

IX

BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER NINE

FOLIOS 83A-88B

9:1

- A. The altar sanctifies that which is appropriate to it. [If something is placed on the altar that is suitable for the altar, it is not to be removed.]
- B. R. Joshua says, “Whatever is appropriate to [not the altar but] the altar fires, if it has gone up [onto the fires], should not go down, since it is said, ‘This is the burnt offering — that which goes up on the hearth on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 9): just as the burnt offering, which is appropriate to the altar fires, if it has gone up, should not go down, so whatever is appropriate to the altar fires, if it has gone up, should not go down.”
- C. Rabban Gamaliel says, “Whatever is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down, as it is said, ‘This is the burnt offering on the hearth on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 2): just as the burnt offering, which is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down, so whatever is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down.”
- D. The difference between the opinion of Rabban Gamaliel and the opinion of R. Joshua is only the blood and the drink offerings.
- E. For Rabban Gamaliel says, “They should not [having been placed on the altar] go down.”
- F. And R. Joshua says, “They should go down.”
- G. R. Simeon says, “[If] (1) the animal sacrifice is valid and the drink offerings invalid, (2) the drink offerings valid and the animal sacrifice invalid,
- H. “[or] even if (3) this and that are invalid — the animal sacrifice should not go down, but the drink offerings should go down.”
- I.1** A. [83B] ...that which is appropriate to it [remains on the altar], but that which is not appropriate to it does not: *to exclude what?*
- B. Said R. Pappa, “It is meant to exclude handfuls of meal offerings that were not sanctified in a utensil consecrated for the Temple service [which are not eligible at all, and even if put on the altar, they are to be taken down (Freedman)].”

- C. *To that proposition Rabina objected, “Then how is that ruling different from the position of Ulla, for Ulla has said, ‘The sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things that were put up on the altar before the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial beast are not to be removed; they have been made bread for the altar.’” [Handfuls of meal offering, which are burned on the altar, correspond to the sacrificial parts, which are burned on the altar as well. The former are sanctified for the altar when placed in a utensil of service; the latter by the sprinkling of the animals’ blood; the same law should apply to both (Freedman).]*
- D. *[The difference is this:] The latter [the sacrificial parts] do not lack any further processing themselves [since it is the blood that has to be sprinkled, but nothing else is done to the parts], while the former do lack further processing [in that it has to be put into a utensil of service].*

- II.1 A. R. Joshua says, “Whatever is appropriate to the altar fires, if it has gone up [onto the fires], should not go down, since it is said, ‘This is the burnt offering — that which goes up on the hearth on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 9): just as the burnt offering, which is appropriate to the altar fires, if it has gone up, should not go down, so whatever is appropriate to the altar fires, if it has gone up, should not go down:”**
- B. *But does not Rabban Gamaliel also have to address the verse, “that which goes up on the hearth on the altar”?*
- C. *That verse comes to indicate that limbs that pop off of the altar must be put back on.*
- D. *And as to the other, how does he derive the rule that limbs that pop off of the altar must be put back on?*
- E. *He derives it from the phrase, “to which the fire has reduced the burnt offering on the altar” (Lev. 6: 3).*
- F. *And as to the other?*
- G. *He requires that verse to make the point that what has been consumed as a burnt offering must be put back on the altar if it pops off, but you do not have to put back onto the altar what has been consumed as incense.*
- H. *For R. Hanina bar Minyomi b. R. Eleazar b. Jacob repeated as a Tannaite formulation: “‘And he shall take up the ashes to which the fire has reduced the burnt offering on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 3) means, what was reduced as a burnt offering you put back on the altar, but you do not put back what was consumed as incense.”*
- I. *And as to the other?*
- J. *Is it not en passant that the rule that what has been consumed as a burnt offering is put back on the altar?*

- III.1 A. Rabban Gamaliel says, “Whatever is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down, as it is said, ‘This is the burnt offering on the hearth on the altar’ (Lev. 6: 2): just as the burnt offering, which is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down, so whatever is appropriate to the altar, if it has gone up, should not go down:”**
- B. *But does not R. Joshua also have to address the verse, “on the altar”?*
- C. *He requires that verse for the following purpose:*

- D. *What is the sense of that verse of Scripture? Whatever is eligible for its firewood, the altar sanctifies. [Freedman: “upon the altar” does not extend the law, as Gamaliel maintains, but explains why whatever is eligible for the altar fire must be replaced, which is, because the altar has sanctified it].*
- E. *And the other party?*
- F. *There is a further reference to “altar” [at Exo. 29:37: “Whatever touches the altar shall be holy”].*
- G. *And the other party?*
- H. *[Two references to the matter are required,] one where what was on the altar was suitable for it for at least a moment, the other where what was on the altar never was suitable for it even for a moment.*
- I. *And the other party?*
- J. *Since in any event what has been put on the altar is now unfit and has been included in the exclusion from the altar by the All-Merciful, there is no distinction to be made between something that has been suitable for the altar for at least a moment and something that has never been suitable for the altar for at least a moment.*

IV.1 A. R. Simeon says, “[If] (1) the animal sacrifice is valid and the drink offerings invalid, (2) the drink offerings valid and the animal sacrifice invalid, [or] even if (3) this and that are invalid — the animal sacrifice should not go down, and the drink offerings should go down:”

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. R. Simeon says, “[The generative analogy is] the burnt offering: just as a burnt offering is presented on its own account, so whatever is presented on its own account is encompassed under the law at hand [that what is put on the altar is left there], excluding, then, drink offerings, which are presented not on their own account [but as accompaniment for another offering].”
- D. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “Since it is said, ‘Whatever touches the altar shall be holy’ (Exo. 29:37), I infer that that is so whether it is suitable for the altar or not suitable for the altar. So Scripture further says, ‘Now this is what you shall alter upon the altar: two lambs’ (Exo. 29:38) — just as lambs are suitable for the altar, so the law applies to whatever is suitable to the altar.”
- E. R. Aqiba says, “[The generative analogy is] the burnt offering: just as a burnt offering is appropriate for the altar, so whatever is appropriate for the altar is covered by the law.”
- F. *What is at issue among these authorities?*
- G. *Said R. Adda b. Ahbah, “At issue is a burnt offering of a bird that is invalid. One master appeals to the analogy of the burnt offering [and this too is a burnt offering, so it is covered by the law], and the other master appeals to the analogy of lambs [and birds then are not covered by the law].”*
- I. *From the perspective of the master who appeals to the analogy of lambs, is burnt offering too not then written?*
- J. *If lambs had been stated and burnt offering not, then I would have drawn the conclusion that the law applies even if the disqualification took place while the*

beast was yet alive [e.g., the beast was blemished]. Scripture then invoked “burnt offering.”

- K. *From the perspective of the master who appeals to the analogy of burnt offering, is lambs too not then written?*
- L. *If burnt offering had been stated and lambs not, then I would have drawn the conclusion that the law applies even to a meal offering. Scripture then invoked “lambs.”*

IV.2. A. *What is at issue between the afore-cited Tannaite authorities and those of our Mishnah-paragraph?*

- B. *Said R. Pappa, “At issue between them is the rule governing handfuls of meal offerings which were consecrated in a utensil of service. In the view of the Tannaite authorities before us, these are not to be removed from the altar.[The handfuls fall within the analogies of “its firewood” and “on the altar, since the handfuls feed the fire and are put on the altar (Freedman).] In the view of the Tannaite authorities of the Mishnah, they are to be removed from the altar.” [They do not fall under the analogies of “lambs” or “burnt offering” (Freedman).]*
- C. *R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “In regard to a meal offering that is presented on its own [an not with an animal sacrifice] all parties [except those to be specified] concur that it is not removed. In the view of R. Yosé the Galilean and of R. Aqiba, [84A] it should be removed [if it is disqualified].*
- D. *“As to a meal offering that is presented along with the meat of an animal offering, in the opinion of Rabban Gamaliel and R. Joshua, it should not be removed; in the opinion of all of the others, it should be removed.*
- E. *“As to drink offerings that are presented on their own, in the opinion of all of the rest they should be removed; in the opinion of Rabban Gamaliel and R. Simeon, they should not be removed.*
- F. *“As to drink offerings that are presented along with the meat of an animal offering, in the opinion of all of the rest they should be removed; in the opinion of Rabban Gamaliel alone, they should not be removed.”*
- G. *That last point is perfectly obvious!*
- H. *It was necessary to make that point on account of a meal offering that is presented on its own, in line with what Raba said. For Raba said, “A person may voluntarily present a meal offering with drink offerings [but without a sacrifice] every day.”*
- I. *Then let R. Simeon b. Laqish make this rule explicit in line with the view of Raba.*
- J. *It was necessary for him to state the law concerning drink offerings that are presented with the meat of an animal sacrifice, where the person offers the libations on the next day or some other day [and not along with the meat itself]. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that, since a master has said, “‘And the meal offerings and their drink offerings’ (Num. 29: 6) can be brought at night; ‘and their meal offerings and their drink offerings’ can be brought on the next day,” therefore, they are comparable to drink offerings that are presented on their own, and R. Simeon then would concede that they are not taken off the altar. In this way R. Simeon b. Laqish implies that that is not the rule.”*

9:2-4

9:2

- A. And what are those things which, if they have gone up, should not go down?
- (1) That which remains overnight,
 - (2) and that which is unclean,
 - (3) and that which goes forth [from its proper bounds],
 - (4) and that which is slaughtered [with the intention to burn the sacrificial parts or to eat the flesh] outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place,
 - (5) and that the blood of which unfit people [M. 2:1] have received or tossed.
- B. R. Judah says, “(1) That which is slaughtered by night, and (2) that, the blood of which has been poured out, and (3) that, the blood of which has gone forth beyond the veils — if it has gone up, should go down.”
- C. R. Simeon says, “It should not go down. For the cause of its invalidity [took place] in the sanctuary.”
- D. For R. Simeon did say, “Anything, the cause of the invalidity of which [took place] in the sanctuary — the sanctuary accepts it [so that it should not be removed from the altar]. [If] its invalidity did not [take place] in the sanctuary, the sanctuary does not accept it [and it should be removed from the altar].”

9:3

- A. What are those things, the invalidity of which did not [take place] in the sanctuary?
- B. (1) The animal which has had sexual relations with a human, and (2) the animal with which a human had sexual relations; and (3) that which is set aside for idolatrous worship, and (4) that which actually is worshipped; and (5) the hire of a harlot, and (6) the price of a dog; and (7) the crossbred animal; and (8) the animal which turned out to be terefah, and (9) that which goes out by the side.
- C. And (10) animals which are blemished.
- D. R. Aqiba declares valid in the case of animals which are blemished. [Thus if they have gone up, they should not go down.]
- E. R. Hananiah, Prefect of the Priests, says, “Father did reject animals which had been blemished [even] from on top of the altar.”

9:4

- A. Just as, if they have gone up, they should not go down, so if they have gone down, they should not [once more] go up.
- B. But all of them [M. 9:2A] which have gone up alive to the top of the altar should go down.
- C. A burnt offering which went up alive to the top of the altar should go down.

D. [If] one did slaughter it on top of the altar, [however] he should then flay and divide it in its place [where it lies, on top of the altar].

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

- B. R. Judah says, “‘This is the Torah of the burnt offering, it is that which goes up’ (Lev. 6:23) — lo, there are three exclusionary statements, thus meaning to exclude, first, a sacrifice that was slaughtered by night, second, one the blood of which has been spilled, and third, one the blood of which has been taken outside of the Temple veils [vs. the Mishnah’s rule]. [These sacrifices are excluded from the law that holds that once a sacrifice has been placed on the altar, it may not be removed from the altar, so that,] in these cases, if an offering has gone up on the altar, it is to be removed from it.”
- C. R. Simeon says, “‘From the word ‘burnt offering’ I know only that the law pertains to a valid offering. How do I know that the law encompasses the sacrifice that was slaughtered by night, one the blood of which has been spilled, and one the blood of which has been taken outside of the Temple veils, as well as the one that has been left over night, and the one that has been taken outside, and the one that has become unclean, and the one that was left over, and the one that was slaughtered by the officiating priest after he had formed the intention to toss the blood outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place, or one the blood of which has been received by unfit priests, or one the blood of which has been tossed in such a way that what was supposed to be tossed above the red line around the altar has been tossed below, and what was supposed to be tossed below the red line around the altar has been tossed above, and one the blood of which was supposed to be tossed inside that was tossed outside, and one the blood of which was supposed to be tossed outside that was tossed inside, and the Passover and the sin offering that the officiating priest has slaughtered not for the sake of those designated purposes at all? Scripture states, ‘This is the Torah of the burnt offering’ (Lev. 6:23). This serves to extend the rule, so that a single Torah applies to all manner of burnt offerings, so that if they should go up on the altar, they are not to be brought down from there.
- D. “‘Might I suppose that I should extend that same law to the animal that has committed an act of sexual relations with a woman or upon whom a man has committed an act of sexual relations, an animal designated as an offering to an animal and one that has actually been used for that purpose, the hire of a harlot and the price of a dog, a hybrid beast and a terefah-beast and one that has been born through caesarean section? Scripture to the contrary states, ‘This....’
- E. “‘And how come you encompass the one set and exclude the other?
- F. “‘Since Scripture has both extended the law and **[84B]** also stated matters in an exclusive way, you might say, ‘I shall encompass these, the invalidating aspect of which has taken place in the sanctuary, but I shall exclude those, the invalidating aspect of which did not come about within the sanctuary.’”
- G. And R. Judah?
- H. *He derives the rule from the following:*
- I. On what account have they said that if blood of an offering is left overnight on the altar, it is fit? Because if the sacrificial parts are kept overnight on the altar, they

are fit. And why if the sacrificial parts are kept overnight on the altar are they fit? Because if the meat of the offering is kept overnight on the altar it is fit. [Freedman: thus the rule governing the sacrificial parts is derived by an appeal to an argument based on shared traits of an other than verbal character shared among two classes of things, and that rule in turn is applied to the case of the blood by another such argument based on shared traits of an other than verbal character shared among two classes of things].

- J. What about the rule governing meat that is taken outside of the Temple court? [If such meat is put up on the altar, it is not removed therefrom. Why so?]
- K. Because meat that has been taken out of the holy place is suitable for a high place.
- L. What about the rule governing unclean meat? [If such meat is put up on the altar, it is not removed therefrom. Why so?]
- M. Since meat that is unclean is subject to a remission of the prohibition affecting it in the case of an offering made in behalf of the entire community.
- N. What about the rule governing the sacrificial parts of a burnt offering that the officiating priest subjected to the intention of being burned after the proper time? [If such meat is put up on the altar, it is not removed therefrom. Why so?]
- O. Since the sprinkling of the blood is effective and propitiates in making such meat refuse by reason of the improper intentionality [we leave the sacrificial portions on the altar once they have been put there].
- P. What about the rule governing the sacrificial parts of a burnt offering that the officiating priest subjected to the intention of being eaten outside of the proper place? [If such meat is put up on the altar, it is not removed therefrom. Why so?]
- Q. Since sacrificial meat in that class is treated as analogous to sacrificial meat that has been subjected to an improper intentionality in respect to eating the meat outside of the proper time.
- R. *What about the rule governing the sacrificial parts of a burnt offering the blood of which unfit priests have received and tossed, when such unfit persons are eligible for an act of service in behalf of the community...? [This question is not answered.]*
- S. Now can an analogy be drawn concerning something that has been disposed of in the proper manner for something that has not been disposed of in the proper manner? [If the sacrificial parts are kept over night, they are not taken off the altar, and therefore the meat kept overnight is fit; but the meat may be kept overnight, while the sacrificial parts may not. So too when the Temple stood, the flesh might not be taken outside, but where there was no Temple and only high places, the case is scarcely analogous!]
- T. *The Tannaite authority for this rule derives it from the augmentative sense, extending the rule, deriving from the formulation, "This is the Torah of the burnt offering" (Lev. 6: 2). [Freedman: the verse teaches that all burnt offerings, even with the defects catalogued here, are subject to the same rule and do not get removed from the altar once they have been put there; the arguments given cannot be sustained but still support that proposition.]*

I.2. A. Said R. Yohanan, "He who slaughters a beast at night, within the Temple court, but offered up the sacrifice outside of the Temple court [Freedman: he offers it up

by laying it on a stone or on an altar like pile] [Freedman: on account of laying limbs sacrificially outside of the Temple court, even according to Judah, who maintained that if it ascended the altar it must still descend; those which if laid on the altar do not descend certainly render the priest culpable if he lays them outside, since these can be received by the altar] **[85A]** — let this not be treated as less of an offense than slaughtering the beast outside and offering up the limbs outside [in which case one is liable on each count separately (Freedman)].”

- B. *Objected R. Hiyya bar Abin*, “He who slaughters a bird [instead of pinching the neck, which is the way in which fowl are sacrificed] inside the Temple but then offers it up outside is exempt. If he slaughtered it outside [where that is the correct mode of killing the bird] and offered it up outside, he is liable. *But why not invoke the same principle, namely*, let this not be treated as less of an offense than slaughtering the beast outside and offering up the limbs outside!”
 - C. *That is a valid refutation.*
 - D. *If you prefer, I shall say, slaughtering a bird [instead of pinching the neck] is merely an act of killing it* [instead of pinching the neck, and that is why in that case one is not liable. But when he slaughters an animal sacrifice at night, that is a valid act of slaughter (Freedman)].
- I.3.** A. Said Ulla, “The limbs of Lesser Holy Things that one put up on the altar prior to the sprinkling of the blood are not to be removed, for they have become the ‘bread’ of the altar.”
- B. *Said R. Zira*, “**We too have learned the same rule: [R. Judah says, “(1) That which is slaughtered by night, and (2)] that, the blood of which has been poured out, and (3) that, the blood of which has gone forth beyond the veils — if it has gone up, should go down.** *Now if you take the position that in that case* if the priest comes to sprinkle the blood, he will have nothing to sprinkle, yet you rule that if these things have gone up on the altar, they should not be removed, *here*, if the priest comes to sprinkle the blood, he will have what to sprinkle, so will it not be an argument a fortiori?”
 - C. *Assign the rule to Most Holy Things* [Freedman: the Mishnah may refer to Most Holy Things only, the sacrificial parts of which are intrinsically holy even before the blood is sprinkled, but the same may not apply to Lesser Holy Things, whose sacrificial parts become holy only with the sprinkling of the blood].
 - D. But there is the case of the Passover Offering, which is of Lesser Holy Things!
 - E. *Assign the rule to a case in which* it was not slaughtered for the purpose for which the beast was originally designated.
 - F. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **But all of them which have gone up alive to the top of the altar should go down.*** Lo, if they have actually been slaughtered, however, they are not to go down. *Does this not mean that there is no distinction to be made between Most Holy Things and Lesser Holy Things?*
 - G. Not at all. If they are slaughtered, some nonetheless are to be taken off of the altar, and some are not to be taken off of the altar.
 - H. *But lo, the language of the Mishnah-statement is, **But all of them!***
 - I. **But all of them** refers to the ones that are alive.
 - J. *That’s obvious.*

- K. *In point of fact the reference is to those that are alive but have cataracts in the eye, in accord with the position of R. Aqiba, who took the view that if they are put up onto the altar, they are not to be removed.*
- L. *Now how have you interpreted the rule? To refer to those that are unfit? But then note what follows: **A burnt offering which went up alive to the top of the altar should go down. [If] one did slaughter it on top of the altar, [however] he should then flay and divide it in its place [where it lies, on top of the altar].** But if the beast were blemished, then is it one that requires flaying and dividing? Scripture has said, “And he shall cut it into pieces” (Lev. 1: 6), “fit” meaning one that is fit but not one that is unfit!*
- M. *The concluding passage refers only to a valid beast, and what does the passage then mean to tell us? It is that flaying and cutting up can be done on top of the altar.*
- N. *Well and good, but from the viewpoint of him who holds that flaying and cutting up can be done on top of the altar, what is to be said?*
- O. *Here, with what sort of case do we deal? It is with one in which the offering for a moment had been fit but then became unfit, and it represents the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, who has said, “Once the blood has been tossed and the meat accepted for a single moment, they may flay the hide for the priests.”*
- P. *If so, when it was taught, “What does he do? He brings down the innards and washes them,” why should he do that [since they are unfit?] [Freedman: though these unfit animals must not be taken down, yet if they are, they may not be taken up again.]*
- Q. *What should he then go? Offer them with their dung? “Present it now to your governor, will he be pleased with you or accept you?” (Mal. 1: 8) [so no offering can be made with filth in the intestines]!*
- R. *That is our difficulty: why does he have to wash them? [Freedman: since they must be taken down but cannot go up again, why not leave them as is?]*
- S. *It is because if another priest happens upon them and does not know that they are unfit, he may take them up.*
- T. **[85B]** *Are we going then to do something to the priests through which they will stumble?*
- U. *Nonetheless, it is better to do it that way, so that Holy Things belonging to Heaven should not be tossed about like carrion.”*

- I.4.** A. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “R. Yohanan raised this question: if the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things were taken up to the altar before their blood was sprinkled, do they have to be taken down again or not?”*
- B. *Said to him R. Ammi, “But why not ask about the issue of sacrilege?” [Freedman: if one misappropriates sacred property for secular use, he is liable for an offering for sacrilege. Normally when the sacrificial parts are laid on the altar after the sprinkling of the blood, they become the property of the altar, and anyone who uses them owes an offering for sacrilege. So why not ask: does the law of sacrilege apply if they were taken up before the sprinkling of the blood?]*
- C. *He said to him, “The reason I do not raise the question about sacrilege is that sprinkling alone makes the rest subject to the law of sacrilege. I raise the*

question only about removing them from the altar.” He ultimately came to the conclusion that they are not to be taken off the altar, but there is no issue of sacrilege either.

- D. *Here is the version of the matter as it was set forth by R. Nahman bar Isaac:*
- E. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “R. Yohanan raised this question: if the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things were put up onto the altar prior to the sprinkling of the blood, does the law of sacrilege apply to them or not?”*
- F. *Said to him R. Ammi, “But why not ask about whether or not these may be removed from the altar?”*
- G. *He said to him, “The reason that I did not raise the question of removing them from the altar, because they have become the bread of the altar. When I raised the question, it had to do with sacrilege.” He ultimately came to the conclusion that they are not to be taken off the altar, but there is no issue of sacrilege either.*

II.1 A. What are those things, the invalidity of which did not [take place] in the sanctuary? (1) The animal which has had sexual relations with a human, and (2) the animal with which a human had sexual relations; and (3) that which is set aside for idolatrous worship, and (4) that which actually is worshipped; and (5) the hire of a harlot, and (6) the price of a dog; and (7) the crossbred animal; and (8) the animal which turned out to be terefah, and (9) that which goes out by the side. And (10) animals which are blemished. R. Aqiba declares valid in the case of animals which are blemished:

- B. *Said R. Yohanan, “R. Aqiba declared fit only those that suffered eye cataracts, since animals in that condition are valid in the case of birds; but that is on condition that the animal was sanctified as a sacrifice prior to the advent of the blemish.*
- C. *“And R. Aqiba concedes that in the case of a female burnt offering, it is to be taken down, because that is tantamount to a case in which the blemish has come prior to the sanctification.”*

II.2. A. R. Jeremiah raised the question, “Does the consideration of having had sexual relations with a human being apply in the case of birds or does that consideration not apply?

- B. *“Do we say, ‘you shall bring your offering of the cattle’ (Lev. 1: 2) excluding the beast that has had sexual relations with a human being or been subjected to sexual relations by a human being, with the consequence that whatever is subject to disqualification by reason of having had sexual relations with a human being is subject to the disqualification of having been subjected to such relationships, and whatever is not subject to the one is not subject to the other [thus excluding a bird]? Or perhaps, in any event, a sin has been committed with it?”*
- C. *Said Rabbah, “Come and take note: **R. Aqiba declares valid in the case of animals which are blemished.** But if the bird that has been subjected to sexual relations by a human being is not disqualified, then let him also declare an animal that has been subjected to sexual relations fit, since it is fit in the case of fowl. So it follows that it is not fit.”*
- D. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “We too have learned on Tannaite authority: Doves that have been worshiped as an idol, devoted for idolatry, used as a harlot’s hire or the price of selling a harlot or a bird of unclear sexual traits and a hermaphrodite*

— all these make garments unclean when the meat from such a bird is located within the esophagus [as does the carrion of a clean bird.]”

E. *That is decisive proof.*

III.1 A. R. Hananiah, Prefect of the Priests, says, “Father did reject animals which had been blemished [even] from on top of the altar.”

B. *What point is he making here?*

C. *If you wish, I shall say that he is just giving us a concrete fact of what was once done.*

D. *And if you prefer, I can say, what is the sense of reject? It means, indirectly [not openly, but in a respectful manner (Freedman)].*

IV.1 A. Just as, if they have gone up, they should not go down, so if they have gone down, they should not once more go up. But all of them which have gone up alive to the top of the altar should go down:

B. Said Ulla, “This rule pertains only in a case in which the fire has not yet taken hold of the object, but in a case in which the fire has taken hold, it is to be put back onto the altar.”

C. *R. Mari repeated that qualification with respect to the initial clause.*

D. *R. Hanina of Sura repeated it with respect to the concluding clause in this way: “The (1) wool on the heads of lambs, and (2) the hair of the beard of goats, and (3) the bones, and (4) the sinews, and (5) the horns, and (6) the hooves, when they are attached [to the flesh], should go up [onto the altar], as it is said, ‘And the priest shall burn the whole upon the altar’ (Lev. 1: 9). [If] they are separated, they should not go up, as it is said, ‘And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood’ (Deu. 12:27) [M. 9:5B-C]. Said Ulla, ‘This rule pertains only in a case in which the fire has not yet taken hold of the object, but in a case in which the fire has taken hold, it is to be put back onto the altar.’”*

E. *He who repeats the qualification of Ulla with regard to the concluding clause all the more so will consider that it applies to the initial one, but he who repeats it in connection with the initial clause can take the position that, as to the final clause, it refers to things that in any event are not ordinarily burned on the altar [and even if the fire has begun to burn them, they are taken down].*

9:5

A. What are those things which, [even] if they have gone up, should go down [being removed from the altar because they are not offered at all and therefore are not appropriate to the altar]?

(1) The meat [that constitutes the share of the priests] of Most Holy Things [sin offerings and guilt offerings] and the meat [that constitutes the share of the priests] of Lesser Holy Things [e.g., peace offerings],

(2) and the excess of the sheaf of first barley that is presented from Passover through Pentecost [the omer],

(3) and the two loaves [of Pentecost] and the show bread [Lev. 24: 5-19],

(4) and the residue of meal offerings,

(5) and the incense offering [that has been erroneously placed on the outer, rather than the inner altar to which it is appropriate] —

- B. But the (1) wool on the heads of lambs, (2) the hair of the beard of goats, (3) the bones, (4) the sinews, (5) the horns, and (6) the hooves, when they are attached [to the flesh], should go up [onto the altar], as it is said, “And the priest shall burn the whole upon the altar” (Lev. 1: 9).
- C. [If] they are separated [from the corpus of the offering, however], they should not go up, as it is said, “And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood” (Deu. 12:27).

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

- B. “And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar” (Lev. 1: 9) — this serves to encompass (3) the bones, (4) the sinews, (5) the horns, and (6) the hooves.
- C. Might one suppose that even if they separated from the corpus of the offering, they nonetheless should be left on the altar?
- D. Scripture states, “And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood” (Deu. 12:27).
- E. Since Scripture speaks of “meat and blood,” [86A] might one suppose that one must remove the bones, the sinews, the horns, and the hooves and place on the altar only the meat?
- F. Scripture says, “And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar” (Lev. 1: 9).
- G. Then how is this to be done?
- H. If they are attached to the corpus of the offering, they should be put up on the altar. If they have separated from the corpus of the offering, then even if they are already located on the top of the altar, they are to be removed from the altar.

I.2. A. *What Tannaite authority have you heard to hold the position, [If] they are separated, they should not go up?*

- B. *It is Rabbi, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar” (Lev. 1: 9) — this serves to encompass (3) the bones, (4) the sinews, (5) the horns, and (6) the hooves — even if they have separated from the corpus of the offering itself.
- D. Then how am I to interpret the verse, “And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood” (Deu. 12:27)?
- E. This is to tell you, pieces of meat that have been burned of the burnt offering you put back onto the altar, but you do not put back onto the altar burnt tendons and bones.
- F. Rabbi says, “One verse of Scripture states, ‘And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar,’ which serves as an augmentatory statement, but another verse of Scripture states, ‘And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood,’ which serves as an exclusionary statement. How am I to interpret these in tandem? If these are attached to the corpus of the offering, they are to go up onto the altar, but if they have been separated from the corpus of the offering, then even if they are located on top of the altar, they are to be removed.”

- II.1 A. [If] they are separated, they should not go up, as it is said, “And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood” (Deu. 12:27):**
- B. Said R. Zira, “This rule has been repeated only for a case in which these parts have separated downward [away from the center of the fire], but if they separated upwards [toward the fire itself], *then this means that they are presented nearer for consumption by the fire.*”
 - C. *Is that the case even if they have separated from the corpus of the offering?*
 - D. Said Rabbah, “This is the sense of the statement: ‘This rule has been repeated only for a case in which the parts separated after the tossing of the blood, but if they separated prior to the tossing of the blood, *the tossing of the blood comes along and permits using them for any purpose [and they are no longer deemed holy, not being part of the corpus that serves as a sacrifice]*, even to the point that one may make with the bones knife handles.’”
 - E. *He takes the view of that which R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Ishmael, namely, “It is said, ‘It shall be his’ is stated with reference to the burnt offering, and ‘it shall be his’ is stated with reference to the guilt offering (Lev. 7: 7-8). Just as the bones of the guilt offering are permitted, since even the meat is permitted to the priests, so the bones of a burnt offering are permitted.*
 - F. *“[And the words that establish verbal analogy] must be available for that purpose, for if they were not available for that purpose, one could challenge the comparison on the following grounds:*
 - G. *“The distinctive trait of the the guilt offering is that its meat is available to the priest [which obviously does not apply to the meat of the burnt offering, which is burnt up on the altar].*
 - H. *“But the language is redundant, since there is a ‘it shall be his’ that is otherwise not needed.”*
 - I. *Objected R. Ada bar Ahbah, ““As to the bones of an offering, the laws of sacrilege apply before the blood has been sprinkled, but they do not apply after the blood has been sprinkled, while to the bones of a burnt offering the laws of sacrilege always apply [since the sprinkling of the blood in any event does not permit the eating of the meat].”*
 - J. *Repeat the matter in this way: while as to those of the burnt offering, if they were severed before sprinkling, the laws of sacrilege apply until sprinkling; if they were severed after sprinkling, the laws of sacrilege always apply.*
 - K. *But Rabbah differs from R. Eleazar, for R. Eleazar has said, “If the pieces separated from the corpus of the sacrifice before the sprinkling of the blood, the laws of sacrilege apply. If this is after the sprinkling of the blood, while one may still not derive benefit from them, the laws of sacrilege nonetheless do not apply.”*

9:6-7B

9:6

- A. And any of them which burst from off the altar —**
- B. one should not put them back.**
- C. And so [is the rule for] a coal which burst from off the altar.**
- D. Limbs which burst from off the altar,**

- E. [if this was] before midnight —
- F. one should put them back,
- G. and the laws of sacrilege apply to them.
- H. [If they burst] after midnight, one should not put them back, but the laws of sacrilege still do not apply to them.

9:7A-B

- A. Just as the altar sanctifies that which is appropriate to it, so the ramp sanctifies.
- B. Just as the altar and the ramp sanctify that which is appropriate to them, so utensils [Exo. 30:28-29] sanctify [that which is appropriate to them]:

I.1 A. *How are we to understand the rule [that what bursts off the altar is or is not to be restored]? If there is some substance involved, then even after midnight, they should still be restored to the altar, and if there is no substance, then even prior to midnight they still should not be restored!*

- B. *The rule is necessary to cover the case of [86B] hardened limbs. [Freedman: the fire had hardened them and completely dried up all their natural moisture, yet had not yet turned them into charred coals].*

II.1 A. [Supply: **Limbs which burst from off the altar, [if this was] before midnight — one should put them back, and the laws of sacrilege apply to them. If they burst after midnight, one should not put them back, but the laws of sacrilege still do not apply to them:]** *What is the source of this rule?*

- B. Said Rab, “One verse of Scripture states, ‘This is the law of the burnt offering: it is that which goes up on its firewood upon the altar all night...and he shall burn thereon...’ (Lev. 6: 2-5), and another verse of Scripture states, ‘all night...and he shall take up the ashes’ (Lev. 6: 3). How are these two verses to be harmonized? [Freedman: the assumption is that ‘and he shall take up the ashes’ also means during the night, since the whole verse reads, ‘and the priest shall put on his linen garment...and he shall take up the ashes.’ As it does not say that he must don his linen garment ‘in the morning,’ it is assumed that he did it at night and immediately took up the ashes; thus this contradicts the implications of the former of the two verses.] Divide the night: half is for burning, the other half for taking the ashes.” [Freedman: the first half is for burning, and during this time the meat is not considered completely consumed unless it has actually been turned into ashes. The second half is for clearing, in the sense that even before the meat has actually become ashes but has merely reached the stage of hardness, it is regarded as ashes. If however it still retains the softness of meat, it obviously is not ashes and must not be removed.]

- C. *Objected R. Kahana, “Every day the priest would take up the ashes at cockcrow or slightly before or slightly afterward. On the Day of Atonement, however, he does it at midnight; on festivals, he does it at the first watch.’ Now if you hold that it is on the authority of the Torah that the altar must be cleared from midnight onwards, how are we going to push up the time for clearing the ashes?”*

- D. Said R. Yohanan, “Since it is said, ‘all night,’ [‘This is the law of the burnt offering: it is that which goes up on its firewood upon the altar all night...and he shall burn thereon...’ (Lev. 6: 2-5)], do I not know that it may be done until

morning? And why then does Scripture say, ‘until morning’? It is to indicate that [Freedman:] one should add another morning to the morning of the night [Freedman: the morning of the night is the dawn, while the additional morning is any earlier hour when priests might rise to commence the service, according to the requirements of the day. Since this is not fixed, it can be put forward or deferred as may be necessary]. *Therefore every day it is sufficient to do so from cockcrow. But on the Day of Atonement, it is done at midnight, on account of the consideration of the exhaustion of the High Priest. On festivals, when there were many sacrifices, so Israelites came very early, it was done at the first watch, as the continuation shows, and before cockcrow the Temple court was full of Israelites.*”

II.2. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If the parts separated from the corpus of the offering prior to midnight, and the priest restored the parts to the altar after midnight —
- C. Rabbah said, **[87B]** “It is only by the second midnight [the following midnight] that they can be assumed to ‘have been consumed [reaching the stage of hardness].”
- D. R. Hisda said, “By the morning star they can be assumed to ‘have been consumed [reaching the stage of hardness].”
- E. *The members of the household of the master stated, “What s the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Hisda? If midnight, which does not confer upon the meat the status of having been kept overnight, does confer upon the meat the status of having been burned up [being regarded now as hard, so if it pops off the altar, it is not put back on], the rise of the morning star, which does confer upon the meat the status of having been kept overnight, surely should confer upon the meat the status of having been burned up!”*

II.3. A. If the parts separated from the corpus of the offering prior to midnight, and the priest restored the parts to the altar after the rise of the morning star —

- B. Rabbah said, “The passage of the second midnight thereafter marks the point at which they have been consumed.”
- C. R. Hisda said, “They never reach the point at which they have been consumed.”
- D. *To this proposition objected R. Joseph, “And who is going to show us that the advent of midnight marks the point at which the parts have been consumed only if they are located on top of the altar? Perhaps it marks the point at which the parts have been consumed wherever they are located?”*
- E. *From there they sent word, “The decided law accords with the position implicit in the statement of R. Joseph.”*
- F. *So too it has been stated:*
- G. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “If the parts separated from the corpus of the offering prior to midnight, and the priest restored the parts to the altar after midnight, people may not derive benefit from them, but the laws of sacrilege do not apply.”
- H. *And so too taught Bar Qappara as a Tannaite statement:*
- I. If the parts separated from the corpus of the offering prior to midnight, and the priest restored the parts to the altar after midnight, they emerge from the point at which the laws of sacrilege apply.

- J. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, "Now since it is the fact that from there they sent word, 'The decided law accords with the position implicit in the statement of R. Joseph,' and, furthermore, And so too taught Bar Qappara as a Tannaite statement, [If the parts separated from the corpus of the offering prior to midnight, and the priest restored the parts to the altar after midnight, they emerge from the point at which the laws of sacrilege apply], then what is at issue between Rabbah and R. Hisda?"*
- K. *He said to him, At issue is the case of fat limbs."* [Freedman: even when they are hardened, they are not regarded as consumed, because their fat keeps them from becoming ashes. Only then do Rabbah and Hisda disagree as to their status. But in the case of ordinary flesh, they concur that midnight marks the point at which they are consumed.]

- II.4.** A. *Raba asked Rabbah, "When the limbs are on top of the altar, does the consideration of being kept overnight take effect [if the limbs are not consumed by midnight] or does the consideration of being kept overnight not take effect? How are we to imagine the circumstances to which the question pertains? If they have not been removed from the altar, [Freedman: but remained on the altar, away from the fresh wood pile for the new sacrifices], then if they had stayed over night in the courtyard, they are not removed from the altar [if they were put up on the altar after the night had passed], can there be a question that if they are already on top of the altar, they should stay there? [Of course they stay there and are not removed!] Rather, the question concerns a case in which they have been taken off the altar. Then do we liken the altar to the table, concerning which we have learned in the Mishnah: [If one set out the bread and the dishes of frankincense after the Sabbath and burned the dishes on the next Sabbath, it is invalid. (They have not been left from Sabbath to Sabbath.) How should one do it? Let him leave it for the coming Sabbath (thirteen days in all)], for even if it is on the table for many days, that is of no account [M. Men. 11:8E-H]. Or perhaps we compare the altar to the pavement of the Temple court [hence it becomes unfit]?"*
- B. *He said to him, "There is no consideration of holding the meat overnight if the meat is located on top of the altar."*
- C. *So did he accept this answer or did he not accept this answer from him?*
- D. *Come and take note, for it has been stated:*
- E. *Limbs that have been kept over night in the Temple court — the priest can continue burning them all night. If they were kept overnight on top of the altar, the priest can go on burning them all night long. If they were taken off the altar —*
- F. *Rabbah said, "One may put them back onto the altar."*
- G. *Raba said, "One may not put them back onto the altar."* [Freedman: being kept overnight does apply to them and so they are disqualified, and therefore they are not put back onto the altar once taken off.]
- H. *That proves that he did not accept this answer from him, does it not?*
- I. *Sure does.*

III.1 A. **Just as the altar sanctifies that which is appropriate to it, so the ramp sanctifies. Just as the altar and the ramp sanctify that which is appropriate to them, so utensils sanctify [that which is appropriate to them]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “Whatever touches the altar shall be holy” (Exo. 29:37) —
- D. I know only that that is so for what touches the altar How about the ramp?
- E. Scripture says, “...the altar,” using the accusative particle which serves to extend the law to other areas.
- F. How about utensils of service?
- G. Scripture states, “whatsoever touches them shall be holy” (Exo. 30:29) [and utensils of service are covered by the “them,” since the preceding verse makes reference to them (Freedman)].

III.2. A. *R. Simeon b. Laqish asked R. Yohanan, “What is the law as to utensils’ of service sanctifying what is invalid to begin with?”*

- B. *He said to him, “You have learned in the Mishnah: **Just as the altar and the ramp sanctify that which is appropriate to them, so utensils sanctify [that which is appropriate to them].**”*
- C. *He said to him, “But what I meant to ask is, to begin with may they be offered [or is this only after the fact]?”*
- D. *He said to him, “This too you have learned in the Mishnah: **[87B] [And what are those things which, if they have gone up, should not go down? That which remains overnight, and that which is unclean, and that which goes forth from its proper bounds, and that which is slaughtered with the intention to burn the sacrificial parts or to eat the flesh outside of its proper time or outside of its proper place,] and that the blood of which unfit people have received or tossed. Does that not mean that unfit persons received and sprinkled the blood?**” [meaning, they may not be put onto the altar in the first place, but if put on the altar, they are to be left there. Hence if unfit persons received the blood, in a utensil of service, while fit persons sprinkled it, the blood may be offered in the first place, and that must be because the utensils sanctified the blood to permit sprinkling it to begin with (Freedman).]*
- E. “No, it speaks of a case in which unfit persons received the blood, *or* unfit persons sprinkled the blood” [Freedman: and we are informed that even then the limbs do not descend once they have ascended, notwithstanding that they were disqualified by the sprinkling].

III.3. A. *Is the airspace above the altar regards as equivalent to the altar or is that not so?*

- B. *Come and take note: **Just as the altar and the ramp sanctify that which is appropriate to them, so utensils sanctify [that which is appropriate to them].** Now if you take the view that the airspace above the altar is not equivalent to the altar, then the air space above the ramp also is not equivalent to the ramp, so how can the priest carry up what has burst from the altar back onto the altar, since it has come down from the altar?* [Freedman: If the airspace of the ascent is not equivalent to the ascent, then when the priest lifts up what has come from the

altar to carry it back, it is as though he had taken it down, and if such a thing has descended it must not be put back.]

- C. *He drags it.*
- D. Still, there is a gap between the ramp and the altar [Freedman: when the limbs reach that space, they are as though taken down from the altar].
- E. When the greater part of the limb is nearer to the ramp, it is as though it were on the ramp, and when the greater part of it is nearer the altar, it is as though it were on the altar.
- F. *On that basis you may find a solution to the problem presented by Rami bar Hama, “Do we maintain that the consideration of connection pertains to limbs that are put onto the altar, or is that not the case? [If the smaller part of a limb pops off the altar, is it regarded as still connected to the larger part and so subject to being put back, or is that not the case? (Freedman)]. On this basis we can reach the conclusion that we do invoke the conception of connection in this case.” [Freedman: for otherwise each portion of the limb becomes disqualified as it enters the gap between the altar and the ascent].*
- G. *That does not represent a challenge [to the position of E]! Just solve the problem as you have proposed!*
- H. *Objected Raba bar R. Hanan, “But if you maintain that the airspace of the altar is equivalent to the altar itself, then how is it possible to imagine a case in which the burnt offering made of a bird can be rendered invalid through the improper intentionality of the officiating priest? Surely [as soon as the neck of the bird prepared as a burnt offering is pinched, which takes place in the airspace above the altar], the altar has received the offering!”*
- I. *To that objection objected R. Shimi bar Ashi, “Why should it not be possible to imagine such a case! It would be possible, for instance, when the officiating priest stated explicitly, ‘Lo, I pinch the neck of this bird with the expressed stipulation of removing the bird tomorrow and offering it up and burning it up.’” [Freedman: that would be forbidden, as if the bird had descended, since it does not then reascend; hence intentionality can disqualify the offering.]*
- J. *That poses no problem from the perspective of Raba, who has said that being kept overnight does apply to limbs that have been kept over night on the altar [and therefore they are not put back onto the altar once taken off.] But from the perspective of Rabbah, who has said that being kept overnight does not apply to limbs that have been kept over night on the altar [and therefore they are put back onto the altar once taken off,] the intentionality really is null [Freedman: for even if the priest kept the bird on top of the altar until the next day, it would not be disqualified, so that if he took it down, he would still have to put it up; then the intention to do so would not disqualify the bird.]*
- K. *Even from the perspective of Rabbah, it is possible to find such a case, specifically, if the officiating priest declared, “Lo, I pinch the neck of this bird with the expressed stipulation of removing the bird prior to the appearance of the morning star, and offering it up and burning it up after the appearance of the morning star.” [Freedman: if the bird was actually on the ground at down, it would be disqualified, so the intention too disqualifies it.]*

- L. *In any event, one still can solve the problem proposed earlier and conclude that the airspace above the altar is equivalent to the altar. For if you take the view that the airspace above the altar is not equivalent to the altar, [88A] then how can one ever find a case in which one is tossing the blood of an invalid sin offering made of a bird? It is in the status of one that has been removed from the altar [Freedman: if one pinched the neck of the bird on the altar having expressed an invalidating intention, it is disqualified; as soon as he lifts it in order to sprinkle the blood, it is as though he had removed it from the altar, and it may not then be put back, so the blood also cannot be sprinkled.] Furthermore, as to other disqualified offerings, how could one sprinkle the blood?*
- M. *He does so with the blood that is in contact with the wall of the altar in any event.*
- N. *So is that an act of sprinkling? It is only an act of raining the blood. Is that an act of tossing the blood? It is only an act of pouring out the blood. So is that pertinent at all to the sprinkling or tossing of the blood?!*
- O. *Said R. Ashi, "If the priest held the bird on top of the altar, that would be a valid objection. But the question is pertinent when the priest stands on the ground and suspends the blood on a cane. What then?" [Freedman: When the man stands on the altar and holds the blood or bird in hand, the airspace is certainly equivalent to the altar itself, for the fact that he is standing on the altar gives the blood the status it would have if it were actually on the altar.]*
- P. *That question stands.*

9:7B-G

- B. **Utensils for liquids [blood, wine, oil, water] sanctify liquid;**
 - C. **and measures for drystuffs [the tenth of the ephah and half issaron measures] sanctify that which is dry.**
 - D. **Utensils for liquids do not sanctify that which is dry, and measures for drystuffs do not sanctify that which is liquid.**
 - E. **Holy utensils which are perforated, if they perform their former function as they did when they were whole, sanctify.**
 - F. **And if not, they do not effect sanctification.**
 - G. **And all of them effect sanctification [of what is contained in them] only [when they are located] in the sanctuary [courtyard].**
- I.1** A. **[Utensils for liquids [blood, wine, oil, water] sanctify liquid:]** said Samuel, "This teaching is repeated as a Tannaite rule only in connection with measures. But basins [which can be used for liquid or meal] in any event sanctify, as it is said, 'Both of them filled with fine flour' (Num. 7:13) [Freedman: 'both' included a basin, normally used for liquids]."
- B. *Said R. Aha of Difti to Rabina, "But that meal offering was a wet one ['with fine flour mingled with oil for a meal offering,' Num. 7:13]."*
 - C. *He said to him, Nonetheless, the rule is required to cover what is dry within the basin.*
 - D. *"If you prefer, moreover, I shall say: meal offering is dry when compared with blood."*

- II.1 A. [Holy utensils which are perforated, if they perform their former function as they did when they were whole, sanctify. And if not, they do not effect sanctification:]** said Samuel, “Utensils of service sanctify only if they are whole; utensils of service sanctify only if they are full; utensils of service sanctify only if they are filled on the inside [Freedman: but if flour is heaped up on the outside of a utensil of service, it is not sanctified].”
- B. *Some say*, “Utensils of service sanctify only if they are full, whole, filled on the inside.”
- C. *What is the difference between these two formulations?*
- D. *At issue between them is the status of the overflow of measures* [specifically, is the overflow sanctified? If only the inside sanctifies, then the overflow is not (Freedman)].
- E. *In a Tannaite formulation it was repeated as follows:*
- F. Utensils of service sanctify only if they are whole, full, on the inside, and within.
- G. Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “That rule [that the utensil has to be filled] applies only if the priest’s plan was not to add more; but if the priest’s plan was to add more, then as each drop falls into the utensil, it is sanctified.”
- H. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. “Both of them filled with fine flour:” “filled” means “complete.”
- J. Said R. Yosé, “When would that qualification pertain? That rule [that the utensil has to be filled] applies only if the priest’s plan was not to add more; but if the priest’s plan was to add more, then as each drop falls into the utensil, it is sanctified.”

III.1 A. Utensils for liquids do not sanctify that which is dry, and measures for drystuffs do not sanctify that which is liquid:

- B. Said Rab, and some say, R. Assi, “The effect of the sanctification described herein is not to permit the offering of what is in the utensil, but it is to sanctify what is in the utensil so that it is disqualified [so that if it is removed from the Temple courtyard or made unclean in some way, it is disqualified and can no longer be used for a meal offering (Freedman)].”
- C. *There are those who repeat as a Tannaite formulation that statement in connection with the following:*
- D. **They do not bring meal offerings and drink offerings, the meal offering that goes with an animal sacrifice, or first fruits, from produce from which tithes have not been taken, or from produce from which only first tithe has been taken, first tithe from which the heave offering has not been taken, second tithe, produced that was sanctified and then not redeemed, produce that has been mixed up with heave offering, new crops before the omer was offered on the sixteenth of Nisan, or produce which was grown in the seventh year. And if one brought meal offerings and drink offerings from such sources, lo, these are invalid. And one need hardly add, one does not bring meal offerings and drink offerings from produce that is subject to the restrictions of orlah or from produce that is prohibited by reason of sanctification as mixed seeds in**

a vineyard [T. Menahot 8:30C-E]. And if one did bring such, it is not sanctified.

- E. Said Rab, and some say, R. Assi, “The effect of the sanctification described herein is not to permit the offering of what is in the utensil, but it is to sanctify what is in the utensil so that it is disqualified [so that if it is removed from the Temple courtyard or made unclean in some way, it is disqualified and can no longer be used for a meal offering (Freedman)].”

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

- B. **Utensils of service that were perforated — they do not melt them and they do not melt lead into them, and they do not grind away the blemish. A knife that broke off — they do not restore it. And they do not grind away its blemish. Abba Saul says, “A knife was causing terefah-blemishes, and they gave orders concerning it to hide it away” [T. Men. 9:22A-B, 9:23A-C].**

III.3. *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. As to priestly vestments, they are not to be sewn but are to be woven [directly into garments (Freedman)], as it is said, “of woven work” (Exo. 28:32).
- C. If they were dirtied, they are not to be washed with natron or with harsh soap.
- D. *But may they be washed in water?*
- E. *Said Abbaye, “This is the sense of the rule: if they required only being rinsed off [being only slightly soiled (Freedman)], they may also launder them with natron or with harsh soap. [88B] But if they had to be laundered with natron or with harsh soap, one may not launder them only through rinsing in water.”*
- F. Others say, “They are not to be washed at all, because there is no admission of poverty in a place that represents wealth.”

III.4. *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The whole of the priestly robe was blue, as it is said, “And he made the robe of the ephod of woven work, all of blue” (Exo. 39:22).
- C. How were the skirt made? It was blue wool, purple wool, and crimson thread, twisted together, that was brought and manufactured into the shape of pomegranates, the mouths of which had not yet opened; and in the shape of the cones of helmets for children’s heads. Seventy-two bells with seventy-two clappers were presented and hung on it, thirty-six on each side.
- D. R. Dosa says in the name of R. Judah, “Thirty-six, eighteen on each side.”
- E. Said R. Inyani bar Sasson, “The dispute here has its parallel in the dispute concerning the colors that mark the skin-ailment, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **as to the colors that mark the skin-ailment, R. Dosa b. Harkinas said, ‘There are thirty-six.’ Aqabia b. Mahallel said, ‘They are eighteen’ [M. Neg. 1:4].**”

III.5. *A. And said R. Inyani bar Sasson, “Why are the passages that concern the sacrificial offerings [Lev. 7] and concerning the priestly vestments [Lev. 8] set side by side? It is to tell you: just as the sacrifices effect atonement, so do the priestly vestments effect atonement.*

- B. “The coat effects atonement for the shedding of blood: ‘And they killed a he goat and dipped the coat in the blood’ (Gen. 37:31).

- C. "The underpants atoned for lewdness: 'And you shall make them linen breeches to cover the flesh of their nakedness' (Exo. 28:42).
- D. "The miter effected atonement for arrogance."
 - E. (How do we know that?
 - F. Said R. Hanina, "Let an article of clothing that is worn high up come and effect offence for holding one's nose in the air.")
- G. "The girdle effected atonement for impure meditations of the heart, corresponding to the place at which it was located.
- H. "The breastplate effected atonement for neglecting the civil laws: 'And you shall make a breastplate of judgment' (Exo. 28:15).
- I. "The ephod effected atonement for idolatry: 'without ephod there are teraphim' (Hos. 3: 4).
- J. "The robe effected atonement for slander."
 - K. (How do we know that?
 - L. Said R. Hanina, "Let an article that carries sound [being fringed with bells] come and effect atonement for a sin that is committed through making sound [gossip].")
- M. "The headplate effected atonement for brazenness: 'And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead' (Exo. 28:38), and of brazenness it is written, 'Yet you had a harlot's forehead' (Jer. 3: 3)."
- N. *Is that so? But has not* R. Joshua b. Levi said, "For two matters we do not find a means of effecting atonement through sacrifices, but we find a means of effecting atonement in another way altogether, and these are they: bloodshed and gossip. Bloodshed is atoned through the heifer the neck of which is broken [Deu. 21: 1-9], and gossip through incense"?
- O. *For R. Hananiah repeated as a Tannaite formulation*, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the burning of incense effects atonement? As it is said, 'And he put on the incense and made atonement for the people' (Num. 17:12)."
- P. *And so too did the household of R. Ishmael teach as a Tannaite formulation*, "For what does incense atone? It is for gossip. Let what is offered away from public view come and effect atonement for a sin that is committed out of public view."
- Q. *The proposal for atonement for slander contradicts the statement on that same matter, and the proposal for atonement for bloodshed likewise contradicts the statement on that same matter!*
- R. *There is no contradiction. The statement on bloodshed does not contradict the other, for in the one case, the murderer is known, while in the other [the heifer] the murderer is not known.*
- S. *But if the murderer is known, he is subject to the death penalty!*
- T. *The sense is, where the act of murder was deliberate, but correct admonition was not delivered [there would be no execution, and that is where this mode of atonement in behalf of the community was carried out].*

- U. *The statement on gossip does not contradict the other, for in the one case, it was done away from public view, in the other, it was done in public view [and that is the gossip for which the robe effects atonement].*