its flavor to other fish, but unsalted fish does not. A-B, where, we assume, the unclean fish is unsalted, the clean fish thus will not have been flavored by it. This is a consideration unknown to M. 10:8.
E-H stands on its own, offering a criterion for determining whether or not unclean fish has rendered unclean the clean fish with which it is cooked. Here there is no issue of brine as an intermediary between the clean and unclean fish. T. therefore suggests a method by which the householder simply may determine whether the unclean fish was sufficient in quantity to flavor the clean. The method is clear, as stated at F.

10:9

A. Unclean locusts which were pickled with clean locusts have not invalidated [i.e., imparted uncleanness to] the brine [in which they were pickled].

B. Testified R. Sadoq concerning the brine of unclean locusts, that it is clean [i.e., that it does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness; y. Ter. 10:8].

M. 10:9 (M. Ed. 7:2, Sifra, Shemini, pereq 5:10; B: T. Ed. 3:1)

The pericope is redacted here because of its relevance to M. 10:8's discussion of the status of brine in which is pickled a mixture of clean and unclean foods. Unlike M. 10:8, however, M. 10:9 adds nothing to the laws of M. Chapter Ten. A's rule, a declarative sentence, is explained by B. Sadoq states that locust-brine is not considered a liquid which imparts susceptibility to uncleanness to foods it wets down. It therefore does not impart uncleanness to the mixture of which it is a part. 39

10:10

A. All [kinds of unconsecrated produce] which are pickled together [with heave-offering remain] permitted [for consumption by non-priests],

B. except [for unconsecrated produce pickled] with leeks [in the status of heave-offering].

C. (1) Unconsecrated leeks [which are pickled] with leeks in the status of heave-offering,

D. [or] (2) unconsecrated vegetables [which are pickled] with leeks in the status of heave-offering

E. are forbidden [for consumption by non-priests].

F. But unconsecrated leeks [which are pickled] with vegetables in the status of heave-offering are permitted [for consumption by non-priests].

M. 10:10

A and C-E+F are joined by B, forming a tight little essay. A
states that unconsecrated produce which is pickled with heave-offering does not take on the status of that offering. The claim, it appears, is that different types of produce which are pickled together do not flavor one another. This is not what is assumed at M. 10:7, a contradiction for which I cannot account. B states that leeks alone do not fall under A's rule. This introduces C-E+F, on the laws for leeks. C-F states, simply, that leeks impart flavor to produce with which they are pickled, but themselves are not flavored by other produce. This point is made through the contrast between D-E and F. C is added to give the rule for a case in which both the unconsecrated produce and the heave-offering with which it is pickled are leeks.

A. These are types of leeks [M. 10:10C-F]:

B. (1) arum (lop), (2) garlic, (3) onions and (4) porret (qplwtwt).

C. R. Judah says, "Porret alone is a type of leek (lyn lk myny ḫwyt 'l' qplwt bibd).

T. 9:3 (A-B: b. Ned. 68b)

T.'s contribution is obvious.

A. R. Yose says, "They pickle onions in the status of heave-offering in unconsecrated vinegar,

B. "but they do not pickle onions in the status of heave-offering in vinegar in the status of heave-offering.

C. "And there is no need to say [that they do not pickle] unconsecrated onions in vinegar in the status of heave-offering."

T. 9:4a

Vinegar which is used for pickling is not thereafter eaten. For this reason, A-B, vinegar in the status of heave-offering may not be used for pickling. If it were, the heave-offering could not afterwards be eaten by the priest. At C, both the unconsecrated onions will be given the status of heave-offering, and the vinegar in the status of heave-offering will be ruined.

10:11

A. R. Yose says, "All [kinds of unconsecrated produce] which are boiled with beets [in the status of heave-offering] are forbidden [for consumption by non-priests],

B. "since they [i.e., beets] impart flavor [to that with which they are cooked]."
C. R. Simeon says, "[Unconsecrated] cabbage from an irrigated field [which is boiled] with cabbage [in the status of heave-offering] from a rain-watered field is forbidden [for consumption by non-priests],

D. "since it [i.e., the cabbage from the irrigated field] absorbs [the flavor of the other cabbage]."

E. R. Aqiba (reading with thirteen MSS. and editions; printed edition reads: Judah) says, "All [kinds of permitted food] which are cooked together [with forbidden food] are permitted [for consumption],

F. "except [for that which is cooked] with [forbidden] meat."

G. R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, "Liver renders [other food] forbidden, but itself is not rendered forbidden,

H. "for it imparts [flavor], but does not absorb [flavor]."

M. 10:11

M. 10:11 is in two parts. A-B+C-D provides two Ushan rules on mixtures of heave-offering and unconsecrated produce. E-H is Yavnean, on mixtures of a wide range of types of forbidden and permitted foods. The two units have been redacted together because of the single issue they share. The points both of A and C, first, are obvious on the basis of the previous rules of the chapter and in light of the glosses at B and D. Aqiba's statement, E-F, is more difficult, for it is not clear to what type of forbidden food he refers. I assume that, as its wording claims, E is intended as a general principle, to be applied to all types of forbidden foods, including heave-offering. Aqiba thus will reject all of the laws of M. Chapter Ten. His point, as stated by F, is that only forbidden meat (i.e., unclean meat, improperly slaughtered meat, or meat deriving from sacrifices, is of sufficient gravity to render forbidden other foods with which it is cooked. Yohanan b. Nuri's statement, G, follows upon that of Aqiba, giving the rule for the specific case of liver. It is explained by H.

D. R. Aqiba says, "All [kinds of permitted food] which are cooked together [with forbidden food] are permitted [for consumption], except [for that which is cooked] with [forbidden meat] [= M. 10:11E-F].

E. "[Permitted] meat [which is cooked] with [forbidden] meat is prohibited [for consumption]."
F. "And [in the case of] any [two kinds, one permitted and one forbidden] which were mixed (supply with E: \textit{nt}or\textit{bw} together and [then] cooked, lo, this is prohibited."

T. 9:4b

F presents an important qualification of Aqiba's position, cited at D.\textsuperscript{49} According to F, the factor which determines the status of permitted food which is cooked with forbidden food is whether or not the permitted and forbidden foods are mixed together to create a single dish before they are cooked.\textsuperscript{50} If they are, the permitted food is deemed to take on the forbidden status of the other food. This is the same notion that is held by M. 10:1A-D, and which is ignored by the rest of Chapter Ten. T. thus shows that view to belong to Aqiba.

A. R. Eliezer says, "Liver renders [other food] forbidden, but itself is not (supply 'ynh with E) rendered forbidden" [= M. 10:11G].

B. R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, "[Liver which has been boiled renders] [other food] forbidden, but is not itself rendered forbidden.

C. "[Liver] which has been spiced renders [other food] forbidden and [also] is itself rendered forbidden [by other food]."

T. 9:5a (b. Hul. Illa)

What is given in the name of Yohanan b. Nuri in M. is here attributed to Eliezer. Ishmael, B-C, qualifies that statement. Rashi (to b. Hul. Illa, s.v., \textit{mtwblt}) explains that spicing the liver, C, softens it, such that it will absorb the flavor of that with which it is cooked. I can suggest no alternative interpretation.\textsuperscript{51}

10:12

A. [As regards] an egg which was spiced (read with 17 MSS. and editions: \textit{ntb}h; printed editions read: \textit{ntbsh}) with forbidden spices [e.g., spices in the status of heave-offering]--

B. even its yolk is forbidden [for consumption].

C. since it [i.e., the yolk] absorbs [the flavor of the spices].

D. Liquid in which heave-offering has been boiled or pickled is forbidden to non-priests.

M. 10:12
Two independent rules, A-C and D, conclude M.'s discussion of the status of unconsecrated food which is prepared with heave-offering or other forbidden produce. The theory here again is that produce which is flavored by heave-offering or other forbidden food itself takes on a forbidden status. This is explicitly stated, C, as the reason for the rule of A-B. The basis for the separate rule at D is the same. The heave-offering imparts its own flavor to the liquid in which it is boiled or pickled.

D. [As regards] clean eggs which one poached with un-clean eggs--

E. if [the unclean eggs] are of sufficient quantity to impart flavor [to the clean eggs, those eggs are] forbidden.

F. But if not, they are permitted.

G. [As regards] eggs which one boiled and [later] found a baby bird in one of them--

H. if it is of sufficient quantity to impart flavor [to all of the eggs, they are] forbidden.

I. But if not, they are permitted.

J. Abortive eggs (Jastrow, p. 241, for gwly bysym) are permitted for consumption.

K. [As regards] spoiled eggs (bysym mwarwt; see Lieberman, TK, I, p. 449)--

let a hearty soul (np yph) eat them [i.e., they are permitted].

L. If one found blood in either of these [i.e., J or K], he may throw out the blood and eat the rest.

T. 9:5b (y. Ter. 10:10; D-I: b. Hul. 98a; J-K: b. Hul. 64b)

A. A man (supply 'dm with E and ed. princ.) may eat fish and locusts whether they are alive or dead and need not scruple.

T. 9:6a

T. takes up the discussion of laws regarding eggs, complementing M. 10:12A-C in a most general way. D-I simply applies the theory of M. Chapter Ten to cases irrelevant to the topic of heave-offering. In issue, J-M and T. 9:6a are autonomous of M. J-M is placed here because, like D-I, it gives rules for eggs. T. 9:6a follows D-I, listing two other foods which are permitted for consumption. The basis of T. 9:6A's rule is that neither fish or locusts require ritual slaughter (HY).