

# VII

---

## BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 66A-70B

7:1-2

7:1

- A. A bird that one designated to serve as sin offering of fowl which one prepared below [the red line],
- B. (1) [that is to say, properly,] in accord with the rites of the sin offering [M. 6:4],
- C. (2) in the classification [“name”] of the sin offering,
- D. [obviously] is valid.
- E. [If one prepared a bird designated to serve as a sin offering of fowl] (1) in accord with the rites of the sin offering,
- F. (2) but in the classification [“for the name”] of a burnt offering [M. 6:7]  
—
- G. (1) [or] in accord with the rites of the burnt offering [below the line, M. 6:5],
- H. (2) but in the classification [“for the name”] of a sin offering —
- I. (1) [or] in accord with the rites of the burnt offering,
- (2) but in the classification [“for the name”] of a burnt offering,
- J. it is invalid.
- K. [If] one prepared it above [the red line instead of below, but, otherwise,] in accord with the rites of either of them.
- L. it [in all events] is invalid.

7:2

- A. The burnt offering of fowl which one prepared above [the red line],
- B. (1) in accord with the rites of the burnt offering,
- C. (2) but in the classification [“for the name”] of the burnt offering,
- D. is valid.
- E. [If one prepared it] (1) in accord with the rites of the burnt offering,
- F. (2) in the classification [“for the name”] of the sin offering,

- G. it is valid,
- H. except that it does not go to the owner's credit [in fulfillment of an obligation].
- I. [If he did so] (1) in accord with the rites of the sin offering
- J. under the classification ["for the name"] of a burnt offering,
- K. [or] (1) in accord with the rites of the sin offering,
- L. (2) in the classification ["for the name"] of the burnt offering,
- M. (1) in accord with the rites of the sin offering,
- N. (2) in the classification ["for the name"] of the sin offering,
- O. it is invalid.
- P. [If] he prepared it below [the red line] in accord with the rites of either of them,
- Q. it is invalid.

- I.1. A. [66B] [If one prepared a bird designated to serve as a sin offering of fowl in accord with the rites of the sin offering, but in the classification [for the name] of a burnt offering, or in accord with the rites of the burnt offering, but in the classification [for the name] of a sin offering — [or] in accord with the rites of the burnt offering, but in the classification [for the name] of a burnt offering, it is invalid:] *[When the priest offered the bird designated as a sin offering with the rite of a burnt offering,] in what way has he deviated from the standard rite?*
- B. *If I should say that he has deviated in performing the rite of pinching the neck [Freedman: nipping both organs and thus severing the neck], then shall we have to say that the rule does not accord with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, who has said, "I have heard that in the case of a sin offering made of a bird, one does sever the neck"?*
- C. *But have we not already established the fact that this does not accord with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon!*
- D. *No, the passage can be interpreted even in accord with his position, in that the point of deviation lies in the sprinkling of the blood [and not in the severing of the carcass], and the reading of the passage shows this to be a reasonable proposition, since the passage goes on to state, [If] one prepared it above [the red line instead of below, but, otherwise,] in accord with the rites of either of them, it [in all events] is invalid. That means even if he had done so in accord with the rites of the sin offering and even in the classification of a sin offering. Now which rite does he deviate [in performing the act above the red line]? If you maintain that he has deviated in some aspect of pinching the neck, surely a master has said, "If he performed the pinching of the neck at any part of the altar, the act is valid." So it must mean that he has deviated in the matter of sprinkling the blood, and, further, since the second clause refers to sprinkling the blood, so the first clause refers to sprinkling the blood.*
- E. *Not at all, why read it in such a way? Each can be referring to its own condition. [Freedman: The sequel may refer to deviating in the rite of sprinkling, but the first can still refer to doing the same in regard to pinching the neck.]*

- II.1 A. The burnt offering of fowl which one prepared above [the red line], in accord with the rites of the burnt offering, but in the classification [for the sake] of the burnt offering, is valid. [If one prepared it] (1) in accord with the rites of the burnt offering, in the classification [for the sake] of the sin offering, it is valid, except that it does not go to the owner's credit [in fulfillment of an obligation]:**
- B. *[When the priest offered the bird designated as a burnt offering of fowl in accord with the rite of the sin offering,] in what way has he deviated from the standard rite?*
- C. *If I should say that he has deviated in performing the rite of pinching the neck [Freedman: nipping both organs and thus severing the neck], then when the Tannaite framer of the passage proceeds, **And all of them [which are invalid] do not impart uncleanness in the gullet. And the laws of sacrilege apply to them,** shall we have to conclude that this does not accord with the position of R. Joshua? For if it were in accord with the position of R. Joshua, he has maintained that the laws of sacrilege do not apply [if the pinching of the neck is not done properly].*
- D. *Rather, the point of deviation was in draining the blood [to which Joshua's reasoning does not pertain].*
- E. *But then note what follows: **The burnt offering of fowl which one prepared below, in accord with the rites of the sin offering for the sake of the sin offering — R. Eliezer says, "The laws of sacrilege apply to it." R. Joshua says, "The laws of sacrilege do not apply to it."** So in what way has he deviated from the standard rite? If we say that it was in draining the blood, while we know that R. Joshua has taken the position that he does where the deviation had to do with pinching the neck, does he also take that same position when the deviation has to do with draining the blood? [Obviously not, as we have just said.] It must follow that at issue is pinching the neck.*
- F. *Then do you maintain that while the first and third clause speak of deviation as to pinching the neck, the middle clause refers to deviation as to draining the blood?*
- G. *Indeed so, while the first and third clause speak of deviation as to pinching the neck, the middle clause refers to deviation as to draining the blood.*

**7:3-4**

**7:3**

- A. And all of them [which are invalid] do not impart uncleanness in the gullet.** [The carrion of clean fowl imparts uncleanness to the one who is eating it when it is located in the gullet, so that the person eating it becomes a Father of uncleanness. The birds have been properly slaughtered, so they are invalid as sacrifices, but they are not deemed carrion.]
- B. And the laws of sacrilege apply to them,**
- C. except in the case of the sin offering of the fowl which one prepared below in accord with the rites of the sin offering for the name of the sin offering [which may be eaten by the priest].**

- A. The bird designated as burnt offering of fowl which one prepared below [instead of above], in accord with the rites of the sin offering, for the sake of the sin offering —
- B. R. Eliezer says, “The laws of sacrilege apply to it.”
- C. R. Joshua says, “The laws of sacrilege do not apply to it.”
- D. Said R. Eliezer, “Now if the sin offering, to which the laws of sacrilege do not apply [when one prepared it] in the classification for which the beast was originally designated [“for its own name”] [M. 7:3C], is subject to the laws of sacrilege when one did it not in the classification for which the beast was originally designated [for the sake of some other name (lit. “when he changed its name”)],
- E. “the burnt offering, to which the laws of sacrilege do apply [when one offered it] in the classification for which the beast was originally designated [for its own name], when one did it not in the classification for which the beast was originally designated [for the sake of some other name] [“when he changed its name”] — is it not logical that the laws of sacrilege should [continue to] apply to it?”
- F. Said to him R. Joshua, “No. If you have so stated the rule in the case of the sin offering, in which case the beast originally designated as a sin offering has been offered up as a burnt offering [“the name of which one has changed to the name of the burnt offering”], [that is because] one indeed has offered the beast in the classification to which the laws of sacrilege apply in any event [“changed its name to that of something to which the laws of sacrilege apply”]. But will you so state the rule in the case of the burnt offering, in which case an animal originally designated as a burnt offering is now offered in the classification of sin offering [the name of which one changed to the name of the sin offering]? For indeed he has classified the beast in a classification that did not originally apply [changed its name] to that of classification of offering to which the laws of sacrilege do not apply.”
- G. [67A] Said to him R. Eliezer, “Now, behold — Most Holy Things which one slaughtered at the southern [side of the altar, instead of the northern side], and slaughtered in the classification [“for the name”] of Lesser Holy Things [e.g., peace offerings], will prove the case. For one indeed has offered the beast in a classification that did not initially apply [“changed their name”] to that classification of offering to which the laws of sacrilege do not apply, [for said law applies only to the sacrificial portions], yet the laws of sacrilege do apply to them.
- H. “So you should not be surprised concerning the burnt offering. For even though one offered a beast originally designated as a burnt offering [“changed its name”] to the classification of something to which the laws of sacrilege do not apply, the laws of sacrilege should most certainly apply to it.”
- I. Said to him R. Joshua, “No. If you have so stated the rule in connection with Most Holy Things which one slaughtered at the southern side of the altar and

slaughtered for the sake of Lesser Holy Things, [that is because] he indeed has offered the beast in a classification other than that for which it was originally designated ["changed their name"], specifically, a classification in which there is both what is forbidden [the sacrificial portions of Lesser Holy Things are forbidden under the law of sacrilege] and what is permitted [their flesh is permitted]. But will you say so concerning the beast originally designated as a burnt offering, the classification ["name"] of which one has changed for that of something which is wholly permitted [the classification of offering in the case of a sin offering, which is entirely given over to the priest, **M. 6:4**]?"

**I.1.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Eliezer to R. Joshua, "An animal designated as a guilt offering, which one slaughtered at the north side of the altar for the in the classification of peace offerings will prove the point, for the priest has deviated from the originally designated classification, and the law of sacrilege applies to the offering. So do not be surprised concerning the burnt offering, in which instance even though the priest has changed the original classification of the beast to some other, the laws of sacrilege should continue to apply to it."
- C. Said to him R. Joshua, "No, if you have stated that rule in the case of a guilt offering, in which instance while the priest has ignored the original classification of the beast, he still has observed the rule governing the proper location at the altar at which the guilt offering is to be prepared, will you say the same of a burnt offering, in which case the priest has not only classified the beast in some other classification than the one that originally applied but also has changed the location on the altar from to one that does not pertain?"
- D. Said to him R. Eliezer, "The animal designated as a guilt offering which the priest slaughtered at the south side of the altar in the classification of peace offerings will prove to the contrary. For here we have a case in which the officiating priest has classified the offering in a category other than that which originally applied and also has changed the correct place at the altar at which the rite is supposed to be carried out. And yet the law of sacrilege still pertains. So do not find it surprising that in the case of a burnt offering, even though the officiating priest has changed the classification of the beast from that which originally applied and also changed the location at the altar from that which should have applied, still the laws of sacrilege do apply."
- E. Said to him R. Joshua, "No, if you have invoked the case of the guilt offering, in which case one has classified the animal as an offering other than that which it was originally designated to serve and also located the rite at a point on the altar other than the point at which the offering originally was contemplated to be prepared, still, the priest in no way has varied from the rites that would have applied to the original classification of offering. But will you say the same of a burnt offering, in which case one has not only deviated from the originally designated classification, and also has deviated from rites that should have applied in the original classification, and also deviated from the location that should originally have served for the performance of the rite?" [T. **Zeb. 7:16-20**].

**I.2.** A. *Said Raba, “But why not answer him with the case of ‘an animal originally designated as a guilt offering, which the priest slaughtered at the south side of the altar, under the classification of peace offerings, in the name of owners other than those who had originally consecrated the beast, in which case one has offered the beast in a classification other than originally designated, in a place on the altar other than should have applied to the originally designated classification of offering, and furthermore has deviated from the rites that would otherwise have applied to the original classification of offering’? Since he did not respond in this way, you may draw the conclusion that R. Eliezer saw R. Joshua’s operative consideration [pertaining only to a bird offering (Freedman)]. For said R. Ada bar Ahbah, ‘R. Joshua would say, “A bird designated as a burnt offering which one prepared sprinkling the blood below the line in accord with the rites of a sin offering and in the classification of a sin offering, once one has pinched a single organ, is turned into a sin offering made of a bird.”’” [Freedman: for the latter requires cutting of one organ only; hence as soon as one organ is nipped, there is nothing to distinguish it from a sin offering, and so it does turn into one before it can become unfit through having its rites incorrectly performed. This reason can only apply to a burnt offering made of a bird, for animal sacrifices have to have both organs of the neck cut.]*

B. *If so, then in the case of a sin offering made of a bird which one prepared above the red line, in accord with the rite of the burnt offering, as soon as the priest has nipped one organ, let it be categorized forthwith as a burnt offering made of a bird. And if you should say, that indeed is so, has not R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Bana’ah, “That is indeed the sense of the Mishnah”? And does that not mean, “That is indeed the sense of the Mishnah” — but no further [and Joshua differs only where his difference is made explicit!*

C. *Not at all, what it means, “that is the sense of the entirety of the Mishnah-paragraph” [and the disagreement concerns both the burnt offering and the sin offering]/*

D. R. Ashi said, “As to a bird offering which one prepared, tossing the blood below the red line, in accord with the rites of a sin offering, for the sake of a sin offering, *there is no problem, since the priest has validated the offering as soon as he cut a single organ; but the other requires the validation of the cutting of both organs, and a bird offering cannot be offered below the red line, so as soon as he nips one organ, it is transformed into a sin offering made of a bird. But, on the other hand, when the priest offers a sin offering of fowl, tossing the blood above the red line, with the rites of a burnt offering, and for the purpose of a burnt offering, since a master has said, ‘The act of pinching the neck is valid wherever it is done,’ as soon as he nips one organ, the fowl becomes unfit, and when therefore he nips the second organ, how can the offering be turned into a burnt offering made of a bird?’”*

**I.3.** A. *Reverting to the text just now cited:*

B. *For said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “R. Joshua would say, ‘A bird designated as a burnt offering which one prepared sprinkling the blood below the line in*

accord with the rites of a sin offering and in the classification of a sin offering, once one has pinched a single organ, is turned into a sin offering made of a bird:”

- C. **[67B]** *Come and take note:* [Where two women, after giving birth, bring two birds, one for a burnt offering and one for a sin offering, and we have in hand a case in which two women have each brought one bird for a burnt offering and one for a sin offering, respectively. Then they bought a pair together, designating one bird for a burnt offering and one for a sin offering, as each required, and they gave them to the priest. so that there are two birds,] a sin offering belonging to this woman, and burnt offering belonging to that one. Now [if] the priest prepared both of them above [the red line, as burnt offerings], half is valid, and half invalid. [If he prepared] all of them below the red line, half of them is valid, and half invalid. [If he prepared] half of them above, and half of them below, both of them are invalid. For I maintain, “The sin offering was offered above, and the burnt offering below [the red line]” [M. **Qinnim 3:3A-F**]. *But even if he did offer the burnt offering below the line, why not regard it as transformed into a sin offering of fowl [for the reason explained above] [Why does one of the women still owe a sin offering?]*
- D. *While R. Joshua made the ruling that he did in the case of one person, did he make such a ruling in the case of two?*
- E. *Come and take note:* Sin offerings and burnt offerings, and one pair of birds which were not designated, and one which were designated [for their particular purposes] — [if] he prepared all of them above the red line, half is valid. [If he prepared] all of them below the red line, half of them is valid and half invalid. [If he prepared] half of them above and half below, valid is only the undesignated pair. And it is divided between them [M. **Qinnim 3:4A-F**]. *But that is not the case for the birds that had been explicitly designated for one purpose or the other. And why should that be the case? For even though he offered the burnt offering below the let, let it be treated as though it had been turned into a sin offering [on the strength of Joshua’s theory]. And should you answer that this simply does not conform to the position of R. Joshua, can you really say that? For come and take note of what we have learned in the Mishnah: The woman who said, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a pair of birds if I bear a male child” — [if] she bore a male child, she brings two pairs of birds, one for her vow and one in fulfillment of her obligation. [If before she had assigned them, designating two as burnt offerings in fulfillment of her vow, and one as a sin offering and one as a burnt offering in fulfillment of her obligation], she gave them to the priest, so that the priest has to prepare three birds above [the red line] and one below, [but] he did not do so, [and], rather, he prepared two above and two below — and he did not first make inquiry [ = M. **3:1.A**] — she has to bring another bird. And he then offers it above the red line. [The foregoing rule applies if she had originally brought*



birds of] the same kind. [If, however, she had brought] two kinds, then she must bring two birds of each kind. [If] she had expressly vowed [which kind she would bring], then she must bring three birds. [This rule applies if she had originally brought birds] of the same kind. [If she had brought them] of two different kinds, she must bring four more. [If] she had determined in her vow [to bring her offering of obligation and her offering as a vow of the same kind and at the same time], [68A] she must bring five more birds.[This rule applies if she had originally brought birds] of a single kind. If she had brought them of two different kinds, she must bring six. [If] she gave them to the priest, and it is not known what [in fact] she gave, [if] the priest went and prepared them, and it is not known what he has done by way of preparation, she must bring another four birds in fulfillment of her vow, and two in fulfillment of her obligation. Ben Azzai says, “Two sin offerings.” Said R. Joshua, “This illustrates that which they have said, ‘When it [the animal] is alive, its voice is one. When it is dead, its voice is seven.’ How is its voice seven? Its two horns become two trumpets, its two leg bones, two flutes, its hide is made into a drum, its innards are used for lyres, and its intestines, for harps.” Some say, “Also its wool is made into blue [for the high priest’s blue pomegranates]” [Exo. 28:33] [M. **Qinnim 3:6A-Z**]. [Freedman: Joshua observes that this is similar to what the rabbis have said about a ram, that when it is alive it has one voice only, but when it is dead it has seven. In a similar way here too, when the woman vowed and did not know what she had specified, she merely required four birds and two for her statutory obligation. Now that she has already brought four, she still needs another eight, four on account of her vow and four on account of her obligation. Since Joshua makes this comment, you may infer that he accepts these laws.]

- F. *But granted that R. Joshua made such a ruling in regard to free someone from having violated the law of sacrilege, did he make such a rule also in respect to converting the bird into an obligatory offering?*

## 7:5

- A. (1) [If] one pinched the neck with his left hand or at night,
- B. (2) [if he] slaughtered unconsecrated [birds] inside [the Temple courtyard] or Holy Things [consecrated birds] outside —
- C. they do not impart uncleanness of the gullet [M. 7:3A].
- D. (1) [If] one pinched the neck with a knife [not with his fingernail, as is required],
- E. (2) [if] he pinched the neck of unconsecrated [birds] inside the Temple courtyard, or of Holy Things outside [instead of inside the courtyard, where consecrated fowl alone are properly killed by pinching the neck] —
- F. [68B] [if he pinched the neck of] (1) turtledoves whose time had not yet come [to serve as sacrifices],
- G. (2) and young pigeons whose time had passed [for serving as sacrifices],



- H. (3) or [a blemished bird, e.g.,] whose wing had dried up,
  - I. (4) or whose eye was blinded, (4) or whose eye was blinded,
  - J. (5) or whose leg was cut off [which are not suitable for sacrifices] —
  - K. [the meat of the bird is deemed carrion and therefore] imparts uncleanness of the gullet.
  - L. This is the encompassing principle: Any [bird] which became invalid [while] in the sanctuary [subject to the rites of sacrifice] does not impart uncleanness of the gullet [for the pinching itself is valid to remove the carcass from the category of carrion].
  - M. [If] it did not become invalid [while] in the sanctuary [subject to the cultic processes], it does impart uncleanness of the gullet.
  - N. And all those [people who are] invalid [listed at M. 2:1], who pinched the neck of a bird — their act of pinching the neck is invalid [so far as the cult is concerned]. But [the carcasses of the birds whose necks they have pinched] do not impart uncleanness of the gullet [since the aspect of the killing of the bird that has led to its classification as invalid has to do with the cultic processes, but not with the act of pinching or the character of the bird itself].
- I.1.** A. [If one pinched the neck with his left hand or at night:] Said Rab, “If this was done by with the left hand or at night, the meat does not impart uncleanness when located in the gullet, but if it was done by a non-priest or a knife, the meat of the bird does impart uncleanness when located in the gullet.”
- B. *So what differentiates the left hand? It is fit on the Day of Atonement. And as to the night? It is fit in regard to burning the limbs and the facts.*
  - C. *But then is not a non-priest fit to perform an act of slaughter?”*
  - D. *The act of slaughtering the beast is not part of the sacrificial rite [while burning the limbs are.]*
  - E. So it isn't, is it? Then what about what R. Zira said, “The act of slaughter of a red cow for the production of purification-water on the part of a non-priest is null.” *And in this regard Rab commented, “The reason is that ‘Eleazar’ and ‘statute’ are stated in connection with that rite [Num. 19: 2].”*
  - F. *The case of the red cow is exceptional, because it falls into the category of Holy Things that serve for the upkeep of the Temple house.*
  - G. *But does that not yield an argument a fortiori: Holy Things that serve for the upkeep of the Temple house must be prepared by the priesthood, so can there be any question about priests’ also being essential for Holy Things for the altar?*
  - H. *Said R. Shisha b. R. Idi, “It is along the lines of examining marks of the skin ailment [of Lev. 13-14], which is not a rite of the Temple at all, and yet which requires the involvement of the priesthood.”*
  - I. *Then derive the matter from the case of high places [where a non-priest might perform the rite of pinching the neck of a bird]? [That would then differentiate why if a non-priest performed the pinching of the neck in the Temple, the bird is not carrion and so should not impart gullet-uncleanness.]*
  - J. *There is no deriving the matter from the case of high places [which were not sanctified as was the Temple].*

- K. *Can one not do so? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. *How do we know that if meat that has been taken out of the Temple court and then put on the altar is not removed from the altar? Because meat that goes out of the Temple court may be offered on the high places. [So the high places do yield an appropriate analogy for the Temple.]*
- M. *The Tannaite authority in point of fact invokes the verse, “This is the law of the burnt offering” (Lev. 6: 2) [and that explains why if meat that has been taken out of the Temple court and then put on the altar is not removed from the altar].*
- N. *[Reverting to A:] And R. Yohanan said, “If a non-priest performed the act of pinching, the meat does not defile in the gullet; if it was done with a knife, it does impart uncleanness in the gullet.”*

- I.2. A. *We have learned in the Mishnah: And all those [people who are] invalid [listed at M. 2:1], who pinched the neck of a bird — their act of pinching the neck is invalid [so far as the cult is concerned. But the carcasses of the birds whose necks they have pinched do not impart uncleanness of the gullet since the aspect of the killing of the bird that has led to its classification as invalid has to do with the cultic processes, but not with the act of pinching or the character of the bird itself].***
- B. *Now from the viewpoint of R. Yohanan, there is no problem, since the language “all” encompasses the non-priest. But from the viewpoint of Rab, what does the word “all” serve to encompass?*
- C. *It encompasses the cases in which the act of pinching the neck was done with the left hand or done at night.*
- D. *Why use language that extends the rule to such cases, if they are in any event explicitly stated in their own terms!*
- E. *The Tannaite framer of the passage has first of all presented the general rule and has then articulated the details by way of explanation.*
- F. ***Come and take note: This is the encompassing principle: Any [bird] which became invalid [while] in the sanctuary [subject to the rites of sacrifice] does not impart uncleanness of the gullet [for the pinching itself is valid to remove the carcass from the category of carrion]. [If] it did not become invalid [while] in the sanctuary [subject to the cultic processes], it does impart uncleanness of the gullet.***
- G. *Now from the viewpoint of R. Yohanan, there is no problem, since the language “all” encompasses the non-priest. But from the viewpoint of Rab, what does the word “all” serve to encompass?*
- H. ***[69A] And even on your reasoning, what does the clause [If] it did not become invalid [while] in the sanctuary [subject to the cultic processes], it does impart uncleanness of the gullet serve to encompass?***
- I. *Rather, the opening clause encompasses the slaughter of bird sacrifices within the Temple court [and the meat of these will not impart uncleanness in the gullet, since that mode of killing serves for birds outside of the cult], and the latter clause encompasses the act of pinching the neck as the mode of slaughtering birds outside of the cult [since that mode of killing serves for birds only within the cult].*

**I.3.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan:*

B. **If a non-priest pinched the neck of a consecrated bird in the sanctuary, or if an unfit person did so, the meat does impart uncleanness of the gullet. But that which has become refuse or is left over after the proper time of eating the meat will not impart uncleanness of the gullet, because that act that renders them invalid has no connection to the sanctuary but takes place only after the rite of sacrifice is complete.** [Citing M., T. adds:] **This is the general principle: any bird that became invalid in the sanctuary does not impart uncleanness of the gullet, but if the invalidity was not in the sanctuary, the meat does impart uncleanness of the gullet** [T. **Zeb. 7:23A-C**].

**I.4.** A. Said R. Isaac, “I have heard two rules, one as to taking up the handful of meal offering by a non-priest, the other as to pinching the neck of the bird by a non-priest. In consequence, if the sacrificial parts are put up onto the altar, in the one case the offering is removed from the altar and in the other the meat is not removed from the altar. *But I don’t know which is which.*”

B. *Said Hezekiah, “It stands to reason that the offering involving the taking of the handful will be removed from the altar, while the one involving the pinching of the neck of the bird will not be removed from the altar. What is the point of differentiation? Pinching of the neck is practiced at the high places.”*

C. *But taking the handful of meal offering also is practiced at the high places! And should you say that there is in point of fact no meal offering at the high places, well, then fowl also are not offered at the high places, [so there would also be no rite of pinching the neck there,] for* R. Sheshet said, “In the view of him who says, ‘A meal offering is presented at the high places,’ then fowl also will be offered at the high places, and in the opinion of him who says, ‘A meal offering is not presented at the high places,’ fowl also are not presented there. Why not? The argument is: ‘And sacrificed peace offerings of oxen to the Lord’ (Exo. 24: 5) [Freedman: this is before the building of the tabernacle, hence equivalent to a high place], so ‘offerings’ means, but not birds, and ‘offerings’ means, but not meal offerings.

D. Rather, say: there was no sanctification of a meal offering in a utensil of service on high places [and that eliminates the handful of the residue, so when the handful is taken by the non-priest, it is unfit so that even if put on the altar, it has to be removed (Freedman)].

**II.1. A. If one pinched the neck with his left hand or at night:**

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. Might one suppose [to the contrary of the Mishnah’s rule] that meat derived from the rite of pinching the neck of the bird when done within the Temple imparts uncleanness when located in the gullet of someone eating it?

D. Scripture states, “And every soul that eats carrion...he shall wash his clothes” (Lev. 17:15).

- E. *But this meat also falls into the classification of carrion* [Freedman: since the pinching of the neck was not properly done and does not allow for eating the meat of the sacrifice, and the bird therefore is like any other not killed by a proper act of slaughter, hence is carrion]!
- F. Rather, Scripture states, ““terefah [that which is torn of beasts]” (Lev. 17:15). [And that yields the following argument:] just as the tearing of the beast does not allow what was prohibited to be eaten, so whatever does not allow the eating of what was prohibited will produce that same uncleanness, excluding, then, the act of pinching the neck of a bird designated as a sacrifice when it is done within the Temple court, for this will permit eating what was formerly forbidden, and hence it will not impart uncleanness to clothing when the meat is in the gullet.
- G. But pinching the neck of birds designated as offerings outside of the Temple and pinching the neck of a bird whether inside or outside of the Temple court, since these acts do not permit eating what was formerly forbidden, and therefore the meat in those cases will impart uncleanness to clothing when the meat is in the gullet.

**II.2.** A. *A further Tannaite teaching is as follows:*

- B. Might one suppose that meat deriving from an act of slaughter of unconsecrated birds inside the Temple court, or the act of slaughter of Holy Things whether inside or outside of the Temple court, defiles when located in the gullet?
- C. Scripture states, “And every soul that eats carrion...he shall wash his clothes” (Lev. 17:15).
- D. *But this meat also falls into the classification of carrion!*
- E. Rather, Scripture states, ““terefah [that which is torn of beasts]” (Lev. 17:15). [And that yields the following argument:] just as the tearing of the beast is treated the same way whether done inside or outside of the Temple court [the result of tearing the meat is prohibited in both places], so the same rule applies to any action done inside and outside the Temple court, with this result:
- F. we exclude the act of slaughtering unconsecrated animals within the Temple court, and Holy Things whether inside or outside of the Temple court, since the result is not the same for an action done inside as outside the Temple court, and consequently the meat that results from such a mode of killing the animal will not impart uncleanness to clothing when the meat is located in the gullet.
- H. *Now there is no problem with respect to unconsecrated animals, which are not classified in the same way inside as outside of the Temple court* [for unconsecrated animals slaughtered outside of the Temple court do not produce meat that imparts uncleanness, even though the act of slaughter will not permit eating the meat, e.g., if the bird is terefah (Freedman)]. *But as to Holy Things, in both cases the sacrifice is unfit!*
- I. Said Raba, “If the act of slaughter outside of the Temple court produces an effect, in that the one who slaughters the consecrated bird outside of the Temple is subject to the penalty of extirpation, should that same action not produce the effect of removing the meat from the uncleanness imparted by carrion?” [It certainly should, so the deduction from the word “terefah” is required only in regard to unconsecrated birds but not in regard to birds designated as sacrifices (Freedman)].

- J. *So we have found the rule covering the act of slaughter outside of the Temple court. How do we know the rule covering the act of slaughter inside the Temple court?*
- K. Since the rule governing the act within the Temple court is not the same as the rule governing the action outside [Freedman: the act of slaughter outside the Temple court involves extirpation, while the act of slaughter inside the Temple court does not, although the rite actually does require pinching the neck].
- L. *If so, then if one has pinched the neck of Holy Things outside of the Temple court, that meat also should not produce uncleanness, for, as before, the rule governing the act within the Temple court is not the same as the rule governing the action outside!*
- M. Said R. Shimi bar Ashi, “We draw a governing analogy for that which does not render the meat of the bird fit from that which does not render the meat of the bird fit. [Freedman: You infer the rule governing the sacrifice of offerings within the Temple court from that same action outside; along these same lines, you infer the rule governing the act of sacrifice of unconsecrated animals inside the Temple court from the same situation outside the Temple court. In all cases the act of slaughter does not make the meat of the bird permitted.]
- N. “But, on the other hand, we do not draw a governing analogy from that which does not render the meat of the bird fit from that which does render the meat of the bird fit” [Freedman: that is, from the rule governing the pinching the neck of a bird designated as Holy Things when that is carried out inside the Temple court, which is an entirely valid action of course].”
- O. *But do we not do so? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- P. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if the meat that was taken out of the Temple court was then put on top of the altar, it is not removed? It is because meat that is taken outside of the consecrated area in the case of high places still is fit for the altar [by definition].
- Q. *The Tannaite authority has depended upon the extension of the law that is contained within the verse, “This is the law of the burnt offering” (Lev. 6: 2).*

## 7:6

- A. [If] one pinched off the neck and [the bird] turned out to be terefah —
- B. R. Meir says, “It does not impart uncleanness of the gullet [since slaughtering a beast is wholly equivalent to pinching the neck of a bird] .”
- C. [69B] R. Judah says, “It does impart uncleanness of the gullet.” [Birds and beasts in no way are comparable; neither slaughtering an unconsecrated clean bird nor pinching the neck of a consecrated one will exempt from uncleanness a bird which turns out to be terefah.]
- D. Said R. Meir, “It is an argument a fortiori [that it does not impart uncleanness of the gullet.] Now if in the case of the carrion of a beast, which imparts uncleanness through contact and through carrying, proper slaughter renders clean from its uncleanness that which was terefah,

- E. “[in the case of] the carrion of fowl, which does not impart uncleanness through contact and through carrying, it should logically follow that its proper slaughter should render clean from its uncleanness that which was terefah.
  - F. “Just as we find that its proper slaughter [in the case of a bird or beast] renders it valid for eating and renders it clean from its uncleanness in the case of terefah, so proper pinching of the neck, which renders it valid for eating, should render it clean from its uncleanness in the case of terefah.”
  - G. R. Yosé says, “It is sufficient that it [the slaughtering of the bird] be equivalent to the carrion of a beast: its [a beast’s or a bird’s] slaughtering renders clean [what is terefah], but the pinching of the neck [of a bird does] not [render clean what is terefah].”
- I.1.** A. *But does not R. Meir accept the principle of sufficiency, [ It is sufficient that the slaughtering of the bird be equivalent to the carrion of a beast: a beast’s or a bird’s slaughtering renders clean what is terefah, but the pinching of the neck of a bird does not render clean what is terefah, in the principle that it suffices for what is inferred by an argument to conform to the traits of the premise of that same argument], seeing that that principle derives from the Torah? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. What case in Scripture illustrates the validity of the argument a fortiori? “And the Lord said to Moses, ‘If her father had only spit in her face, should she not hide in shame seven days?’ (Num. 12:14). How much more should a divine reproof deriving from the Omnipresent impose shame for fourteen days — but it suffices for what is inferred by an argument to conform to the traits of the premise of that same argument! [Freedman: since you argue from her father’s reproof, even a divine reproof does not necessitate a longer period of shame. Scripture proceeds, “Let her be shut up without the camp for seven days,” so the principle of sufficiency is scriptural.]
  - C. *Said R. Yosé b. R. Abin, “R. Meir turned up a verse of Scripture and interpreted its implications, as follows: ‘This is the Torah of the beast and of the bird:’ (Lev. 11:46) — now in respect to what torah has the law applied in the same terms the law applying to the beast to the fowl, and the law applying to the fowl to the beast? The [carrion meat of a] beast imparts uncleanness in when it is carried or touched, while the carrion meat of a bird does not impart uncleanness when it is touched or carried. Carrion meat of a bird imparts uncleanness to the clothing of him who wears it when it is located in his gullet, but the carrion meat of a beast does not imparts uncleanness to the clothing of him who wears it when it is located in his gullet. So the statement is to inform you that, just as in the case of a beast, an action that makes the meat fit for eating renders it clean of uncleanness if it is found to be terefah-meat, and so too, in the case of a bird, that act that makes the meat fit for eating [which is pinching the neck in the sanctuary] will render it clean of all uncleanness if it turns out to be terefah-meat].”*
  - D. *And what is the scriptural basis for R. Judah’s position?*
  - E. *Said Rabbah, “R. Judah turned up a verse of Scripture and interpreted its implications, as follows: ‘And every soul that eats meat that is carrion or terefah...shall wash his clothes’ (Lev. 17:15). Now, said R. Judah, ‘Why does*



Scripture refer to terefah-meat? It is to indicate that if the beast that turns out to be terefah can live, then carrion is stated, and if the terefah-beast cannot live, then it is encompassed by the reference to carrion in any case [so the allusion is superfluous]! Rather, it is to encompass a terefah-beast that one slaughtered and to indicate that it imparts uncleanness.”

- F. *Said to him R. Shizbi, “Then what about the following verse of Scripture: ‘And the fat of carrion and the fat of terefah may be used for any other service, but you shall in no way eat it’ (Lev. 7:24) [which is understood to mean that the forbidden fat of carrion is clean and does not impart uncleanness (Freedman)] — why not argue in this case as we just did, namely: ‘Why does Scripture refer to terefah-meat? It is to indicate that if the beast that turns out to be terefah can live, then carrion is stated, and if the terefah-beast cannot live, then it is encompassed by the reference to carrion in any case [so the allusion is superfluous]! Rather, it is to encompass a terefah-beast that one slaughtered and to indicate that its forbidden fat is clean?’”*
- G. *So must it follow that it imparts uncleanness? [Freedman: the Talmud interposes: since Shizbi objects in this way, it follows that such forbidden fat is unclean and imparts uncleanness]. But has not R. Judah said Rab said — and others say that it has been taught in a Tannaite formulation — “‘And if there die of a beast’ (Lev. 11:39) [meaning, if death takes beasts of some species, but not of others] bears the sense, the carrion of some beasts imparts uncleanness, and that of others does not. And which ones are excluded? It would be a terefah-beast that was properly slaughtered.” [It follows that Shizbi cannot maintain that it imparts uncleanness.]*
- H. *Rather, the question that he raised concerned the reference to the terefah-beast: “The reference to ‘terefah’ in the cited verse excludes an unclean animal [with the result that the forbidden fat of an unclean animal does not impart uncleanness], on the basis of the following reading of the matter: the inclusion of a reference to terefah involves a species of animal that can encompass a terefah-beast is covered by the law, excluding a species of beast that does not by definition produce a terefah-beast, which is to say, an unclean species. Here too, in the matter of the verse adduced in evidence for his position in the Mishnah by R. Judah, argue in the same way: the inclusion of a reference to terefah involves a species of animal that can encompass a terefah-beast is covered by the law, excluding a species of beast that does not by definition produce a terefah-beast, which is to say, an unclean species.*
- I. *[Returning to the explanation of Judah’s position:] the unclean bird in R. Judah’s view is excluded by reason of an argument deriving from the law governing carrion. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. *R. Judah says, “Might one suppose that meat deriving from the carrion of fowl that is unclean should impart uncleanness when it is located in the gullet? Scripture states, “‘Carrion or terefah-meat he shall not eat to defile himself therewith’ (Lev. 22: 8) — that which defiles is something that is prohibited on the count of ‘do not eat carrion,’ while this unclean bird is excluded from that consideration, since it is forbidden not on the count of ‘do not eat carrion,’ but on the count of ‘do not eat that which is unclean.’”*



- K. **[70A]** *Let this too be derived from, “And the fat of carrion,” bearing the sense, “that the prohibition of which is by reason of ‘you shall not eat the forbidden fat of carrion,’ [Freedman: only that forbidden fat does not impart uncleanness], then excluding the forbidden fat of a forbidden animal, since the prohibition in that case is not on account of ‘do not eat the forbidden fat of carrion’ but on the count of uncleanness [in that the whole animal is forbidden (Freedman)].*
- L. *Rather, this reference to terefah-meat [in Shizbi’s verse] is required to encompass the wild beast. For I might have proposed the following argument: that the forbidden fat of which is forbidden, but the meat of which is permitted [Freedman: a non-domesticated animal, e.g., a deer, that may be eaten, produces forbidden fat that is permitted; that of a domesticated beast is forbidden], excluding that the forbidden fat and meat of which are permitted [that is, a domesticated beast]. So we are informed by the word “terefah” that that is not a valid position to take [Freedman: the word teaches that the forbidden fat of anything that can become terefah, excluding the wild beast, does not defile when it is carrion].*
- M. *He said to him, “Then what differentiates the unclean forbidden animal, [so that the verse at hand does not yield the lesson that its forbidden fat is clean and does not defile]? Is it that the forbidden fat is not differentiated from its meat [both being forbidden, so you do not apply this verse to that case, since it implies that there is a distinction between them (Freedman)]? Then in the case of the wild beast too, there is no differentiation between its forbidden fat and its meat. And furthermore, it is written, ‘But you shall in no way eat it’ (Lev. 7:24).”*
- N. *Rather, said Abayye, “The reference to the terefah-beast is required in its own terms [Freedman: to show that the forbidden fat of a terefah-beast that has died is clean]. It is so that you shall not argue as follows: since an unclean beast is forbidden while it is yet alive, and a terefah-beast likewise is forbidden while it is yet alive, just as the forbidden fat of an unclean beast is unclean, so too the forbidden fat of a terefah-beast will be unclean. [The cited verse rejects that proposed argument.]”*
- O. *If so [if you require a verse to show that it does not impart uncleanness in the verse concerning the terefah-beast cited by R. Judah], then the reference to terefah in that verse is required to forestall the following proposition: since eating an unclean bird is forbidden, and eating the terefah-one is forbidden as well, just as an unclean bird does not impart uncleanness to clothing when the meat is in the gullet, so the meat of a terefah-one will not impart uncleanness to the garments when it is in the gullet.*
- P. *Furthermore, can the rule governing terefah-beasts really derive from an unclean animal at all [so that you require a verse of Scripture to demonstrate that it does not impart uncleanness (Freedman)]? That is hardly the case, for as to an unclean species, it has never for one moment been valid, while a terefah-species has once been valid but has become invalidated! And should you maintain, what is to be said in the case of a terefah-beast that bore the traits of being terefah even in the womb, yet of the species of such a case this same rule pertains [even though that particular terefah-case was never fit].*
- Q. *Rather, said Raba, “The Torah has said, ‘Let the prohibition of carrion come and take effect upon the prohibition of forbidden fat, let the prohibition of terefah-meat*

come and take effect over the prohibition of forbidden fat' [Freedman: when one eats forbidden fat of carrion or of a terefah-beast, he is liable not only on account of the forbidden fat but also on account of the status of the beast as carrion or terefah. For otherwise one might argue, since the prohibition of forbidden fat comes first, the other prohibitions cannot apply to it at all].

R. *"And it is necessary for both cases to be covered. For had we been given the rule only concerning carrion, it would have been thought that that is because it imparts uncleanness, while as to terefah-meat, I would say that the prohibition of forbidden fat is unaffected. And if we were given the rule about the terefah-beast, I might have supposed that the operative consideration is that the prohibition derives from the time at which the beast was yet alive, but as for carrion, I would say that the rule does not pertain. So both cases are necessary."*

S. *And how does R. Meir interpret the same reference to terefah in the verse cited by R. Judah?*

T. *He requires it to exclude from the rule the case of an animal that has been slaughtered within the Temple court.*

U. *And R. Judah?*

V. *There is another reference to "terefah" stated [one at Lev. 17:15, the other at Lev. 22: 8, and hence one is used to cover each case (Freedman)].*

W. *And R. Meir?*

Y. *One is to exclude from the rule the case of an animal that has been slaughtered within the Temple court, and the other is to exclude the case of the unclean bird.*

Z. *And R. Judah?*

AA. *He derives that rule from the matter of carrion.*

BB. *And how does R. Meir treat that reference to carrion?*

CC. *He derives from that reference the minimum requisite measure that would define an act of eating, which is the volume of an olive [Freedman: one is liable for eating carrion only if he eats an olive's bulk].*

DD. *But surely that measure can be derived from the initial text that has been cited [Lev. 17:15], for that verse makes reference to eating?*

EE. *One serves to establish the minimum requisite measure that would define an act of eating, which is the volume of an olive, and the other to establish the minimum time in which such an act of eating takes place, which is the time that is required to eat half a loaf of bread. For I might have argued that since this case is an innovation, then the minimal span of time for the eating to take place may be even more than that which is required for eating a half loaf of bread. So we are informed that that is not so.*

## **I.2. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:**

B. *"And the forbidden fat of carrion and the forbidden fat of a terefah-beast may be used for any other purpose, but you shall in no way eat of it" (Lev. 7:24) — Scripture speaks of the forbidden fat of a clean domesticated beast.*

- C. You maintain that Scripture speaks of the forbidden fat of a clean domesticated beast, but perhaps Scripture speaks only of the forbidden fat of an unclean domesticated beast?
- D. Here is what you may say in reply: Scripture has declared an animal clean if it has been properly slaughtered, and it has declared it clean on account of forbidden fat [so that if the animal is properly slaughtered, the forbidden fat does not impart uncleanness, and the forbidden fat of carrion does not impart uncleanness (Freedman)]. Just as when Scripture declared the beast to be clean when it has been properly slaughtered, it referred to a clean animal but not to an unclean animal [for even if an unclean animal is properly slaughtered, it still imparts uncleanness], so when Scripture declared the beast clean by reason of the forbidden fat, it has referred to a clean animal but not to an unclean one.
- E. But why not argue in the following way: Scripture has declared carrion clean [in that there is a case in which it does not impart uncleanness], and it also has declared forbidden fat clean [as just now noted]. Just as, when Scripture declared carrion to be clean, that rule pertained to the carrion of an unclean beast and not to the carrion of a clean one [an unclean bird does not impart uncleanness as carrion when the meat is in the gullet, while when the carrion of a clean bird is in the gullet it does impart uncleanness], so when Scripture declared clean the forbidden fat, it made that rule for the unclean but not for the clean beast.
- F. Thus you may say by way of reply: **[70B]** when you take this route, Scripture speaks of the clean category, and when you take that route, it speaks of the unclean category. Therefore it is necessary for Scripture to specify, “terefah-beast,” bearing the sense, the rule pertains to a species that can produce a terefah-beast. Then I exclude unclean species, which cannot produce a terefah-beast in such a species [for the animal is forbidden under all circumstances]. But I shall not exclude the wild beast, since there is no possibility of the wild beast producing a terefah-animal. But Scripture teaches, “But you shall in no way eat of it,” bearing the implication that Scripture refers to a species, the forbidden fat of which is forbidden while the meat is permitted, then excluding the wild beast, since both the forbidden fat and the meat are permitted.

**I.3.** A. [With reference to the suggestion that the carrion of a forbidden animal is clean] *said R. Jacob bar Abba to Raba*, “If so, then does only the carrion of a clean animal impart uncleanness, while the carrion of an unclean animal does not impart uncleanness?”

B. *He said to him, “How many elders have made a mistake in that matter! The second clause speaks of the carrion of an unclean bird.”*

**I.4.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “R. Meir declared clean [fowl that after being put to death by pinching the neck turned out to be terefah] only unblemished birds, but not blemished ones [which cannot have been eligible for slaughter within the cult].”

B. And R. Eleazar said, “Even blemished ones [are subject to his position].”

C. *So too it has been stated:*

D. R. Bibi said R. Eleazar said, “R. Meir declared blemished birds clean [under the stated circumstances], with his rule extending even to ducks and chickens [that are not eligible for use in sacrifices at all].”

- I.5.** A. *R. Jeremiah raised the question, “If one broke a goat’s neck [as at Deu. 21:19], what is the law? The rule concerning ducks and chickens is because they are a species of bird, while a goat is not of the same species as a heifer, or perhaps the operative consideration is that it is of the species of cattle?”* [Freedman: the act of slaughter by breaking the neck renders an animal carrion, so that it imparts uncleanness, but it is prescribed for the heifer at Deu. 21: 1-9, it presumably does not impart uncleanness in such a case. What if one broke the neck of a goat instead of a heifer in that same context: is the goat carrion or not. The goat is not of the same species as a heifer, because a heifer is classified as large cattle, the goat small, and hence it will impart uncleanness. Or perhaps it is a species of cattle nonetheless, so it will not impart uncleanness.]
- B. *R. Dimi went into session and stated this tradition. Said to him Abayye, “But is it to be inferred that the heifer the neck of which is broken is clean?”*
- C. *He said to him, “Yes indeed. For the household of R. Yannai stated, ‘Expiation is written in that case, as in the case of Holy Things.’”*
- D. *Objected R. Nathan, father of R. Huna, “‘But you shall in no way eat of it:’ I know that this law applies to forbidden fat, which is not to be eaten but which may otherwise be used. But how do we know that the same rule applies to the forbidden fat of an ox that is stoned and of a heifer the neck of which is broken? Because it says, ‘all forbidden fat....’ Then might you think that the heifer the neck of which is broken is clean, while the forbidden fat is unclean? [Certainly not, and no verse is required to make that point!]”*
- E. *Where one broke the neck, no verse of Scripture is required to make that point. The verse of Scripture covers a case in which one has slaughtered the beast [after it had been designated for the purpose at hand, one properly slaughtered the beast instead of breaking the neck; a verse of Scripture then is needed to show that the forbidden fat does not impart uncleanness (Freedman)].*
- F. *Then why should not the correct act of slaughter serve also to clean the beast from the uncleanness attaching to it by reason of its being carrion?* [Freedman: though the act of slaughter will not serve to permit the meat, at least it should free the meat from uncleanness, since we find no instance of a slaughtered and permitted animal’s imparting uncleanness].
- G. *The verse of Scripture is required to cover a case in which the animal died [on its own, prior to having the neck broken; here the meat is carrion, and the verse then indicates that the forbidden fat does not impart uncleanness (Freedman)].*
- H. *Does it then follow that the animal is forbidden even while it is alive?* [Freedman: since the question is asked in respect of a heifer that died, it follows that even before it was beheaded, while yet alive, all benefit deriving from the heifer is forbidden, and that is why the question is asked concerning the forbidden fat.]
- I. *Yes indeed.*
- J. *Said R. Yannai, “I have heard that there is a time limit on the matter [of when the designated heifer becomes forbidden], but I have forgotten what it is. Our colleagues take the view that when the beast is taken down into the rugged valley, that is the moment at which it becomes forbidden [and not prior, from the time at which it was designated for this purpose].”*