

VII.

BAVLI PESAHI CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 74A-86B

7:1-2B

7:1

- A. How do they roast the Passover offering?
- B. They bring a spit of pomegranate wood,
- C. and stick it through [the carcass] from the mouth to the buttocks.
- D. “And one puts its legs and entrails inside it,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- E. R. Aqiba says, “That would be a kind of cooking. But one hangs them outside [the carcass].”

7:2A-B

- A. They do not roast the Passover offering either on a [metal] spit or on a grill.
- B. Said R. Sadoq, “M’S H B: Rabban Gamaliel said to Tabi his servant, ‘Go and roast the Passover offering for us on a grill.’”
- I.1 A. [They bring a spit of pomegranate wood:] *But why not use a spit made of metal?*
- B. *Since, when part of it is hot, the whole of it is hot, part of the beast is roasted by the spit, while the All-Merciful has said, “roast with fire” (Exo. 12: 8) — not roasted on account of some other cause.*
- C. *But why not use a spit of palm wood?*
- D. *Since it has grooves, it yields sap, and that would be like boiling the lamb.*
- E. *Why not use fig wood?*
- F. *Since it has an empty center, it exudes water, so it’s like boiling the lamb.*
- G. *Why not use oak wood, or carob, or sycamore wood?*
- H. *Since these have knots, they exude water.*
- I. *But pomegranate wood also has knots.*
- J. *But its knots are smooth. Or, if you prefer, I shall say, this refers to the shoot of the first year’s growth, which has no knots.*
- K. *But what about the point where the cut is made?*

L. *The householder shoves the cut outside of the animal's carcass.*

I.2. A. *Our Mishnah-passagage does not accord with R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Judah says, "Just as a spit made of wood isn't burned [by the fire, being inside the carcass], so a spit made of metal doesn't boil the meat."

C. They said to him, "But if this is heated in part, the whole of it gets hot, but the other, if part is hot, the whole is not."

II.1 A. **and stick it through [the carcass] from the mouth to the buttocks:**

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. R. Ishmael calls it, "Tokh tokh" [when the knees are put inside, it makes the sound of boiling (Freedman)].

D. R. Tarfon calls it, "A helmeted goat."

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

B. **What is the definition of a helmeted goat, which these days is forbidden for eating on the night of Passover? It is any the whole of which is roasted at once. If a limb was cut from it, or if a limb was boiled, it is not a helmeted goat [T. Yom Tob (=Besah) 2:15].**

C. *Now that you have said that, if a limb was cut from it, even if one roasted it together with the carcass, it is not a helmeted goat, then if a limb is boiled does it have to be said that the rule is the same?*

D. Said R. Sheshet, "It means, he boiled it while it was attached."

II.3. A. *Said Rabbah, "A stuffed lamb is permitted."*

B. *Said to him Abbaye, "But lo, it absorbs the blood [from the meat stuffing, when the whole is roasted (Freedman)]!"*

C. He said to him, "As it absorbs, it exudes."

D. *May we say that the following supports his reply: and stick it through [the carcass] from the mouth to the buttocks? Now what's the operative consideration? Isn't it because we invoke the principle, As it absorbs, it exudes?*

E. *Say: that case is exceptional, since there is the place where the cut of the slaughter is made, which is hollow, [74B] the blood does ooze out.*

F. *May we say that the following supports his reply: The heart: one cuts it open and takes out its blood. If he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account [M. Hul. 8:3F-H]? Now what's the operative consideration? Isn't it because we invoke the principle, As it absorbs, it exudes?*

G. *That case is different, because it is smooth [Freedman: and won't absorb, so that even if it were boiled in a pot, it would be permitted, though there that it is not directly over the fire we cannot say, so it exudes].*

H. *But lo, Rabin the Elder put a dough-paste over a roasted pigeon for Rab, and Rab said to him, "If the paste is good, give it to me and I'll eat it"!* [Freedman: paste absorbs blood from the roasted pigeon, since he wanted to eat it, he must have known that it re-exudes it.]

I. *Sure, but that was a paste of fine flour, which crumbles [so the blood oozes out].*

- J. *But lo, Raba came to the household of the exilarch, and they put a paste of dough over a roasted duck for him. He said, "If I didn't see that it is as clear as white glass, I wouldn't eat it." Now, if you suppose that the operative principle is, As it absorbs, it exudes, why insist that it be clear? It should be permitted even if it isn't clear!*
- K. *In that case, it was prepared with white flour, so the paste is compact.*
- L. *And the decided law is: a paste of finest flour, whether it is red or not, is permitted [Freedman: even if it looks red, we assume the blood that the paste has absorbed has oozed out, leaving a mere color]; if it is of white flour, if it is as clear as white glass, it is permitted, if not, forbidden; if the paste is of any other flours, if it looks red, it is forbidden; if it doesn't look red, it is permitted.*
- M. *As to a stuffed lamb, he who forbids it forbids it even if the mouth is at the bottom, and he who permits it does so even if the mouth is up top.*
- N. *And the law is: a stuffed lamb is permitted, even if the mouth is up top.*

II.4. *A. Raw meat, eggs, and the jugular vein: there is a dispute on that matter involving R. Aha and Rabina —*

- B. *through the rest of the entire Torah, R. Aha takes a strict position, Rabina takes the lenient position, and the decided law accords with Rabina's lenient position, except in respect to these three, in which case R. Aha takes the lenient position and Rabina the stringent one, but the law accords with R. Aha, thus —*
- C. *As to raw meat: if it turns red, if one cuts and salts it, it is permitted even for a pot; if one impales it on a spit over fire, it is permitted, because the blood will certainly ooze out.*
- D. *If one placed it on coals, R. Aha and Rabina —*
- E. *one forbids, the other permits.*
- F. *The one who forbids maintains that the fire binds the blood [so it doesn't ooze out], and the one who permits maintains that the fire draws the blood out.*
- G. *And the decided law is: the fire draws the blood out.*
- H. *As to eggs: if he cut and salted them, they are permitted even for a pot. If he suspended them from a spit, they are permitted, since the blood certainly oozes out.*
- I. *If one placed it on coals, R. Aha and Rabina —*
- J. *one forbids, the other permits.*
- K. *The one who forbids maintains that the fire binds the blood [so it doesn't ooze out], and the one who permits maintains that the fire draws the blood out.*
- L. *So too with the throat portion that holds the cut jugular veins: if he cut and salted it, it is permitted even for a pot. If he suspended it on a spit, the place of the cut on the down side, it is permitted, because the blood oozes out.*
- M. *If one placed it on coals, R. Aha and Rabina —*

- N. *one forbids, the other permits.*
- O. *The one who forbids maintains that the fire binds the blood [so it doesn't ooze out], and the one who permits maintains that the fire draws the blood out.*
- P. *And the decided law is: the fire draws the blood out.*

II.5. A. *Raw met that turns red — its serum is forbidden.*

- B. *If it doesn't turn red, its serum is permitted.*
- C. *Rabina said, "Even if it doesn't turn red, the serum is forbidden, since it surely contains streaks of blood."*
- D. *Said Mar bar Amemar to R. Ashi, "Father would drink it."*
- E. *Others say, "He himself drank it."*

6. A. *Said Mar bar Amemar to R. Ashi, "Vinegar that has been used one time for contracting meat [to bind the blood vessels and the blood] — father wouldn't use it again for the same purpose [since it loses its power to do that]."*

- B. *How does it differ, then, from weak vinegar, which may be used for that purpose?*
- C. *In that case [75A] [Freedman:] the tartness of the fruit is present in its natural state, in this case, the tartness of the fruit is not present in its natural state.*

III.1 A. **They do not roast the Passover offering either on a [metal] spit or on a grill.**
Said R. Sadoq, "M'SH B: Rabban Gamaliel said to Tabi his servant, 'Go and roast the Passover offering for us on a grill:'"

- B. *So is the purpose of the precedent to contradict the rule?!*
- C. *The formulation is flawed, and this is the correct statement of the Tannaite rule:*
- D. **[They do not roast the Passover offering either on a [metal] spit or on a grill.]**
But if the grill was perforated, it is permitted. Said R. Sadoq, "M'SH B: Rabban Gamaliel said to Tabi his servant, 'Go and roast the Passover offering for us on a perforated grill.'"

III.2. A. *R. Hinena bar Idi asked this question of R. Abba bar Ahbah: "In the case of an oven that was fired up with the shells of nuts of a tree in the first three years of its growth, and which one swept out, and in which one then baked bread — what is the law in the opinion of the one who forbids the use of such bread [that is, in line with the view of Rabbi in the following: If a loaf of bread was baked in that oven — Rabbi says, "The bread is forbidden." And sages say, "The bread is permitted." If he baked the loaf on the coals, all concur that it is permitted]?"*

- B. *He said to him, "The bread is permitted."*
- C. *He said to him, "But R. Hinena the Elder said R. Assi said R. Yohanan [said], 'An oven that one heated up and then swept out, in which one roasted a Passover — this is not regarded as roasted in fire, as it is said, "roast with fire" two times [at Exo. 12: 8, 9, so the fire must do the roasting, not merely the heat].' So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has exposed the matter by repeating twice, 'roast with fire,' so if the All-Merciful had not revealed it, I might have said, it really is 'roast with fire.'"*
- D. *He said to him, "Well, the All-Merciful did expose that point in that case, and we derive from that case by analogy the rule governing other situations. If you prefer, I shall say, there, indeed, the operative consideration is that the All-*

Merciful has exposed the matter by repeating twice, ‘roast with fire,’ so if the All-Merciful had not revealed it, I might have said, the All-Merciful has expressed meticulous concern about fire, with the result that, even if he swept it out, that too would constitute being ‘roast with fire,’ but here, the All-Merciful has rejected the use of forbidden fuel, and that consideration now is not present.”

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

- B. If one cut the Passover offering [without dividing it up] and put it on live coals —
- C. Rabbi says, “I say that this falls into the classification of ‘roast with fire.’”
- D. *Objected R. Ahadeboi bar Ammi to R. Hisda, “But did Rabbi make the statement that live coals are classified as fire? And by contrast:*
- E. **“or when there will be a burning by fire on the skin of the flesh’ (Lev. 13:24)**
—
- F. **“I know only that this is the case when one is smitten on the flesh.**
- G. **“How do I know that, if one is smitten by a burning coal or by an ash or by boiling lime, or by boiling gypsum and anything on account of fire, this is a burning?**
- H. **“Scripture says, ‘A burning’ (Lev. 13:24), ‘a burning’ (Lev. 13:24) — as an inclusionary clause [Sifra CXXXVII.4/Parashat Negaim Perek 7].**
- I. *“So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has used the augmentative language, ‘A burning’ (Lev. 13:24), ‘a burning’ (Lev. 13:24) — as an inclusionary clause. So then, if the All-Merciful had not used the augmentative language, ‘A burning’ (Lev. 13:24), ‘a burning’ (Lev. 13:24) — as an inclusionary clause, coals would not have been classified as fire.”*
- J. *He said to him, “It was not necessary for Scripture to find inclusionary language to cover coals of wood, but a verse of Scripture was necessary to address the case only of coals of metal.”*

III.4. A. *So are coals of metal not classified as fire? But lo, with respect to a priest’s daughter who committed adultery, concerning whom it is written, “she shall be burned with fire” (Lev. 21: 9), said R. Mattenah, “They made her a lead wick”!*

- B. That case is exceptional, for Scripture has said, “she shall be burned with fire”(Lev. 21: 9), with “she shall be burned” serving to encompass every kind of burning that derives from fire.
- C. And all the more so, fire itself! So let’s surround her with bundles of faggots and burn her up?
- D. The meaning of “burning” derives from the use of the word “burning” that pertained to the sons of Aaron. Just as in that case, it involved the burning of the breath, while the body remained, so here too, it is the burning of the breath, while the body remained.
- E. *Well, then, why not make for her boiled water heated by fire?*
- F. Because of what R. Nahman said, for R. Nahman said, “Said Scripture, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself’ (Lev. 19:18) means, select for him a suitable form of the death penalty.”
- G. *Well, then, since we have in hand what R. Nahman has said, what need do I have for an argument by verbal analogy?*

H. *Say: if it were not from the argument by verbal analogy, I might have thought that, if the breath is burned up but the body remains, that is not a form of burning; and if I had to rely solely on what R. Nahman has said, I might have supposed, let's use lots of bundles of faggots for her, so she'll die quickly. Therefore the argument by verbal analogy tells us that that is not the case.*

I. *Then what's the point of "she shall be burned with fire"?*

J. *It is to exclude boiling lead that comes right from its source.*

III.5. A. *Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zira, "So is it the fact, then, that in any context in which it is written, 'she shall be burned with fire,' it is meant to encompass any form of burning that is produced by fire? And lo, with reference to the sacrificial bullocks, which were burned, in which case, it is written, 'and the priest shall burn it on wood with fire' (Lev. 4:12), nonetheless, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'and the priest shall burn it on wood with fire' (Lev. 4:12) — and not by boiling lime, or by boiling gypsum!"*

B. *He said to him, "But how are the cases parallel! There 'with fire' is written first, then, 'she shall be burned; so that is to include any kind of burning that fire produces; here, it is written, 'and he shall burn it on wood with fire,' and 'with fire' comes at the end to indicate, only fire is permitted, but nothing else."*

C. *"In that case too, burning is written at the end, for it is written, [75B] 'where the ashes are poured out shall it be burned' (Lev. 4:12)."*

D. *"Say: "That 'it shall be burned' is required in line with what has been taught on Tannaite authority: "it shall be burned" even if there are no ashes there; "it shall be burned" even if he made the fire catch onto the greater part of it."*

III.6. A. [Reverting to 3.D,] *Rabina said, "Unite them and repeat the Tannaite rule as follows: 'a burning by fire: I know only that if it was burned by fire or with a coal [that it is valid]. [Freedman: coal is implied by the term 'fire,' not deriving from the repeated reference to burning.] If it was burned with hot ashes, boiling lime, boiling gypsum, or anything made by fire, including hot water heated by fire, how do we know that it is valid? Scripture repeats 'burning' twice, to amplify the category."*

B. *Raba raised this contradiction: "So did Rabbi say that coals are classified as fire? But to the contrary:*

C. *"and he shall take a censer full of coals of fire' (Lev. 16:12) —*

D. *"Might one think that they were merely glowing?*

E. *"Scripture says, 'of fire.'*

F. *"Since Scripture says 'fire,' might one suppose that it was in flames?*

G. *"Scripture says, 'coals of fire.'*

H. *"How so?*

I. *"It was to be smouldering.*

J. *"And how do we know that the fire would be null on the coals [and not leap up as flame]?"*

K. *"Scripture says, 'coals' [Sifra CLXXVIII:L3/Parashat Aharé Mot Pereq 3]."*

L. *But there is a contradiction in the body of the formulation. First you say,*

- M. **“and he shall take a censer full of coals of fire’ (Lev. 16:12) —**
- N. **“Might one think that they were merely glowing? So that proves that brightly burning coals are classified as fire. But then the passage proceeds to say:**
- O. **“Since Scripture says ‘fire,’ might one suppose that it was in flames?**
- P. **“Scripture says, ‘coals of fire.’ So that proves that even brightly burning coals are not classified as fire!”**
- Q. *“And said R. Sheshet, ‘This is the sense of the Tannaite formulation:*
- R. *“Since Scripture says, ‘coals,’ you might think that both smouldering and brightly burning coals can be used. Therefore Scripture says, ‘fire.’ Since Scripture says ‘fire,’ you might think the flame must be brought, so coals is said. How so? He must bring brightly burning coals.’ So, one way or the other, coals are not classified as fire, and that is a problem for Rabbi!”*
- S. *Said Abbaye, “Here is the solution to the problem:*
- T. *“‘coals...’ you might think, quenched but not brightly burning. Scripture states, ‘fire.’ If ‘fire,’ you might think, he can bring either a flame or a coal, as he wishes; so ‘coals of fire’ is stated. How so? He must bring brightly burning coals.”*
- U. *Said Raba, “‘you might think, he can bring either a flame or a coal, as he wishes’?! But how can there be a flame without a coal? That is only if one puts oil in a utensil and lights a fire in it. So why do I need a verse of Scripture to exclude such a procedure, since, after all, you would not do such a thing before a mortal king, all the more so is it forbidden before the Holy One, blessed be he.”*
- V. *Rather, said Raba, “Here is the solution to the problem:*
- W. *“‘coals...’ you might think, quenched but not brightly burning; Scripture states, ‘fire.’ If ‘fire,’ you might think, he can bring half coal and half flame, so that by the time he carries the flame inside the Holy of Holies, it is all coal; therefore it is said, ‘and he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from all the altar’ — at the moment they are taken off the altar, they must be coals.”*

III.7. A. *The question was raised:* Is the word ‘omemot [alef] or omemot [‘ayin]?

B. Said R. Isaac, “‘The cedars in the garden of God could not darken [amamuhu] it’ (Ezekiel 31: 8).”

7:2C-E-7:3

7:2C-E

- C. [If] it touched the earthenware part of an oven, one should scale off that place [which has been roasted by the heat of the oven’s side].
- D. [If] some of its gravy dripped on the earthenware and went back onto it, he must take some [of the meat] away from that place [and burn it].
- E. [If] some of its gravy dripped on the flour, he must take a handful away from that place.

- A. [If] one basted it with oil in the status of heave offering —
- B. if it was an association of priests [who were registered for this offering], they may eat it.
- C. If it was one of Israelites,
- D. if it was [yet] raw, let one rinse it off.
- E. If it was [already] roasted, let one scale off the outer surface.
- F. [If] one basted it with oil in the status of second tithe,
- G. he may not charge its value against the members of the association [registered for that offering].
- H. For they do not redeem second tithe [for funds] in Jerusalem [itself].

I.1 A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If what is hot fell into what is hot [hot milk into hot meat, or hot forbidden meat into hot permitted meat (Freedman)], all parties concur **[76A]** that the mixture is forbidden. If what is cold fell into what is cold, all parties concur that the mixture is permitted.
- C. If what is hot fell into what is cold, or what is cold fell into what is hot —
- D. *Rab said, “The upper prevails”* [if hot falls into cold, the hot heats the cold, and that is as if hot fell into hot, and vice versa (Freedman)].
- E. *And Samuel said, “The lower prevails.”*
- F. *We have learned in the Mishnah: [If] some of its gravy dripped on the earthenware and went back onto it, he must take some [of the meat] away from that place [and burn it].*
- G. *Now, in the assumption that we are dealing with cold earthenware, there is no problem from the perspective of Rab, who has said, “The upper prevails,” and that is why he must take some [of the meat] away from that place [and burn it]. For the gravy goes and heats the earthenware, which in turn heats the gravy, and when the gravy drips back on the lamb, the lamb is roasted at that spot by the heat of the earthenware, while the All-Merciful has said, “roast with fire,” but not roast with something else. But from Samuel’s perspective, maintaining, “The lower prevails,” since the earthenware is cold, it cools the gravy, so why is it the rule that he must take some [of the meat] away from that place [and burn it]?*
- H. *It is in line with what R. Jeremiah said Samuel [said], “It pertains to hot flour,” and here too, it pertains to hot earthenware.*
- I. *We have learned in the Mishnah: [If] some of its gravy dripped on the flour, he must take a handful away from that place. Now in the assumption that the flour is cold, there is no problem from the perspective of Rab, who has said, “The upper prevails,” and that is why he must take a handful away from that place. For it heats the flour around it and the flour then goes and heats it, and the gravy is roast by the heat of the flour, while the All-Merciful has said, “roast with fire,” but not roast with something else. But from Samuel’s perspective, maintaining, “The lower prevails,” since the flour is cold, it cools it; so why is it that he must take a handful away from that place?*

- J. Said R. Jeremiah said Samuel, "It refers to hot flour."
- K. *We have learned in the Mishnah:*
- L. **[If] one basted it with oil in the status of heave offering —**
- M. **if it was an association of priests [who were registered for this offering], they may eat it.**
- N. **If it was one of Israelites,**
- O. **if it was [yet] raw, let one rinse it off.**
- P. **If it was [already] roasted, let one scale off the outer surface.**
- Q. *Now there is no problem from the perspective of Rab, who has said, "The upper prevails," and is why scaling off suffices, since the upper is cold. But from Samuel's perspective, maintaining, "The lower prevails," since it is hot, it absorbs, so why is scaling off sufficient? Let us forbid it entirely?*
- R. *The case of scaling is exceptional, since only a little bit is used.*
- S. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Samuel:*
- T. If hot falls into hot, it is forbidden; if one put cold into hot, it is forbidden; if one put hot into cold or cold into cold, he must wash it off.
- U. "one put hot into cold, he must wash it off" — *but since it's hot, it surely must absorb a bit until it cools, so it should at least require scaling!*
- V. Say: "one put hot into cold, he must scale it off; if he put cold into cold, he must wash it off."
- W. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- V. Hot meat that fell into hot milk, and so too, cold that fell into hot — it is forbidden. If hot fell into cold or cold into cold, one washes it off.
- X. "If hot fell into cold, one washes it off" — *but since it's hot, it surely must absorb a bit until it cools, so it should at least require scaling!*
- Y. Say: "hot into cold — he must scale it off; if it is cold into cold, he must wash the meat."

I.2. A. The master has said: "or cold into cold, one washes it off" —

- B. Said R. Huna, "They have repeated that rule only to cover a case in which he hadn't salted the meat, but if he'd salted it, it is forbidden. For said Samuel, 'Salted meat is in the status of hot; what is preserved in vinegar is in the status of what is boiled.'"
- C. *Said Raba, "As to the statement of Samuel, 'Salted meat is in the status of hot,' we have made that statement only in connection with what cannot be eaten because it is too salty [until the salt is washed off], but if it can be eaten despite the salt, that is not the rule."*

I.3. A. *A young pigeon fell into a jug of relish that had milk in it [Freedman]. R. Hinena b. Raba of Pashrunayya permitted it. Said Raba, "Who is smart enough to permit such a thing, if not R. Hinena b. Raba of Pashrunayya. For he is an eminent authority. For he can say to you, 'Under what circumstances did Samuel make the statement, "Salted meat is in the status of hot"? It is only in connection with what cannot be eaten because it is too salty [until the salt is washed off], but if it can be eaten despite the salt, that is*

not the rule.’ *And that is the case only if it is raw, but if it is roast, it has to be scaled; and that is said only if it has no splits [in which case scaling is fine] but if it has splits, it is forbidden. And if it is seasoned with condiments, it is forbidden.*”

- I.4.** A. Said Rab, **[76B]** “Fat meat of a properly slaughtered animal that was roasted along with lean meat of carrion is forbidden. *How come? Because they fatten each other.*”
- B. And Levi said, “Even lean meat of a properly slaughtered animal that one roasted with fat meat of carrion is permitted. *How come? Because it’s nothing more than a fragrance, and fragrance is insubstantial.*”
- C. *Levi made a practical decision along these lines at the household of the exilarch in the case of a goat mixed with pig meat [permitting the mixture].*
- D. *An objection was raised: **They don’t roast two Passover offerings together in the same oven, because of the mixture [T. Pisha 5:11].** Doesn’t that mean, the mixture of flavors, and that would present a contradiction to Levi?*
- E. *No, it means, the mixture of their carcasses. And that stands to reason. For since the concluding Tannaite rule states, **even a kid and a lamb**, then, if you say that the operative consideration is the mixture of their carcasses, then that explains why the Tannaite rule encompasses, **even a kid and a lamb**. But if you say that it is because of the mixture of flavors, then what difference does it make to me if it is a kid and a lamb or if it is a kid and a kid?*
- F. *So what’s the upshot? You have to say, it is forbidden only because of the mixing of the carcasses, but as to the mixing of flavors, it is permitted. ?*
- G. *But then may we not say that that refutes the position of Rab?*
- H. *Said R. Jeremiah, “Here with what situation do we deal? It is one in which he roasted them in two pots.”*
- I. *Two pots?! Can you think so? Rather, say: it is as if they were roasted in two pots, and this is the intent of his statement: **They don’t roast two Passover offerings together in the same oven, because of the mixture.** What is the mixture? It is the mixture of flavors. And even in the case of roasting them as if in two pots, in which case there is no mixture of flavors, it is still forbidden, because of the mixture of the carcasses, and even a kid and a lamb may not be roasted together.*
- J. *Said R. Mari, “It is in accord with the following Tannaite dispute:*
- K. **“One who scrapes hot bread [from the side of an oven] and places it on top of a jug of wine in the status of heave offering —**
- L. **“R. Meir deems [the bread] forbidden [for consumption by non-priests]**
- M. **“But R. Judah deems [it] permitted.**
- N. **“R. Yosé deems [it] permitted in [the case of] bread made from wheat, but deems [it] forbidden in [the case of] bread made from barley, for barley absorbs [the wine vapor] [M. Ter. 10:3A-F].**
- O. *“Is it not the case that there is a Tannaite dispute, then, so that what is at issue among them is this: one authority that fragrance is a matter of substance, and the other maintains that that fragrance is not a matter of substance?”*

- P. *From Levi's perspective, it is certainly subject to dispute among Tannaite authorities. But from Rab's perspective do we say that that is the case?*
- Q. *Rab may say to you, "All parties concur that fragrance is a matter of substance, but in connection with what R. Judah said, was it not stated: 'said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "When at issue here are a hot loaf of bread and an open jug, all parties concur that it is forbidden. When at issue are a cold loaf of bread and a sealed jug, all parties concur that it is permitted. The dispute concerns only a case in which the loaf of bread is hot but the jug is sealed, or the loaf of bread is cold but the jug is open."' And in the case to which I make reference, the parallel is to a loaf that is hot and a jug that is open."*
- I.5.** A. *R. Kahana b. R. Hinena the Elder repeated as a Tannaite rule: "A loaf of bread that one baked with roasted meat in the oven is forbidden for consumption with a relish that has milk in it."*
- B. *There was a fish baked with meat, and Raba of Parziqayya forbade eating it with a relish containing milk.*
- C. *Mar bar R. Ashi said, "It is forbidden even to eat it with salt, since that's bad for one's sense of smell and libido."*

7:4

- A. **Five things are offered in a state of cultic uncleanness but are not eaten in a state of cultic uncleanness:**
- B. **(1) the first sheaf of barley presented on the sixteenth of Nisan [omer] [Lev. 23:10], (2) the Two Loaves of Bread [Lev. 23:17], (3) the Show Bread [Lev. 24:51], (4) communal peace offerings [Lev. 23:19], and (5) the goats which are offered at the New Month [Num. 28:15].**
- C. **[But] the Passover offering, which is offered in a state of cultic uncleanness, is eaten in a state of cultic uncleanness,**
- D. **for to begin with it is offered only for eating.**

I.1 A. **Five things:** *excluding what?*

- B. *Excluding the festal offering on the fifteenth of Nisan [or any other festal offering]. For it might have entered your mind to argue, since it is a public sacrifice, and is offered at a fixed season, let it override the restrictions of uncleanness. So we are informed that since there is the possibility of making it up throughout the entire seven days of the festival if it is not presented on the first day, it does not override the prohibitions of the Sabbath, and since, as a matter of fact, it does not override the prohibitions of the Sabbath, it also does not override the prohibition against doing the rite in uncleanness.*
- I.2.** A. *But why not encompass in the Tannaite rule also the goats offered on the festivals [Num. 28:15, etc.]?*
- B. *But the Tannaite formulation does state: communal peace offerings [Lev. 23:19] [and that covers all items in its classification, including the goats].*
- C. *If so, then let him not include the goats which are offered at the New Month as well, for lo, he has made explicit reference to communal peace offerings [and that covers all items in its classification, including the goats].*

D. *Say: [77A] it was necessary for him to make reference to the he-goats of the new moons. For otherwise I might have argued, the language “appointed time” is not written in connection with them [and that is the basis for deducing the rule that public sacrifices of the festival override the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness (Freedman)]. Therefore he informs us that the new moon falls into the category of “an appointed time,” in line with what Abbayye said, for said Abbayye, “The Tammuz of that year [in which the spies went into the Promised Land, Num. 13] was made full [consisting of thirty days], as it is written, ‘He has proclaimed an appointed time against me to crush my young men’ (Lam. 1:15).” [Freedman: the spies set out on the 29th of Sivan; the forty days of the mission ended on the ninth of Ab; their weeping on that night, Num. 14:1, became the forerunner of subsequent lamentation on that date for many generations; Abbayye reads Lam. 1:15 in this way: God caused the new moon, appointed time, of Tammuz in that year to be proclaimed on such a day that their return and the weeping of the people would coincide with the future anniversary of the destruction of the Temple; on this interpretation, the new moon falls into the category of “appointed time.”]*

I.3. A. *Is that to imply, then, that all of the items in the Mishnah, which may be offered in a state of uncleanness, derive from the reference to “appointed time”? How do we know that fact?*

B. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **[Rabbi says,] “What is the meaning of the statement, ‘Thus Moses declared to the people of Israel the appointed feasts of the Lord’ (Lev. 23:44)?**

D. **“The reason is that we have solid proof only that Passover [Exo. 12: 1ff.] and the daily whole offering [Num. 28: 2] override the restrictions of the Sabbath and of uncleanness, since in both cases the language of ‘in its season’ is used [hence specifying that the offering is to be made even on the Sabbath].**

E. **“And as to all other public offerings, how do we know that that is the case?**

F. **“As it is said, ‘These you shall offer to the Lord in your appointed seasons’ (Num. 29:39).**

G. **“As to the waving of the sheaf and what is offered with it, the Two Loaves of bread and what is offered with them, we have up to now had no evidence.**

H. **“Thus, when Scripture says, ‘Thus Moses declared to the people of Israel the appointed feasts of the Lord,’ an appointed time was imposed in all such cases [so that they too are offered even on the Sabbath]” [Sifra CCXXXIX:III.2].**

I.4. A. *Well, then, why do I need individual proofs for each of these items?*

B. *It was necessary to specify them all. For if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the daily whole offering, I might have thought that that is so of the daily whole offering, since it is perpetual and wholly consumed, but the same rule would not apply to the Passover. So we are informed that the rule does apply. And if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the Passover, I might have supposed that that is the rule, since to the Passover applies the penalty of extirpation, but as to the daily whole offering, to the violation of the rules of which extirpation does not apply, I*

might have thought that that is not the case. So we are informed to the contrary.

- B. *And if the All-Merciful had written the rule concerning these two, I might have supposed that that is the case because to both of these there is a stringent aspect, the daily whole offering's being that it is perpetual and wholly burned up, the Passover's being that it is subject to the penalty of extirpation, but as to the other public offerings, I might have thought that that is not the case. So the All-Merciful wrote, "These you shall offer to the Lord in your appointed times."*
- C. *And if the All-Merciful had written only, "These you shall offer to the Lord in your appointed times," I might have supposed that that is the case concerning all other public offerings, which serve to effect atonement, but the first sheaf of barley and the two loaves of bread, which do not serve to effect atonement but only to permit the use of new grain in general, would not be subject to that same rule; so we are informed to the contrary.*
- D. *And if the All-Merciful had made reference to the sheaf of first barley and the two loaves of bread alone, I might have thought that, to the contrary, the sheaf of first barley and the two loaves of bread, which are powerful, since they serve to permit the use of the new grain, are subject to the rule, but that would not be the case for anything else. So we are informed to the contrary.*

I.5. A. *It was taken for granted that all parties concur that considerations of uncleanness are set aside in the case of the community, which explains why the head plate is required to propitiate [in line with Exo. 28:38: "and the head-plate shall be upon Aaron's forehead, and Aaron shall bear the iniquity committed in the Holy Things...and it shall always be upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord]. [Freedman: the iniquity is understood to refer to a case in which a sacrifice accidentally became unclean, and the head-plate atones for it, so that it remains fit. Since we hold that even in the case of a community uncleanness is overridden but not actually permitted, the head-plate is required for propitiation even then.] For there is no Tannaite authority who is known to maintain that uncleanness is wholly permitted in the case of a community offering except for R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *"Whether or not the front-plate is actually on the high priest's forehead, it propitiates," the words of R. Simeon.*
- C. *R. Judah says, "While it is till on his forehead, it propitiates. If it is no longer on his forehead, it does not propitiate."*
- D. *Said R. Simeon to [Judah], "The condition of the high priest on the Day of Atonement will prove the matter. For on that day the front-plate is not on his forehead, and yet it serves to propitiate [and render acceptable sacrifices offered in a state of uncleanness, in line with Exo. 28:36-38]."*
- E. *Said R. Judah to [Simeon], "Omit reference to the Day of Atonement, on which uncleanness affecting the community is permitted [and abrogated. So the case at hand proves nothing.]" [Thus uncleanness affecting the community is treated as null].*

- F. *So it follows that R. Simeon maintains that uncleanness is merely set aside when the community's offering is involved.*
- G. *It was further taken for granted that all parties concur that the head-plate does not propitiate when it comes to edible food. [Freedman: if meat or meal offering that is eaten is made unclean, the offering cannot be completed; the head-plate propitiates only if the blood or handful burned on the altar is made unclean.] For there is no Tannaite authority who is known to maintain that the head-plate does not propitiate when it comes to edible food, except for R. Eliezer, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. R. Eliezer says, "The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten."
- I. R. Yosé says, "The priestly frontlet atones for portions of the offering that may be eaten."
- J. *May we therefore say that our Mishnah-rule is not in accord with R. Joshua, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. "And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood" (Deu. 12:27) —
- L. **R. Joshua says, "If there is no blood, there is no meat, and if there is no meat, there is no blood." [If the one is made unclean, the other is invalid.]**
- M. **R. Eliezer says, "There may be blood, even though there is no valid meat, for it is said, 'And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord your God' (Deu. 12:27). If so, why is it said, 'And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood' (Deu. 12:27)? This is to tell you that just as the blood is presented by being tossed, so the meat is presented by being tossed. So you conclude that there is a space between the ramp on which the priests stood and the altar itself" [T. Zeb. 4:2].**
- N. *Now for R. Joshua too, it is written, "And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord your God" (Deu. 12:27).*
- O. He may say to you, "Lo, alongside it is written, 'and you shall eat the meat' (Deu. 12:27) [so the meat too has to be edible]."
- P. **[77B]** *So what need do I have for these two verses?*
- Q. *One pertains to the burnt offering, the other to peace offerings, and both were required. For if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the burnt offering, I might have thought that the burnt offering is subject to a more stringent rule, since it is wholly burned up on the altar, but peace offerings which are not subject to such a stringent ruling, I might have thought are not subject to the same rule. And if the All-Merciful had made reference to peace offerings, I might have supposed that, to the contrary, the operative consideration is that it is eaten in two forms [the fat being consumed by the altar fire, the meat being consumed partly by the priests and partly by the owner], but in the case of the burnt offering, which is not subject to two forms of consumption, I might have thought that that is not the case. So we are informed to the contrary.*
- R. *And as to R. Eliezer, he also has to address the issue of the verse that states, "and you shall eat the meat" (Deu. 12:27) [so the meat too has to be edible].*
- S. *He will say to you, "That is required to indicate that it is not permitted to eat the meat until the blood has been properly tossed."*

- T. *If so, then why not say the entire verse serves that purpose, so how do we know that the blood is fit even if there is no valid meat?*
- U. *He will say to you, "If so, let the All-Merciful write, 'you shall eat the meat,' and then, 'and the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out,' as it is written at the outset: 'and you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood.' Why put 'blood of your sacrifices' first? It is to imply that the blood is fit to be tossed even if there is no meat, and it is to imply too that the meat may not be eaten until the blood is tossed."*
- V. And R. Joshua?
- W. *It is not permitted to eat the meat until the blood is tossed derives by an argument a fortiori from the case of the sacrificial parts that are to be burned up: if the sacrificial parts, which are not indispensable to eating the meat when they are not available [e.g., if lost or made unclean], yet, if they are indispensable when they are available, then blood, which is indispensable if it is not available [so if it is tossed or made unclean, the rite is ruined], if it is available, how much the more so should it be indispensable to the rite!*
- X. And R. Eliezer?
- Y. *If there is a proposition that can be derived by an argument a fortiori, would Scripture have gone to the trouble of writing it out?*
- Z. And R. Joshua?
- AA. *Wherever there is the possibility of formulating an exegetical basis for a rule, we do so.*
- BB. *[Reverting to the main point:] may we then say that our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with R. Joshua, for, since he maintains that we require both blood and meat to be validly in hand, but the priestly head plate does not propitiate for uncleanness of what can be eaten, how can the offering be presented in a state of uncleanness? [Freedman: propitiation is required, but there is no propitiation for what can be eaten, and from Joshua's view, edibles and blood are interdependent.]*
- CC. *You may even maintain that it does accord with R. Joshua. But R. Joshua takes the view that the priest's head-plate does propitiate for what goes up on the altar [that is, the sacrificial parts, and if as much as an olive's bulk goes up on the altar, the head-plate propitiates for its uncleanness, in which case the blood may be sprinkled].*
- DD. *Well, that settles the matters of offerings, where there is something that goes up on the altar, but as to the sheaf of first barley and the two loaves, there being nothing taken up on the altar, what is to be said?*
- EE. *Say: when R. Joshua makes that statement that we require both, it concerns only animal offerings, but he did not say that is the rule in the case of meal-offerings.*
- FF. *Then did he not say that is the rule in the case of meal-offerings? But haven't we learned in the Mishnah: [If before the handful was offered up] its residue was made unclean, [if] its residue was burned, [if] its residue was lost, in accord with the reasoning of R. Eliezer, it is valid, and in accord with the reasoning of R. Joshua, it is invalid [M. Men. 3:4A-B]? [Freedman: so Joshua requires both in the case of meal offerings too.]*

- GG. It is in accord with his reasoning but also not in accord with his reasoning. It is in accord with the reasoning of R. Joshua, *that we do require both*, but not entirely in accord with his reasoning, *for while R. Joshua made that ruling in the case of animal offerings, he did not make the same ruling in the case of meal offerings; for this Tannaite authority maintains that that is the rule even in the case of meal offerings.*
- HH. *And who is the Tannaite authority who concurs with him but imposes a more stringent ruling than he does? And furthermore, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* said R. Yosé, “I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in meal offerings and animal offerings, and the opinion of R. Joshua in in meal offerings and animal offerings.
- II. “I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer animal offerings: for he said, ‘The blood is sprinkled even if there is no valid meat.’
- JJ. “...and the opinion of R. Joshua animal offerings: for he said, ‘If there is no valid blood for sprinkling, then there is no meat for the priests to eat; and if there is no valid meat, then there is no valid blood.
- KK. “I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in meal offerings: for he said, ‘The handful is taken up even if there is no valid residue for the priests to eat.’
- LL. “... and the opinion of R. Joshua in in meal offerings: ‘If there is no valid handful, there is no valid residue, and if there is no valid residue, there is no valid handful.’” [What follows is that Joshua does maintain the same ruling for meal offerings as for animal offerings.]
- MM. *Rather, R. Joshua takes the view that the priestly frontlet propitiates for what goes up on the altar and also for what is edible.*
- NN. *If so, why* “in accord with the reasoning of R. Joshua, it is unfit”?
- OO. *That pertains to what is lost or burned* [if the residue is lost or burned, the handful is unfit; the frontlet propitiates only for what is unclean (Freedman)].
- PP. *Then according to which authority is the Tannaite rule, if the residue is unclean? Can it be in accord with R. Eliezer? But that is self-evident. Since you say that even if it is lost or burned, that is, not existing at all, R. Eliezer declares the handful fit, is it necessary to say the rule for a case in which it is made unclean, when, after all, it is in existence? So the Tannaite rule must accord with R. Joshua, and yet he teaches that it is unfit!* [Freedman: on his view this is necessary, since it tells us that he holds the handful unfit not only if the rest is now entirely non-existent, but even if the rest is in existence but unclean.]
- QQ. *And furthermore, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- RR. R. Joshua says, “With respect to all other offerings that are specified in the Torah, whether the offering contracted uncleanness at the sacrificial fat, while the meat remained valid, the priest sprinkles the blood, or the offering contracted uncleanness at the meat but the sacrificial fat is intact, the priest sprinkles the blood.” *But if both of them have contracted uncleanness, that is not the case. Therefore R. Joshua takes the view that the priestly frontlet does not propitiate either for what goes up on the altar or for edibles.*
- SS. *Rather: in point of fact our Mishnah-paragraph does concur with R. Joshua, but there is no problem still: in the one case, we speak of the rule governing to begin*

with, in the other, after the fact. R. Joshua maintains that both are required only to begin with, but not if the offering has been made. [If only the blood was clean and it was sprinkled, though that should not have been done, after the fact that is valid.]

- UU. *And how do you know that R. Joshua makes a distinction between what is done to begin with and what is done after the fact?*
- VV. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- WW. *If the meat was made unclean or unfit, or if it was taken outside of the curtains,*
- XX. *R. Eliezer says, "The priest sprinkles the blood."*
- YY. *R. Joshua says, "He does not sprinkle the blood."*
- ZZ. *But R. Joshua concedes that if he has sprinkled it, it is accepted.*
- AAA. *But, by way of objection, first of all, "invalid" bears the sense of "after the fact as well," and, furthermore, the language, **Five things are offered in a state of cultic uncleanness but are not eaten in a state of cultic uncleanness**, bears the implication, to begin with!*
- BBB. **[78A]** *Rather: there is no problem still: the one speaks of an offering of an individual, the other, an offering of the community. [An unclean offering to begin with may be presented in behalf of the community.]*
- I.6.** A. *Our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of R. Yosé, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. *R. Eliezer says, "The priestly frontlet atones for portions of the offering that may be eaten."*
- C. *R. Yosé says, "The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten."*
- D. *It is assumed that, since R. Yosé holds, "The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten," he concurs with R. Joshua, who has said that we require both blood and meat. So may we therefore maintain that our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of R. Yosé?*
- E. *Not at all. R. Yosé concurs with R. Eliezer, who has said, "The blood is sprinkled even if there meat is not available."*
- F. *If so, then for what legal purpose does he take the position, "The priestly frontlet does not atone for portions of the offering that may be eaten"? [The blood can be sprinkled one way or the other (Freedman).]*
- G. *And, from your own reasoning, when R. Eliezer says, "The head-plate does propitiate [for uncleanness of what can be eaten]," since he has said that the blood may be sprinkled even though there is no meat, for what purpose does the priestly frontlet atone for edibles?*
- H. *Rather, they differ in regard to assigning to the offering the unfitness of refuse and excluding it from the law of sacrilege. R. Eliezer maintains that, since the priestly frontlet propitiates for the uncleanness of the meat and makes it as though it were clean, the offering is in the status of refuse [there being no other disqualification] and therefore is not subject to the law of sacrilege, and R. Yosé maintains that the priestly frontlet does not propitiate, and does not render it as*

though it were clean; so it cannot be classified as refuse or excluded from the law of sacrilege.

- I. *Objected R. Mari, "Granting that R. Yosé takes the position of R. Eliezer, well, then, there is no problem when it comes to animal offerings [that our Mishnah lists as items offered in uncleanness], there is the blood; as to the first sheaf of barley, there is the handful; as to the show bread, there are the censers of frankincense. But what is to be said about the two loaves" [which are entirely eaten? Yosé says the frontlet doesn't propitiate, so how can they be offered in uncleanness (Freedman).] And should you say, it is in regard to what is offered together with them [that is, slaughtering the sacrifices listed at Lev. 23:18-19 sanctifies the loaves, sprinkling that blood permits eating them, so the Mishnah-rule teaches that the head-plate propitiates for uncleanness of the show bread so far as the sacrifices can now be brought (Freedman)], that is covered by communal peace offerings, in which case, there would be only four items, but the Mishnah-formulation involves five!"*
 - J. *Rather, R. Yosé takes the view that uncleanness is wholly permitted when it comes to communal offerings [and not merely propitiated].*
 - K. *But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - L. *"Both in the case of this one and in the case of that one [the priest who burned the red cow and the high priest], they sprinkle purification water on him all seven days, out of the purification water of all the purification offerings that were there," the words of R. Meir.*
 - M. *R. Yosé says, "They sprinkle on him only on the third and seventh days alone."*
 - N. *Now, if it should enter your mind that R. Yosé takes the view that uncleanness is wholly permitted when it comes to communal offerings [and not merely propitiated], for what do I need sprinkling at all! So clearly our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with R. Yosé.*
- I.7.** A. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, "And does R. Yosé assign a court decision to both contending parties [Eliezer and Joshua]? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: said R. Yosé, 'I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in meal offerings and animal offerings, and the opinion of R. Joshua in in meal offerings and animal offerings.*
- B. *"I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer animal offerings: for he said, 'The blood is sprinkled even if there is no valid meat.'*
 - C. *"...and the opinion of R. Joshua concerning animal offerings: for he said, 'If there is no valid blood for sprinkling, then there is no meat for the priests to eat; and if there is no valid meat, then there is no valid blood.*
 - D. *"I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in meal offerings: for he said, 'The handful is taken up even if there is no valid residue for the priests to eat.'*
 - E. *"... and the opinion of R. Joshua in in meal offerings: 'If there is no valid handful, there is no valid residue, and if there is no valid residue, there is no valid handful.'"*
 - F. *He said to him, "He states what seems logical to him. With reference to animal sacrifices, he said, it stands to reason that, just as they differ in regard to animal sacrifices, so they differ in regard to meal offerings.*

And when he was dealing with meal offerings, he said, it stands to reason that, just as they differ in regard to meal offerings, so they differ in regard to sacrifices as well.”

- G. *He said to him, “Well, that’s o.k. when it comes to animal sacrifices. He said, it stands to reason that, just as they differ in regard to animal sacrifices, so they differ in regard to meal offerings,’ because when the pertinent verses of Scripture are set forth, they are set forth with reference to animal sacrifices. But, when he was dealing with meal offerings, he said, it stands to reason that, just as they differ in regard to meal offerings, so they differ in regard to sacrifices as well — lo, when the pertinent verses of Scripture are set forth, they are set forth with reference to animal sacrifices! Rather, there is no problem. ‘I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in a case in which the sacrificial material was made unclean, and the opinion of R. Joshua in the case in which it was lost or burned.”*
- H. *[He said to him,] “in a case in which the sacrificial material was made unclean: how come? Because the head-plate propitiates? Lo, you have in fact heard that R. Yosé takes the view that the frontlet does not propitiate for edibles! Rather, there still is no problem. ‘I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer in the case of a public offering, and the opinion of R. Joshua in the case of a private offering.”*
- I. *[He said to him,] “In a case of a public offering: how come? Because in the case of a public offering, uncleanness is permitted? But, first of all, you know as fact only that R. Yosé takes the view that in the case of a public offering, uncleanness is permitted, but do you know that he takes the position that uncleanness in the case of a public offering is actually overridden? and, if it speaks of a community, then is it only R. Eliezer who declares it fit, but not R. Joshua? [78B] Lo, you have said, in the matter of a communal offering, even R. Joshua concurs. Rather: ‘I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer after the fact, and the opinion of R. Joshua to begin with. But if the offering was already made, then even R. Joshua concurs, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Joshua concedes that if one has tossed the blood, it is acceptable.”*
- J. *But the one speaks of a case in which the blood was unclean, the other, a case in which it was lost or burned. So, when does the statement apply, R. Joshua concedes that if one has tossed the blood, it is acceptable? That is when the blood was made unclean, but if it was lost or burned up, that is not the case. So, when is it that R. Yosé said, “I accept the ruling of R. Eliezer?” It is after the fact, and when the meat was lost or burned up.*

7:5

- A. **[If] the meat [of the Passover, offered by clean sacrificers] was made unclean but the fat continued [clean],**
- B. **one does not toss the blood.**
- C. **[If] the fat was made unclean but the meat continued [clean],**
- D. **one does toss the blood.**

- E. **And in the case of [other] things which have been consecrated it is not so, but:**
- F. **even though the meat is made unclean, if the fat continued [clean],**
- G. **one does toss the blood,**

- I.1 A. Said R. Giddal said Rab, "If the blood was tossed, the Passover-offering is made acceptable [and no other is required]. *But lo, we require the possibility of eating the meat [and the owner can't eat unclean meat]!"*
- B. *The act of eating is not indispensable to the rite.*
- C. *But lo, it is written, "According to every man's eating you shall make your count for the lamb" (Exo. 12: 4)!*
- D. *That has to do with the proper fulfillment of the religious duty in the best possible manner, but it is still not indispensable.*
- E. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. "Then he and his neighbor next to him shall take one according to the number of souls" (Exo. 12: 4) — this teaches that the animal designated as a Passover offering is slaughtered only in behalf of those who are registered for it.
- G. Might you suppose that if one slaughters the beast in behalf also of those who are not registered for it, he should be classified as one who has violated the religious duty, [which is to say, the offering nonetheless is fit]?
- H. Scripture states, "You shall make your count" (Exo. 12: 4) — in this way Scripture goes over the same matter a second time, to indicate that this provision of the law is indispensable, *and so treated as analogous the matter of those who eat the meat and those who sign up on the beast.*
- I. *Rather, Rab made his statement in accord with the position of R. Nathan, who said, "Eating the Passover offering is not indispensable to the rite."*
- J. *Which statement of R. Nathan is under discussion? Should we say it is the following, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. R. Nathan says, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that every Israelite, all together, may carry out their obligation to the Passover offering on the basis of a single Passover offering? 'And the whole assembly of the congregation shall kill the Passover sacrifice at evening' (Exo. 12: 6) — now does the entire assembly actually slaughter the Passover offering? And is it not the fact that only a single individual does it? But on the basis of this formulation, we learn that every Israelite, all together, may carry out their obligation to the Passover offering on the basis of a single Passover offering."
- L. *But maybe that case is exceptional, because, if some sign off, it is fit for the others, and if others sign off, it is fit for some. So rather, it is the following statement of R. Nathan, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. If one association signed up on the beast, and then another association signed up on it, the former, for whom there is as much as an olive's bulk per person, may eat from that beast and are not required to sacrifice another Passover offering, but the latter, for whom there is not enough for an olive's bulk of meat per person, cannot eat of it and they are required to make another Passover offering.

- N. R. Nathan says, "These and those alike are exempt from having to make another Passover offering. For the blood has already been tossed."
- O. *Still, maybe that case is exceptional, since, if these sign off, it is suitable for the others* [so that it is fit for all, but in this case, it's not fit for anybody (Freedman)].
- P. *If so, let him state as the Tannaite rule: since they are eligible to withdraw. Why use the language, For the blood has already been tossed? That proves that everything depends on sprinkling the blood, and eating the meat is not indispensable to the rite.*

I.2. A. *Now what has forced Rab to interpret our Mishnah to speak of the situation prevailing at the outset, and so in accord with the position of R. Nathan? Why not assign our Mishnah to the authorship of rabbis, and impute the principle that even if the blood was sprinkled post facto it is unfit?*

B. *Rab found a problem in our Mishnah-rule, namely: why use the language, **one does not toss the blood**? Rather say, it is invalid. So that implies, to begin with **one does not toss the blood**, but after the fact, it is perfectly all right to do so.*

I.3. A. *And for what purpose does R. Nathan require the verse, "According to every man's eating you shall make your count for the lamb" (Exo. 12: 4)?*

B. *It is to indicate that we require a man who is capable of eating.*

I.4. A. *In accord with what authority is the following, which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *If one slaughtered the beast in behalf of those who are to eat it but tossed its blood in behalf of those who are not going to eat it, the Passover offering itself is valid, and someone carries out his obligation to make such an offering through that beast.*

C. *Now in accord with which authority is that statement made? Should we say that it is R. Nathan but not rabbis?*

D. *You may even say that it is in accord with rabbis. The intentionality as to who is or is not going to eat the meat of the Passover has no bearing upon the act of tossing the blood.*

I.5. A. *In accord with what authority is the following, which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *Lo, if someone was sick at the time of the act of slaughter but well at the time of tossing of the blood, well at the time of the act of slaughter but sick at the time of the tossing of the blood, they do not slaughter and toss the blood in his behalf — that is done only when he is well enough to eat the meat from the time of slaughtering the beast until the time of tossing the blood.*

C. *Now in accord with which authority is that statement made? Should we say that it is rabbis but not R. Nathan?*

D. *You may even say that it is in accord with R. Nathan. We require a man who is capable of eating.*

I.6. A. *In accord with what authority is the following, which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. If he slaughtered the Passover in a state of cleanness and afterward the owner became unclean, the blood should be tossed in a state of cleanness, but the owner should not eat the meat in a condition of uncleanness.
- C. *Now in accord with which authority is that statement made?*
- D. Said R. Eleazar, "This was taught in the context of a dispute and represents the position of R. Nathan."
- E. *And R. Yohanan said, "You may even say that it represents the view of rabbis, but here, with what case do we deal? It is a communal offering, in which case it may be offered even in a state of uncleanness."*
- F. *If it speaks of a communal offering, then why isn't the meat eaten in a condition of uncleanness?*
- G. It is a precautionary decree, lest the owner contract uncleanness after the tossing of the blood, and people might then say, "Last year weren't we unclean and yet ate the meat? *This year too we will eat it,*" and they won't know that last year the owner was unclean when the blood was sprinkled, but this year the own was clean when the blood was sprinkled.

I.7. A. **[79A]** *And if you prefer, I shall say, Rab [who does not consider eating indispensable to the rite] made his statement in accord with the position of R. Joshua, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Joshua says, "With respect to all other offerings that are specified in the Torah, whether the offering contracted uncleanness at the sacrificial fat, while the meat remained valid, the priest sprinkles the blood, or the offering contracted uncleanness at the meat but the sacrificial fat is intact, the priest sprinkles the blood. In the case of a Nazirite or someone who is offering a Passover, if the fat became unclean and the meat remains, one sprinkles the blood; if the meat became unclean and the fat remained, one doesn't sprinkle the blood. But if he sprinkled the blood, it is accepted. If the owner contracted corpse uncleanness, he should not sprinkle the blood, and if he sprinkled the blood, it is not accepted." [Freedman: eating is not indispensable in general; but here eating is not indispensable, but the people registered for it must be fit to eat it, and Scripture itself has assigned such a person to the second Passover, so Num. 9:10.]

II.1 A. **And in the case of [other] things which have been consecrated it is not so, but: even though the meat is made unclean, if the fat continued [clean], one does toss the blood:**

- B. *In accord with which authority is our Mishnah-rule?*
- C. *It is in accord with R. Joshua, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **R. Joshua says, "All the sacrifices that are mentioned in the Torah of which there remained an olive's bulk of meat and an olive's bulk of fat — the priest sprinkles the blood on its account. If there remained only a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, he does not toss the blood on its account. And in the case of a burnt offering, even if there is a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, one tosses the blood on its account, because in**

any event all of it is suitable for burning. And in the case of a meal offering, if there did not remain of the sacrifice a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, even if the whole meal offering in its entirety remains available, one does not sprinkle the blood on its account. As to the Passover, if there is an olive's bulk for each and every participant, one tosses the blood, and if not, one does not toss the blood" [T. Zeb. 4:3A-F].

II.2. A. *What in the world is the meal offering doing here?*

B. *Said R. Pappa, "It is the meal offering that accompanies drink offerings. It might have entered your mind to suppose that since it is presented along with an animal offering, it is comparable to the body of the animal offering itself. So we are informed that that is not the case [but that it follows its own rule]."*

II.3. A. *What is the source of this rule [that the blood may be sprinkled even though only an olive's bulk of fat remained]?*

B. *Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Ishmael, and some assigned it in the name of R. Joshua b. Hanania, "Said Scripture, 'And he shall burn the fat for a sweet savor to the Lord' (Lev. 17: 6) — that refers to sprinkling the blood on account of the fat, even if there is no valid meat." [Cashdan: "And the priest shall sprinkle the blood...and burn the fat...," which clearly shows that the sprinkling is performed on account of the fat.]*

C. *So we have found the evidence that shows the rule for the fat. As to the rule covering the caul of the liver and the two kidneys?*

D. *It is in line with that which has been repeated as a Tannaite rule:*

E. **And in the case of a meal offering, if there did not remain of the sacrifice a half olive's bulk of meat or a half olive's bulk of fat, even if the whole meal offering in its entirety remains available, one does not sprinkle the blood on its account.**

F. *It is on account of the meal offering that, under such conditions, one does not toss the blood. Lo, in regard to the rule covering the caul of the liver and the two kidneys?*

G. *Said R. Yohanan in his own name said, "[Said Scripture, 'And he shall burn the fat] for a sweet savor to the Lord' (Lev. 17: 6) — that applies to any portion of the beast that produces a sweet savor to the Lord."*

H. *And it was necessary for Scripture to set forth the rule covering the fat and also to set forth the rule covering the sweet savor. For if Scripture had noted the rule covering only the fat, I might have concluded that in the case of the fat the rule pertains, but in the case of the caul of the liver and the two kidneys it does not. So Scripture wrote, "for a sweet savor," to encompass them as well. And if Scripture had written only "for a sweet savor," I might have supposed that that is the case even with the meal offering. So Scripture also included the explicit reference to the fat [to exclude the grain offering].*

7:6

- A. [If] the congregation was made unclean, or the greater part of it,
- B. or if the priests were unclean while the congregation remained clean,
- C. [the Passover offering] is prepared in a state of uncleanness.

- D. [If] a minority of the congregation was made unclean,
- E. those who remain clean keep the first Passover [offering], and those who are unclean keep the second.

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

- B. Lo, if the Israelites were unclean but the priests and utensils of service clean, or if the Israelites were clean and the priests and utensils of service unclean, or even if the Israelites and priests were clean but the utensils of service unclean, they should prepare the Passover offering in a condition of uncleanness, because an offering presented by the community is not divided [with some clean, some unclean; the majority are unclean, so the minority make their presentation in a state of uncleanness as well].

I.2. A. Said R. Hisda, “They have taught that rule only if the slaughtering knife had contracted corpse uncleanness, *for the All-Merciful has said, ‘and whoever touches one slain by the sword’* (Num. 19:16), meaning, — the sword is in the remove of uncleanness of the corpse itself, and so is a generative source of uncleanness. *So it imparts uncleanness to a human being. So to begin with, when the animal is sacrificed, it is sacrificed in a condition in which the person is unclean, and that involves extirpation. But if the knife became unclean by reason of the uncleanness of a dead creeping thing, in which case it imparts uncleanness to the meat alone but not the person, then only those who are clean make the sacrifice, and those who are unclean do not, for it is better eaten when the meat is unclean, which is a mere negative commandment, rather than when the person is unclean, which is a matter of extirpation.*” *That proves R. Hisda takes the view: uncleanness is overridden in the case of a community [overridden, not permitted to begin with]. And that is what R. Isaac said as well, “Uncleanness is overridden in the case of a community [overridden, not permitted to begin with].”*

- B. *And Raba said, “Even the unclean persons also may make the offering. How come? Because it is written, ‘And the meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten; it shall be burned with fire; and as for the meat, every one that is clean may eat of it’* (Lev. 7;19) — *in any passage in which we invoke the language, And the meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten, we also invoke the language, and as for the meat, every one that is clean may eat of it. And in any passage in which we do not invoke the language, And the meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten, we also do not invoke the language, and as for the meat, every one that is clean may eat of it.*” [Freedman: the two are interdependent; since the meat is now eaten unclean, unclean persons may eat it too.]

I.3. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Lo, if the Israelites were half clean and half unclean —
- C. Rab said, “Half and half is resolved as a majority.”
- D. And R. Kahana said, “Half and half is not resolved as a majority.”
- E. Rab said, “Half and half is resolved as a majority.” these make the sacrifice by themselves and those do the same” [at the first Passover, but the clean should not contract uncleanness; each half is a majority, and the majority

that is clean is not to do the sacrifice unclean; but the unclean half doesn't have to keep the second Passover (Freedman)].

F. And R. Kahana said, "Half and half is not resolved as a majority." the clean ones observe the first Passover, the unclean ones the second.

G. *There are those who say:* said R. Kahana, "Half and half is not resolved as a majority." the clean ones observe the first Passover, **[79B]** and the unclean ones do not observe either the first or the second Passover. They do not observe the first Passover, *for they're no majority;* and they do not observe the second, *for they're also no minority."*

H. *We have learned in the Mishnah: [If] the congregation was made unclean, or the greater part of it, or if the priests were unclean while the congregation remained clean, [the Passover offering] is prepared in a state of uncleanness. So only the majority sacrifices in uncleanness, but if it is half and half, they don't make the sacrifice at the first Passover — a challenge to Rab's position!*

I. *Rab may say to you, "When a majority is unclean, everybody sacrifices in a state of uncleanness, but if it is half and half, these observe Passover by themselves, and those by themselves. That stands to reason, since the next clause goes on to say, [If] a minority of the congregation was made unclean, those who remain clean keep the first Passover [offering], and those who are unclean keep the second. So only a minority observes the second Passover, but not when it is half and half; then they sacrifice at the first Passover, these observe Passover by themselves, and those by themselves.*

J. *So isn't that a challenge to the position of R. Kahana?*

K. R. Kahana may say to you, "If a minority of the congregation contracted uncleanness, the clean ones prepare the first Passover, the unclean ones the second. *Lo, if it is half and half,* the clean ones prepare the first Passover, but the unclean ones do not prepare either the first or the second Passover."

L. *Well, that's o.k. with the second version of R. Kahana's statement, but in line with the version in which R. Kahana says, the clean ones observe the first Passover, the unclean ones the second, what is to be said?*

M. *R. Kahana may say to you, "The same law applies: even in the case of half and half, the clean observe the first Passover, the unclean, the second; and as to the Tannaite formulation, [If] a minority of the congregation was made unclean..., since to begin with the Tannaite formulation reads, [If] the congregation was made*

unclean, or the greater part of it, at the end the Tannaite language proceeded to say, [If] a minority of the congregation was made unclean....

- N. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with Rab, it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with both versions of R. Kahana's ruling.*
- O. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with Rab:*
- P. If the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, these prepare the offering by themselves, and those prepare it by themselves.
- Q. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the first version of R. Kahana's ruling:*
- R. **Lo, if half of the Israelites were clean and half unclean, the clean ones observe the first Passover and the unclean ones the second [T. Pisha 6:2C-D].**
- S. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the second version of R. Kahana's ruling:*
- T. Lo, if the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, the clean ones observe the first Passover and the unclean ones do not prepare either the first of the second Passover.
 - U. *Now from the perspective of both Rab and the framer of the second version of R. Kahana's statement, when the Tannaite authority teaches, **the clean ones observe the first Passover and the unclean ones the second**, how are they going to iron out that problem?*
 - V. It would involve a case in which the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, and women made up the number of the unclean [and are counted]. *He takes the view, so far as women's observance of the Passover on the first time around, that is an optional matter, so deduct the women from the number of unclean, and now the unclean are a minority and a minority is postponed to the second Passover.*
 - W. *And from the perspective of Rab and the first version of the opinion of R. Kahana, lo, that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: the unclean ones do not prepare*

either the first of the second Passover, *how are they going to iron out that problem?*

- X. *Rab works it out this way:* it would involve a case in which half of the Israelites were unclean and half clean, and women were added to the clean, forming the majority thereby. *He takes the view,* so far as women's observance of the Passover on the first time around, it is obligatory, but on the second it is optional. *So the unclean ones don't prepare the offering at the first Passover, forming a minority, and a minority of unclean persons would not sacrifice the Passover on the first go around; but they also cannot make the offering at the second Passover, because if you deduct the women from their number, there is now a mixture of half and half, and if they are half unclean and half clean, they don't sacrifice at the second either.*
- Y. *And from the perspective of R. Kahana, who has said that if it is half and half, they do prepare the Passover offering at the second Passover, how is it to be ironed out?*
- Z. It would be a case in which the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, and women made up the number of the half that were clean. *He takes the view,* so far as women's observance of the Passover on the first time around, it is obligatory, but on the second it is optional. *On the first Passover, they don't make the offering, being half and half, and a half doesn't make the offering on the first Passover; on the second Passover, they also don't prepare the offering, since if you take the women off the number of the clean, the unclean are a majority, and a majority of the community that is unclean do not sacrifice on the second Passover [which is reserved for individuals].*
- AA. *And from the perspective of R. Kahana, as to that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:* If the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, these prepare the offering by themselves, and those prepare it by

themselves, *how does he harmonize his position with that law?*

BB. R. Kahana may say to you, “*It is a conflict of Tannaite opinion. There is one who maintains that half against half forms a majority, and there is the view that half against half is not a majority.*”

I.4. A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

B. If the Israelites were half clean and half unclean, these prepare the offering by themselves, and those prepare it by themselves. If the unclean were more numerous than the clean, even by one person, they should observe the offering in a state of uncleanness, since a public sacrifice cannot be divided.

C. R. Eleazar b. Matya says, “An individual cannot overbalance the community as to uncleanness, since it is said, **[80A]** ‘You may not sacrifice the Passover offering at one of your gates’ (Deu. 16: 5) [meaning, you may not sacrifice it on account of one person].”

D. R. Simeon says, “Even if one tribe was unclean and the rest of all the tribes were clean, these go it by themselves and those do it by themselves.”

E. *What is the basis for the position of R. Simeon?*

F. *He takes the view that a single tribe is classified as a community.*

G. R. Judah says, “Even if one tribe is unclean and all the other tribes clean, all of them should make the offering in a state of uncleanness, since a public sacrifice cannot be divided.”

H. *R. Judah takes the view that one tribe is classified as a community, so we have a case of half against half, and, since a public sacrifice cannot be divided, all of them should make the offering in a state of uncleanness.*

I.5. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If half of the Israelites were clean and half unclean —
- C. said Rab, “They impart uncleanness to one of them with a dead creeping thing” [so that the majority is now unclean].
- D. *But why should that be the rule? Why not let this half prepare the offering on its own, and that half do the same? For lo,* said Rab, “These make the sacrifice by themselves and those do the same.”
- E. *Say: here with what case do we deal? It is one in which the unclean were more numerous than the clean by one.*
- F. *If so, then it is a case in which the majority was unclean, so let all of them prepare the offering in uncleanness!*
- G. *He concurs with R. Eleazar b. Matya, who says, “An individual cannot overbalance the community as to uncleanness.”*
- H. *If so, then our problem reverts to center stage: then let these do the rite by themselves and those by themselves! Rather, this is the sense of his statement: if there is a Tannaite authority who concurs with the first Tannaite figure [above], who has said, “If they are half against half, they do not all of them make the offering in uncleanness,” and he also concurs with R. Judah, who has said, “A communal offering is not divided,” then, but only then, let them impart uncleanness to one of them with a dead creeping thing.”*
- I. Ulla said, “They send one of them off on a long trip.”
- J. Well, now, why not just make one of them unclean with a dead creeping thing?
- K. *He takes the view that they slaughter the Passover offering and toss its blood in behalf of an unclean person who suffers uncleanness from a dead creeping thing.*
- L. Why not make him unclean with corpse uncleanness?
- M. Then you would prevent him from offering his festal offering.
- N. *Well, here too, you also prevent him from offering his festal offering.*
- O. *It’s possible for him to present it on the second Passover.*
- P. *Well, here too, it’s possible for him to present it on the on the seventh day, which would be the eighth day after contracting uncleanness.*
- Q. *Ulla takes the view that all of the offerings made on later days serve to compensate for the first day, with the result that, if someone is suitable for making the offering on the first day, he is suitable to do it on all the other days, but anyone who is not suitable to make the offering on the first day is also not suitable to do it on any of the later days.*
- R. *Said R. Nahman to them, “Go, tell Ulla, Who will pay any attention to you so as to pull up his tent pegs and tent and run off? [No one will agree to your proposal anyhow.]”*

I.6. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If most of them were unclean with flux uncleanness [Lev. 15] and a minority were unclean with corpse uncleanness —

- C. said Rab, “Those who had contracted corpse uncleanness do not prepare the Passover on the first Passover or on the second: *they don’t do it on the first, because they are a minority, and the minority that is unclean with corpse uncleanness doesn’t prepare the offering on the first Passover; but they also don’t prepare it on the second, because in any case in which the community prepares the Passover on the first Passover, an individual does it on the second, but in any case in which the community at large doesn’t prepare it on the first Passover, the individual also doesn’t prepare it on the second.*”
- D. *Said Samuel to them, “Go, tell Abba: ‘Let the children of Israel keep the Passover in its appointed season’ (Num. 9: 2) — how do you deal with that verse?”*
- E. *He said to them, “Go, tell him: so if all of them had been afflicted with flux uncleanness, how would you deal with that verse? You have to say, if it’s impossible to do it, so it’s impossible; and here too, it’s impossible, so forget it.”*

I.7. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If most of them were unclean with corpse uncleanness and a minority with flux uncleanness —
- C. R. Huna said, “There is no making up a Passover offering that is presented in a state of uncleanness [those with flux uncleanness do not observe the second Passover, since that can be observed only if the majority is unclean with corpse uncleanness].”
- D. And R. Adda bar Ahbah said, “There is making up a Passover offering that is presented in uncleanness.”
- E. *May we say that this is what is subject to dispute: one who maintains, “There is no making up a Passover offering that is presented in a state of uncleanness,” takes the view that the uncleanness is overridden on account of the requirement of the community. And one who maintains, “There is making up a Passover offering that is presented in a state of uncleanness,” takes the view that the uncleanness is utterly permitted on account of the requirement of the community.*
- F. *Say: not at all. All parties concur that the uncleanness is overridden on account of the requirement of the community. But this is what is subject to dispute: the one authority maintains [80B] Cleanness postpones [when the offering comes in a state of cleanness, then it defers the offering of the unclean to the second Passover, but if the offering itself is unclean, it does not postpone those who also are unclean to the second Passover], and the other takes the view that uncleanness also defers.*

I.8. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If a third of the community was afflicted with flux uncleanness, a third was clean, and a third was afflicted with corpse uncleanness —
- C. Said R. Mani bar Pattish, “Those who are afflicted with corpse uncleanness do not prepare the Passover offering either on the occasion of the first Passover or on the occasion of the second.”
- D. *They do not prepare the Passover offering on the occasion of the first Passover, because the ones afflicted with flux add to the number of those who are clean, and the latter do not present the sacrifice in uncleanness, and a minority then is not allowed to sacrifice on the first Passover. And they also do not prepare it on the occasion of the second, because those afflicted with flux combine with those who*

are unclean with corpse uncleanness who didn't make the offering on the first; they now form a majority, and we do not dismiss a majority to the second Passover either.

7:7

- A. A Passover offering, the blood of which was tossed,
 - B. and afterward it becomes known that it [the Passover offering] was made unclean [after it had been slaughtered] —
 - C. the [high priest's] frontlet effects acceptance.
 - D. [If] the person [of any of the sacrificers] was made unclean,
 - E. the high priest's frontlet does not effect acceptance.
 - F. For they have stated:
 - G. As to the Nazirite and one who prepares the Passover offering,
 - H. the high priest's frontlet effects acceptance despite uncleanness affecting the blood, but the high priest's frontlet does not effect acceptance for uncleanness affecting the person [of the sacrificer (the one for whom the rite is performed)].
 - I. [If] one was made unclean by reason of uncleanness in the nethermost depths, the high priest's frontlet effects acceptance.
- I.1** A. *So the operative consideration is only that it was first sprinkled and then became known that it was unclean; but if it first became known and then the blood was sprinkled afterwards, it does not propitiate. But by contrast:* For what does the high priest's head plate atone? For blood, meat, and forbidden fat, that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, whether in the case of an offering in behalf of an individual or an offering in behalf of the community.
- B. Rabina said, "As to the uncleanness affecting it, whether it was made unclean inadvertently or deliberately, the offering is acceptable; but as to sprinkling the blood, if the blood was sprinkled inadvertently, it is acceptable, but if this was done deliberately, it is not." [Cashdan, *Menahot* to 25B: Rabina explains away the contradiction between the two statements. The first formulation, which says 'with regard to the private offering, if inadvertently, it is acceptable, if deliberately, not,' deals with sprinkling unclean blood; the second, which says that the plate atones for blood that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately deals with the uncleanness; the sprinkling would be acceptable only if done inadvertently.]
 - C. And R. Shila said, "As to tossing the blood, whether this is done inadvertently or deliberately, the offering is acceptable; but as to uncleanness, if it was made unclean inadvertently, it is acceptable, but if deliberately, it is not."
 - D. *And how does R. Shila explain the formulation, "which became unclean, whether inadvertently or deliberately"?*
 - E. It means, it was inadvertently rendered unclean, but the blood was tossed whether inadvertently or deliberately.
 - F. *But as to the Tannaite formulation, the blood of which was tossed, and afterward it becomes known that it [the Passover offering] was made unclean*

[after it had been slaughtered] — so the operative consideration is only that it was first sprinkled and then became known that it was unclean; but if it first became known and then the blood was sprinkled afterwards, it does not propitiate.

- G. *Not at all: the same law pertains even if it became known first and was sprinkled afterward, and the point of the Tannaite formulation, **the blood of which was tossed, and afterward it becomes known**, is that the framers wishes to proceed in the second clause to, [If] the person [of any of the sacrificers] was made unclean, the high priest's frontlet does not effect acceptance. In that case, even if it was sprinkled first and became known afterwards, it doesn't propitiate; therefore he includes in the first clause as well, **the blood of which was tossed, and afterward it becomes known.***

II.1 A. [If] one was made unclean by reason of uncleanness in the nethermost depths, the high priest's frontlet effects acceptance:

- B. *This question was raised by Rami bar Hama, "As to a priest who propitiates with their sacrifice, is the uncleanness of the deep remitted so far as he is concerned, or is the uncleanness of the deep not remitted so far as he is concerned?" [Freedman, Zebahim to 23A: If the priest who offers the Passover sacrifice or the offerings of a Nazirite on behalf of the owners was made unclean with uncleanness emanating from the deep, does the head-plate propitiate, so that the offering is a valid one, or is that not the case]? Do we invoke the argument that, when we have learned the rule about the uncleanness of the deep, it pertains to the owner of the beast, but we have learned no tradition with respect to the priest? Or maybe, we have a tradition that concerns the offering itself, without regard to whether it is the owners or the priest who is made unclean?"*
- C. *Said Raba, "Come and take note of what R. Hiyya taught as a Tannaite teaching: Sages spoke in connection with uncleanness that emanates from the deep only of buried corpse matter. And what is then excluded by that statement? Is it not uncleanness emanating from the deep that is caused by a dead creeping thing that has just been uncovered? and with what case do we deal? Should we say, the uncleanness pertains to the owners? Then in what case? If we say it pertains to a Nazirite, then does the uncleanness of a dead creeping thing apply to him, since the law is explicit, 'and if any man die beside him' (Num. 6: 9)? So it must refer to one who is offering his Passover lamb. And that presents no problem to him who has said, they do not slaughter a Passover offering or sprinkle the blood in behalf of those unclean through a dead creeping thing. But from the perspective of him who has said, they do slaughter a Passover offering or sprinkle the blood in behalf of those unclean through a dead creeping thing, then, if a certified uncleanness is remitted for him, will not uncleanness deriving from the deep all the more so be remitted to him? So surely it refers to the priest, and that proves that when we speak of the remission of uncleanness of the deep, it is remitted so far as the priest is concerned."*
- D. *Said R. Joseph, "Not at all. In point of fact it makes references to the owner, and it also speaks of the Passover offering, but what is excluded is uncleanness of the deep deriving from flux uncleanness. [The head-plate propitiates for the uncleanness of the Passover offering so far as personal uncleanness.]"*

- E. *But is it the fact then that uncleanness of flux that is buried in the deep is not propitiated by the head-plate? Surely it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* R. Yosé says, “A woman who is watching from day to day, in behalf of whom the priest slaughtered the Passover lamb and sprinkled the blood [81A] on her second day, and who then produced a discharge, may not eat the sacrifice, but she also is exempt from observing the second Passover.” [Reference is made to the eleven days between the menstrual period and the next one, during which time a flow of blood is classified not as menstrual blood but as flux. These are called ‘flux-days.’ A discharge on one or two days within the eleven imparts uncleanness for that day alone. The one cannot immerse and conduct the purification rite until a day has passed in which no flux emerged, so she is called ‘a woman who is watching from day to day.’ If another discharge comes on the third day, she has to wait for seven days without issue. The eve of Passover occurred on the second day of her discharge; the sacrifice was offered, the blood sprinkled. That was prior to a discharge on that day. If she had not had a discharge, she would have been fit to eat in the evening. But she did, so she cannot eat the sacrifice or immerse until — the next day being clean — the following evening (Freedman).] *What is the operative consideration here? Isn’t it that the priest’s frontlet propitiates?* [Freedman: when the blood was sprinkled, she was doubtfully unclean, since she might discharge again on that day. Thus she is assumed to be unclean with the uncleanness of the deep and is exempt from observing the second Passover because the head-plate propitiates and makes her sacrifice valid, though she cannot partake of it.]
- F. *Say: not at all. It is because R. Yosé maintains that* it is from the time that the flux appears and thereafter that she is unclean. [Freedman: if she discharges on one day, waits part of the following and immerses, she is clean; if she subsequently discharges on the same day, she becomes unclean anew; but does not continue her prior uncleanness; hence when the sacrifice was slaughtered, she was actually clean, having already performed immersion, so no propitiation is required.]
- G. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority:* R. Yosé says, “A person afflicted with flux who has produced two flows, in behalf of whom they slaughtered the Passover lamb and tossed the blood on the seventh day of counting of clean days, and who afterward produced a flux, and so too, a woman awaiting day against day in behalf of whom they slaughtered the Passover lamb and tossed the blood and who afterward produced a flux — lo, these retroactively impart uncleanness to objects on which they lie and sit and they are exempt from preparing a Passover at the second Passover.” [Freedman: so they are not unclean only for the future and yet they are exempt from a second Passover; the reason must be that it is an uncleanness of the deep of flux and the head-plate then propitiates.]
- H. *Say: what is the meaning of “retroactively”?* *It is only by decree of rabbis.* [Freedman: according to the law of the Torah she was clean during the interval between the immersion until the third discharge.]
- II.2.** A. *So too R. Oshayya maintains that the retroactive uncleanness derives only from a decree of rabbis, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Oshayya says, "But a person afflicted with flux who produced a discharge on his seven day loses the prior clean days [and has to count out another seven clean days]."
- C. and said to him R. Yohanan, "He should only lose that one day [which we ignore, he needs only one more clean day to become clean again]."
- D. *[That is a poor version of his statement, for] what's your choice? If one maintains that the uncleanness is retroactive, then he should lose all seven days; and if he takes the view that it is only from now on that he is unclean, then he should also not lose even that one day! Rather, say, "He does not lose even that day."*
- E. *And [Oshayya] said to him, "R. Yosé concurs with your view."* [Freedman: since he exempts her from observing the second Passover, he holds she is not retrospectively unclean.]
- F. But lo, R. Yosé says, "These retroactively impart uncleanness to objects on which they lie and sit"!
- G. *So doesn't it follow that the retroactive uncleanness derives only from a decree of rabbis?*
- H. *Yes, it does follow.*

II.3. A. Now, from R. Yosé's perspective, since he maintains that he only imparts uncleanness from now on, what is excluded by the language, Sages spoke in connection with uncleanness that emanates from the deep only of buried corpse matter? [Freedman: for on the present ruling there is no uncleanness of the deep with respect to flux uncleanness, so it must involve uncleanness deriving from a dead creeping thing affecting a priest.]

- B. *Should we not solve on that basis the problem and maintain it speaks of the priest and bears the meaning that the uncleanness of the deep is remitted to the priest?*
- C. *Say: in point of fact, it refers to the owner and to the Passover, and he takes the view that they do not slaughter a Passover offering or sprinkle the blood in behalf of those unclean through a dead creeping thing. So on that account it was necessary to exclude it.*

II.4. A. Well, then, how are you going to find a case of a woman totally in the grip of flux uncleanness [Freedman: since he holds that part of the day is counted as a whole day, and she is unclean only from when she discharges, each day is distinct and she can never be unclean for the three consecutive days that are necessary to establish that status].

- B. *It would be a case in which she had a continuous discharge; or, if you prefer, she has a discharge for the entirety of two successive twilights [thus the end of one day and the beginning of the next, e.g., Sunday and Monday yields Sunday, Monday, Tuesday (Freedman)].*

II.5. A. R. Joseph raised this question: "The priest who officiates at the daily whole offering — by the priestly frontlet is uncleanness remitted to him or is it not remitted to him? If you should choose to say, the uncleanness of the deep is remitted to the priest who officiates at their [the Nazirite's or the Passover-observers'] sacrifices, what about the priest who officiates at the continual offering? Do we invoke the argument that, when we have learned the rule about

the uncleanness of the deep, it pertains to the Passover, but as to the daily whole offering, we have learned no tradition? Or perhaps the rule governing the daily whole offering ought to derive from the Passover's rule?'

- B. Said Rabbah, "It is an argument a fortiori: if in a case in which a known uncleanness is not remitted, uncleanness of the deep is remitted, then in a case in which a known uncleanness is remitted, [81B] isn't it reasonable to suppose that the uncleanness of the deep also should be remitted?"
- C. *Say: do we derive an argument a fortiori from a law handed on by tradition? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: said to him R. Eleazar, "Aqiba, That the size of a bone that imparts uncleanness is as much as a barley grain is a received law, but that a quarter log of a corpse is what imparts uncleanness is presented by you on the basis of an argument a fortiori, and we do not compose an argument a fortiori on the foundations of a received law"?*
- D. *Rather, said Raba, "We learn the meaning of 'its appointed time' from the law governing the Passover offering" [Freedman: and as the head-plate propitiates for the uncleanness of the deep in the Passover, it does in the other matter as well.]*

II.6. A. *And as to the law about the uncleanness of the deep, where is that law itself written in Scripture?*

- B. Said R. Eliezer, "Said Scripture, 'And if any man die beside him' (Num. 6: 9) — when it is very clear that he is beside him [but not when corpse matter is in the great deep and not apparent]."
- C. *So we find the rule for the Nazirite, what about the rule for the one who is going to offer the Passover offering?*
- D. Said R. Yohanan, "Said Scripture, 'If any man shall be unclean by reason of a corpse or in a distant trip to you' (Num. 9:10) — when it is very clear to you."
- E. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "It is comparable to a trip: just as a trip is made out in the open, so the corpse must be out in the open."
- F. ***An objection was raised: What is the definition of uncleanness in the nethermost depths? It is any source of uncleanness that cannot have been known even to a person on the other side of the world. If someone on the other side of the world can have known about it, it does not fall into the classification of 'uncleanness of the nethermost depths' [T. Zab. 2:9]. And from the view of R. Eliezer, who said that it is in that classification of uncleanness only when it is very clear that he is beside him [but not when corpse matter is in the great deep and not apparent], then it is uncleanness of that sort only if he himself knows of it. And from the view of R. Yohanan, who said that it is uncleanness of that sort only when when it is very clear to you, it is such only if two people know about it. And from the perspective of R. Simeon b. Laqish, who said that it has to be as exposed as a road, then it would not be in that classification unless everyone knew about it!***
- I. *Rather, "the uncleanness of the deep" is a category defined by received tradition, and the verses of Scripture serve only as general supports therefor.*

II.7. A. Said Mar bar R. Ashi, "They have repeated this rule [the head-plate propitiates for uncleanness of the deep for the Nazirite and the one who is performing the Passover rite] only if the fact that he had been made unclean by uncleanness of that

sort after the sprinkling of the blood. *Then, when the blood was sprinkled, it was sprinkled quite properly.* But if it was known to him prior to the sprinkling of the blood, it does not propitiate at all.”

- B. *An objection was raised: he who finds a corpse lying across the width of a path [where he had gone by, so he had to have touched it or overshadowed it], so far as priestly rations are concerned, he is unclean; so far as a Nazirite or one who is preparing a Passover is concerned, he is clean [T. Zab. 2:8].*
- C. But do and all rulings of unclean or clean refer to the future? [Freedman: though it is now known to him before the blood is sprinkled, the head-plate propitiates, for this too was a case of uncleanness of the deep, since as far as is known none was aware of the corpse before.]
- D. *Rather, if such a statement was made, this is what was said: said Mar bar R. Ashi, “Do not maintain that this rule [the head-plate propitiates for uncleanness of the deep for the Nazirite and the one who is performing the Passover rite] applies only if the fact that he had been made unclean by uncleanness of that sort after the sprinkling of the blood, but if it was known to him prior to the sprinkling of the blood, it does not propitiate at all. But even if it was known to him prior to the sprinkling of the blood, it does propitiate.”*

- II.8.** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: he who finds a corpse lying across the width of a path [where he had gone by, so he had to have touched it or overshadowed it], so far as priestly rations are concerned, he is unclean; so far as a Nazirite or one who is preparing a Passover is concerned, he is clean.*
- B. Under what circumstances? If he has no room to squeeze by. But if there is room to squeeze by, then even for priestly rations he is clean.
 - C. Under what circumstances? If he finds it whole. But if he finds it in pieces and spread about, he is clean, for he may have passed between the pieces.
 - D. But if it is in a grave, then even if it is broken or in pieces, he is unclean, since the grave joins the whole together.
 - E. Under what circumstances? If he is going by foot. But if he is laden or is riding, for if he is laden or riding, he has no alternative but to touch it or overshadow it.
 - F. Under what circumstances? In the case of “the uncleanness of the deep,” but if it is a form of uncleanness that is already known, he is unclean [T. Zab. 2:8].
 - G. What is the definition of uncleanness in the nethermost depths? It is any source of uncleanness that cannot have been known even to a person on the other side of the world. If someone on the other side of the world can have known about it, it does not fall into the classification of ‘uncleanness of the nethermost depths.
 - H. If he found it hidden in straw, earth, or pebbles, it falls into the class of “an uncleanness of the deep.” If he found it in water, darkness or clefts of rocks, it is not “uncleanness of the deep.
 - I. And they stated the law of uncleanness of the deep in regard to only a corpse alone [T. Zab. 2:9].

- A. [If] the whole or the larger part [of the Passover offering] was made unclean,
- B. they burn it before the Temple building, with wood set aside for the altar hearth.
- C. [If] the lesser part of it was made unclean, and as to that which remains over [and is not eaten in the time limit set for the eating of the Passover offering]
-
- D. they burn it in their courtyards or on their roofs with their own wood.
- E. But the cheapskates burn it before the Temple building, so as to enjoy the use of wood set aside for the altar hearth [instead of using their own].

I.1 A. *What is the reason [for the public burning]?*

- B. Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “So as to shame [those who were so careless as to allow the offering to contract uncleanness].”

II.1 A. [If] the lesser part of it was made unclean, and as to that which remains over [and is they burn it in their courtyards or on their roofs with their own wood:

- B. *And by contrast: And so too: He who went forth from Jerusalem and remembered that he had in hand meat in the status of Holy Things, if he had already passed Mount Scopus, he burns it right where he is. But if not, [82A] let him go back and burn it before the Temple pile with wood which has been set aside for the altar hearth [M. 3:8A-C]. [Even a small portion is burned in this way (Freedman)].*
- C. *Said R. Hama bar Uqba, “No problem, the one speaks of a guest, the other a householder [the Mishnah-rule refers to a householder, the guest has no home of his own and can’t burn the stuff there, so he can do it in before the Temple].”*
- D. *R. Pappa said, “Both refer to a lodger, but the one refers to someone who has already made his way some distance, the other to someone who has not yet launched out on the open road.”*
- E. *R. Zebid said, “In point of fact it is as was stated to begin with, namely, the one speaks of a guest, the other a householder [the Mishnah-rule refers to a householder. And even though he has not yet launched himself onto the open road, since the lodger hasn’t got any wood of his own, he is classified as a miser, for we have learned in the Mishnah: But the cheapskates burn it before the Temple building, so as to enjoy the use of wood set aside for the altar hearth.”*

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

- B. If they come to burn it in their own courtyards with wood of the altar pile, we do not listen to them [and permit them to do that]. If they wanted to do it before the Temple pile with their own wood, we do not listen to them [T. Pisha 3:3G-I].

II.3. A. *Now there is no difficulty understanding why if they come to burn it in their own courtyards with wood of the altar pile, we do not listen to them. It may be that the wood will be more than they need, and they will end up stumbling*

through it. But how come if they wanted to do it before the Temple pile with their own wood, we do not listen to them?

- B. R. Joseph said, "So as not to shame someone who doesn't have any."
- C. Raba said, "Because of suspicion [onlookers may think it is wood of the altar pile and assume it is a theft]."
- D. *What's at stake between these two explanations?*
- E. *If he brought cane reeds and dried branches, which are not suitable for the pile [which will be an embarrassment, so Joseph's reason applies, but Raba's doesn't].*
- F. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: the head of the priestly watch then had the unclean people stand at the eastern gate [M. Tam. 5:6C]. How come?*
- G. R. Joseph said, "So as to shame them."
- H. Raba said, "Because of suspicion [that they neglect the temple to do private business]."
- I. *What's at stake between these two explanations?*
- J. *Delicate persons or rope-makers [who are not paid much; no priest will neglect the Temple service for this (Freedman)].*

7:9

- A. **The Passover offering which went forth [from Jerusalem] or which was made unclean is to be burned immediately [on the fourteenth].**
- B. **[If] the owner was made unclean or died,**
- C. **its appearance is allowed to spoil, and it is to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan.**
- D. **R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, "Also: his is to be burned immediately, for it has no one to eat it."**
- I.1 A. **[The Passover offering which went forth from Jerusalem or which was made unclean is to be burned immediately on the fourteenth:]** *There is no problem understanding why that is the rule if it is made unclean, since it is written, "And the meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten, it shall be burned with fire" (Lev. 7:19). But how on the basis of Scripture do we know the same rule applies to that which went forth [from Jerusalem]?*
- B. *As it is written, "Behold, the blood of it was not brought into the sanctuary within" (Lev. 10:18). Said Moses to Aaron, "Why didn't you eat the sin offering? Is it possible that its blood has been taken into the innermost sanctuary?"*
- C. *He said to him, "No."*
- D. *He said to him, "Then perhaps it has been taken outside of its appropriate limit?"*
- E. *He said to him, "No. It was in the Holy Place"*
- F. *He said, "If the blood was not brought within the sanctuary, and 'Behold, the blood of it was not brought within,' why didn't you eat it?"*
- G. *From that it follows that it was taken out, or if its blood entered within that area, it has to be burned.*

- I.2.** A. *Now there is no problem with respect to what is made unclean, since the All-Merciful has made that rule explicit when it comes to Lesser Holy Things, and all the more so Most Holy Things.*
- B. *But when it comes to that which goes out of the sanctuary, while we have found an appropriate scriptural foundation for the rule of burning Most Holy Things that have been taken out, how do we know that that is the rule also for Lesser Holy Things? And furthermore, lo, as to that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: if its blood was kept overnight, [82B] or if its blood was poured out, or if the blood was taken outside the Temple hangings, it is an established fact for us that it requires burning. But how do we know that fact?*
- C. *It derives from that which R. Simeon stated, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, “‘In the holy place...it shall be burned with fire’ — this teaches that the sin offering is to be burned in the holy place. Now I know only that that concerns this item alone. How do I know that the same is so of Most Holy Things that are invalid and the limbs of Lesser Holy Things? Scripture states, ‘in the holy place...it shall be burned with fire’ [Freedman: whatever would normally be disposed of in the holy place must be burned there].”*
- D. *So we have found the rule for Most Holy Things? How do we know it of Lesser Holy Things [since we have spoken only of the sacrificial parts of Most Holy Things]?*
- E. *We have a tradition that wherever there is invalidation of Holy Things, burning is required, whether Most Holy Things or Lesser Holy Things. And as to the sin offering of Aaron, that is because the conditions of the particular incident were that way [but not to make the point just now given on the strength of tradition].*
- I.3.** A. *And to the Tannaite authority of the household of Rabbah bar Abbuha, who said, “Even an animal made refuse by an improper intentionality of the officiating priest has to be left to be disfigured,” how do we know it?*
- B. *He derives the sense of “iniquity” from the rule governing “left-over” [“iniquity” with reference to both what is rendered refuse and what is left over, at Lev. 7:18 and Lev. 19:8, respectively; what is left over is disfigured naturally, and “iniquity” tells us that the same rule applies to what is rendered refuse by the improper intention of the officiating priest].*
- C. *Why shouldn’t he learn the rule from the one governing the sin offering, since the word “sin” occurs both with Aaron’s sin offering [Lev. 10:17] and also with respect to the offering that is refuse [and so burn it on the spot and not some days later]?*
- D. *He will say to you, “As to the sacrifice such as Aaron’s sin offering, in that case too there would be time for disfiguring the offering in time to come, but in that particular case, it was an instruction that applied to that particular moment.”*
- I.4.** A. *Now that we have said, In any case in which there is invalidation for Holy Things, they are to be burned, without distinction between Most Holy Things or Lesser Holy Things, maintaining that we have that rule by tradition, then what’s the point of “in the holy place it shall be burned with fire”?*
- B. *That is required to say that the burning must take place in the holy place.*

- C. And as to “and the meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten, it shall be burned with fire” — *what’s the purpose of that verse?*
- D. *That’s required to make its own point. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that “all invalidations of Holy Things” refers to the blood’s being kept overnight, the blood’s being spilled, the blood’s being taken outside, the beast’s being slaughtered by night, and you would have supposed that these actions require the burning of the offering, since these considerations do not apply to secular beasts. But if it became unclean, which would invalidate secular beasts as well, I would say, since it has been treated as secular, it doesn’t have to be burned, and burial should be enough; so we are informed that that is not the case.*

II.1 A. [If] the owner was made unclean or died, its appearance is allowed to spoil, and it is to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “Also: this is to be burned immediately, for it has no one to eat it:”

- B. Said R. Joseph, “The dispute pertains to a case in which the owner became unclean after the tossing of the blood, *in which case the meat had been suitable for eating*, but if the owner had contracted uncleanness prior to the sprinkling of the blood, *in which case the meat had not been suitable for eating*, all parties concur that it is to be burned immediately.”
- C. **By contrast: this is the encompassing rule: In any case in which the grounds for invalidation are intrinsic, the holy thing must be burned forthwith; but if the disqualification is in the blood rite or in the status of the owner, the meat must be left to rot and only then go out to the place of burning [T. Pisha 6:6F-G].** *So the Tannaite rule treats the owner’s condition as comparable to that of the blood: just as the disqualification of the blood takes place prior to its sprinkling, so the uncleanness of the owner takes place prior to the sprinkling.*
- D. *So if such a statement was made, this is what it must have said: “The dispute pertains to a case in which the owner became unclean before the tossing of the blood, in which case the meat had not been suitable for eating, in which case it is as if the invalidation is intrinsic, but if the owner had contracted uncleanness after the sprinkling of the blood, in which case the meat had not been suitable for eating, all parties concur that the invalidation is extrinsic, and it is left to be disfigured and only then burned.”*
- E. And R. Yohanan said, “The dispute pertains also to the situation after the sprinkling of the blood.”
- F. *And R. Yohanan is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said R. Yohanan, “R. Yohanan b. Beroqah and R. Nehemiah said the same thing.” R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, as we have just said. But what is the one concerning R. Nehemiah? It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Nehemiah says, “Aaron’s sin-offering was burned [not eaten] because of a bereavement, therefore it is stated, ‘and there have befallen me such things as these’ (Lev. 10:19). And lo, bereavement is an invalidation that takes place after sprinkling [Freedman: for even if Nadab and Abihu died before sprinkling, it would not be invalid, the sin offering being dissimilar to the Passover offering in this respect; for the latter is mainly to be eaten, and if the owner is defiled before sprinkling, the sprinkling is invalid, but if they are made unclean after the sprinkling the sprinklings is valid. But the purpose of the sin offering is atonement, so even if the priests are unclean,*

e.g., bereaved, before sprinkling and cannot eat the meat, the sprinkling is valid; hence this bereavement, even if it occurred before the blood was sprinkled, is the same as when the owner of the Passover offering is made unclean after the sprinkling.] *And when the animal was burned up, that was done immediately.*

- G. **[83A]** *Rabbah adds, “R. Yosé the Galilean too. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé the Galilean says, ‘The entire passage addresses the case only of the bullocks that are to be burned and the he goats that are to be burned, indicating that when they are disqualified, they must be burned before the Temple [not beyond the Temple mount], and also to prohibit eating them through a negative commandment [violation of which is penalized by flagellation].’ [Freedman: Rabbis relate the verse under discussion to a sin offering prepared at the outer altar, the blood of which was carried into the inner court; it is disqualified. Yosé refers the verse to a sin offering prepared on the inner altar, e.g., the bullock brought when the entire congregation sins in ignorance. The verse then does not refer to sin offerings prepared on the outer altar at all.] They said to him, ‘As to the sin offering the blood of which is brought into the inner sanctum, how do we know that it is invalid?’ He said to them, “‘Behold, the blood of it was not brought into the sanctuary within” (Lev. 10:18).’ Then it follows that if the sacrifice had gone outside or if its blood had been taken inside, it would require burning.”*
- H. *And R. Yohanan maintains that the blood and the meat are one thing, and the condition of the owner, something else [and not comparable].*

7:10

- A. **Bones, sinews, and that which is left over [and not eaten within the stated limits] are to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan.**
- B. **[If] the sixteenth of Nisan coincides with the Sabbath, they are to be burned on the seventeenth.**
- C. **For [burning] them does not override the prohibitions either of the Sabbath or of a festival day.**
- I.1 A. [Bones, sinews, and that which is left over are to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan:]** Said R. Mari bar Abbuha said R. Isaac, “Bones of Holy Things that served as the container for left-over sacrificial material [Freedman: marrow left in them after the time permitted for eating the sacrifice having become left-over, for which the bones served as a container] impart uncleanness to hands, since they have served as the basis for something forbidden.”
- B. *May we say that the following serves as support for his position: **Bones, sinews, and that which is left over [and not eaten within the stated limits] are to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan?** Now what can be the character of these bones? Should we say that they have no marrow? Then why burn them? Let’s just toss them into the garbage [since they are not in the status of left-over Holy Things]! So it is obvious that they have marrow in them. Now, if you maintain that what performs service to left-over bears consequence, well, then, there’s no problem in explaining why they have to be burned. But if you maintain that service to left-over Holy Things is null, then why in the world should they be burned? Let’s just break them, scoop out the marrow, burn that, and throw the*

bones into the garbage. So doesn't that rule then demonstrate that what performs service to left-over bears consequence?

- C. *Say: no, not at all. I may say to you, service to left-over Holy Things is null, but the framer of our passage maintains that the verse, "neither shall you break a bone thereof" (Exo. 12:46) means, a valid one, but even an invalid one.*
- D. *Do you really imagine that it means even an invalid one? But we have learned in the Mishnah: [He who breaks the bone of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic cleanness — lo, this person receives forty stripes.] But one who leaves over [any part] of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic cleanness and one who breaks a bone of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic uncleanness do not receive forty stripes [M. Pes. 7:11D-F]!*
- E. *No problem! The one speaks of a case in which it had a moment of validity [even a bone rendered unfit as left over was fit before hand, so the prohibition takes effect and remains valid even when it becomes unfit (Freedman)]; the other speaks of a case in which it never had a moment of validity [Freedman: if the bone was rendered unfit before the sprinkling of the blood, then it was never fit, and the prohibition of left-over doesn't apply to it].*

I.2. A. *So what Tannaite authority maintains a distinction between a case in which it had a moment of validity and a case in which it never had a moment of validity?*

B. *It is R. Jacob, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. *"Neither shall you break a bone thereof" meaning, "thereof, but not of the festal offering" (Exo. 12:46).*

D. **R. Jacob says, "If it had a moment of validity but then was rendered unfit, it is subject to the prohibition of breaking the bone, but if it never had a moment of validity, it is not subject to the prohibition of breaking the bone."**

E. **R. Simeon says, "All the same are this and that: the prohibition of breaking the bone does not apply" [T. Pisha 6:9C-D].**

F. *An objection was raised: No bones of Holy Things require burning except for the bones of the Passover, on account of the possibility of their forming a stumbling block [since someone might break them]. Now what can be the character of these bones? Should I say that they have no marrow? Then why burn them? Then why burn them? So it is obvious that they have marrow in them. Now, if you maintain that what performs service to left-over bears consequence, well, then, why is it the claim that bones of Holy Things don't have to be burned?*

G. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Here with what case do we deal? One in which one found the bones scooped out. In the case of bones of sacrifices that are not subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone, we assume they were scooped out before the marrow become left-over, so they never served for left over Holy Things and don't have to be burned. But in the case of bones of the Passover offering, which may not be broken, we do assume they were scooped out after they became left-over Holy Things, so they have served left-over Holy Things and have to be burned."*

H. *R. Zebid said, "Here with what case do we deal? It is one, for example, [83B] in which he found them piled in heaps, some of them having had their marrow scooped out. In the case of bones of other Holy Things, which are not subject to the prohibition of breaking the bone, I assume they have been scooped out and the marrow has been eaten, so they don't require burning; but bones of the Passover offering, which are subject to the prohibition against breakage, — [the ones examined] may be only the ones that were scooped out, but others, not examined, were not scooped out, so they have to be burned in toto."*

I.3. A. Said R. Judah said Rab, "All sinews are classified as meat except for the sinews of the neck."

B. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **Bones, sinews, and that which is left over [and not eaten within the stated limits] are to be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan.** Now what can be the character of these sinews? If we say that they are sinews in the category of meat, well, then, let's eat them. If they had been left over, then they fall into the category of left over of Holy Things. So they must be sinews of the neck. Now, there is no problem if I say that they fall into the category of meat, and that's why they have to be burned. But if you maintain that they don't fall into the category of meat, why do they have to be burned?*

C. *Said R. Hisda, "The rule is required only to deal with the thigh sinew, and it is in accord with the position of R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "The prohibition of the sinew of the thigh pertains only to one, and it stands to reason that it is the right one." [Freedman: thus one of the thigh sinews is permitted; we don't know which, therefore this is classified as left over Holy Things and has to be burned.]*

D. *Then you have to draw the conclusion that R. Judah is in doubt [as to which is forbidden and which is permitted (Freedman)], for if he were certain, then let's eat the permitted one and discard the forbidden one. Why do both have to be burned?*

E. *Said R. Iqa bar Hinena, "It involves a case in which to begin with they were distinguished from one another but later on got confused with one another." [The prohibition applies to the right thigh, but the ones in the Mishnah are mixed up, and we don't know which is which (Freedman).]*

F. *R. Ashi said, "The rule is required to cover the fat of the sinew of the thigh. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: the fat is permitted, but the Israelites are holy and treat it as forbidden."*

G. *Rabina said, "It deals with the outer sinew of the thigh, in accord with what R. Judah said Samuel said, for said R. Judah said Samuel, 'As to the two sinews, the inner one, near the bone, is forbidden, and one is liable on account of eating it to a flogging; the outer one, near the meat, is forbidden, but one is not liable on its account.'"*

II.1 A. [If] the sixteenth of Nisan coincides with the Sabbath, they are to be burned on the seventeenth. For [burning] them does not override the prohibitions either of the Sabbath or of a festival day:

- B. *But why should this be so? Let the commandment involving affirmative action come and override the negative commandment* [since if the two conflict, the affirmative sets aside the negative; the affirmative command is to burn the left over, Exo. 12:10, the negative, not to work on the festival, Exo. 12:16 (Freedman)].
- C. Said Hezekiah, *and so too a Tannaite authority of the household of Hezekiah [stated]*, “Said Scripture, ‘And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning, but that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire’ (Exo. 12:10). The second ‘until the morning’ is hardly required, and why does Scripture say it? Scripture comes to assign the second morning as the occasion for burning Holy Things” [in the context of Passover, the sixteenth of Nisan, which is not a festival day, and that indicates burning on the festival of unclean Holy Things is forbidden (Freedman)].
- D. Abbaye said, “Said Scripture, ‘The burnt offering of the Sabbath shall be burned on its Sabbath’ (Num. 28:10) — but not the burnt offering of weekdays on the Sabbath, not the burnt offering of weekdays on festivals” [Freedman: hence Holy Things if unfit may not be burned on festivals].
- E. Raba said, “Said Scripture, ‘No manner of work shall be done in them, except that which every man must eat, that only may be done by you’ (Exo. 212:16) — ‘that’ — but but not what is required to make that possible; ‘only — **[84A]** but not circumcision at other than its proper time on the eighth day, which otherwise might derive by an argument a fortiori.” [Freedman: thus we learn that when an act need not be done on a particular day, it may not be done on the Sabbath or festivals, the same then applies to burning Holy Things that have become unclean.]
- F. R. Ashi said, “Said Scripture, ‘On the first day shall be a solemn rest’ (Lev. 23:39) is a commandment involving a positive action, and a commandment involving refraining from action in respect to the festival; a commandment involving a positive action cannot take effect over a commandment involving both a positive action and also refraining from action.” [Freedman: the negative “no manner of work,” the positive, “to burn what is left over,” at Exo. 12:10; the unfit Holy Things may not be burned on festivals.]

7:11A-B

- A. **Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender lamb,**
- B. **even the ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts.**
- I.1 A. *Rabbah introduced the contrast: “We have learned in the Mishnah: **Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender lamb.** So what cannot be eaten of the one may not be eaten of the other. And by contrast note what follows: **even the ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts.** But lo, these can’t be eaten in the case of a full-grown ox at all!”*
- B. *Rather, what we have is a conflict of Tannaite opinion, and this is the sense of the matter: **Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender lamb,** and what is not eaten in the one may not be eaten in the other. But some say, **“Even the ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts.”***

- C. *Raba said, "The latter clause serves to define the former, and this is the sense of the passage: **Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox after plenty of boiling may be eaten of a tender lamb** after roasting. And what might that be? **Even the ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts.**"*
- D. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of Raba: Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox after plenty of boiling may be eaten of a tender lamb after roasting. And what might that be? The ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts are treated like meat.*

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

- B. Sinews that ultimately harden [Freedman: sinews of the neck of a young lamb fit for a Passover offering are soft but when it grows older they harden and are unfit for food] —
- C. R. Yohanan said, "People may sign up for them in connection with the Passover offering."
- D. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "People may not sign up for them in connection with the Passover offering."
- E. R. Yohanan said, "People may sign up for them in connection with the Passover offering." *we invoke the criterion of their present condition.*
- F. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "People may not sign up for them in connection with the Passover offering." *we invoke the criterion of their ultimate condition.*
- G. *R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan, " **Whatever is eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender lamb.** And what might that be? **The ends of the shoulder blades and the gristly parts.** These, but not sinews that ultimately harden."*
- H. *He said to him, "The Tannaite intention is: these, and the same law applies to those. As to these, how so? For lo, they are eaten in the case of a full-grown ox after a lot of boiling, so those too can be eaten in the case of a full-grown ox after much boiling."*

I.3. A. *Said R. Jeremiah to R. Abin, "When you go before R. Abbahu, present the following contradiction to him: did R. Yohanan say, 'As to sinews that ultimately harden people may sign up for them in connection with the Passover offering'? Therefore we follow the present condition of the matter? And yet R. Simeon b. Laqish raised this question to R. Yohanan: 'As to the skin of the head of a tender goat, does it contract uncleanness as food [since it's edible now, but it won't be when the goat gets older]?' And he said to him, 'It doesn't contract uncleanness.' Therefore we follow the ultimate condition of the matter."*

B. *He said to him, "The one who raised this contradiction for you is not very meticulous about his 'flour.' Isn't it the fact that R. Yohanan retracted his view in respect to R. Simeon b. Laqish, and he said to him, 'Don't provoke me, for I repeat the Mishnah-rule to which reference is made only as the opinion of a private person'?" [Freedman: but in the present discussion he rules that we invoke*

the present condition, since the Mishnah under discussion represents the opinion of the majority, a view he abandoned].

7:11C-D

- C. **He who breaks the bone of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic cleanness — lo, this person receives forty stripes.**
- D. **But one who leaves over [any part] of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic cleanness and one who breaks a bone of a Passover offering which is in a state of cultic uncleanness do not receive forty stripes.**
- I.1 A. *There is no problem understanding the rule concerning him who leaves over meat of a clean offering, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - B. “And you shall let nothing remain of it until the morning, and that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire” (Exo. 12:10):
 - C. “Scripture comes to set forth an affirmative commandment after a negative one, so as to indicate that on that account, one does not incur flogging,” the words of R. Judah.
 - D. R. Jacob [B. Mak. 4B: Aqiba] says, “That is not the pertinent consideration here, but rather because we deal with a negative commandment that does not involve the commission of an actual deed, and in the case of any negative commandment that does not involve a concrete deed, flogging is not incurred.”
 - E. *But how on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule covering one who breaks a bone of an unclean one?*
 - F. Said Scripture, “Neither shall you break a bone thereof” (Exo. 12:46) — “thereof” if it is valid, not if it is invalid.
- I.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - B. “Neither shall you break a bone thereof” (Exo. 12:46) — “thereof” if it is valid, not if it is invalid.
 - C. Rabbi says, “In one house shall it be eaten...neither shall you break a bone thereof” (Exo. 12:46) — whatever is suitable for eating is subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone, and whatever is not suitable for eating is not subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone.”
- I.3. A. *What is at issue between them?*
 - B. *Said R. Jeremiah, “A Passover that is presented in a condition of uncleanness is at issue between them. To him who has said [84B] that the verse speaks of a valid sacrifice, lo, this one is invalid; but to him who said that whatever is fit for eating is subject to the prohibition — this too is fit for eating.”*
 - C. *R. Joseph said, “In that case all concur that it is not subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone, for this is certainly unfit. Rather, at issue between them is a case of one that had been fit but then been made invalid [e.g., the sacrifice was made unclean after the blood was sprinkled]. He who has said that the verse speaks of a sacrifice that was fit will concur that this was fit; but he who maintains that only what is fit for eating is subject to the rule will maintain that it is not now fit for eating [so the prohibition doesn’t apply].”*

- D. *Abbaye said, "In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone doesn't apply. How come? Because at this moment, at any rate, it is invalid. But at issue between them is the case of breaking the bone while it is still day. From the perspective of him who maintains that the verse refers to a valid sacrifice, this one is valid; but he who maintains that only what is fit for eating is subject to the rule will maintain that it is not now fit for eating [so the prohibition doesn't apply]."*
- E. *An objection was raised: Rabbi says, "People may sign up on the offering for taking a share of the marrow in the head, but they may not sign up for the marrow in the thigh bone." So what is the consideration that governs in the case of the marrow in the head? It is because one can scrape the marrow and extract it. Now, if you maintain that breaking the bone while it is still day is permitted, then in the case of the thigh bone too, let's break it during the day, extract the marrow, and so register for it as a share of the beast?*
- F. *Abbaye may say to you, "Well, then, according to your reasoning, once it gets dark too, let's take a glowing coal and put it on it and burn it and extract the marrow and so register for it! For lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **he who burns the bones or chops up the sinews doesn't violate the prohibition against breaking a bone [T. Pisha 6:7].**"*
- G. *So what's to be said here [about not registering for the marrow]?*
- H. *Abbaye said, "Because it may split [through the burning, and that would be like breaking the bone (Freedman)]."*
- I. *Raba said, "Because of the loss of Holy Things that he may bring about by his own action, since the fire may consume some of the marrow."*
- J. *In any event, doing so during the day is forbidden as a precautionary decree against doing so after nightfall.*
- K. *R. Pappa said, "In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone does apply. How come? Because in the evening it's fit for eating. But they differ concerning a limb part of which was taken out [beyond Jerusalem, where the offering had to be eaten; if it was taken outside it is unfit; if only part of a limb was taken out, this part should be cut off, but that means breaking the bone]. The one who says that it is valid maintains that in this case it is valid, and the one who says it has to be suitable for eating holds that this is not suitable for eating. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, 'A limb part of which was taken outside of Jerusalem, which one broke off, is not subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone' [cf. T. Pisha. 6:9E].**"*
- L. *R. Sheshet b. R. Idi said, "In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone doesn't apply. How come? Because this limb is certainly unfit. They differ about breaking the bone of an offering that is only half-roasted. On the view that subject to the law is a fit sacrifice, this is fit; but on the view that*

only what is suitable for eating is subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone, this at the moment is not fit to be eaten.”

- M. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone does apply. How come? Because it is suitable for eating, since he can go ahead and roast it thoroughly and eat it. Where they differ, it concerns breaking the bone of the fat tail. On the view of him who says that subject to the prohibition is a fit offering, this is fit; on the view that it pertains to what is fit for eating, this is not fit for eating, since it is wholly offered up to the Most High [burned on the altar].”*
- N. *R. Ashi said, “In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone doesn’t apply, for lo, it certainly is not at all suitable for eating. But what is at issue between them is a limb that doesn’t have an olive’s bulk of meat on it. The one who says that the law applies to a valid bone — lo, this is a valid bone. But the one who said that we require that it be suitable for eating, in this case the measure of meat that would add up to eating is required but is not present.”*
- O. *Rabina said, “In such a case all parties concur that the prohibition against breaking a bone doesn’t apply, because we require the presence of the volume of meat that constitutes a minimum for eating. Rather, what is at issue between them is a limb that doesn’t have an olive’s bulk of meat on it at this point, but it does have an olive’s bulk of meat on it at some other point. The one who says that the law applies to a valid limb would concur that this is a valid limb. the one who says that it applies to a limb that is suitable for eating, then we require the measure of meat requisite for eating in the place in which the bone is broken, and lo that condition has not been met.”*

I.4. *A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with four of these authorities [Joseph, Nahman bar Isaac, Abbaye, and Rabina], as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *Rabbi says, “In one house shall it be eaten...neither shall you break a bone thereof (Exo. 12:46) — whatever is suitable for eating is subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone, and whatever is not suitable for eating is not subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone. If it had a moment at which it was fit but by the time of eating had become unfit, it is not subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone. If it contains the standard volume of meat that would add up to an act of eating, it is subject to the prohibition against breaking a bone; if it doesn’t have enough meat to add up to the requisite volume of a minimum for eating, it is not subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone. What is intended for the altar is*

not subject to that prohibition. Only at the time of eating is it subject to that prohibition, but not at the time of eating, it is not subject to that prohibition.”

I.5. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. A limb that doesn't have an olive's bulk of meat on it at this point, but it does have an olive's bulk of meat on it at some other point —
- C. R. Yohanan said, “It is subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone.”
- D. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “It is not subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone.”
- E. *R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish:* “ “Neither shall you break a bone thereof” — both a bone on which there is as much as an olive's bulk of meat and a bone on which there is not as much as an olive's bulk of meat.’ *Now what is the meaning of a bone on which there is not as much as an olive's bulk of meat? Should I say that it has not got an olive's bulk of meat at all? Then on what basis would it be subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone? So isn't this the sense of the statement:* all the same are a limb that doesn't have an olive's bulk of meat on it at this point and also a limb that doesn't have an olive's bulk of meat on it at this point, but it does have an olive's bulk of meat on it at some other point?”
- F. *He said to him, [85A]* “No, this is the sense of the statement: all the same are a limb that has as much as an olive's bulk of meat on the outside and a limb that doesn't have as much as an olive's bulk of meat on the outside but has as much as an olive's bulk of marrow on the inside, at the point of a breakage. *For so it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* “Neither shall you break a bone thereof” — all the same are a bone that has marrow and a bone that has no marrow. Then how do I carry out, “and they shall eat the meat in that night” (E 12: 8)? It pertains to the meat on the bone. But maybe that's not true, and rather refers to the meat that is in the bone? Then to what do I apply, “neither shall you break a bone thereof”? To a bone that has no marrow. But one that has marrow may one break so as to get at the marrow. And don't find that surprising, for what you have is an affirmative commandment, which comes and overrides a negative one. But when they say in connection with the second Passover, “you shall not break a bone thereof” (Num. 12), which didn't have to be stated, since Scripture says in any event, “according to all the statute of the Passover they shall keep it” (Num. 9:12), that yields the deduction that at issue are both a bone that contains marrow and a bone that doesn't contain marrow.”
- G. *An objection was raised:* a bone part of which was taken out of Jerusalem — one cuts the meat down to the bone and pares it until he gets to the joint and then cuts it off [eating the meat that hasn't gone outside of Jerusalem]. *Now, if you say that* all the same are a limb that doesn't have an olive's bulk of meat on it at this point and also a limb that doesn't have an olive's bulk of meat on it at this point, but it does have an olive's bulk of meat on it at some other point, neither being subject to the prohibition against breaking the bone, then why is it that one cuts the meat down to the bone and pares it until he gets to the joint and then cuts it off? *Let's scrape a bit away and just break the bone?*
- H. *Abbaye said, “Because it may split.”*

I. *Rabina said, "This refers to the thigh bone."*

I.6. A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: As to what has been rendered refuse by a priest's improper intention and what is left over from an offering beyond the valid time for eating it impart uncleanness to hands [M. Pes. 10:6].*

B. *R, Huna and R. Hisda —*

C. *one said, "It is because of suspects in the priesthood [who intentionally injured the donor by ruining his offering; the priest who handles that offering is unclean, and that would discourage doing so]."*

D. *The other said, "Because of lazy priests" [who didn't trouble to eat the meat at the proper spell and permitted it to become left over].*

E. *One recited the reason that he gave with reference to refuse, the other with reference to left over. The one who recited it with regard to refuse said that the reason involved suspects in the priesthood, and the one who stated it with regard to left over because of priests too lazy to eat their food.*

F. *One recited the rule to pertain to as much as an olive's bulk [that much would impart uncleanness to hands].*

G. *The other recited the rule to pertain to as much as an egg's bulk [that much, but no less, imparts uncleanness to hands].*

H. *The one who recited the rule to pertain to as much as an olive's bulk invoked the volume that is subject to a prohibition.*

I. *The one who recited the rule to pertain to as much as an egg's bulk referred to the bulk that is required to receive uncleanness [and the smallest volume that imparts uncleanness is an egg's bulk; the same standard then applies to the volume that imparts uncleanness to hands].*

I.7. A. *The question was raised: as to what is taken outside of Jerusalem, did rabbis decree uncleanness for that meat or did they not do so? Do we invoke the argument that it was in respect to left over in particular that they imposed uncleanness, because the priests might turn out to be slovenly in dealing with it; but as to that which goes outside, they are certainly not going to carry it out with their own hands, so rabbis did not issue a decree of uncleanness in that regard? Or maybe there's no difference between the one and the other?*

B. *Come and take note: A limb [of a Passover offering] part of which projected outside [of Jerusalem] — one cuts it away until he reaches the bone, pares off the flesh until he reaches the joint, and then he cuts it away [M. 7:12A-D]. Now, if you maintain that rabbis decreed uncleanness, if he cuts it away, so what difference does it make? Still the inner part of the meat is made unclean by contact with the part that went outside anyhow!*

C. *It is uncleanness that is concealed [the point of contact not being visible in the way in which the point of contact of two distinct pieces of meat is visible (Freedman)], and concealed uncleanness doesn't impart uncleanness.*

D. *And from the perspective of Rabina, who has said, "Connection effected by foodstuffs is not a valid connection, and they are as though distinct from one another," what is to be said [since we cannot invoke the argument of concealed uncleanness]? Now they do touch each other, so the inner portion is unclean!*

- E. *In the view of him who recited, an olive's bulk, would have to say that it didn't have as much as an olive's bulk; and in the view of him who said, an egg's bulk, would have to maintain it didn't have an egg's bulk.*
- F. *Come and take note: He who carries out the meat of a Passover offering from one association to another, even though that is subject to a prohibition, remains clean. Isn't the meaning, he is clean, but it is forbidden to do so, since what is taken from one association to another is in the status of what is taken outside of the partition affecting it, and it is invalidated; but even so, it is taught that he is clean, so it follows that rabbis made no such decree of uncleanness?*
- G. *No, the meaning is, he is clean, and it is permitted to do so, since what is taken from one association to another is not in the status of what is taken outside of the partition affecting it, and it is not invalidated.*
- H. *But note that the next clause teaches, he who eats it is subject to a negative commandment. Now there is no problem in the view of him who said, an egg's bulk, since this rule may speak of a case in which the volume is an olive's bulk but not an egg's bulk. But from the perspective of him who says, as much as an olive's bulk, what is to be said?*
- I. *Rather, in the case of one who takes out a Passover offering, we do not raise a question; rabbis certainly didn't decree uncleanness in that case. How come not? Members of an association are meticulous and careful about the matter, so there is no need to make such a decree. But the question does pertain to what is taken out in the case of sacrifices in general, so what is the upshot?*
- J. *That question will just have to stand.*
- I.8.** A. And one who takes out the meat of a Passover offering [85B] from one association to another — how on the basis of Scripture do we know [that he violates a negative commandment]?
- B. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“You shall not carry any of the meat abroad out of the house” (Exo. 12:46) —*
- D. *I know only that that is the rule against carrying it from house to house. How do we know that the same applies to carrying the meat from one association to another?*
- E. *Scripture says, “abroad,” meaning, outside where it is eaten.*
- I.9.** A. Said R. Ammi, “One who takes out the meat of a Passover offering from one association to another is liable only if he leaves it there. *For we find reference to ‘carrying out’ with respect to this matter and with respect to the Sabbath: just as in the case of the Sabbath, liability is incurred only when the same person has carried out the lifting up and the putting down, so here too, liability is incurred only if one has accomplished both the lifting up and the putting down.*”
- B. *Objected R. Abba bar Mammel, “They would carry them on poles. [If] the foremost [bearers] went outside the wall, and the latter did not [yet] go outside the wall, the former impart uncleanness to clothing, and the latter do not impart uncleanness to clothing — until they [actually] go forth [M. Zeb. 12:6A-D]. But lo, it has not come to rest.”*
- C. *He raised the question and he settled it: “Reference is made to carcasses that are dragged on the ground [which is an act of laying down].”*

- A. A limb [of a Passover offering] part of which projected outside [of Jerusalem]
—
 - B. one cuts it away until he reaches the bone,
 - C. pares off the flesh until he reaches the joint,
 - D. and then he cuts it away.
 - E. And in the case of Holy Things, he [simply] chops it off with a chopper.
 - F. For to [any of the Holy Things except for the Passover offering], the law against breaking a bone does not apply.
 - G. From the doorstep and toward the inner part of the city is an area deemed inside the city.
 - H. From the doorstep and outward is an area deemed outside the city.
 - I. The windows and the thick part of the wall are deemed an area inside the city
- I.1** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “And the same rule applies to prayer.” [A quorum of ten includes someone standing inside of the door stop, but if he is standing outside, he is not counted.]
- B. *He differs from R. Joshua b. Levi, for said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Even a wall of iron cannot get between Israel and their father in heaven.”*
- I.2.** A. *Lo, there is a contradiction in the body of the rule. First you say, **From the doorstep and toward the inner part of the city is an area deemed inside the city.** Then the doorstep itself is classified as outside of the city. But then note what follows: **From the doorstep and outward is an area deemed outside the city.** Then the doorstep itself is classified as inside of the city.*
- B. *No problem! The one speaks of the gates of the Temple court [the door step is inside], the other, the gates of Jerusalem [the door step is outside], for said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “How come the gates of Jerusalem were not sanctified? Because there those afflicted with the skin ailment take shelter, in summer from the sun, in winter from the rain.”*
- C. And said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “How come the gate of Nicanor wasn’t sanctified? Because there those afflicted with the skin ailment stand and poke their thumbs of their hands into the court [during the purification rite].”
- II.1** A. **The windows and the thick part of the wall are deemed an area inside the city:**
- B. Said Rab, “The rules and upper chambers weren’t sanctified [so offerings couldn’t be eaten there].”
- C. *But is that so? Lo, said Rab in the name of R. Hiyya, “If there was only as much as an olive’s bulk of the meat of the Passover offering, and yet the Hallel was sung so loud that it split the roofs” [86A] — doesn’t that mean that they were eating on the roof and reciting the Hallel on the roof?*
- D. *No, it means, they were eating on the ground but recited Hallel on the roof.*
- E. *Can that be so? But we have learned in the Mishnah: **They do not conclude after the Passover meal by saying, To the aftermeal entertainment**” [M. Pes.*

10:8 (trans. Freedman)]. And said Rab, “That means that people should not go running from one association to another” [but should stay where they are].

- F. *No problem, the one speaks of the time of eating [when people should stay where they are], the other speaks not of the time of eating [with the Hallel psalms recited when the meal were all over].*
- G. *Come and take note: Abba Saul says, “The status of the upper chamber of the house of the Holy of Holies enjoys a weightier status than the Holy of Holies, for as to the house of the Holy of Holies, the high priest goes into there once a year, but as to the upper chamber of the house of the Holy of Holies, they don’t go into there even once every seven years” — some say, “twice every seven years,” and some say, “once every Jubilee,” “to find out what it needs” [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:7].* [So the upper chambers were holy, in contrast to B.]
- H. *Said R. Joseph, “Should someone get up and object on the basis of evidence of the sanctuary [that held the golden altar]? The sanctuary is exception, since it is written, ‘Then David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch of the Temple and of the houses thereof and of the treasures thereof and of the upper rooms thereof and of the inner chambers thereof and of the place of the ark cover’ (1Ch. 28:11), and further, ‘All this I give you in writing as the Lord has made me wise by his hand upon me’ (1Ch. 28:19) [so this was a divine decree].”*
- I. *Come and take note: The [Temple] chambers built in the holy [precinct] and open to the unsanctified [area] — their inner space is deemed to be unsanctified and their roofs are deemed to be sanctified [M. M.S. 3:8A-B].*
- J. *Explained R. Hisda, “That speaks of a case in which their roofs were level with the ground of the Temple court.”*
- K. *If so, note what follows: Those built in the unsanctified area and open to the sanctified [precinct their inner space is [deemed to be] sanctified and their roofs are [deemed to be] unsanctified. [Those] built [partly] in the holy [precinct] and [partly] in the unsanctified [area] and open to [both] the sanctified [precinct] and the unsanctified area — as for their inner spaces and their roofs — that part which is in the sanctified [precinct] and inward is [deemed to be] sanctified [and that part which is] in the unsanctified [area] and outward is [deemed to be] unsanctified [M. M.S. 3:8C-G]. Now if it should enter your mind that the meaning is that the roofs are level with the ground, then they are nothing other than the cellars, and said R. Yohanan, “The cellars were not sanctified.”*
- L. *When R. Yohanan made that statement, it pertained to those that opened onto the Temple mount, but that was taught in regard to those opening into the Temple court.*
- M. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “The cellars under the sanctuary were not holy [and its roof is consecrated]” [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:11D]?*
- N. *When that Tannaite statement was set forth, it made reference to those that opening into the secular space.*
- O. *Come and take note: and its roof is consecrated [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:11D].*

- P. *But does that stand to reason? Lo, it has been taught as a Tannaite statement: As to the roofs of the Temple, people are not to eat Most Holy Things there or to slaughter there Lesser Holy Things. So in that case the statement, **and its roof is consecrated** [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:11D], presents a problem!*
- Q. *Said R. Hama bar Guria, “This pertained to those two cubits, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **The cubit of which they have spoken-with a middle-sized cubit. And two cubits were in the Palace of Shushan, one at the northeastern corner, and one at the southeastern corner. [That one] which was on the northeastern corner was longer than that of Moses by a half-fingerbreadth, and that one which was at the southeastern corner was longer than it by a half-fingerbreadth. It comes out that it was longer than that of Moses by a fingerbreadth. And why have they said one larger and one smaller? So that the workers [would] take according to the smaller [measure] and return according to the larger, so that they should not happen to commit sacrilege [M. Kel. 17:9].**”*
- R. *What need was there for two?*
- S. *One for gold and silver, the other for building [Cashdan: for building work the standard cubit was increased by one whole fingerbreadth].*
- T. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **The windows and the thick part of the wall are deemed an area inside the city.** Now there is no problem presented by the windows, you would find such a case if they were level with the ground of the Temple court. But in regard to the wall, how would you find such a situation?*
- U. *You would find such a situation in the case of a small wall: “But he has made the rampart and the wall mourn” (Lam. 2: 8), and said R. Aha, and some say, R. Hanina, “This refers to a wall and a little wall.”*

7:13

- A. **Two associations [registered for two separate Passover offerings] that were eating in one room —**
- B. **these turn their faces to one side and eat,**
- C. **and those turn their faces to the other side and eat.**
- D. **And the kettle is in the middle [between them].**
- E. **And when the waiter [who eats with one association but serves them both] stands up to mix the wine [of the company with which he is not eating],**
- F. **he shuts his mouth and turns his face away until he gets back to his own association,**
- G. **and then continues eating.**
- H. **And a bride turns her face aside while she eats,**
- I.1 A. *In accord with what authority is our Mishnah-rule?*
- B. *It is R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“Upon the houses wherein they shall eat it’ (Exo. 12: 7) — this teaches that the Passover offering may be eaten by two associations. Might one suppose that the one who eats it may do so in two places [e.g., in two separate rooms or in one divided room]? Scripture states, ‘in one house shall he eat it’ (Exo. 12:46). On this basis they have said: if the servant ate as much as an olive’s bulk at the side of*

the oven, a smart one will eat his fill; but if the members of the association want to do him a favor, they'll come and sit at his side" [Freedman, eating there, but he may not go and eat with them, for then he would be eating in two places], the words of R. Judah.

- D. R. Simeon says, "'Upon the houses wherein they shall eat it' (Exo. 12: 7) — this teaches that one who eats it may do so in two places. [86B] Might one suppose that it may be eaten by two associations? Scripture states, 'in one house shall he eat it' (Exo. 12:46)."
- E. *What is at issue?*
- F. *R. Judah maintains that the received spelling governs, and R. Simeon holds that the received vocalization governs.*

- I.2.** A. If they were sitting in one association, and a partition was spread between them [so they are now two companies], in the opinion of him who says, the Passover may be eaten by two associations, they continue eating. In the opinion of him who says, the Passover may not be eaten by two associations, they do not continue eating.
- B. If they were sitting and the partition was removed from between them, in the opinion of him who says, he who eats the Passover offering may eat it in two places, they continue to eat. In the opinion of him who says, one who eats the Passover offering may not eat it in two places, they do not continue eating.
- C. *In session R. Kahana set this statement forth as a definitive statement. Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana, "But don't you think it should be a question? For does removing a partition or setting up a partition change it into two places or two companies respectively?"*
- D. *That question stands.*

II.1 A. And a bride turns her face aside while she eats:

- B. *How come?*
- C. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "Because she is demur."

- II.2.** A. *R. Huna b. R. Nathan visited the household of R. Nahman bar Isaac. They said to him, "What's your name?"*
- B. *He said to them, "Rabbi Huna."*
- C. *They said, "Will the master care to sit on the couch?"*
- D. *He sat down.*
- E. *They offered him a cup. He accepted it right off the bat, but drank it in two gulps, and he didn't turn his face away.*
- F. *They said to him, "How come you call yourself Rabbi Huna?"*
- G. *He said to him, "Because that's my title."*
- H. *"How come, when they said to you, 'Will the master care to sit on the couch?' you sat down?"*
- I. *He said to them, "Whatever the household says to you, do."*
- J. *"How come, when they offered you a cup, you accepted it right off the bat?"*
- K. *He said to them, "They feign reluctance to a lightweight but not to a heavyweight."*

- L. *"So how come you drank it in two gulps?"*
- M. *He said to them, "Because it has been taught on Tannaite authority: he who drinks his cup in one gulp is a glutton, in two, it is proper, in three, it is arrogant."*
- N. *"How come you didn't turn your face away?"*
- O. *He said to them, "What we learned in the Mishnah is, **a bride turns her face aside while she eats.**"*

II.3. A. *R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé visited the household of R. Simeon b. R. Yosé b. Laqonayya. They offered him a cup. He accepted it right off the bat, but one it in one gulp.*

- B. *They said to him, "Doesn't the master concur: he who drinks his cup in one gulp is a glutton?"*
- C. *He said to them, "Well, they weren't talking about a case of a cup such as yours, which is niggardly, and wine such as yours, which is sweet, and a big belly such as mine."*

II.4. A. *Said R. Huna, "The members of an association enter by threes and leave one at a time."*

- B. *Said Rabbah, "But that is the rule that governs only if they enter at the time that people enter, and also only if the servant has noted their coming."*
- C. *Said Rabina, "And they pay in full, and the last has to give some extra."*
- D. *But the law is not in accord with his opinion.*