

# VI

---

## BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER SIX

FOLIOS 58A-66A

### 6:1A-C

- A. [58A] Most Holy Things, [supposed to be slaughtered at the north side of the altar,] that one slaughtered on top of the altar —
  - B. R. Yosé says, “They are as if they were slaughtered at the north [side of the altar].”
  - C. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “From the midpoint [above] the altar to the north is deemed equivalent to the north, from the midpoint [above] the altar to the south is deemed equivalent to the south.”
- I.1** A. *Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “R. Yosé would say, ‘The whole of the altar stands at the north.’”*
- B. *Then what is the meaning of the formulation, “They are as if they were slaughtered at the north [side of the altar]”?*
  - C. *What might you otherwise have supposed? We require the animals to be slaughtered “at the side of the altar” (Lev. 1:11), and this condition has not been met. So we are informed that that is not a valid supposition.*
- I.2.** A. *Said R. Zira to R. Assi, “Then do you maintain that R. Yosé b. R. Judah maintains that the altar actually is located half in the northern half of the courtyard and half in the southern? And should you concede that that is the fact, then it was you yourself who said in the name of R. Yohanan, ‘R. Yosé b. R. Judah concedes that if one has slaughtered the beasts [Freedman:] in a corresponding position on the ground, the sacrifices are unfit’?” [Freedman: It cannot mean on the pavement at the side of the altar, for then there would be no difficulty on Assi’s view. For even if the whole altar stood in the north, yet if one slaughtered the animal on the west or east of it at some distance from the actual side, it would still be unfit because the animal must be killed between the north side of the altar and the opposite wall of the Temple court; therefore this could not prove that Yosé did not hold that half of the altar was in the north and half in the south. Hence it must apparently mean, ‘on the ground of the altar itself,’ and how is this possible?]*
- B. *He said, to him, “This is the sense of what R. Yohanan said, ‘Both of the cited authorities interpret the same verse of Scripture, namely, “And you shall sacrifice*

upon it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings” (Exo. 20:21). *R. Yosé maintains that the whole of it serves for a burnt offering and the whole of it for peace offerings, and R. Yosé b. R. Judah maintains that half of it serves for burnt offerings and half for peace offerings. For if you should imagine that the whole of it is suitable for burnt offerings, then if the whole of it is suitable for burnt offerings, can there be any question that the whole of it is suitable for peace offerings?”*

- C. *Then how does the other party deal with this argument?*
- D. *It was necessary for Scripture to frame matters as it does, for you might have supposed that it is the burnt offering in particular that may be slaughtered on the top of the altar, since the area is crowded [Freedman: as the burnt offering must be slaughtered in the north, there may not be enough room when there are many sacrifices; hence Scripture permitted using the whole top of the altar as well], but as for peace offerings, for which there is ample space [since they can be slaughtered anywhere in the Temple court (Freedman)], I might have said that that is not the rule. So we are informed that even for peace offerings, the top of the altar is a suitable place.*

**I.3.** A. *Reverting to the body of the above discussion:*

- B. *Said R. Assi, said R. Yohanan, “R. Yosé b. R. Judah concedes that if one has slaughtered the beasts [Freedman:] in a corresponding position on the ground, the sacrifices are unfit.”*
- C. *Said R. Aha of Difti to Rabina, “What is the sense of the language, ‘in a corresponding position on the ground’? Shall we say that it means, on the cubit of the base or on the cubit of the terrace of the altar? That area itself is classified as the altar itself! Furthermore, what does the language, ‘on the ground’ mean? Should you say that the priest made a holy in the ground and slaughtered the animal therein, would that be a proper altar at all? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority, “An altar of earth you shall make for me” (Exo. 20:21) — this means that the altar must be attached to the earth and must not be built over holes in the ground or on rocks’?”*
- D. *It means that he cut it back. [Freedman: it was decided to shorten the altar, and the northern half of it was thus left clear. Although it is still the side, the offerings slaughtered there are unfit, which proves that he holds that the altar is in the south, as there is no other reason for its unfitness.]*

**I.4.** A. *Said R. Zira, “Is it possible that R. Yohanan made such a statement of the fact [that R. Yosé takes the view that the entirety of the altar stood at the north half of the courtyard (Freedman)], and that we have not repeated it as a Tannaite rule in our Mishnah?”*

- B. *So he went and looked closely and found the following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: **They selected from there fine pieces of fig wood with which to arrange the second altar fire, the one for the incense toward the southwestern corner, four cubits to the north of the corner. On weekdays, they took sufficient wood to produce an amount of five seahs of cinders, and on the Sabbath, sufficient for an amount of eight seahs of cinders. For there did they place the two dishes of frankincense which accompany the showbread.***

**[The limbs and pieces of fat which had not been consumed the preceding evening they put back onto the altar fire. They kindled the two altar fires. And they came down. And they went to the office made of hewn stone] [M. Tamid 2:5A-H].**

- C. [We now see how Yosé's position is adumbrated in a Mishnah-rule:] *And by what evidence did sages rule that the second pile was in the spot that has been designated in particular?*
- D. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **[58B]** R. Yosé says, "This is the evidence [on the basis of which sages designated that particular spot: whatever is taken from the inner altar to be placed on the outer altar is placed as near as possible to the inner altar, and whatever is taken from the outer altar to be placed on the inner altar is taken from as near as possible on the outer altar to the inner altar."
- F. "whatever is taken from the inner altar to be placed on the outer altar:" *what might this be? If we say that it is the residue of the blood, that matter is explicitly treated in the following verse of Scripture: "And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering which is at the door of the tent of meeting" (Lev. 4: 7). [Freedman: that is the nearest point to the inner altar, so why must Yosé give a general rule for it, when it is explicitly stated by Scripture itself?]*
- G. *Further, as to the statement, "whatever is taken from the outer altar to be placed on the inner altar:" what might this be? If we say that it is the coals of the Day of Atonement, that matter is explicitly treated in the following verse of Scripture, "And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord" (Lev. 16:12) [Freedman: "before the Lord" means, "near the inner sanctum].*
- H. So "whatever is taken from the inner altar to be placed on the outer altar" refers to the two dishes of frankincense for the show bread [taken on the Sabbath from the table, which was inside], which rule is to be inferred from the law governing the disposition of the residue of the blood [Freedman: they must be placed on the side facing the door, which is the nearest point].
- I. And "whatever is taken from the outer altar to be placed on the inner altar" refers to the goals of the altar every day [Freedman: which are taken from the second pile and placed on the inner altar], the disposition of which is to be inferred from the law governing the disposition of coals on the Day of Atonement.
- J. [Now when Yosé makes that point and says that this second pile is arranged four cubits from the horn northwards], *what is his view? If he takes the view that the whole of the altar is located at the southern half of the courtyard, then the priest would have to carry the coals twenty-seven cubits from the horn. [Freedman: the width of the door was ten cubits, five of which were in the north and five in the south, while the altar was thirty two cubits square. Now deducting the five cubits of the door on the northern side, the nearest point to the door would thus be twenty seven cubits from the opposite horn.]*
- K. *And even if he holds that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same, then he would have to carry it for twenty-two cubits. [Freedman: for then as soon as he reaches a point opposite the door of the inner sanctum, he is "before the Lord."*

As the door of the sanctum was five cubits wider than that of the entrance of the hall on both sides — ten wider in all — five cubits can be deducted from the preceding calculation].

- L. *And if he holds that it was half in the north and half in the south, he would have to bring it down eleven cubits [sixteen cubits in the south, deducting the five of the door from these sixteen (Freedman)].*
- M. *And even if he holds that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same, then he would have to carry it for six cubits.*
- N. *So it must follow that he holds that the whole altar was in the north, [and hence we have a Mishnah-ruling in accord with Yosé's position,] and the four cubits are as follows: one cubit for the base, one for the terrace, one for the horns, and one for the feet of the priests. If one goes further than this, there would be no more space left for the door [Freedman: it would carry it beyond the line of the door].*
- O. *[Freedman: to refute this proof,] said R. Adda b. Ahbah, "Who is the authority of this ruling? It is R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, 'The altar stood at the very middle of the Temple court [half to the north, half to the south]. It was thirty two cubits square, ten cubits faced the door of the inner sanctum, eleven cubits on either side thereof, so that the altar was exactly opposite the inner sanctum.' So according to R. Judah, the priest would still have to bring it down eleven cubits. And even if he took the position that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same, then he would have to carry it for six cubits."*
- P. *But do you suppose that these four cubits encompass the cubit at the base and the cubit of the terrace? Not at all, they exclude the cubit at the base and the cubit of the terrace. And we may accommodate this to the view of R. Yosé, so that he too maintains that the altar stood at the center [and why insist that only Judah can be the holder of that position]?*
- Q. *It is because in connection with R. Judah we have heard explicitly that he takes the view that the altar stood in the middle [and in fact we do not know what Yosé thought on that matter].*
- R. *And R. Sherabayya said, "Lo, who is the authority? It is in accord with R. Yosé the Galilean. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé the Galilean says, 'Since it is said, "And you shall set the laver between the tent of meeting and the altar" (Exo. 40: 7), and further, [59A] "And you shall set the altar of burnt offering before the door of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting" (Exo. 40: 6), the altar was at the door of the tent of meeting while the laver was not at the door of the tent of meeting. Where was the laver located? It was between the entry way to the inner sanctum and the altar, somewhat toward the south.' Now what is his premise? If he maintains that the whole of the altar was located in the southern half of the courtyard, then the laver should be placed southward from the wall of the inner sanctum, which would be between the entry way to the inner sanctum and the altar. And even if he maintains that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same, then he should locate the laver southward from the wall of the entry*

*way to the inner sanctum, for that would still be between the entry way and the altar. Then, again, if he maintains that half was in the north and half in the south, then let the laver be located southward from the wall of the inner sanctum, between the entry way and the altar. And even if he holds that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same, then he still can have it located southward from the wall of the entrance of the hall, which is between the entrance hall and the altar. So it must follow that he maintains that the whole of the altar is located in the north."*

- S. *But then let the laver be placed between the altar and the inner sanctum at the north.*
- T. *He holds that the sanctity of the hall containing the golden altar and the entrance of the hall containing the golden altar is one and the same.*
- U. *But then let the laver be placed northward from the wall of the entry chamber, so that it would be located between the entry and the altar?*
- V. Scripture says, "northward," meaning that the area at the north must be free of such utensils as a laver.
- W. *Who is the Tannaite authority who differs from R. Yosé the Galilean?*
- X. *It is R. Eleazar b. Jacob, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Y. R. Eleazar b. Jacob says, "'Northward' means that the north must be free of everything, even of the altar itself."

- I.5.** A. Said Rab, "If the altar is damaged [e.g., after the destruction of the Temple], all of the Holy Things that were sacrificed there are invalid. That is the lesson of a verse of Scripture that is in our possession, which we have forgotten."
- B. *When R. Kahana came up, he found R. Simeon b. Rabbi who stated in the name of R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if the altar is damaged, all of the Holy Things that were sacrificed there are invalid? It is said, 'And you shall sacrifice upon it your burnt offerings and your peace offerings' (Exo. 20:21). And is it upon the altar that you sacrifice the animals? But the sense is, you do so when it is whole and not when it is damaged."*
- C. *He said, "This is the verse that eluded Rab's grasp."*
- D. But R. Yohanan said, "All the same are this and that: they are unfit." [If an animal is sanctified when the altar was unfit, then whether it was slaughtered or not makes no difference; it is unfit one way or the other (Freedman)]."
- E. *What is at stake between them?*
- F. *Rab takes the position that living animals cannot be permanently invalidated for use as an offering.*
- G. *R. Yohanan takes the position that living animals may be permanently invalidated for use as an offering. [A beast that is consecrated can be removed for ever from sacred use and even though later on it became fit to be offered, it cannot be offered, since it has earlier been suspended from use on the altar for some reason. So if to begin with at the point of its consecration an animal is removed from sacred use, then the suspension remains valid forever.]*
- H. *An objection was raised: All animals that had been consecrated prior to the building of the altar [of the second Temple], after the altar was built are unfit for*

use on the altar. *Now if it was before the altar was built, then they were rejected at the very moment at which they were consecrated [there being no altar], to begin with! Rather phrase matters, “before the altar was torn down.”*

- I. “Before the altar was torn down”? *But then the animals would in any event have become superannuated! Rather, read, “animals that had been sanctified before the altar was damaged, then if the altar was damaged, are unfit [even if they were slaughtered after the altar was repaired, as against Rab’s view that after the altar is repaired they would be fit (Freedman)].*
- J. *Since you are the one who has emended the formulation, emend it to read: “which were slaughtered [while the altar was damaged] [and that would not contradict Rab’s position after all].*
- K. But has not R. Giddal said Rab said, “If the altar was uprooted, still they burn incense in its place.”
- L. *The answer accords with Raba: “R. Judah concurs in the case of blood” [which can be sprinkled only if there is an altar], so here too, “Rab concurs in the case of blood” [which can be sprinkled only if there is an altar].*

**I.6.** A. *What is the context of the statement, “R. Judah concurs in the case of blood”?*

- B. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. ““The same day did the king sanctify the middle of the court that was before the house of the Lord...because the brazen altar that was before the Lord was too small to receive the burnt offering and the meal offering and the fat of the peace offerings’ (1Ki. 8:64) — this is literally the fact [Freedman: Solomon sanctified the whole of the pavement to serve as an altar, to permit the burning of the limbs and so forth upon it],” the words of R. Judah.
- D. Said to him R. Yosé, **[59B]** “But is it not said, ‘A thousand burnt offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar’ (1Ki. 3: 4) [the altar made in the days of Moses, 2Ch. 1:6], and further of the eternal house it is said, ‘And Solomon offered for the sacrifice of peace offerings, which he offered to the Lord, twenty-two thousand oxen’ (1Ki. 8:63). If you add up the number of burnt offerings and the number of cubits, was the latter altar bigger than the former altar anyhow? [Freedman: Moses’ altar had one cubit square for the actual burning, and Solomon’s altar was twenty cubits larger, four hundred times larger; if the smaller altar could cope with a thousand animals, the larger one could take the number offered that day, so ‘too little to receive’ cannot be literally the fact]. So then what does the language, ‘too little to receive mean’? It is in line with what someone euphemistically says to someone else, ‘So and so is a dwarf,’ when he is unfit for the service. [Here too, rather than say that the altar was unfit for service, it was deemed more courteous to say, ‘it was too small’ (Freedman)].”
- E. *But surely R. Yosé has given a good answer to R. Judah!*
  - F. *R. Judah is consistent with views held elsewhere, for he has said, “The altar that Moses made was a big one.” For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - G. ““And you shall make the altar of acacia wood, five cubits long and five cubits broad, the altar shall be square’ (Exo. 27: 1)’ — literally so,” the words of R. Yosé.



- H. R. Judah says, "Here we find the usage, 'square,' and elsewhere [at Eze. 43:16] the same word occurs. Just as 'square' there is measured from the center, so here too it was measured from the center. And how do we know that that is the case there? Because it is written, 'And the hearth shall be twelve cubits long by twelve cubits broad, squared' (Eze. 43:16). You might think that was only twelve cubits square, but when Scripture says, 'to the four sides thereof,' it means that the measurement was taken from the middle." [Freedman: accordingly, Moses's altar was ten cubits square, not five, and when the two cubits on all sides are deducted, it was still six as against Solomon's twenty cubits square; the latter therefore would not be large enough for the extra work it had to do.]
- I. And how does R. Yosé deal with this claim?
- J. *When he appeals by an argument on the basis of analogy of intersecting language, the shared language concerning "cubit" refers to the height of the altar. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. "'And the height thereof shall be three cubits,' (Exo. 27: 1) — this is meant literally," the words of R. Judah.
- L. R. Yosé says, "Here we find the usage, 'square,' and elsewhere [at Exo. 30: 2, with reference to the golden calf] the same word occurs. Just as 'square' there means that the height was twice the length, so here too the height as twice the length" [Freedman: hence ten cubits].
- M. Said to him R. Judah, "Is it possible to imagine that the priest would be standing on the altar performing the service while all the people saw him from outside [Freedman: as would be the case of the altar were ten cubits high]?"
- N. Said to him R. Yosé, "But has it not been stated, 'And the hangings of the court and the screen for the door of the gate of the court, which is by the tabernacle and by the altar round about' (Num. 4:26) — [this teaches that] just as the tabernacle was ten cubits high, so the altar was ten cubits high, and it says, 'The hangings for the one side were fifteen **[60A]** cubits' (Exo. 38:14). What then is the meaning of 'and the height was five cubits' (Exo. 27:18)? From the upper edge of the altar to the top of the hangings. And what is the meaning of 'and the height thereof shall be three cubits'? From the edge of the terrace to the top of the altar."
- O. And how does R. Judah rebut this argument?
- P. *When he adduces the argument by verbal analogy, it is with reference to the breadth.*
- Q. *But from the perspective of R. Judah, lo, the priest will be visible [when performing the rite]!*
- R. *Granting that the priest will be visible, the actual performance of the rite that is under his responsibility is not going to be visible.*
- S. *From the view of R. Judah, there is no problem with the verse, "the king did sanctify" [the pavement to serve as the altar].*
- T. *But from the viewpoint of R. Yosé, what is the meaning of "the king did sanctify" [the pavement to serve as the altar]?*
- U. He sanctified it so that he could set up the altar upon it.

- V. *From the viewpoint of R. Yosé, there is no problem with the statement, “it was little,” but from the viewpoint of R. Judah, what can have been meant by “little”* [Freedman: since according to him even the stone altar was not large enough, why state that “the brazen altar was too little”?]
- X. *This is the sense of the verse: the altar of stones that Solomon made in place of the altar of copper was little.*
- Y. [In the dispute about the verbal analogy, whether, as Yosé has claimed, it derives from the use of “square” with reference to the golden altar, or, as Judah has claimed, it derives from the usage in Ezekiel,] *what is at stake in the dispute?*
- Z. *One authority holds that we construct an analogy between a usage with reference to the outer altar and another usage with reference to the outer altar, and we do not construct an analogy for a usage with reference to the outer altar from a usage with reference to the inner altar.* [Freedman: The bronze altar and the Temple court were “outer,” not in the inner sanctum; the golden altar was in the inner sanctum]. *One authority holds that we draw an analogy between one utensil of service in the Temple and another such utensil of service, while we do not draw an analogy for a utensil of service from a trait of the building itself* [Freedman: both the brazen altar and the golden altar were utensils of service, while Ezekiel’s stone altar as a constructed edifice].
- AA. Said Raba, “R. Judah concurs in the matter of blood [that it could not be sprinkled on the pavement; the pavement was sanctified only for burning up the fats and limbs of the sacrificial animals]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- BB. **“R. Judah says, ‘The priest would fill one cup with mingled blood and sprinkle it once against the base of the altar [for if the blood of one of them was mixed in, this will turn out to validate it’ [T. Pes. 4:12D-E]** *Now if you should imagine that Judah holds that the whole of the Temple court was sanctified in respect to sprinkling the blood, then the religious duty of sprinkling the blood has been carried out when the blood simply spilled on the pavement!”*
- CC. *But perhaps it is invalid only because he holds that we require that the blood be poured out through the deliberate action of a human being [intentionally, and not accidentally]?*
- DD. *If so, let us take the blood and pour it out in its proper place* [Freedman: as soon as the blood is received in a utensil, let it be poured out there and then].
- EE. *But perhaps the operative consideration is that it cannot be done because he maintains that the religious duty has to be performed in a proper way* [sprinkling the blood on the altar, but if he intentionally poured it out on the ground, after the fact the rite would be valid].
- I.7.** A. Said R. Eleazar, “On account of the altar’s being damaged [after the destruction of the Temple], priests may not eat the residue of the meal offering, because it is said, ‘And eat it without leaven beside the altar’ (Lev. 10:12).
- B. “Is it the fact then that they actually ate it beside the altar? [It was eaten anywhere in the Temple court.] The sense, then, can only be, when the altar is whole and not when it has been damaged.”



- I.8.** A. *We therefore have found the rule* [that on account of the altar's being damaged, after the destruction of the Temple, priests may not eat their share of the offerings] *with respect to Most Holy Things?*'
- B. Scripture states, "Most Holy Things." [Freedman: the same law is applied to sacrifices of Most Holy Things by reason of Lev. 6:18.]
- I.9.** A. *We therefore have found the rule* [that after the destruction of the Temple, priests may not eat their share of the offerings] *with respect to Most Holy Things? How do we know the rule governing Lesser Holy Things?*
- B. *Said Abayye, "It is derived by the exegesis proposed by R. Yosé. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:"*
- C. **[In the version of T. Sanhedrin 3:6A-Q:] R. Yosé says three matters [60B] in the name of three elders, and this is one of them:**
- D. **[So R. Yosé states,] "R. Ishmael says, 'Is it possible to suppose that a person should bring second tithe up to Jerusalem at this time [after the destruction of the Temple] and eat it there? Now it is logical to think that that might not be the case. For the firstling requires transportation to the holy place, and second tithe requires transportation to the holy place. Just as the firstling is eaten only in the time of the Temple, so second tithe should be eaten only in the time of the Temple. But no, if you state that rule in regard to the firstling, which produces blood and sacrificial parts for the altar [and for which, therefore, the proper conduct of the sacrificial service is necessary], will you say the same rule in regard to second tithe, which does not, after all, produce blood and sacrificial parts for the altar? But the matter of first fruits will prove the case [forming the required exception to the foregoing], for they do not produce blood and sacrificial parts for the altar, and yet they are eaten only in the time of the Temple. But no, if you have stated that rule in the case of first fruits, which require being set into place before the altar, will you state the same rule for second tithe, which does not require being set into place before the altar? Scripture says, 'And you will eat before the Lord your God the tithe of your grain wine and oil, and the firstborn of beasts' (Deu. 14:23). Just as the firstling is eaten only in the time of the Temple, so second tithe should be eaten only in the time of the Temple.'"**
- E. *But why not reverse the argument and prove the case of second tithe by appeal to the analogy of the shared traits?* [Miller to Bavli Temurah 21A: if you say that the analogy between firstfruits and tithe is not exact, since in the former there is no setting before the altar, then the case of firstling will prove that even without the setting before the altar it is necessary for the Temple to be in existence in order that the firstling can be brought, and the same therefore will apply to second tithe. Again, if you say that the firstling is different because it requires the application of its blood to the altar, then the case of firstfruits will prove that although there is no application of blood, only when the Temple stands can they be brought, and the same therefore will apply to second tithe. Firstlings and firstfruits have one point in common, the need of bringing them to a holy place, and the Temple must be standing; the same will apply to second tithe, that it will be brought only when the Temple is standing.]

- F. [Supply, following the version of B. Tem. 21A: *Said R. Ashi,*] *“The reason that that is not so is that one may raise the following problem: the point in common among them [the firstling and firstfruits] is that they have some relationship to the altar. Now what is R. Ishmael’s conception [since he knows that a firstling is not eaten when the Temple is not standing, but is not sure about second tithe]? If he holds that when the Temple was originally consecrated, Joshua consecrated the land for the time being [when it was inhabited by Jews] and also for the future [in which case, even without the Temple, Jerusalem is still a holy place]? Then there should be no difference between the case of the firstling and that of the second tithe, both of them being appropriately brought. But if R. Ishmael maintained that the initial act of consecration was for the moment but that he did not consecrate it for all time in the future, then even the status of the firstling also should be a problem for you!”*
- G. *Said Rabina, “In point of fact, he takes the view that the initial act of consecration was for the moment but that he did not consecrate it for all time in the future, but here, what is at stake? The case in which the blood of the firstling was tossed on the altar while the Temple was still standing, but then the Temple was destroyed, and the meat is still there. Since, if the blood were available, it would no longer be suitable for sprinkling [Jerusalem then having been destroyed in the interim,] we derive the case of the flesh of the firstling [as regards eating it] from the case of the blood of the firstling. [Miller, loc. cit.: And just as the blood cannot be sprinkled, so the flesh cannot be eaten.] And then we derive the case of second tithe from the case of the firstling [Miller, loc. cit.: just as the firstling is certainly not eaten in Jerusalem, there being no Temple, so second tithe is not eaten in Jerusalem.]*
- H. *But do we infer the rule of one matter of consecration from another? [Supply, following the version at B. Tem. 21B:] And has not R. Yohanan said, “Throughout the Torah we infer one rule from another that has itself been derived by inference, except for the matter of consecration, in which we do not derive a rule from another that has itself been inferred”?*
- I. Tithe is a matter of what is secular [Miller, loc. cit.: therefore when we compare second tithe with the firstling, we are not really making an analogy between dedications, as is the case when we inferred “flesh” from “blood.”]
- J. *That poses no problem to one who maintains that we follow the upshot of that which is derived [whether the subject is dedications or not. And since it is second tithe that is the subject learned and derived from dedication, it is quite in order, because second tithed can be rendered unconsecrated (Miller)]. But what will you say to one who maintains that that from which the derivation comes is the operative consideration [Miller: here, the blood of the firstling, as we derive the rule for second tithe from it, and this does belong to the category of that which has been consecrated]?*
- K. *“Flesh” and “blood” in the matter of the firstling are deemed a single subject [Miller: and since this is the case, we are only making one inference, i.e., second tithe from the blood and flesh of a firstling, which are considered as one subject as regards dedications].*

- I.10.** A. *When Rabin went up [to the Land of Israel,] he reported this matter before R. Jeremiah, who stated, “Stupid Babylonians! Because they live in a gloomy country, they repeat obscure traditions! Have they not heard that which was taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **“At the time that the tabernacle was dismantled during the wanderings in the desert, sacrifices that might have been made were invalid, and persons afflicted with flux [Lev. 15] and with the skin ailment [Lev. 13-14] were expelled from their camps [where during the time that the tabernacle was set up, they could remain]. [Freedman: those afflicted with flux were sent out of the camp of the Levites, with the skin ailment out of the camp of the Israelites] [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:12F, with variations].**
- C. *“Another Tannaite teaching states: In two locales Holy Things may be eaten [in the area that was permitted for their purpose when the tabernacle was set up, and in any locale at all when the people were travelling]. [This contradicts the foregoing.]*
- D. *“[The contradiction is to be resolved by the supposition that] the former refers to Most Holy Things, the latter, Lesser Holy Things.”*
- E. *Said Rabina, “The one and the other refer to Lesser Holy Things, and still there is no contradiction. [61A] The one presents the view of R. Ishmael [who treats the meat as equivalent to the blood, so if the one has not been disposed of, the other may not be eaten], and the other represents the view of rabbis [who treat the two as distinct entities].*
- F. *“And if you prefer, I shall say, both speak of Most Holy Things, but what is the sense of the statement, In two locales Holy Things may be eaten? Prior to the Levites’ setting up of the Tabernacle, [61B] and posterior to the Levites’ setting up of the Tabernacle [Freedman: The former refers to the time at which the Tabernacle was standing, so the two places are (i) within the normal precincts of the Tabernacle while it stood, and (ii) within the normal precincts but after the Tabernacle had been dismantled, with the altar still standing]. What might you have imagined? That in the latter case the meat would have been invalidated because it has been taken outside of the bounds [of the Tabernacle, now that the hangings are taken down]? So we are informed that that is not the case.”*
- G. *But maybe it is the case?*
- H. Scripture says, “Then the tent of meeting shall set forward” (Num. 2:17) — even when it has set forward, [having been dismantled.] it is still the tent of meeting!

## **Comparing the Altars at Shilo, the First Temple and the Second Temple. The Character of the Second Temple and its Altar**

- I.11.** A. *Said R. Huna [or: Hisda] said Rab, “The altar at Shilo was made of stones. For so it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- B. R. Eleazar b. Jacob says, “Why is the word ‘stones’ stated three times [at Exo. 20:22: ‘And if you make me an altar of stone, you shall not build it of hewn stones,’ and at Deu. 27: 5-6, ‘And there you shall build an altar of stones, you shall build the altar of the Lord your God from unhewn stones’]? One refers to the altar at Shilo, one to the altar at Nob and Gibeon, and one to the altar at the eternal house.”

- C. *Objected R. Aha bar Ammi*, “The fire that came down from heaven in the days of Moses [Lev. 9:24] did not leave the bronze altar until the days of Solomon. [Freedman, citing Rashi: a pot was placed over that fire when they travelled and the fire remained in its place; when Solomon built the Temple, this fire left the bronze altar and moved to the stone altar in the Temple.] The fire that descended in the days of Solomon did not leave until Manasseh came and removed it. *But if it is so [that the altar of Shilo was made of stone] then the fire should have left earlier* [Freedman: as soon as the stone altar was built at Shilo, the fire should have departed from Moses’s bronze altar].”
- D. *He has framed matters in accord with R. Nathan, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. R. Nathan says, “The altar at Shilo was made of bronze; it was hollow and filled with stones.”
- F. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said*, “What is the meaning of ‘did not leave’? ‘It did not leave for nought.’” [Freedman: until Solomon built the Temple, the fire did not completely depart from Moses’s altar, which was still in existence, for though it did move to the altar at Shilo, some of it remained on that of Moses.]
- G. *What was it?*
- H. *Rabbis said*, “It was a fire that sent forth sparks” [when fat was burnt on the stone altar, sparks flew from the heavenly fire that was on the bronze altar that was there on the stone altar (Freedman)].
- I. *R. Pappa said*, “It took up residence sometimes here, sometimes there.”
- I.12.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah:* [The altar was thirty-two by thirty-two [cubits] [at the base]. It rose by one cubit and drew in by one cubit [on every side]. This is the foundation. Thus was left [an area] thirty cubits by thirty. It rose by five cubits and drew in by one cubit. This is the circuit. Thus was left [an area] twenty-eight by twenty-eight. The area of the horns is a cubit on this side and a cubit on that side. Thus was left [an area] twenty-six by twenty-six. The place for the passage of the priests is a cubit on this side and a cubit on that side. Thus was left [an area] twenty-four by twenty-four [as] the place for the [altar] fire. Said R. Yosé, “At the outset it was only twenty-eight by twenty-eight. It draws in and rises in this same measure, so that the area for the altar fire turns out to be twenty by twenty (2Ch. 4:11.)] But when the men of the Exile came up, they added four cubits at the south and four cubits at the west, in the shape of a gamma, [since it is said, And the altar hearth shall be twelve cubits long by twelve broad, square’ (Eze. 43:16). [Is it possible that it should be only twelve by twelve? But when it also says, In the four quarters thereof, it teaches that from the middle one measures twelve cubits in all directions so that the area for the altar fire must be twenty-four by twenty-four” [M. Mid. 3:1A-P]. [Freedman: The altar of the first Temple was twenty-eight cubits square overall, while that of the second Temple was thirty-two cubits, the addition would be a strip four cubits broad in triangular shape, like a Greek gamma.]
- B. *How come [they made the altar larger]?*
- C. *Said R. Joseph*, “It is because the smaller dimensions did not suffice.”

- D. *Said to him Abayye, "Now if in the time of the first Temple, concerning which it is written, 'Judah and Israel were as many as the sand that is by the sea in multitude (1Ki. 4:20),' it was sufficient, why in the world would it have been insufficient in size for the offerings brought in the time of the second Temple, in which case it was written, 'The whole congregation together was forty-two thousand' (Ezr. 2:64)?"*
- E. In the time of the first Temple the heavenly fire assisted them [in consuming the vast quantities of meat on the altar], but in the time of the second Temple the heavenly fire did not assist them.
- I.13.** A. *When Rabin came, he said R. Simeon b. Pazzi in the name of Bar Qappara [said], "They added pits to the structure."* [Freedman: in Solomon's Temple there was a pit near the southwest of the altar, into which the altar libations were poured directly. In the second Temple the altar was extended on the south and the west, so that the place of the pit was incorporated in it, and over against this extension on top of the altar they made holes for the libations to flow into the pit below.] *[The reason is that] at first they supposed that 'an altar of dirt' meant that it was to be closed in with dirt* [Freedman: not hollow in any way]. *But then they took the view that drinking must be comparable to eating* [and as the meat was consumed on top of the altar, so the libations must be on the top of the altar (Freedman)]. *And what then did they understand by 'an altar of dirt'? It was to be an altar attached to the earth [62A] and not resting on rocks or over cellars* [but it could be hollow (Freedman)].
- B. *Said R. Joseph, "Is that not in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *""And they set the altar upon its bases" (Ezr. 3: 3) —that the altar had completely filled out its final measurements?"* [Freedman: it was revealed to the builders of the second altar exactly which site was sacred for the altar, this knowledge having been withheld from Solomon when he built the first altar.]
- D. But is it not written, "And all this do I give you in writing, as the Lord has made me wise by his hand upon me, even all works of this pattern" (1Ch. 28:19) [that is, the plans of the first Temple with all its appurtenances]? Thus it had all been revealed to Solomon too, which contradicts the former statement (Freedman).]
- E. *Rather, said R. Joseph, "They found a verse of Scripture and interpreted it, as follows: 'Then David said, "This is the house of the Lord God, and this is the altar of burnt offering for Israel"' (1Ch. 22: 1). The altar was like the Temple building itself: just as the Temple building was sixty cubits in length, so the altar encompassed sixty cubits square* [and they could build anywhere in that area]."  
[So they did not need so large an area and enlarged it in accord with their needs (Freedman)].
- I.14.** A. *Now as to the site of the Temple itself, there is no problem for the outline of the building was easily discerned even in its ruin. But as to the site of the altar, how did they know where it should go?*
- B. Said R. Eleazar, "They envisioned the altar built, with Michael, the important prince, standing and offering on it."
- C. R. Isaac Nappaha said, "They discerned the dust of Isaac laying in that place."

- D. And R. Samuel bar Nahman said, “At the site of the entire destroyed building throughout they could detect the smell of incense, but from that site [where the altar had stood] they could detect the smell of burned limbs.”
- E. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “Three prophets returned with them from the exile [Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi], one who bore witness to them as to [the dimensions] of the altar, one who bore witness to them as to the site of the altar, and one who bore witness to them that people may make offerings even though there was no Temple [the location of the Temple being held sanctified for all time, not only when a Temple was built on the spot].”
- F. *In a Tannaite statement it was taught:*
- G. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “Three prophets returned with them from the exile [Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi], one who bore witness to them as to [the dimensions] of the altar and as to the site of the altar, and one who bore witness to them that people may make offerings even though there was no Temple [the location of the Temple being held sanctified for all time, not only when a Temple was built on the spot], and one who bore witness to them concerning the Torah, that it was to be written in Assyrian letters.”

**I.15.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The facts that the altar is to have a horn, an ascent, a base, and to be squared shape are indispensable. The prescribed measurements on the length, breadth, and height of the altar are not indispensable.
- C. *What is the source in Scripture for that rule?*
- D. Said R. Huna, “[In these regards] said Scripture, ‘The altar,’ and in any passage in which a rule is given with the formula including ‘the altar,’ that detail is indispensable in the proper construction of the altar.”
- E. *Then how about the laver, in the view of Rabbi, and the terrace, in the view of R. Yosé b. R. Judah? These too should be indispensable, since it is written, “And you shall put it under the ledge around the altar beneath” (Exo. 27: 5).*
- F. *And it was taught on Tannaite authority: What is the ledge?*
- G. Rabbi says, “This refers to the laver.”
- H. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “This refers to the terrace.”
- I. *True enough, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. **For there was the case of the Boethusian who poured out the water on his feet, and all the people stoned him with their citrons [M. Sukkah 4:9N-O].**
- L. **And the horn of the altar was damaged that day [so the sacred service was annulled for that day], until they brought a lump of salt and put it on it, not because the altar was once more validated, but so that the altar should not appear to be damaged.**
- M. **For any altar lacking a horn, ramp, or foundation is invalid. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “Also the rim” [T. Suk. 3:16D-F].**

**I.16.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. What is the ledge?
- C. It is a place for the priests to walk between one horn and another.



- D. *But did the priests walk between one horn and another?*
- E. *Rather, read as follows: it was a place where the priest walked.*
- F. But is it not written, "...under the ledge and around it beneath, reaching halfway up" (Exo. 38: 4)? [Freedman: Scripture states that the network grating around the sides of the altar was under the ledge. This implies that the ledge was on the wall of the altar, for if it was on the top surface, a grating on the sides could not be described as under it.]
- G. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "There were two, one for decoration, the other for the use of the priests, so that they should not slip."* [Freedman: there was an ornamental ledge on the side of the altar and a trench on the top, to provide a firm foothold for the priests.]

- I.17.** A. The prescribed measurements on the length, breadth, and height of the altar are not indispensable.
- B. Said R. Mani, "That is on condition that the altar not be smaller than the one that Moses made."
  - C. And how large was that?
  - D. Said R. Joseph, "One cubit square."
  - E. *They laughed at him:* "And you shall make the altar...five cubits long and five wide" (Exo. 27: 1).
  - F. *Said to him Abayye, "Perhaps what you meant to say was, 'the place of the pile [where the sacrifice was burnt].'"* [Freedman: Of the five cubits, two had to be deducted on all sides for the strip between the horns and the pathway for the priests, leaving an area of one cubit square for the place of the pile itself.]
  - G. *[He said to him,] "The master [you] is an eminent authority, and you really do know full well precisely what I meant." In the others' regard he cited the verse, [62B] "...the children of Keturah" (Gen. 25: 4) [of Abraham, but then not of Isaac and Jacob].*

**I.18.** A. *R. Tarfon's sister's sons were in session before R. Tarfon [and had nothing to say.*

- B. He cited the verse as, "And Abraham took another wife, and her name was Yohani" (Gen. 25: 1) [though the right name was Keturah].
- C. *They said to him, "What is written is 'Keturah.' "*
- D. *In their regard he cited the verse, "...the children of Keturah" (Gen. 25: 4) [of Abraham, but then not of Isaac and Jacob].*

- I.19.** A. Said R. Abin b. Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "The logs of wood that Moses cut for the altar fire for the morning and evening whole offerings were a cubit long and a cubit wide and they were of the thickness of the instrument for levelling off the top of a seah."
- B. Said R. Jeremiah, "It was with a cubit-measure that was cut off [shorter than a usual cubit]."
  - C. *Said R. Joseph, "Is that not in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:"*
  - D. "Upon the wood that is on the fire that is on the altar" (Lev. 1: 8) —
  - E. this indicates that the wood is not to project at all beyond the sides of the altar.

**I.20.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: And a ramp was at the south of the altar, thirty-two by a breadth of sixteen [M. Mid. 3:3C].*

- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know [that the ramp had to be at the south side of the altar]?*
- C. Said R. Huna, “Said Scripture, ‘And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward’ (Lev. 1:11) — meaning that the side must be in the north and the front in the south.” [Freedman: The word translated side means ‘thigh,’ hence legs; thus the altar must be like a man lying with his legs stretched northward and his face in the south. The side of the altar having this ascent would naturally be the front.]
- D. *But why not say, “the side in the north and the face in the north”* [Freedman: like a man sitting upright]?
- E. *Said Raba, “Throw a man down on his face.”* [Freedman: it must be like a man lying face downward, with the face in the opposite direction to the legs.]
- F. *Said to him Abayye, “To the contrary! Let the man sit upright!”*
- G. It is written, “And the altar shall be four square” (Exo. 27: 1). [The word for square uses letters that can be read, “lie down,” so the altar must be like a man lying down (Freedman)].
- H. *But does it say, “square”* [with no other possible reading]?
- I. *And on your theory, does it read “lying down”* [with no other possible reading]? Rather, what it says can be read either way [square. lying down].

**I.21.** A. *There is a Tannaite figure who derives the matter from the following, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Judah says, “‘And its steps shall face eastward’ (Eze. 43:17) — every time you turn, you must be to the right of the east” [Freedman: the reference is to the altar and is interpreted to mean that the altar must be so constructed that when the priest, standing by the altar, has to turn round the side, he will turn right and go eastward; that is possible only if the ascent is at the south].
- C. *But why not say, “...will turn left and go eastward”?*
- D. *Perish the thought! For as a Tannaite statement Rami bar Ezekiel stated, “The sea that Solomon made ‘stood on twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, three looking toward toward the west, three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east’ (2Ch. 4: 4) — thus every time you turn, you must be to the right of the east.”*
- E. *But that statement is required to make its own point [concerning the position of the oxen].*
- F. *If so, why repeat “looking toward”?*

**I.22.** A. R. Simeon b. Yosé b. Laqonayya asked R. Yosé, “Did R. Simeon b. Yohai say, ‘There was an open space between the ascent and the altar [with a gap between the one and the other]?’”

- B. He said to him, “And as to you, do you not say the same thing? And is it not stated, ‘And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood’ (Deu. 12:27) — just as it is necessary to toss the blood against the altar, so it is necessary to toss the meat [onto the fire, randomly].” [Freedman: consequently a

priest standing at the top of the ascent could not place the meat on the altar but had to throw it, so there must have been a gap.]

- C. He said to him, "But I say that he would stand at the side of the wood pile and throw it" [and no gap was needed].
- D. He said to him, "When the priest would toss the meat, was it onto a pile of wood that was burning or onto a pile of wood that was not burning? Surely it must have been onto a pile of wood that was burning, and there it would be impossible to do otherwise." [Freedman: since the wood was burning, the priest obviously could not go right up to it but had to stand at a distance and throw it. But in that case, since it was impossible to do otherwise, no verse of Scripture would be required to make that point. So the purpose of the verse must be to teach that there was a gap between the ascent and the altar, not that there was between the priest and the pile of wood.]
- E. R. Pappa said, "[‘And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the meat and the blood’ (Deu. 12:27):] like the blood, in that just as in the case of the blood, the airspace above the pavement would interpose, so in the case of tossing the meat, the airspace above the pavement would interpose" [Freedman: which would not be the case if he stood at the side of the pile].
- F. Said R. Judah, "Two small stairways branched off from the ascent, by which one turned to the base and to the terrace. These were distant by a hairsbreadth from the altar, since it is said, ‘round about.’" [Freedman: This implies that it must be possible to encompass the altar itself, even if only by drawing a thread about it. But if the ascent actually joined the altar, this could not be done.]
- G. And R. Abbahu said, "What is written is ‘four square’" [Freedman: which implies that the altar stood unattached as a square edifice].
- H. *And it is necessary to state both "round about" and "four square."*
- I. *For if Scripture had written "round about" and not "four square," I might have concluded that it can be circular, so Scripture had to specify, "four square." And if Scripture had written only, "four square," I might have concluded that it could be long and narrow, so it was necessary for Scripture to state, "round about" [equal on all sides].*

**I.23.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: the ramp and the altar, sixty-two [M. Mid. 5:2B]. But as a matter of fact they were sixty-four [thirty-two each]!*

B. The upshot is that it overhung a cubit of the base and a cubit of the balcony.

**I.24.** A. [63A] Said Rami bar Hama, "All of the ascents had a gradient of one cubit in three [rising one cubit in every three] except for the ascent of the altar, [Freedman:] which was one and a half cubits and a finger and a third, counting the little fingers" [Freedman: as heavy limbs of animals had to be carried up on it, it had an easier gradient, nine cubits in thirty two]."

### 6:1D-I

- D. Meal offerings were taken in hand in any place in the courtyard,
- E. and [the residue] was eaten within the veils,
- F. by males of the priesthood,
- G. [cooked] in any manner of preparing food,

H. for that day and the [following night]

I. down to midnight.

- I.1** A. [Meal offerings were taken in hand in any place in the courtyard:] Said R. Eleazar, “The handful of meal offering that was taken up in the inner sanctum is valid. For so we find the rite down in connection with the censers of frankincense.” [Freedman: When the censers of frankincense were removed from the tables on which the twelve loaves of the showbread were placed in the inner sanctum, the showbread was available for the priests to eat. So removing the censers of frankincense corresponded to taking the handful, in that this rendered the rest permitted. Since the former was done in the inner sanctum, if the latter was done there, it also is valid.]
- B. *Objected R. Jeremiah*, “‘And from there he shall take his handful’ (Lev. 2: 2) — namely, from the place at which the feet of the non-priest may be located [that is, outside of the inner sanctum]. [In connection with the same verse,] Ben Betera says, ‘How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if one has taken the handful with his left hand, he should go and take it with his right? Scripture says, “And from there he shall take his handful” (Lev. 2: 2) — from the place from which he has already taken the handful.’”
- C. *There are those who say that R. Jeremiah raised the objection and answered it on his own, and others say it was R. Jacob who answered R. Jeremiah, as follows: “Bar Tahalipa explained the matter for you: the purpose of that statement is only to declare the whole of the Temple court fit [the non-priest may go anywhere in the Temple court, and that whole area is fit for the rite, all the more so the inner sanctum and the priests’ court]. You might have imagined that since the burnt offering is classified as Most Holy Things, and the meal offering is classified as Most Holy Things, just as the burnt offering must be prepared at the north side of the altar, so the meal offering must be prepared at the north side of the altar. [So we are informed that that is not the case.]”*
- D. But what differentiates the burnt offering is that it is entirely burned up [while a meal offering is not, so why should it require preparation at the north side of the altar, the analogy falling away]?
- E. The analogy derives from the sin offering [also Most Holy Things, which is subject to the same rules as the burnt offering].
- F. What differentiates the sin offering is that it achieves atonement for those who are liable to extirpation.
- G. The analogy then derives from the guilt offering [also Most Holy Things, which is subject to the same rules as the burnt offering].
- H. What differentiates the guilt offering is that it is a blood rite [and the meal offering is not].
- I. Then let the analogy derive from them all.
- J. What they all have in common [but not the meal offering] is that they are all blood rites.
- K. *Still, it is necessary to prove the point on the basis of a verse of Scripture, since I might have thought that, since it is written, “And he shall bring it to the altar...and he shall take therefrom his handful” Lev. 6: 8), just as it must be brought near to*

the southwest horn of the altar, so must the handful be taken by the southwest horn of the altar. *Thus we are informed that that is not the case.*

- I.2.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “Peace offerings that one slaughtered in the inner sanctum are valid, as it is said, ‘And he shall kill it at the door of the tent of meeting’ (Lev. 3: 2), and that which is ancillary cannot be subject to a more strict rule than that which is principal.” [Freedman: since it must be killed at the door of the tent of meeting, the tent of meeting, corresponding to the inner sanctum, obviously is the principal place for it, while the Temple court is but an adjunct thereto.]
- B. *An objection was raised:* R. Yohanan ben Betera says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if gentiles surrounded the entire courtyard, the priests enter there [the inner sanctum] to eat their Most Holy Things therein? Scripture states, ‘In a Most Holy Place you shall eat thereof’ (Num. 18:10).” *Now why should a verse of Scripture be required to make that point? Let him invoke the conception,* “in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it,” and that which is ancillary cannot be subject to a more strict rule than that which is principal!
- C. *How are the cases parallel at all? There we are dealing with an act of service, and so we invoke the principle, that which is ancillary cannot be subject to a more strict rule than that which is principal, for someone can perform the act of service in the presence of his master. But as for eating, can someone eat in the presence of his master? [Obviously not!] Therefore we do not invoke the principle, that which is ancillary cannot be subject to a more strict rule than that which is principal.*

## 6:2-3

### 6:2

- A. The sin offering of fowl was prepared [its neck wrung, its blood tossed] at the southwestern corner [of the altar].
- B. [If it was prepared] in any place [in the courtyard, however,] it was valid. But this was its [usual] place.
- C. And three purposes did the space of that [southwestern] corner serve below [the red line around the altar], and three above:
- D. Below [the red line was sprinkled the blood of] (1) the sin offering of fowl, and (2) the bringing near [of meal offerings (M. Men. 5: 5)], and (3) [for pouring out] the remnants of the blood [M. 5:3].
- E. Above [the red line at the southwestern horn were poured out ]: (1) [for] the water offering [M. Suk. 4:91, and (2) [for] the wine offering, and (3) [for] the burnt offering of fowl,
- F. when it [the burnt offering of fowl] was [too] abundant at the east.

### 6:3

- A. Whoever goes up to the altar goes up on the right [east side] [63B] and makes a circuit and goes down on the left,
- B. except for the one who goes up for these three things [ = M. 6:2E], rightward].

- I.1 A. [The sin offering of fowl was prepared — its neck wrung, its blood tossed — at the southwestern corner of the altar:]** *What is the scriptural source for this rule?*
- B. Said R. Joshua, “Said Scripture, ‘He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon, for it is a sin offering’ (Lev. 5:11) [the sin offering of a sinner in the form of a mere meal offering, because the sinner is poor and cannot present a bird as his sin offering] — this sin offering is classified as a meal offering, and a meal offering is classified as a sin offering. Just as the sin offering has to be prepared at the north side of the altar, so does the meal offering have to be prepared at the north. Just as the meal offering is presented at the southwest horn of the altar, so the sin offering of a fowl have to be offered at the southwest horn of the altar.”
- C. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that rule for the meal offering itself?*
- D. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. “The sons of Aaron shall offer it [the meal offering] before the Lord” (Lev. 6: 7) [that is, at the altar] — Might one think that it is at the western side of the altar [facing the inner sanctum, hence “before the Lord” (Freedman)]?
- F. Scripture states, “...in front of the altar” (Lev. 6: 7).
- G. How so?
- H. He would present it at the southwest corner of the altar, at the edge of the horn, and that suffices.
- I. R. Eleazar says, “Might one think that he should present it at the west side of the horn or at the south side of the horn? [Not at all, for] in any case in which you find to verses of Scripture, one of which makes its own point but also supports the point of the other, the other of which makes its own point but denies the point of the other, you ignore the one that makes its own point but denies the point of the other and rely upon the one that makes its own point but also supports the point of the other. So if you maintain that ‘before the Lord’ means the rite must be done in the west, how can you sustain, ‘in front of the altar’? But if you say ‘in front of the altar’ means, in the south, then you support the view that ‘before the Lord’ means at the south.”
- J. And whence do you sustain this point?
- K. *Said R. Ashi, “This Tannaite authority takes as his premise that the entire altar stood in the northern part of the courtyard” [Freedman: hence the south of the altar ended opposite the door leading to the inner sanctum, and so that too would be called “before the Lord”].*

**II.1 A. If it was prepared in any place in the courtyard, however, it was valid. But this was its usual place:**

- B. *What is the sense of this statement?* [Freedman: if it was fit in any place, why insist on a particular spot?]
- C. *Said R. Ashi, “This is the sense of this statement: Any place in the courtyard was suitable for pinching the throat of the bird [and so killing it as a sacrifice], but this was the correct place for sprinkling its blood.”*



- D. *So too we have learned as a Tannaite statement, for our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. If the priest pinched the neck of the bird offering any where at the altar, it is valid. If he sprinkled the blood on any part of the altar, it is valid. If he sprinkled the blood but did not drain it out, it is valid, so long as he puts some of the gushing blood below the red line on the altar.
- F. *What is the sense of this statement?*
- G. *This is the sense of this statement:* If the priest pinched the neck of the bird offering any where at the altar, it is valid. If he sprinkled the blood on any part of the altar, it is valid. **[64A]** For if he sprinkled and did not drain the blood, it is valid [so it is valid even if he omitted draining the blood, and therefore it is certainly valid when he drains it anywhere by the altar (Freedman)], so long as he puts some of the gushing blood below the red line on the altar.

**III.1 A. And three purposes did the space of that southwestern corner serve below the red line around the altar, and three above: Below [the red line was sprinkled the blood of] (1) the sin offering of fowl, and (2) the bringing near of meal offerings, and (3) for pouring out the remnants of the blood:**

- B. **the sin offering of fowl:** as we have just now said.
- C. **the bringing near of meal offerings:** as it is written, “And he shall bring it near unto the altar” (Lev. 2: 8) [at the southwest corner].
- D. **for pouring out the remnants of the blood:** “And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:30) [meaning, the southern base].

**IV.1 A. Above the red line at the southwestern horn were poured out for the water offering, for the wine offering, and for the burnt offering of fowl, when it the burnt offering of fowl was too abundant at the east:**

- B. *What is the operative consideration for this rule [which implies that the proper place for offering the burnt offering of a bird was the eastern side of the altar (Freedman)]?*
- C. R. Yohanan said, “Because that is the side that is nearest to the ash-bin [the ashes were cleared out at the side of the altar east of the ascent (Freedman)].”
- D. Said R. Yohanan, “Come and take note of how great was the physical prowess of the priests, for you have no lighter part of fowl than the crop and feathers, and nonetheless on occasion the priest would throw them more than thirty cubits. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: He took the silver fire shovel and went up to the top of the altar, and he cleared away the cinders from one side and the other, scooped up the innermost ashes, and came down. He reached the pavement. He turned his face northward [toward the altar]. He went along ten cubits to the east of the ramp. He heaped up the cinders together on the pavement, three handbreadths from the ramp, the place in which they toss the crops of fowl, and the ashes of the innermost altar and the candlestick [M. Tamid 1:4I-N].*”
- E. *Then that is more than thirty-one cubits!*
- F. *[Yohanan] does not count the place where the person himself is standing [that is, a cubit].*

**V.1 A. Whoever goes up to the altar goes up on the right [east side] and makes a circuit and goes down on the left, except for the one who goes up for these three things rightward:**

- B. *What is the operative consideration for the exceptions to the rule [except for the one who goes up for these three things rightward]?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, "In the case of drink-offerings, it is lest they become filled with smoke, and in the case of the burnt offering of a bird, lest it die through the smoke" [Freedman: of the burning wood and limbs; hence the shortest route was taken].
- D. *An objection was raised: He comes then to walk around the altar [toward the right, to the southwestern corner]. From what point does he begin? From the southeastern corner, then northeastern one, northwestern, and southwestern. They gave him wine to pour out [M. Tam. 7:3H-K].* [Freedman: it is now assumed that he is given wine when he commences the circuit, which shows that we are not afraid of the smoke.]
- E. Said R. Yohanan, **[64B]** "The passage refers to a circumambulation on foot [and he did not carry the wine until he had made the circuit]."
- F. *Said Raba, "A close reading of the passage yields that inference, for the language that is used is, They gave him wine to pour out, and not, 'he was told to pour it out' [Freedman: which would be the case if he already had the wine in hand when he started]."*
- G. *That proves it.*

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

- B. **All who go up to the altar go up at the east and go down at the west, go up at the right and go down at the left, except for those who go up to the southwestern corner, in connection with the libations of water and wine and the burnt offering of fowl, who go up at the west and go down at the west, go up at the right and go down at the right [T. Zeb. 7:7A-D].**
- C. "By the right"? But it is by the left! [Freedman: the west of the ascent was on the left side of a man facing the altar.]
- D. Said Rabina, "*Repeat as the Tannaite formulation the word: left.*"
- E. *Raba said, "What is the meaning of 'right'? To the right of the altar. And what is the meaning of 'left'? To the man's left hand."*
- F. *Then let him formulate the passage either entirely with reference to the altar or entirely with reference to the person.*
- G. *So that's a problem.*

## 6:4

- A. **The sin offering of fowl — how was it prepared?**
- B. **[The priest] would pinch off its head close by its neck.**
- C. **But he does not divide [the head from the body].**
- D. **And [holding onto the bird,] he sprinkles its blood on the wall of the altar.**
- E. **The remnants of its blood would he drain out on the base [below the red line, as at M. 6:2D].**

**F. The altar owns only its blood, but the whole [rest] of [the carcass] belongs to the priests.**

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

- B. “And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin offering” (Lev. 5: 9) — [that means that the sprinkling must be done] with the body of the sin offering itself.
- C. How is it done? He holds the head and body of the bird and sprinkles the blood on the wall of the altar, but not on the wall of the ramp or on the wall of the inner sanctum or on the wall of the entry way to the inner sanctum.
- D. And which area of the wall? It is the lower part of the wall of the altar.
- E. But perhaps it is only on the upper part of the wall, for that is a matter of logic, namely: if the blood of a beast, which in the case of a burnt offering is tossed below the line and in the case of a sin offering is tossed above the line, in the case of the blood of a fowl, which in the instance of a burnt offering is tossed above the line, surely in the case of the blood of a sin offering, the tossing should be above the line!
- F. Scripture therefore says, “And the rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 5: 9), meaning, sprinkled on a wall where the residue will drain down to the base. And which wall is that? It is the lower part of the wall.
- G. *But why not first perform the rite above the line and then below it [sprinkling the blood on the upper part of the wall, then draining out the rest at the bottom (Freedman)]?*
- H. *Said Raba, “Is the language of the verse, ‘he shall drain’? It is ‘shall be drained, implying, drip down on its own.’”*

**I.2.** A. Said R. Zutra bar Tobiah said Rab, “**How is the bird that is a sin offering pinched off? He puts its two wings in his two fingers and its two legs in his two fingers, and he would stretch its neck out on his fingers. He would pinch the neck with his fingernail at its shoulder. And he does not divide the head from the neck [T. Zeb. 7:4A-D].**”

- B. *In a further Tannaite formulation it was repeated in this language:*
- C. *The bird is without [Freedman: grasped face downward to the palm of the hand so that the nape is uppermost].*
- D. **He puts its two wings in his two fingers and its two legs in his two fingers, and he would stretch its neck out on his fingers. He would pinch the neck with his fingernail at its shoulder. And he does not divide the head from the neck. This was the most difficult rite that was performed in the sanctuary.**
- E. *This and no other? Lo, there are the rites of taking up the handful of meal offering and the two hands full of incense on the day of atonement [which are also difficult to do]!*
- F. Rather: this was one of the most difficult rites that was performed in the sanctuary.

**6:5-6:7**

**6:5**

**A. The burnt offering of fowl — how was it prepared?**

**B. [The priest] went up on the ramp and went around the circuit.**

- C. He came to the southeastern cornet
- D. He would wring off its head from its neck and divide [the head from the body].
- E. And he drained off its blood onto the wall of the altar.
- F. He took the head and pressed the place where it was severed against the altar.
- G. And he dried it with salt and tossed it on the altar fires [Lev. 2:13].
- H. He came to the body and removed the crop and the plumage and the intestines which come out with it.
- I. And he threw them on the place of the ashes.
- J. He slit [the body] open [at the wings] but did not divide it.
- K. But if he divided it, it is valid.
- L. And he dried it with salt and tossed it on the altar fires.

## 6:6

- A. [If] he did not remove the crop or the plumage or the intestines which go out with it and did not salt it —
- B. anything which he did in a different way after he had drained out its blood —
- C. it is valid.
- D. [If] he divided [the head from the body] in the case of a sin offering [of fowl] but did not divide [them] in the case of burnt offering [of fowl] [since this is before the rite of draining of the blood of the body], he has rendered it invalid.
- E. [If] he drained off the blood of the head but did not drain off the blood of the body, it is invalid.
- F. [If] he drained off the blood of the body but did not drain off the blood of the head, it is valid.

## 6:7

- A. The sin offering of fowl, [the neck] of which he wrung not for its own name [but rather under some classification other than that for which the animal was originally designated as holy],
- B. the blood of which he drained not for its own name,
- C. or [one of which he did] for its name and [one] not for its own name,
- D. or [one of which he did] not for its own name and [one] for its own name —
- F. [In the case of] the burnt offering of fowl, it is valid, with the proviso that it has not gone to the credit of its owner
- G. All the same [in the following aspects] are the sin offering of fowl and the burnt offering of fowl, — the heads] of which he wrung off, and the blood of which he drained out —
- H. [with the intention] (1) to eat something which is usually eaten, (2) to burn something which is usually burned,
- I. outside of its proper place — it is invalid. And extirpation does not apply to it.

- J. [If he wrung off the head or drained the blood] with the intention of eating what is to be eaten or of burning what is to be burned outside of its proper time, it is refuse, and they are liable on its account for extirpation, with the proviso that that which renders the offering permissible is offered in accord with its requirement.
- K. How is that which renders the offering permissible offered in accord with its requirement?
- L. [If] he wrung the neck in silence, and drained the blood [intending to [intending to eat what is to be eaten or to burn what is to be burned] outside of its proper time,
- M. or [if] he wrung the neck [intending to eat what is to be eaten or to burn what is to be burned] outside of its proper time, and drained off the blood in silence,
- N. or [if he] wrung the neck and drained off the blood [articulately intending to eat the flesh or burn the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper place —
- O. this is [what is meant by a case in which] that which renders the offering permissible has been offered in accord with its requirement.
- P. How is that which renders the offering permissible not offered in accord with its requirement?
- Q. [If] he wrung the neck [with the intention of eating the flesh or offering the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper place, and he [then] drained off the blood [intending to eat the flesh or offer the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper time,
- R. or [if] he wrung the neck [intending to eat the flesh] outside of its proper time, and drained off the blood [intending to eat the flesh or to burn the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper place [intending to eat what is to be eaten or to burn what is to be burned] outside of its proper time,
- S. or [if] he wrung the neck and drained off the blood [intending to eat the flesh] outside of its proper place —
- T [65A] the sin offering of fowl, [the neck of which] one wrung not for its own name, and the blood of which one drained off [intending to eat the flesh or to offer up the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper time —
- U. or the neck of which one wrung [intending to eat the flesh or to burn the sacrificial parts] outside of its proper time, and the blood of which one drained off not for its own name —
- V or the neck of which one wrung and the blood of which one drained off not for its own name-
- W this is a case in which that which renders the offering permissible has not been offered in accord with its requirement.
- X. [If one did any of these things intending] to eat an olive's bulk outside and an olive's bulk on the next day,
- Y an olive's bulk on the next day and an olive's bulk outside,
- Z. a half-olive's bulk outside and a half-olive's bulk on the next day,
- AA. a half-olive's bulk on the next day and a half-olive's bulk outside-

- BB. it is unfit. And extirpation does not apply to it.
- CC. Said R. Judah, "This is the general rule: If the [improper] intention concerning time came before the [improper] intention concerning place, it is refuse, and they are liable on its account to extirpation.
- DD. "But if the [improper] intention concerning place came before the [improper] intention concerning time, it is invalid and extirpation does not apply to it."
- EE. And sages say, "This [case] and that are invalid, and extirpation does not apply to it."
- FF. [If one intended] to eat a half-olive's bulk and to offer up a half-olive's bulk, it is valid.
- GG. For eating and offering up do not join together.

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

- B. "And the priest shall bring it to the altar" (Lev. 1:15) [Freedman: referring to the bird burnt offering and apparently superfluous, since the prior verse says, "Then he shall bring his offering"]:
- C. What is the point of making this statement?
- D. Since it is said, "Then he shall bring his offering of turtle doves or of young pigeons" (Lev. 1:14), might one then suppose that one who volunteers to bring an offering of fowl must bring no fewer than two birds? Scripture says, "And the priest shall bring *it* to the altar" (Lev. 1:15).
- E. Why does Scripture specify that it must be the priest who does the rite?
- F. It is to assign the rite to a priest.
- G. For one might have supposed that it is an argument a fortiori that a non-priest could perform the rite: if a beast that derives from the flock, for the sacrifice of which the northern side of the altar is assigned, is not assigned a priest for the performance of the rite [since a non-priest can kill the animal], fowl, for the blood of which the northern side of the altar is not assigned, surely should not require the act of a priest in particular in fulfillment of the rite!
- H. Accordingly, it is necessary for Scripture to specify, "And *the priest* shall bring it to the altar" (Lev. 1:15) — it must be the priest who does the rite.
- I. Might one suppose that the priest should pinch the neck using a knife?
- J. For one might have supposed that it is an argument a fortiori that he should do so. For if Scripture did not require that a priest slaughter the animal but did require that a utensil be used, then if for the pinching of the neck of a bird a priest is required, should not all the more so a utensil be required for the same rite?
- K. Scripture therefore states, "and the priest...shall pinch off its head" (Lev. 1:15).
- L. Said R. Aqiba, "But could it ever really enter your mind that a non-priest might legitimately approach the altar? Rather, why does Scripture state, '[And] the priest [shall bring it to the altar]' (Lev. 1:15)? It means that the act of pinching the neck should be done by the priest himself [and not with a knife].
- M. "Might one suppose that he may pinch off the neck of the bird either above the red line or below the red line around the altar/ Scripture states, '...and pinch off its head and make it smoke on the altar' (Lev. 1:15) — just as the smoking of the bird is done on top of the altar, so the pinching is to be done on top of the altar."



- N. “And shall pinch off.” that is to be done close by the nape of the neck.
- O. You say that it is to be done close by the nape of the neck. Or perhaps that means that it is to be done at the throat. For it is a matter of logic. Here we find the statement, “And shall pinch off,” and further, “and he shall pinch off” (Lev. 5: 8). Just as there the meaning is, close by the neck, so here the meaning is, close by the neck.
- P. Then might one say that just as there he pinches off the neck but does not sever it, so here to he pinches the neck but does not sever it?
- Q. Scripture states, “and shall pinch off its head and make it smoke,” meaning, just as when the bird is sent up in smoke, the head is by itself and the body is by itself, so after pinched the head is by itself and the body is by itself.
- R. And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that the head is sent up in smoke by itself and the body is sent up in smoke by itself?
- S. Because Scripture says, “and make *it* smoke,” meaning, when the bird is sent up in smoke, the head is by itself and the body is by itself, so after pinched the head is by itself and the body is by itself.
- T. And how do I interpret, “and the priest shall make it smoke upon the altar” (Lev. 1:17)?
- U. Scripture here discusses the burning up of the head [done separately from the body].
- V. “And the blood of it shall be drained out on the side of the altar” (Lev. 1:15) — but not on the wall of the ascent or the wall of the inner sanctum.
- W. And which part of the wall is meant?
- Y. It is the upper part of the wall.
- Z. But perhaps it is only on the lower part of the wall, for that is a matter of logic, namely: if the blood of a beast, which in the case of a sin offering is tossed above the line and in the case of a burnt offering is tossed below the line, in the case of the blood of a fowl, which in the instance of a sin offering is tossed below the line, surely in the case of the blood of a burnt offering, the tossing should be below the line!
- AA. Scripture therefore says, “And shall pinch off..and shall burn...and the blood thereof shall be drained out....” And can you imagine that after he has burned the carcass, he can go and only then drain it?! [Obviously not.] Rather the meaning is: just as the sending up in smoke of the bird is done at the top of the altar, so the draining out of the blood is at the top of the altar.
- BB. And how did he do so?
- CC. He would go up on the ramp and turn to the terrace and go on to the southeast horn. He would pinch off the head close by the neck, sever it, drain the blood onto the wall of the altar. If he did it below his feet [Freedman: stooping down], even a cubit, it is fit [Freedman: because the red line, which demarcated the upper part of the altar from the lower, was a cubit below the terrace].
- DD. R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob say, “The essence of the rite must take place only at the top of the altar.”
- EE. *What is at stake between the two formulations of the rule?*

- FF. *Both Abayye and Raba say, “They differ in regard to building on the terrace a pyre for burning up the carcass.” [The initial authority says that that is permitted, so the blood can be drained out even below the terrace; Nehemiah and Eliezer say that since the smoking must be done on top of the altar, the draining must be done there too (Freedman).]*

**II.1 A. He came to the body and removed the crop and the plumage and the intestines which come out with it. And he threw them on the place of the ashes:**

- B. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:*  
C. “And he shall take away its crop with the feathers thereof” (Lev. 1:16) — this refers to [what we know by a different word for] the crop.  
D. Might one suppose that he should cut through it with a knife and take the crop alone, [without the skin and feathers]?  
E. Scripture states, “with the feathers thereof,” meaning, he takes the plumage together with the crop.  
F. Abba Yosé b. Hanan says, “He takes the crop together with the craw.”  
G. The Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “‘with the feathers thereof.’ with its very own feathers [those along with the crop]. He cuts it with a knife like a skylight.” [Freedman: he cuts the skin exactly opposite the crop and then removes the crop, skin, and feathers.]

**III.1 A. [65B] He slit [the body] open [at the wings] but did not divide it:**

- B. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:*  
C. “And he shall rend it” (Lev. 1:17) — this is done only by hand,  
D. in line with the usage as follows: “and he rent him [by hand] as one would have rent a kid” (Jud. 14: 6)

**IV.1 A. If he did not remove the crop or the plumage or the intestines which go out with it and did not salt it — anything which he did in a different way after he had drained out its blood — it is valid. If he divided the head from the body in the case of a sin offering [of fowl] but did not divide [them] in the case of burnt offering of fowl [since this is before the rite of draining of the blood of the body], he has rendered it invalid:**

- B. *Our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*  
C. Said R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, “I have heard that the sin offering of the bird has to be split.” [Freedman: in the sense that if both organs of the throat are nipped, the bird is still fit; the Mishnah’s rule says that it is unfit].  
D. *What is at issue between these two versions of the law concerning the sin offering made of a bird?*  
E. *Said R. Hisda, “At issue between them is whether draining the blood of a bird that is presented as a sin offering is indispensable to the rite. The initial authority holds that it is indispensable to the rite, and, since he must drain out the blood, when he also severs the bird, he performs the rite of a burnt offering with a bird that serves as a burnt offering [and the rites then do not differ and in that case the bird offering is unfit]. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon takes the view that the*

*draining out of the blood of a bird that is presented as a sin offering is not indispensable. [In the case of a bird presented as a burnt offering, it is indispensable (Freedman).] Therefore he is merely cutting meat.” [Freedman: when he nips the second organ, he is merely cutting meat. By not draining the blood afterward, he makes it clear that he is not performing the rites of a burnt offering.]*

- F. *Raba said, “At issue is the effect of delaying nipping of the second organ in the case of a bird that is presented as a burnt offering. The initial Tannaite authority maintains that that delay does not invalidate the rite, and, though the priest does delay, he is carrying out the rite of a burnt offering with a sin offering. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says that it does invalidate the rite, and since he delays, he is merely cutting meat.”*
- G. *Abayye said, “At issue between them is whether or not cutting through of the greater part of the meat is indispensable to the rite.”*
- H. *The difference between Raba and Abayye runs along the lines of the difference between R. Zira and R. Samuel b. R. Isaac:*
- I. *One said, “At issue between the initial Tannaite authority and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon is whether delay in cutting the second organ invalidates the rite, “and the other takes the view, “t issue is whether cutting the greater part of the meat is indispensable.” [Freedman: after the priest nips the first organ, he must cut through the greater part of the flesh that surrounds it, and this makes a delay before the second organ is cut inevitable. Abayye holds that all parties maintain that a delay at the second organ of a burnt offering invalidates the sacrifice, but they disagree as to whether cutting through the flesh in the case of a sin offering is indispensable. The initial Tannaite authority holds that it is not indispensable, hence it is possible to nip both organs without a delay, and so it becomes like the rites of a burnt offering and is therefore invalid. But Eleazar b. R. Simeon holds that this cutting through is indispensable, hence there must be a delay between the organs, and thereby it differs from a burnt offering.]*
- J. *It must then be inferred that to begin with we require cutting through of the greater part of the meat [Freedman: since they disagree on whether it is indispensable, they concur that it is necessary].*
- K. *Indeed it is to be inferred, and so it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - L. *How is the act of pinching the neck done in the case of a bird that is presented as a sin offering? The priest cuts through the spinal column and the nape, without the greater part of the meat, until he reaches the gullet or windpipe. When he reaches the gullet or windpipe, he cuts one organ or the greater part thereof along with the greater part of the flesh.*
  - M. *In the case of a bird presented as a burnt offering, he cuts two organs or the greater part thereof.*
  - N. *When this statement was said before R. Jeremiah, he said, “Have they not heard when R. Simeon b. Eliaqim said in the name of R. Eleazar b. Pedat in the name of R. Eleazar b. Shammua: ‘R.*

Eleazar b. R. Simeon would say, “I have heard that when a bird is presented as a sin offering, it is severed. And what is the sense of ‘he shall not divide it in two’ (Lev. 1:17)? [66A] It is not necessary to divide it in two.””

- O. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, “But how about the following, stated with reference to a pit: ‘And if a man shall open a pit and not cover it...’ (Exo. 21:33) — does this mean that he does not have to cover it?”*
- P. *How are the two cases comparable! In the case of the pit, it is written, “The owner of the pit shall make it good” (Exo. 21:34), so it obviously is necessary to cover it. But here it is written, ‘And the priest shall offer it [the burnt offering] on the altar’ (Lev. 1:15), so distinguishing a sin offering made of a bird from a burnt offering made of a bird. [There will be two distinct rites.]*
- Q. *Why then say “he shall not divide it [the sin offering of fowl] into two” (Lev. 5: 8)?*
- R. *What follows is that he does not have to do so [but he may do so if he wishes].*

**V.1 A. [If] he drained off the blood of the head but did not drain off the blood of the body, it is invalid. [If] he drained off the blood of the body but did not drain off the blood of the head, it is valid:**

- B. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“it is a burnt offering” (Lev. 1:17) — even if he drained the blood of the body but not the blood of the head [it is still a burnt offering validly presented].*
- D. *Might one suppose that even if he drained the blood of the head but not the blood of the body, it is valid?*
- E. *Scripture says, “it is.” [It must be done with the correct rites.]*
- F. *What compels that reading [rather than the opposite]?*
- G. *Said Rabina, “It stands to reason, since most of the blood is located in the body.”*