

XI

BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER ELEVEN

FOLIOS 92A-98B

11:1-2

11:1

- A. [92A] The blood of a sin offering which splattered on the garment —
- B. lo, this [garment] requires washing.
- C. Even though Scripture speaks only about [sin offerings] that are eaten, as it is said, “In a holy place will it be eaten” (Lev. 6:26), [nonetheless], all the same in requiring washing are that which is eaten and that [the blood of which must be brought to the] inner area,
- D. as it is said, “The law of the sin offering” (Lev. 6:25) — one law for all sin offerings.

11:2

- A. An invalid sin offering — its blood [that had spurted on a garment] does not require washing,
 - B. (1) whether it had a moment of validity [for tossing the blood] or (2) it did not have a moment of validity [having been invalidated before the receiving of the blood].
 - C. What is the sort which had a moment of validity?
 - D. That which remained overnight or which was made unclean or which went forth [beyond the veils] [since prior to these events, the offering had been entirely valid].
 - E. And what is the sort which did not have a moment of validity?
 - F. That which was slaughtered [with the intention to eat the meat or to toss the blood] outside its proper time or outside its proper place, and that [the blood of] which unfit people received, or the blood of which [unfit people] tossed.
- I.1** A. The blood of a sin offering which splattered on the garment — lo, this [garment] requires washing:

- B. *Now if a single rule [torah] covers all sin offerings, then even the blood of a sin offering made of a bird also should have been included under the rule. Then why has it been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Might one suppose that the blood that spurted from a sin offering prepared of a bird should have to be washed off?
- D. Scripture says, “This is the rule covering the sin offering” (Lev. 6:18) [and “this” is exclusive].
- E. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of Bar Qappara, “Scripture has said, ‘...shall the sin offering be slaughtered...’ (Lev. 6:18) — Scripture speaks only of the sin offerings that are killed through an act of slaughter [and not those killed through the pinching of the neck].”
- F. *But why not say that Scripture speaks of those that are eaten, in line with the verse, “in a holy place shall it be eaten” — but not the sin offerings prepared at the inner altar?*
- G. *Scripture encompassed them to in speaking of “...the rule of...”*
- H. *If that were the case, then even a sin offering prepared of a bird would be covered by the law, and Scripture says, “This is the rule covering the sin offering” (Lev. 6:18) [and “this” is exclusive].*
- I. *How come that is how you sort things out?*
- J. It is more reasonable that Scripture should encompass under the law the sin offering of a beast that is prepared at the inner altar, for it is a beast, it is slaughtered at the north side of the altar, its blood is received in a utensil of service, [92B] and it has to be tossed on the horn; it is to be tossed with the finger; it is to be placed on the edge of the horn; it is an offering made by fire. [Freedman: the sin offering prepared on the inner altar has all these in common with those prepared at the outer altar, but the bird offering is unlike the one prepared at the outer altar in all of these aspects.]
- K. *To the contrary! The sin offering prepared of a bird should be encompassed under the law, for it is an offering prepared on the outer altar, like itself, and it is eaten, like itself.*
- L. *The points in common between the animal offerings prepared as sin offerings on the inner altar and on the outer altar are more numerous.*
- I.2.** A. R. Joseph said, “Said Scripture, “‘The priest shall eat it’ (Lev. 6:19) — this one he shall eat, but not another, and in so stating, Scripture has excluded some of those that are eaten.”
- B. Then what purpose is served by the language, “This is the rule covering the sin offering” (Lev. 6:18) [and “this” is exclusive]?
- C. *Were it not for that usage, I might have supposed that “...shall eat it...” is merely how Scripture says things [yielding no exegetical implications beyond the plain sense], so we are informed to the contrary.*
- I.3.** A. Rabbah said, “Said Scripture, ‘...and when there is sprinkled...’” [which pertains only to sin offerings prepared at the inner altar, so it is the sin offerings prepared at the outer altar that are covered by the proof deriving from ‘This is the rule covering the sin offering’ (Lev. 6:18) (Freedman)].

- B. *But have we not learned in the Mishnah, Even though Scripture speaks only about [sin offerings] that are eaten, as it is said, “In a holy place will it be eaten” (Lev. 6:26), [nonetheless], all the same in requiring washing are that which is eaten and that [the blood of which must be brought to the] inner area, as it is said, “The law of the sin offering” (Lev. 6:25) — one law for all sin offerings?*
 - C. *This is the sense of the statement: Even though Scripture speaks only about [sin offerings] that are eaten, that is only in respect to scouring and rinsing, but as to washing, the operative language is, “...and when there is sprinkled...”*
 - D. *If so, the formulation should be not all the same in requiring washing are that which is eaten and that [the blood of which must be brought to the] inner area, but rather, “both that [the blood of which must be brought to the] inner area and also that which is eaten.”*
 - E. *Then repeat it in that way: “both that [the blood of which must be brought to the] inner area and also that which is eaten.”*
- I.4.** A. *[In light of the allegation that “..and when there is sprinkled...” which pertains only to sin offerings prepared at the inner altar, means that it is the sin offerings prepared at the outer altar that are covered by the proof deriving from ‘This is the rule covering the sin offering’ (Lev. 6:18),] if so, then the sin offering prepared of a bird also should be encompassed by the rule [since the key word is used in that regard as well]?*
- B. *Scripture has excluded that classification by the limiting language, “This is....”*
 - C. *If so, then the sin offering prepared on the outer altar also should be excluded!*
 - D. *Scripture has extended the law to that classification by saying “the rule governing....”*
 - E. *How come that is how you sort things out?*
 - F. *It is more reasonable that Scripture should encompass under the law the sin offering of a beast that is prepared at the inner altar, for it is a beast, it is slaughtered at the north side of the altar, its blood is received in a utensil of service, and it has to be tossed on the horn; it is to be tossed with the finger; it is to be placed on the edge of the horn; it is an offering made by fire. [Freedman: the sin offering prepared on the inner altar has all these in common with those prepared at the outer altar, but the bird offering is unlike the one prepared at the outer altar in all of these aspects.]*
 - G. *To the contrary! The sin offering prepared of a bird should be encompassed under the law, for it is an offering prepared on the outer altar, like itself, and it is eaten, like itself.*
 - H. *The points in common between the animal offerings prepared as sin offerings on the inner altar and on the outer altar are more numerous.*

I.5. A. R. Abin raised this question: “As to a sin offering prepared of a bird, the blood of which one carried into the inner altar using its neck for that purpose, what is the law? [Freedman: the blood was not taken in in a utensil of service, but the neck was taken inside and the blood therein. Is the sacrifice disqualified under the rule that forbids taking inside, into the inner altar, the blood of a sin offering prepared at the outer altar?] *Is the*

neck treated as the equivalent to a utensil of service, in which case the offering is invalidated, or perhaps it is treated as equivalent to the neck of a beast? And Scripture has said, 'And every sin offering whereof any of the blood is brought into the tent of meeting shall be burned with fire' (Lev. 6:23) — blood but not meat?"

- B. *Come and take note:* If the bird struggled, flipped inside the inner sanctum, and then was taken out, the offering remains fit. *Lo, if it was the priest that had brought the bird inside, it would have been unfit.*
- C. *Then in line with your reasoning, when the rule is taught on Tannaite authority in the context of Most Holy Things,* If the beast struggled and went into the area at the southern side of the altar and then returned, it is fit, *do you maintain that if the priest himself carried the beast out of the northern and into the southern area, it is disqualified?* [Freedman: surely not, for no barrier divided the north from the south so as to disqualify a sacrifice if the blood was carried from one into the other area.]
- D. *Rather, this is required in a case in which it went on its own outside of the proper place, and there too that is the requirement where the sacrifice went on its own outside of the proper place.* [Freedman: if it struggled and went out of the Temple court, even if it returned, it is disqualified; so too the bird remains fit only if it struggled and went inside, but if it struggled and went out of the Temple court, it is disqualified; no deduction is to be drawn for the case in which one carried the bird inside.]

I.6. A. *R. Abin raised this question: "As to a case in which the blood of a bird offering was poured out on to the pavement of the sanctuary and collected again, what is the law? The All-Merciful has merely not imposed the requirement of using a utensil of service [in particular, so using the throat of the bird for that purpose is suitable], and therefore one can collect the blood and it is fit, or perhaps in this case the All-Merciful has in fact disqualified an offering in which a utensil of service is used, and therefore while one collects the blood, it is disqualified [since the blood must be sprinkled directly from the throat]?"*

- B. *Said Raba, "Come and take note:* Might one suppose that the blood that spurted from a sin offering prepared of a bird should have to be washed off? Scripture says, 'This is the rule covering the sin offering' (Lev. 6:18) [and 'this' is exclusive]. *Now, if you take the position that in that case the All-Merciful has disqualified the offering if a utensil of service is used, I can draw such an inference, since it was disqualified in the air space of a utensil"* [that is, as soon as the blood enters the airspace of the garment, it has been received in a utensil, and it is disqualified for sprinkling; so the garment does not have to be washed, since only blood fit for sprinkling has to be washed. So what need is there for such a verse of Scripture? (Freedman)].
- C. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "The text is still required to cover the case in which one presses the garment of service to the neck of the bird"* [so that the blood does not enter the airspace of the garment at all; even then it does not have to be washed (Freedman)].

- I.7.** A. *Levi raised the question to Rabbi: “If the blood [of an animal offering] spurted from one garment to another, what is the rule? Do we or do we not say that the blood has been ejected from the first garment and does not have to be washed [from the second]?”* [Freedman: when the blood fell on the first garment, it became unfit for sprinkling, since it has to be washed, and therefore the second garment does not have to be washed, the blood being unfit?]
- B. He said to him, “That’s a good question. In point of fact, either way you go, it does have to be washed. *If one can collect the blood and it is fit for sprinkling, then this blood is fit. If it is collected but unfit, then I concur with R. Aqiba, who has held that, if something had once been fit but was then disqualified, the blood still has to be washed off.*”
- I.8.** A. **[93A]** *Rami bar Hama asked R. Hisda, “If the blood [of an animal offering] spurted onto an unclean garment, what is the rule?*
- B. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, “Now, since he raised the question in this manner, it must follow: if at some point the matter had been valid but then was invalidated, its blood does not have to be washed off.”*
- C. *[The question is to be refrained in this way:] is that the case only when the sequence was consecutive [first the blood was invalidated, then it spurted onto the garment] or simultaneously [when the blood was disqualified and spurted at the same moment]? Or perhaps there is no difference?*
- D. He said to him, “*It represents a dispute between R. Eleazar and rabbis in respect to the opinion of Rabbah, as has been explained by Abbaye. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ”*
- E. R. Eleazar says, “Purification water that was made unclean nonetheless has the power to effect purification. For lo, people sprinkle purification water upon a woman who is unclean by reason of menstruation [and who also was unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness, which is removed by the purification water].” [That is done even though the woman is still unclean by reason of her menstruation, but the subsequent immersion counts for both forms of uncleanness; she is not required first to immerse from the uncleanness of menstruation, then to be sprinkled with the purification water and to be immersed a second time on account of her corpse uncleanness. When the purification water touches her, it is made unclean because of her menstruation-uncleanness, yet it still cleans her of the corpse uncleanness (Freedman)]. *And in this regard said Rabbah, “R. Eleazar sets matters forth in accord with the theory of his master, R. Aqiba, who said, ‘Passing a utensil containing purification water over an unclean place is tantamount to having laid it down there.’ For we have learned in the Mishnah: **If one was standing outside of an oven and stretched his hand to the window and took the flagon and passed it over the oven — R. Aqiba declares unclean. And sages declare clean. [But: he who was clean for the purification rite stands on top of the oven, and in his hand is an empty utensil which is clean for the purification rite, and with water which is not mixed [M. Par. 10:5A-F]. And this is what is at issue between the two sides: R. Aqiba takes the view that it is as though the flagon has been laid down, and rabbis maintain that it is not as though the flagon has been laid down. And an objection was raised by Abbaye from the following: R. Aqiba concedes that, in the case of sprinkling, if one carried the flagon***

over an unclean earthen utensil or over an unclean couch or seat, the purification water remains clean, for there is nothing that imparts uncleanness whether to what is above it or to what is below it other than an olive's bulk of corpse matter or other things that impart uncleanness through overshadowing [T. Par. 9:3]. *That latter clause serves to encompass a stone afflicted with the skin ailment [of Lev. 14].* [Freedman: now an oven unclean with the uncleanness of a dead creeping thing does not impart uncleanness through overshadowing, and that contradicts Rabbah's claim that Aqiba holds that there too the airspace above a utensil imparts the purification-water just as though the purification water had come to rest on it.] *Rather said Abbaye, "All parties concur that if it was carried above, it is not as though it had come to rest, but here, what is at issue? R. Aqiba maintains that we make a precautionary decree taking account of the possibility that the matter will come to rest, and rabbis maintain that we make no such precautionary decree." Still, R. Aqiba concedes the case of sprinkling [where not the utensil but the water itself has passed through the airspace of something unclean as the water was sprinkled (Freedman)] that since the water has gone out, it has gone out [of the priest's hand as he sprinkles it, and we do not fear that he will put the water on something unclean, e.g., the oven (Freedman)].*

- F. *And as to R. Eleazar and rabbis, what is at issue between them [in the matter of introducing the analogy to the case of the woman unclean with menstrual uncleanness and corpse uncleanness]?*
- G. *Said Abbaye, "At issue between them is whether we draw an analogy between a previous event of uncleanness and one that has just now taken place. One master maintains that we do so [Eleazar, and the uncleanness is simultaneous], and the other that we do not do so [therefore if the purification water was unclean prior, it does not effect uncleanness; here too when blood of an animal sin offering spurts onto an unclean garment, Eleazar will rule it must be deemed unclean and disqualified for sprinkling even before it spurted and therefore the garment does not have to be washed; rabbis reject this view and hold that it must be washed; this is the answer to Rami's question, that it is dependent on a Tannaite dispute (Freedman)].*
- H. *Raba said, All parties maintain that we do not draw an analogy of that kind, but here, what is at issue between the two sides? R. Eleazar maintains that sprinkling is subject to a minimum standard and sprinklings do join together to make up the requisite volume, and rabbis take the view that sprinkling does not require a minimum volume."* [Freedman: the first sprinkling does not contain the minimum standard and does not count as sprinkling, but it is made unclean when it falls on the menstruating woman; hence at the next sprinklings, which is to combine with the first, the first is already unclean. Therefore it is a case of prior uncleanness, completely analogous to sprinkling with the unclean purification water. Rabbis hold that sprinkling does not require a minimum standard, so the first counts as a sprinkling; the uncleanness and sprinkling as simultaneous; no inference is to be drawn in respect to prior uncleanness.]

II.1 A. An invalid sin offering — its blood [that had spurted on a garment] does not require washing, whether it had a moment of validity [for tossing the blood]

or it did not have a moment of validity [having been invalidated before the receiving of the blood]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof” (Lev. 6:20) — of blood that is valid, not of blood that is invalid.
- D. R. Aqiba says, “If it had a moment of validity but was then invalidated, the blood has to be washed off. If it did not have a moment of validity and was invalidated to begin with, the blood does not have to be washed off.”
- E. R. Simeon says, “All the same are both classifications: the blood does not have to be washed off.”
- F. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Simeon?*
- G. The word “thereof” is written (at Lev. 6:22, “Every male among the priests may eat thereof,” and the word “of the blood thereof” is written [“And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof” (Lev. 6:20)]. [These two exclusionary usages bear the consequence that] one excludes the case in which the blood had a moment of validity and the other a case in which the blood never had a moment of validity.
- H. And R. Aqiba?
- I. “thereof” excludes heave offering [Freedman: if heave offering is boiled in a pot, the pot does not need scouring and rinsing.]
- J. *And R. Simeon is consisted with his views expressed elsewhere, for he has said, “Pots in which Lesser Holy Things are cooked do not require scouring and rinsing,” — and all the more so heave-offering.*

11:3A-D

- A. **[If] the blood spurted [directly] from the neck [of the slaughtered beast] onto the garment [and was not received in a pot, being invalid for sprinkling on the altar], it does not require washing.**
- B. **[If the blood spurted] from the horn or from the foundation [of the altar], it does not require washing.**
- C. **[If] it was poured onto the pavement and one gathered it up [and then it spurted onto a garment], it does not require washing.**
- D. **That [sort of blood] which requires washing is only the blood which has been received in a utensil and is suitable for sprinkling [on the altar].**

- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. Might one suppose that **[if] the blood spurted [directly] from the neck [of the slaughtered beast] onto the garment [and was not received in a pot, being invalid for sprinkling on the altar],** it might require washing?
- C. Scripture states, “and when there is sprinkled...” (Lev. 6:20) — I have spoken to you only concerning that which is **suitable for sprinkling [on the altar].**
- D. *There is a further Tannaite formulation that is pertinent:*
- E. Might one suppose that **[if the blood spurted] from the horn or from the foundation [of the altar],** it might require washing?
- F. Scripture states, “and when there is sprinkled...” (Lev. 6:20) — thus excluding blood that has already been sprinkled.

II.1 A. [If] it was poured onto the pavement and one gathered it up [and then it spurted onto a garment], it does not require washing:

B. [93B] *For what do I require this further statement?*

C. *The sense of the statement is, “what is the reason,” which is to say, “What is the reason that [If] it was poured onto the pavement and one gathered it up [and then it spurted onto a garment], it does not require washing? It is because That [sort of blood] which requires washing is only the blood which has been received in a utensil and is suitable for sprinkling [on the altar].*

III.1 A. ...suitable for sprinkling [on the altar]:

B. *What then is excluded by this provision?*

C. *It is to exclude a case in which in one utensil one has received less than the volume of blood that is required for sprinkling, and in another utensil likewise one has received less than the volume of blood that is required for sprinkling. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. R. Halapta bar Saul says, “If one sanctified in one utensil less than the volume of purification-water that is required for sprinkling, and in another utensil likewise one has sanctified less than the volume of purification-water that is required for sprinkling, he has not sanctified the purification-water [since the volume that is required must be sanctified in a single utensil of service].

E. *The question was raised: what is the rule as to blood? Is this a received law, and from a received law no analogies are to be drawn to further cases, or perhaps the operative consideration in that case is that Scripture states, “And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water” (Num. 19:18), and in this context, “And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood” (Lev. 4: 6) [in both cases, implying that there must be sufficient liquid for that purpose]?*

F. *Come and take note, for* said R. Zeriqa *said* R. Eleazar, “In the case of blood too if the volume is insufficient, the blood has not been sanctified.”

III.2. A. *Said Raba, “It has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*

B. “And the priest shall dip + accusative particle et + his finger in the blood and sprinkle the blood seven times before the Lord” (Lev. 4: 6) — but not sponge it up [Freedman: by wiping around the sides of the utensil]. [The accusative particle is treated as an extension also in the phrases “he shall dip” and “in the blood.” That usage then yields a number of additional laws about sprinkling and dipping.]

C. “In the blood” teaches that there must be sufficient blood [in a single utensil] to begin with to dip [and we do not collect blood in two utensils and pour the blood together to form enough].

D. “and sprinkle of the blood” — of the blood that is specified in this passage.

E. *And it is necessary to present the word as both “and he shall dip” and also to write the words “in the blood.” For if the All-Merciful had written only “and he shall dip,” I might have supposed that even where the blood is to begin with insufficient for dipping, it would be acceptable. Therefore Scripture wrote, “in the blood.” And if the All-Merciful had written only, “in the blood,” I might*

have supposed that even if one sponges up the blood, it would be acceptable. Accordingly, Scripture used the wording, “and he shall dip.”

- F. *What is excluded by the formulation, “and sprinkle of the blood” — of the blood that is specified in this passage?*
- G. *Said Raba, “It is meant to exclude blood that may be remaining on his finger [so that the priest must not sprinkle with blood left on his finger but must dip the finger into the blood for each of the seven sprinklings].”*
- H. *That supports the position of R. Eleazar, for said R. Eleazar, “Remnants of blood left on the finger are unfit [for sprinkling].”*
- I. *Said Rabin bar R. Ada to Rab, “Said your disciple said R. Amram, ‘There is the following Tannaite statement: If [in connection with a sin offering prepared at the inner altar,] the priest was sprinkling, and the blood of the sprinkling spurted out of his hand onto a garment, if this took place before he had sprinkled, the garment requires washing, but if this was after he sprinkled, the garment does not require washing.’ Now is this not the sense of that statement: If this took place before he had finished sprinkling, the garment has to be washed, but if this was after he had finished sprinkling, the garment does not have to be washed [Freedman: this implies that if blood that remained on his finger after one of the sprinklings spurted onto a garment, it must be washed; as a corollary, that remaining blood must be fit for sprinkling, for only such necessitates washing, and hence this contradicts Eleazar]?”*
- J. *Not at all! This is the sense of the statement: if this took place before the sprinkling had left his hand, it requires washing; if it was afterward, it does not [Freedman: he dipped his finger into the blood; if this blood spurted off the finger before he had sprinkled it, the garment has to be washed; if it was afterward, the garment does not have to be washed, because it is then residue of the blood].*
- K. *Objected Abbaye, “When the officiating priest at the slaughter of the red cow for ashes for purification water had finished sprinkling the blood, he wipes his hand on the body of the cow [so that the blood will be burned together with the cow]. Thus, only if he had finished does he do so, but not if he had not finished [Freedman: yet if he does not wipe it, he is using this blood for the next sprinkling, among the seven required sprinklings].”*
- L. *He said to him, “It was when he finished that he wiped his hand on the body of the cow, but if he did not finish, he wipes only his finger. Now there is no problem with the rule that it was when he finished that he wiped his hand on the body of the cow, for it is said, ‘And the meat shall he burn in his sight, the hide, the meat, and the blood shall be burned’ (Num. 19: 5). But on what does he wipe his finger [between sprinklings]?” [He cannot wipe it on the body, as he would get hair from the hide onto the finger (Freedman)]?*

- M. Said Abbayye, “On the edge of the bowl: ‘wipers of gold’ (Ezr. 1:10).”

11:3E-G-11:4

11:3E-G

- E. “[If blood] spurted onto the hide before it was flayed, it does not require washing. [If it spurted onto the hide] after it was flayed, it does require washing,” the words of R. Judah.
- F. R. Eleazar says, “Also: [if it spurted onto the hide] after it was flayed, it does not require washing.”
- G. Only (1) the place [on which] the blood has fallen, and (2) something which is susceptible to receive uncleanness, and (3) something suitable for washing require washing.

11:4

- A. The same are the cloth and the sackcloth and the hide: they require washing.
- B. And the washing must be in a holy place [Lev. 6:20].
- C. And the breaking of earthenware utensils [in which a sin offering is cooked] is [to be] in a holy place.
- D. And the scouring and rinsing in the case of a copper utensil [are to be] in a holy place.
- E. In this matter the [rule] is more strict in the case of the sin offering than in the case of Most Holy Things.

- I.1** A. [The same are the cloth and the sackcloth and the hide: they require washing:] *What is the scriptural source for this rule?*
- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “‘And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon a garment’ (Lev. 6:20) —
- D. “[Since reference is made to ‘a garment,'] I know only that the rule pertains to the garment. How do I know that under the law is encompassed also a hide after it has been flayed?
- E. “Because Scripture says, ‘You shall wash that on which it was sprinkled’ (Lev. 6:20).
- F. “Might one suppose that I should encompass the hide before it has been flayed?
- G. “Scripture says, ‘a garment,’ meaning, a garment being an article that can become unclean, so extending the law to anything that can become unclean [excluding a hide before it is flayed],” the words of R. Judah.
- H. R. Eleazar says, “‘And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon a garment’ (Lev. 6:20) —
- I. “[Since reference is made to ‘a garment,'] I know only that the rule pertains to the garment. How do I know that under the law is encompassed also garments made of sacking [94A] and all other sorts of garments?
- J. “Because Scripture says, ‘You shall wash that on which it was sprinkled’ (Lev. 6:20).
- K. “Might one suppose that I should encompass the hide after it has been flayed?

- G. “Scripture says, ‘a garment,’ meaning, a garment being an article that can become unclean, so extending the law to anything that can become unclean [but a hide after flaying is susceptible to uncleanness not automatically but only if the owner has decided to use it as a garment].”
- H. *What is at issue between the two positions?*
- I. *Said Abbaye, “At issue between them is a piece of cloth less than three fingerbreadths square [the minimum size for a garment]. One who says that it must be suitable would maintain that this is suitable for use as a garment, for if the owner wants, he may give it thought for that purpose. One who says it must be something that is susceptible to uncleanness, lo, this is not at this moment susceptible to uncleanness [unless the owner intends it to serve as a useful item].”*
- J. *Raba said, “At issue between them is a garment that the owner planned to embroider. He who says that it must be suitable would maintain that this is suitable for use as a garment, for if the owner wants, he may change his mind. But he who says it must be something that is susceptible to uncleanness, lo, this is not at this moment susceptible to uncleanness.”*
- K. *Said Raba, “At issue between them is an untrimmed hide that the owner planned to trim. He who maintains that it must be suitable will recognize that this too is suitable. But he who says it must be something that is susceptible to uncleanness, lo, this is not at this moment susceptible to uncleanness, until the owner actually trims it.”*
- L. *And so too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. R. Simeon b. Menassia says, “A hide that the owner intended to trim is insusceptible to uncleanness until it is actually trimmed.”

II.1 A. Only the place [on which] the blood has fallen...require[s] washing:

- B. *What is the scriptural source for this statement?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. Might one suppose that if blood spurted on part of a garment, the whole of the garment would have to be washed?
- E. Scripture states, “You shall wash that on which it was sprinkled” (Lev. 6:20) — I have spoken to you concerning only the place of the blood alone.

III.1 A. Only...something which is susceptible to receive uncleanness... require[s] washing:

- B. *The unattributed rule of the Mishnah is in accord with the position of R. Judah.*

IV.1 A. Only ...something suitable for washing require[s] washing;

- B. *excluding a utensil that has to be scarped [since washing does not good, e.g., one of wood].*

V.1 A. The same are the cloth and the sackcloth and the hide: they require washing:

- B. *Is that to imply that a hide can be washed? And an objection may be introduced: If [on the Sabbath, when one cannot wash garments] there is dirt on it [a cushion], one wipes it off with a rag [since this is not washing]; if it is of hide, water is poured over it until it disappears [since this is not washing].*

- C. *Said Abbayye, "There really is no contradiction here. The one represents rabbis, the other speaks for others, in that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *"As to a garment or sack cloth, these are washed; a utensil and a hide are scraped. Others say, 'A garment, sack cloth, and hide are washed, a utensil is scraped.'"*

V.2. A. *In accord with which of the foregoing authorities is this statement made by R. Hiyya bar Ashi, "Many times I would stand before Rab and dab his shoes with water"?*

- B. *With whom? With rabbis, of course!*

V.3. A. *Said Raba, "And is there anybody who takes the position that hides cannot be washed? Has it not been written, 'And the garment or warp or woof or whatever thing of skin it be, which you shall wash' (Lev. 13:58)?"*

- B. *Rather, said Raba, "The verse of Scripture and our Mishnah-paragraph speak of soft skins, while the difference of opinion concerns hard ones [such a leather]."*
- C. *But did not R. Hiyya bar Ashi say "Many times I would stand before Rab and dab his shoes with water"?*
- D. *That speaks of hard leather, and he acted in line with the position of rabbis.*
- E. *Then said Raba, "What I said is null. How can we say that the verse of Scripture refers only to soft hides? Does it not refer even to clothing of foresters that comes from abroad? And yet the All-Merciful says that it must be washed."*
- F. *Rather, said Raba, "As to the skin ailment [of Lev. 14], once it has broken out from within the article itself, it moistens the article and softens it." [Freedman: hence the verse refers even to hard leather, and the Mishnah-passages refers to soft leather, and the controversy is in respect to hard leather.]*
- G. *Said Raba, "If I have a problem, it is in the following: [94B] Pillows and bolsters are soft, and yet we have learned in the Tannaite statement cited just now: If [on the Sabbath, when one cannot wash garments] there is dirt on hide, water is poured over it until it disappears [since this is not washing]."*
- H. *Rather, said Raba, "Any form of washing that does not involve rubbing is not classified as washing. And as to the statement of R. Hiyya bar Ashi, 'Many times I would stand before Rab and dab his shoes with water,' — dabbing is simply not the same thing as rubbing."*
- I. *Our Mishnah-passages then addresses either soft hides and accords with all authorities, or it deals only with hard hides and represents only the view of others.*
- J. *If so, then let water be poured even over a garment as well [and why must it be wiped off only with a rag, as stated above]?*
- K. *In the case of a garment, soaking it in water is the same as washing it.*
 - L. *Raba is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said Raba, "If one threw a scarf into water, he is liable [on the count of washing it on the Sabbath], if he threw linseed into water, he is liable."*
 - M. *Now as to a scarf, that poses no problem, for he washes it when he throws it into the water, but why linseed? And should you propose that it is because he helps it grow, the same would apply to wheat or barley seed!*
 - N. *Linseed emits mucus.*

- O. *The same is so of undressed hides.*
- P. *There he kneads* [in that the mucus causes the linseed to stick together (Freedman)].
- Q. Expounded Raba, "It is permitted to wash a sandal on the Sabbath."
- R. Said R. Pappa to Raba, "But did not *R. Hiyya bar Ashi* say, '*Many times I would stand before Rab and dab his shoes with water*'? *So dabbing is permitted but not washing!*"
- S. *Then Raba set up a loud-speaker for his lecture and had him repeat as he lectured*, "What I told you was a mistake. In point of fact, this is what they have said: 'Dabbing is permitted, washing is forbidden.'"

VI.1 A. And the washing must be in a holy place:

- B. *What is the scriptural source for this statement?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. "You shall wash it in a holy place" (Lev. 6:20) — on this basis we learn that **the washing must be in a holy place**.
- E. How do we know that earthen utensils have to be broken?
- F. Because Scripture states, "But the earthen utensil in which it is boiled shall be broken" (Lev. 6:21).
- G. How do we know that bronze utensils are to be scoured and rinsed?
- H. Because Scripture states, "And if it is boiled in a bronze utensil, it shall be scoured and rinsed in water" (Lev. 6:21).

VII.1 A. In this matter the [rule] is more strict in the case of the sin offering than in the case of Most Holy Things:

- B. **In this matter** *and in no other? But lo, there is the fact that the blood of the sin offering is taken inside to the inner altar [and that is not the case for other Most Holy Things]!*
- C. *The reference of the language* **In this matter** *is to sin offerings prepared on the outer altar.*
- D. *But sin offerings prepared on the outer altar are nonetheless subject to another strict rule, specifically, if the blood is taken inside to the inner altar, the offering is invalidated!*
- E. *The rule is formulated in accord with the position of R. Aqiba, who has said, "All blood that is taken into the inner altar space to make atonement is deemed invalidated."*
- F. But the fact is that the blood effects atonement for those who are liable to the penalty of extirpation!
- G. Reference is made to the sin offering that is presented on account of an oath taken in connection with bearing witness or an oath of utterance [in which extirpation is not incurred, even if the oath is deliberately false].
- H. Yet the blood has to be sprinkled four times.
- I. The rule is formulated in accord with the position of R. Ishmael, who has said, "All blood has to be sprinkled four times."

- J. Yet there is the fact that the sprinklings must be done on the four horns of the altar!
- K. *In line with your reasoning, there is the consideration that the blood must be applied with the finger, on the horn, on the edge of the horn [and in all these aspects the rule here is more stringent than that governing other Most Holy Things]!*
- L. *Rather, the formulation of the passage is merely intended to make reference to one among two or three points in which the [rule] is more strict in the case of the sin offering than in the case of Most Holy Things.*

11:5-6

11:5

- A. A garment which went forth outside of the veils is brought back, and one washes it in a holy place.
- B. [If] it was made unclean [while] outside of the veils, one tears it, and it is brought back, and one washes it in a holy place.
- C. An earthenware utensil which went forth outside of the veils is brought back, and one breaks it in a holy place.
- D. [If] it was made unclean outside of the veils, one makes a hole in it, and it is brought back, and one breaks it in a holy place.

11:6

- A. A copper utensil which went forth outside of the veils is brought back, and one scours it and rinses it in a holy place.
- B. [If] it was made unclean outside of the veils, one breaks it down, and it is brought back and one scours and rinses it in a holy place.
- I.1 A. *To this rule Rabina objected, “[If it was made unclean while outside of the veils,] one tears it. But the All-Merciful has spoken of a ‘garment’ and this is not a garment [once it is torn]!”*
- B. *The priest leaves enough unshorn to be used as an apron.*
- C. *But can that be true? And has not R. Huna said, “They learned the rule [that once torn a garment is clean of prior uncleanness] only if one has not left enough of the cloth to be used as an apron, but if one has left enough of the cloth untorn to be used as an apron, it is deemed joined [to the rest and therefore the garment remains unclean]”?*
- D. **[95A]** *The uncleanness is in accord only with the authority of rabbis [but so far as the Torah is concerned, the cloth is clean even if not fully torn].*
- II.1 A. **An earthenware utensil which went forth outside of the veils is brought back, and one breaks it in a holy place:**
- B. *It is concerning a utensil that the All-Merciful spoke, and this is not a utensil! [So how can it be brought back into the courtyard at all?]*
- C. *But the hole [that suffices to render the utensil insusceptible to uncleanness by reason of breakage and consequent uselessness] is only such as is made by a small root [growing through a pot].*

III.1 A. A copper utensil which went forth outside of the veils is brought back, and one scours it and rinses it in a holy place. [If] it was made unclean outside of the veils, one breaks it down, and it is brought back and one scours and rinses it in a holy place:

B. *But lo, this is not a utensil!*

C. *He hammers the hole back* [which makes it a utensil once more (Freedman)].

III.2. A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “A priestly robe that became unclean [outside of the Temple court] — one brings it back into the Temple courtyard in segments of less than three fingerbreadths square [which are insusceptible to uncleanness], and then one washes it, because it is said, ‘That the robe be not torn’ (Exo. 28:32)” [Freedman: hence it cannot be torn; therefore small patches are brought back into the courtyard, since then it is not an unclean garment].

B. *Objected R. Ada bar Ahbah, “Thick or sort garments are not subject to the minimum measure of three fingerbreadths square [but are susceptible to uncleanness only if they are three handbreadths square, a much larger piece] [M. Kel. 25:8]. [Why not bring in patches that large?]*”

C. *The smaller patches nonetheless are taken into account [as valuable, and hence useful and susceptible to uncleanness] because of the larger piece [from which they are torn].*

III.3. A. *And lo, it is required that the seven substances [used to test the character of a blotch on a piece of fabric be washed into the cloth, to make sure that it does not contain urine, which may not be brought into the Temple]! [Reference is made to the following: Seven substances do they pass over the bloodstain [to see whether it is blood or dye]: (1) tasteless spit, and (2) water from boiled grits, and (3) urine, and (4) nitre, and (5) lye-soap, (6) Cimolian earth, and (7) lion’s leaf. [If] one immersed it and prepared things requiring cleanness depending upon it, [if] one rubbed on it these seven substances and it did not disappear, (1) lo, this is dye (M. Nid. 9:6A-D).]* For said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “As to blood that has spurted from a sin offering and appearances of the skin ailment on pieces of cloth [in line with Lev. 14], it is necessary to test the character of such blotches with the seven substances [which include urine], but it is forbidden to take urine into the Temple.” [So how is this procedure to be followed?] **[95B]** *And should you take the view that one mixes it with the seven substances all at once, surely we have learned in the Mishnah: [If] one rubbed them on not in order, or [if] one rubbed in all seven substances at once, he has done nothing whatsoever [M. Nid. 9:7E]. And if you should propose that he mixes it up in only one of the substances, surely we have learned, And one must scour [the stain] with each of the seven substances three times (M. Nid. 9:7D).*

B. *Rather, he mixes it with tasteless spit, for* said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “With each of the substances must be included tasteless spit.”

11:7A-D

A. **All the same are one in which one has cooked and one into which one has poured boiling [stew],**

- B. [and] all the same are one [used] for Most Holy Things [e.g., a sin offering or a guilt offering] and one for Lesser Holy Things [e.g., peace offerings]:
- C. they require scouring and rinsing.
- D. R. Simeon says, “Those used for Lesser Holy Things do not require scouring and rinsing.”

I.1 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “But the clay utensil in which it is boiled” (Lev. 6:21) — I know that the law applies only to one in which one has cooked. How do I know that it applies also to **one into which one has poured boiling [stew]**?
- C. Scripture says, “...in which it is boiled shall be broken” [even if it had not actually been boiled in it, for if boiling meat is put into the utensil, it will be absorbed therein (Freedman)].

I.2. A. *Rami bar Hama raised this question: “If one suspended the meat in the contained airspace of a clay oven [boiling it in the steam], what is the law? Has the All-Merciful taken a particular interest only in the matters of boiling and absorbing, or perhaps the issue also is boiling even without absorbing?”*

- B. *Said Raba, “Come and take note: **All the same are one in which one has cooked and one into which one has poured boiling stew.**”* [Freedman: even if the utensil absorbed but as not used for actual boiling, and presumably boiling without absorbing is the same].
- C. *[He replied,] “What we asked concerned not absorbing without boiling, we asked about boiling without absorbing. What is the law?”*
- D. *[He replied,] “Come and take note, for said R. Nahman said Rabbah b. Abbuha, ‘The oven in the Temple was made of metal’ [so that it would not have to be broken when it was purified of uncleanness]. Now if you suppose that only boiling and absorbing the meat makes it necessary to break the utensil, then let it be a clay oven [Freedman: since the meat was not actually placed in the oven but roasted on a spit].”*
- E. *Since there was the residue of meal offerings, which were baked in the oven, in which case there are both boiling [=baking] and absorbing, it had to be made of metal.*

I.3. A. *There was an oven that was greased in fat. Rabbah bar Ahilai prohibited forever eating bread that was baked in it [even though the oven were refired and burned through to remove the fat], even eating the bread with salt, lest one end up eating it with a preserve that contained milk as well.*

- B. *An objection was raised: one may not knead dough with milk, and if one does so, the whole loaf is prohibited, because such a situation leads to sin [eating the bread, now classified as a dairy product, with meat]. So too, one must not grease an oven with fat, and if one does grease it, all the bread baked in the oven is forbidden until the oven will have been refired. Is this not a refutation of the ruling of Rabbah bar Ahilai?*

C. *For sure.*

I.4. A. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “Now since the position of Rabbah bar Ahilai has been refuted, why has Rab said, ‘Pots [to remove leaven that will have*

inherited through the year] shall be broken on Passover' [since one can just as well reheat them]?"

- B. *He said to him, "He spoke of one made of metal.*
- C. *"If you prefer, I shall explain, 'while it is a clay oven, it is one that is fired from the inside [which can expel absorbed matter (Freedman)], while the other pot is one that was fired on the outside.'*
- D. *So why not burn the pot on the inside?*
- E. *[If that is permitted,] the owner will try to take it easy with the fire, so as not to break the pot [and so only burn it on the outside (Freedman)]. Therefore as to a tiled pan, since it is burned from the outside [with the coals underneath, bread on top], it is forbidden for use on Passover.*
- F. **[96A]** *Then as to pots belonging to the sanctuary, why should it be necessary to break them? Why not just put them back into the kiln [to expel what they have absorbed (Freedman)]?*
- G. Said R. Zira, "Since kilns are not to be made in Jerusalem."
- H. Said Abbaye, "And lo, do they even make garbage dumps [of sherds] in the Temple court!"
- I. *But he had missed that which Shemaiah of Kalnebo stated as a Tannaite statement: "Sherds of clay utensils were swallowed up on the spot."*
- J. *But, with regard to what R. Nahman said Rabbah b. Abbuha said, "The oven in the Temple was made of metal" [so that it would not have to be broken when it was purified of uncleanness], why not make it a clay one, since it was heated within? [Freedman: and thus what it absorbed of the sacrifices would be expelled.]*
- K. *Since the Two Loaves and the Showbread were baked in the oven and sanctified in the oven, it was classified as a utensil of service, and we do not make a utensil of service out of clay.*
- L. **[96B]** *And even R. Yosé b. R. Judah made his statement only with reference to those that were made of wood [which might be used in the Temple], but not those that were made of clay. [Reference is made to the following, at B. Suk. 50B: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: As to utensils of cultic service which one made out of wood, Rabbi declares them invalid, and R. Yosé bar Judah declares them valid. (In explanation of this dispute:) Rabbi applies the exegetical principle of "generalization followed by specification" in which the generalization includes only the elements expressed in the specific example, thus permitting only a very narrow reading of the proposed analogy. R. Yosé b. R. Judah applies the exegetical principle of "extension and limitation" in which the generalization is treated as encompassing, and a single item is excluded*

therefrom, thus permitting a much broader reading of the analogy. Rabbi applies the exegetical principle of “generalization followed by specification.” Citing the verse, “And you shall make a candlestick of pure gold, of beaten work shall the candlestick be made” (Exo. 25:31), “And you shall make a candlestick...” represents a generalization, “of pure gold” constitutes a specification limiting the foregoing, “of beaten work shall the candlestick be made” then supplies a further generalization. Accordingly, we have in hand a generalization, a specification which limits the foregoing, and a further generalization. You may then draw an analogy only in accord with the limitations of the specification. Just as, in the specification, it is explicitly stated that the candlestick must be made of metal, so any [utensil of the cult] must be made of metal. That is why Rabbi declares invalid utensils of cultic service that are made out of wood. R. Yosé b. R. Judah, by contrast, applies the exegetical principle of “extension and limitation.” “And you shall make a candlestick...” represents an extension or, an encompassing statement, “... of pure gold,” constitutes a limitation on the foregoing. Then the framer of the passage went and made yet another extension by the encompassing statement, “of beaten work shall the candlestick be made.” Accordingly, we have in hand an extension, a limitation, and a further extension. The second extension then encompasses everything. And what is subject to the encompassing statement? It serves to encompass all sorts of objects, of whatever substance. Any sort of substance, including wood, may be used to manufacture utensils for the Temple. What then is the force of the limitation “of pure gold”? It has the force of excluding the use of earthenware.]

- I.5.** A. *R. Isaac b. R. Judah would regularly come before Rami bar Hama [to hear his teaching]. He left him and went to R. Sheshet. One day [Rami] met him and said to him, “‘The aristocrat has taken us by the hand, and so we stink of his perfume too’ [Do you think you smell better because you went to someone of greater standing than I?] Just because you went before R. Sheshet, you imagine you have become like him.”*
- B. *He said to him, “That was not what was on my mind at all! Whenever I asked you something, you gave the answer on the basis of reasoning. And when I found a Tannaite rule, to the contrary, it would refute your reasoned answer. But with R. Sheshet, whenever I ask him a question, he gives his answer on the basis of a Tannaite rule, so when I find another Tannaite rule to the contrary, it is a case of one Tannaite rule in conflict with another [of the same standing].”*
- C. *He said to him, “Then ask me a question, and I will give you the answer on the basis of a Tannaite rule.”*

- D. *He asked to him, "If one has boiled meat of a sacrifice in only part of a utensil, does the part not used require scouring and rinsing, or does it not require scouring and rinsing?"*
- E. *He said to him, "The part not used does it not require scouring and rinsing, on the analogy of spurting of blood [in which case only the part of the garment that is bloodied has to be washed]."*
- F. *He said to him, "But lo, this is not formulated as a Tannaite statement!"*
- G. *He said to him, "It stands to reason that it is to be classified like a garment. For just as in the case of a garment, washing is required only for the part onto which the blood has spurted, so in the case of a utensil, scouring and rinsing should be required only in the part of the pot where the boiling has taken place."*
- H. *He said to him, "But are they really comparable at all? Blood does not spread, while boiling spreads. And, moreover, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A strict rule applies to blood for sprinkling which spurts onto a garment that does not apply to scouring and rinsing, and a strict rule applies to scouring and rinsing that does not apply to blood used for sprinkling that spurts onto a garment. The more strict rule that applies to the case of the splattering of blood used for sprinkling is that it applies to sin offerings that are offered on the inner altar and applies before the actual sprinkling of the blood, which is not the case with scouring and rinsing. The strict rule that applies to scouring and rinsing is that scouring and rinsing apply to Most Holy Things and to Lesser Holy Things. And if only part of a utensil is used for cooking, the whole utensil has to be scoured and rinsed, which is not the case with blood used for sprinkling that spurts onto a garment [T. Zeb. 10:15A-F]."*
- I. *He said to him, "If that is the Tannaite rule, that is the Tannaite rule [and it prevails]. And what is the scriptural basis for the rule? Scripture says, 'And if it be boiled in a bronze utensil,' meaning, even in part of a utensil."*

II.1 A. [and] all the same are one [used] for Most Holy Things [e.g., a sin offering or a guilt offering] and one for Lesser Holy Things [e.g., peace offerings]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *"...a sin offering..." (Lev. 6:18) — I know that the rule applies to a sin offering alone. How do I know that it applies to all other sacrifices? Because Scripture says, 'It is most holy' (Lev. 6:22). [Freedman: this includes not only Most Holy Things but also Lesser Holy Things.]*
- D. *"Might I then suppose that food in the status of heave offering is included as well?*
- E. *"Scripture states, 'Every male among the priests may eat thereof' — excluding heave-offering," the words of R. Judah.*
- F. *R. Simeon says, "Those used for Most Holy Things require scouring and rinsing. Those used for Lesser Holy Things do not require scouring and rinsing.*
- G. *"For it is written, 'It is Most Holy,' yielding the principle: Those used for Most Holy Things require scouring and rinsing. Those used for Lesser Holy Things do not require scouring and rinsing."*
- H. *What then in Scripture sustains the position of R. Judah?*

- I. “Thereof” serves to exclude food in the status of heave offering, and since it is necessary to exclude that class of food, it follows that utensils used for cooking other Lesser Holy Things are subject to the requirement of scouring and rinsing.
- J. *And R. Simeon?*
- K. *He will say to you, “The force of ‘thereof’ is to suggest what we said elsewhere [at B. Zeb. 93A: R. Simeon says, “All the same are both classifications: the blood does not have to be washed off.” What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Simeon? The word “thereof” is written (at Lev. 6:22, “Every male among the priests may eat thereof,” and the word “of the blood thereof” is written, thus “And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof” (Lev. 6:20). These two exclusionary usages bear the consequence that] one excludes the case in which the blood had a moment of validity and the other a case in which the blood never had a moment of validity.]*

II.2. A. *And does a utensil used for cooking food in the status of heave offering not have to be scoured and rinsed? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **As regards a pot in which one cooked meat — he should not thereafter cook dairy products in it. If he cooked dairy products in it, he should not thereafter cook meat in it. If he cooked in it heave offering, he should not thereafter cook in it unconsecrated produce. But if one cooked food in any of these forbidden ways, lo, this is forbidden if the food booked first imparted a flavor to what was put in afterward [T. Ter. 8:16A-F, trans. Avery-Peck]. [Freedman: hence it must be made fit by scalding with boiling water, which expels the absorbed matter; this scalding is then assumed to be the same as scouring and rinsing.]**
- C. *Said Abbaye, “The position that a pot used for heave offering does not have to be scoured and rinsed pertains in particular to that which a master has said: And if only part of a utensil is used for cooking, the whole utensil has to be scoured and rinsed [T. Zeb. 10:15F]. But in the case of food in the status of heave offering, only the part of the pot where the food was boiled has to be scoured and rinsed.”*
- D. *Raba said, “The position that a pot used for heave offering does not have to be scoured and rinsed pertains in particular to that which a master has said: “It shall be scoured and rinsed in water” — but not in wine; “in water” — but not in a mixture of wine and water.’ But in this case, even in a mixture of wine and water the scouring and rinsing is satisfactory.”*
- E. *Rabbah bar Ulla said, “The position that a pot used for heave offering does not have to be scoured and rinsed pertains in particular to that which a master has said: ‘Scouring and rinsing must be in cold water.’ But in this case, even in hot water the scouring and rinsing is satisfactory.”*
- F. *Well, then, there is no problem from the perspective of him who maintains that the scouring and rinsing must be done in cold water, but from the view of him who maintains that the scouring is done in hot water and the rinsing in cold, what is there to be said?*

- G. *There has to be an additional rinsing [and that is not the case for pots used for the cooking of food in the status of heave offering].*

11:7E-J

- E. **R. Tarfon says, “If one cooked in it from the beginning of the festival, he cooks therein throughout the festival.”**
- E. **And sages say, “At the end of the time [which is permissible] for eating [the offering], [the pot is subject to] scouring and rinsing.”**
- F. **Scouring [is done] as is the scouring of a cup.**
- G. **And rinsing [is done as is] the rinsing of a cup [on the outside].**
- H. **Scouring is done with hot water,**
- I. **and rinsing is done with cold water.**
- J. **[97A] And the spit and the grill [used for a sin offering] does one put into scalding water.**

- I.1** A. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Tarfon?*
- B. Scripture has said, “And you shall turn in the morning and to into your tents” (Deu. 16: 7) [Freedman: this means that the Israelite could return home on the morning of the festival.] In that way, Scripture has treated the entirety of the festival as a single morning. [Freedman: since the reason for scouring and rinsing is that what is absorbed of the meat in the pot becomes left over, it follows that it cannot become left over from the beginning until the end of a festival, as it is all counted as one day.]
- C. *Objected R. Ahadeboi bar Ammi, “But then does the consideration of refuse not pertain on the festival, and does the consideration of left over not pertain on the festival? [Obviously these considerations do apply!] And should you say, Indeed they do not, has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Nathan says, ‘R. Tarfon made his statement only in connection with this matter alone [but not left over or refuse]’ [T. Zeb. 10:13C]?***
- D. “Rather, matters accord with that which R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said, for said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, ‘Each day is treated as though it effects the scalding for the prior day.’” [Freedman: many peace offerings were sacrificed during the festival, and the boiling of each day’s sacrifice expels from the pot what it absorbed on the previous day, and thus it does not become left over.]

- II.1** A. **And sages say, “At the end of the time [which is permissible] for eating [the offering], [the pot is subject to] scouring and rinsing:”**
- B. *What is the sense of this statement?*
- C. Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “One has to wait for as long a time as it is permitted to eat the sacrificial meat, *and then scour and rinse the pot.*”
- D. *What is the scriptural basis for that rule?*
- E. Said R. Yohanan in the name of Abba Yosé b. Abba, “It is written, ‘it shall be scoured and rinsed’ Lev. 6:21), and it is further written, ‘every male among the priests may eat’ (Lev. 6:22). How so? One has to wait for as long a time as it is permitted to eat the sacrificial meat, *and then scour and rinse the pot.*”

III.1 A. Scouring [is done] as is the scouring of a cup. And rinsing [is done as is] the rinsing of a cup [on the outside]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “Scouring and rinsing are done with cold water,” the words of Rabbi.
- D. And sages say, “Scouring is done in hot water and rinsing in cold.”
- E. *What is the operative consideration for their position?*
- F. *It has to be analogous to the cleaning of utensils belonging to gentiles.*
- G. *And Rabbi will say to you, “I was not referring to that process of scalding, but rather, I was referring to the scouring and rinsing that comes after that process of scalding.”*
- H. *And rabbis?*
- I. *If so, Scripture ought to have stated either, “it shall be scoured” or “it shall be well rinsed,” but why say, “it shall be scoured and well rinsed”? It is to imply that scouring is done in hot water and rinsing in cold.*
- J. *And Rabbi?*
- K. *If Scripture had written, “it shall be well scoured,” I should have drawn the conclusion that the process requires two scourings or two rinsings. When Scripture says, “it shall be scoured and well rinsed,” it is to indicate to you, **Scouring [is done] as is the scouring of a cup. And rinsing [is done as is] the rinsing of a cup [on the outside].***

11:8

- A. **[If] one cooked in it Holy Things and unconsecrated food,**
- B. **or Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things,**
- C. **if they were [sufficient] to impart flavor, lo, that [the rule of which is] less [stringent] is eaten in accord with [that the rule of which] is the more stringent [thus applying to the more holy things].**
- D. **And [if they do not impart flavor] they do [not] require scouring and rinsing,**
- E. **and [if the invalid proportion of the mixture does not impart flavor], they do not invalidate merely by having made contact.**
- F. **An [unfit] wafer which touched [another] wafer, or a piece of meat [which touched] another piece of meat —**
- G. **not the whole of the wafer or the whole of the piece(s) [of meat] is prohibited.**
- H. **Prohibited is only the place which absorbed [that which is forbidden].**

- I.1 A. [If one cooked in it Holy Things and unconsecrated food, or Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things, if they were sufficient] to impart flavor, lo, that [the rule of which is less stringent is eaten in accord with [that the rule of which] is the more stringent thus applying to the more holy things:]** *What is the sense of this statement [that it is not scoured and rinsed at the end of the period allowed for the more stringent (Freedman)]?*
- B. *[Here is the sense of the passage:] if in the mixture is enough to impart the flavor [supplied by that subject to the more stringent rule, then] the part of the mixture subject to the less stringent rule is eaten in accord with the rules governing the more stringent rule, and the pot has to be scoured and rinsed, and portions of the*

mixture invalidate that which they touch. If in the mixture the more stringent component does not impart its flavor to the whole, then the proportion of the mixture subject to the less stringent rule is not eaten in accord with the rule governing the more stringent, the pot does not have to be scoured and rinsed, and a part of the mixture does not invalidate that which it touches.

- I.2.** A. *Well, then, while in the latter case the pots do not require scouring and rinsing by reason of having been used for Most Holy Things, yet should they not require scouring and rinsing for having been used for Lesser Holy Things anyhow?*
- B. *Said Abbaye, “What is the sense of the language, **And [if they do not impart flavor] they do [not] require scouring and rinsing?** The reference is to Most Holy Things, but in the aspect of Lesser Holy Things, they still require scouring and rinsing.”*
- C. *Raba said, “Who is the authority behind the passage? It is R. Simeon, who has taken the view that pots used for cooking Lesser Holy Things do not require scouring and rinsing.”*
- D. *Now there is no problem with the position of Raba, for that explains the usage, **If one cooked in it Holy Things and unconsecrated food, or Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things.** But as to the view of Abbaye, what need do I have for the language set forth in two clauses [since the same principle applies in both cases anyhow (Freedman)]?*
- E. *It was necessary for both matters to be made explicit. For if reference were made only to **Holy Things and unconsecrated food**, I might have supposed that only unconsecrated food has the power to nullify the presence of Holy Things, since they are not of the same species of meat, but in the case of **Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things**, that would not be the case. And if reference had been made only to **Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things**, I might have supposed that only Holy Things have the power to nullify the presence of other Holy Things, but as to unconsecrated meat, I should have supposed that that is not the case. So both points have to register.*

- II.1** A. **An [unfit] wafer which touched [another, fit] wafer, or a piece of meat [which touched] another piece of meat — not the whole of the wafer or the whole of the piece(s) [of meat] is prohibited. Prohibited is only the place which absorbed [that which is forbidden]:**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“Whatever shall touch...shall be holy” (Lev. 6:20) — might one suppose that that is so even if the latter did not absorb anything from the former?*
- D. *Scripture says, “in the meat thereof” (Lev. 6:20) — **[97B]** only if it absorbs some of the meat.*
- E. *Might one suppose that if it touched part of a piece of meat, the whole of it should be invalidated?*
- F. *Scripture says, “shall touch...” — only that which touches is invalidated.*
- G. *How does this work?*
- H. *One cuts off the part that has absorbed the forbidden flavor.*

- I. “in the meat thereof” (Lev. 6:20) — but not the tendons, bones, horns, or hooves.
- J. “shall be holy” (Lev. 6:20) — to enter into the same classification as whatever it touches, thus: if it is unfit, then that which it touches shall be unfit; if it is fit, it may be eaten only in accord with the stringencies that affect that which it has touched, so if it is a sin offering, it is eaten only in accord with the strict rules governing the sin offering.

II.2. A. *But why should this be the rule? Let the commandment that carries an affirmative action* [“and they shall eat those things wherewith atonement was made” (Exo. 29:33), meaning, the meat of the offerings (Freedman)] *come and take precedence over the negative commandment* [that prohibits eating what is unfit. there being a conflict between the two religious duties]?

- B. Said Raba, “A commandment requiring an affirmative action does not override a commandment requiring refraining from action when it has to do with the sanctuary, as it is said, ‘Nor shall you break a bone thereof’ (Exo. 12:46). [Supply: for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘Nor shall you break a bone thereof’ (Exo. 12:46) —] R. Simeon b. Menassia says, ‘This refers to both a bone that contains marrow and one that does not.’ *But why should this be the rule? Let the commandment that carries an affirmative action ? It follows that a commandment requiring an affirmative action does not override a commandment requiring refraining from action when it has to do with the sanctuary.*”
- C. R. Ashi said, “‘shall be holy’ is a positive commandment, so we have a positive and a negative commandment, and where you have a positive and a negative commandment, a positive commandment does not override a positive and a negative commandment.”

II.3. A. *Thus we have found that the sin offering imparts the status of sanctification [in the sense just now set forth] to whatever touches it and absorbs from it. How do we know that that is the case for other Holy Things?*

- B. Said Samuel in the name of R. Eleazar, “‘This is the Torah of the burnt offering, of the meal offering, of the sin offering, of the guilt offering, of the consecration offering, and of the sacrifice of peace offerings’ (Lev. 7:37) [all of which are covered by the same rule].
- C. “‘the burnt offering:’ just as a burnt offering requires the use of a utensil for receiving the blood, so all the others require the use of a utensil for that same purpose.”
- D. *What sort of a utensil can be meant? If it is a basin, then in respect to peace offerings in behalf of the community it is written, “And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins” (Exo. 24: 6). [Freedman: the blood was that of burnt offerings and peace offerings, hence peace offerings need not be inferred from burnt offerings.]*
- E. *Rather, it means a knife.*
- F. *And how do we know that in the case of a burnt offering that is the case?*
- G. *Because it is written, “And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to kill his son” (Gen. 22:10), and that was a burnt offering: “And offered him up for a burnt offering instead of his son” (Gen. 22:13).*

- H. [Resuming from where the amplification of the proof text was interrupted:] “‘of the meal offering:’ just as a meal offering is eaten only by male priests, so all of the others may be eaten only by male priests.
- I. *Which can be meant here? If reference is made to the sin offering and guilt offering, as a matter of fact that is stated explicitly in their regard: “Every male among the priests may eat thereof” (Lev. 7: 6). And if it is peace offerings presented in behalf of the community, that is derived from an extension of Scripture: “In a most holy place you shall eat of it, every male may eat of it” (Num. 18:10) teaches that peace offerings may be eaten only by male priests.*
- J. *As a matter of fact, it is a dispute among Tannaite formulations, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. **[98A]** *There are those who infer the rule from the one verse, and there are those who infer it from the other.*
- E. [Resuming from where the amplification of the proof text was interrupted:] “‘of the sin offering:’ just as a sin offering imparts the status of sanctity to that which absorbs its brine, so all sacrifice impart the status of sanctity to those that absorb its brine.
- F. “‘of the guilt offering:’ just as in the case of the guilt offering, the foetus and afterbirth inside it are not holy, so in the case of all Holy Things, the foetus and the afterbirth inside are not holy.
- G. The framer maintains that the offspring of Holy Things become holy only when they have come into existence and that we infer what is possible even from what is not possible [a guilt offering is a male, so there will be no foetus].
- H. [Resuming from where the amplification of the proof text was interrupted:] “‘of the consecration offering:’ just as in the case of the consecration offering, what is left over is burned, and there are no living animals among what is left over, so for all other Holy Things, the left over meat is burned, but living things are not classified as left over. [Freedman:Only meat and bread are left over, these alone were burned; whatever remains of a sacrifice is burned, but that does not apply to a living beast that is left over, e.g., designated for the offering, lost, replaced, then found, and the like.]
- I. “‘and of the sacrifice of peace offerings:’ just as the improper intentionality of the officiating priest in the case of a peace offering imparts to the parts of the offering the status of refuse which those parts then impart to other things, or just as the parts of the peace offering may be subjected to the status of refuse deriving from other parts that are subject to that status, so the same pertains throughout wherever the law of refuse applies.”

II.4. A. *In a Tannaite formulation it was repeated in the name of R. Aqiba:*

- B. “[‘This is the Torah of the burnt offering, of the meal offering, of the sin offering, of the guilt offering, of the consecration offering, and of the sacrifice of peace offerings’ (Lev. 7:37) all of which are covered by the same rule]:
- C. “‘the meal offering:’ just as the burnt offering becomes holy if it absorbs that which is holy, so everything else becomes holy if it absorbs that which is holy.”
- D. *[That rule is expressed explicitly in connection with the meal offerings at Lev. 6:11, and the same is stated explicitly in connection with sin offerings, and]*

it was necessary to make the matter explicit in both cases. For had we been given an inference in regard to the meal offering, that might be thought to be so because it is soft and so absorbs, but as to a sin offering, I might have been led to think that that is not the case. And if we had been given the rule on the sin offering, I might have thought that that is because it is solid, but a meal offering might not be subject to the rule. Thus both are necessary.

- E. [Resuming from where the exposition was broken off:] “‘sin offering:’ just as the sin offering derives only from unconsecrated beasts, and is offered only by day, and is presented only with the use of the right hand of the priest, so all Holy Things are subject to the rule that each derives only from unconsecrated beasts, and is offered only by day, and is presented only with the use of the right hand of the priest.”
- F. *And how do we know that that is the fact for the sin offering itself?*
- G. Said R. Hisda, “Scripture has said, ‘And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin offering which is his’ (Lev. 16: 6) — thus it must belong to him personally and not to the community or tithe.
- H. “As to the rule that it must be by day: *that derives from the statement, ‘in the day that he commanded’* (Lev. 6:38). *That pertains to all Holy Things.*”
- I. *As to the use of the right hand?*
- J. *That is in line with Rabbah bar bar Hannah, for said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Every passage in which reference is made to ‘finger’ and ‘priesthood,’ the right hand only is what is meant.” That pertains to all Holy Things.*
- K. *And if you prefer, I shall say that he is in accord with R. Simeon, who has said that a reference to “finger” then excludes the requirement that a priest officiate, and a reference to “priesthood” includes the requirement that the finger be used. [Freedman: both are stated in connection with a sin offering, but only priesthood is stated in connection with the others; hence they must be inferred from a sin offering.]*
- L. [Resuming from where the exposition was broken off:] “‘of the guilt offering:’ just as in the case of the guilt offering, the bones are permitted, so in the case of all other Holy Things, the bones are permitted.”

II.5. A. Said Raba, “*It is obvious to me that [98B] if the blood of a sin offering below [on the garment] and then the blood of a burnt offering fell on top of that, the garment has to be washed.*” But, asked Raba, “If the blood of a burnt offering is below, and then the blood of a sin offering splashes on top, what is the law? *Is the operative consideration that the blood has made contact with the garment, and here there is contact? Or perhaps the operative consideration is that of absorption, and here there is no possibility of absorbing blood that has to be washed out?*”

B. *But he himself solved the problem: “There is no requirement to wash in the latter case.”*

II.6. A. [In consequence of the foregoing,] said Raba, “*It is obvious to me that [in an immersion pool], the blood interposes [as just now explained]. But in the case of a slaughterer [on whom blood spatters routinely], it does not interpose. [Foreign*

matter may not interpose between what is immersed and the water of the immersion pool. Blood is a foreign matter, and so interposes, because a person will not want to have blood on the garment, and that is the operative consideration. But a slaughterer will not object to blood on his garment, so it is not foreign matter in his case (Freedman)]. Along these same lines, grease on a garment interposes, but if the owner is a grease seller, it does not interpose.” *But, asked Raba, “If there is blood and grease on a garment, what is the rule?”*

- B. *If he is a slaughterer, you have to reason that the immersion is null because of the grease, and if he is a grease seller, you have to conclude that the immersion is null because of the blood. The question concerns a case in which the man is both a slaughterer and a grease seller. Do we then say that he will not object to the presence of one but will be meticulous about the presence of them both? Or perhaps he will not be meticulous about the presence of them both?*
- C. *The question stands.*