

II.

BAVLI MEILAH CHAPTER TWO

FOLIOS 8A-10B

2:1

- A. The sin offering of fowl —
 - B. the laws of sacrilege apply to it once it [the bird] has been sanctified [designated as a sin offering].
 - C. [When] its head has been severed, it is rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
 - D. [When] its blood has been tossed, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
 - E. And sacrilege does not apply to it [any longer].
- I.1.** A. When its head has been severed, it is rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight: *that formulation yields the inference, it is rendered disqualified, but it is not thereby made able to transmit uncleanness to other things. Then with whose view of the law does our Mishnah-passage concur?*
- B. *It accords with our rabbis in that which has been taught on Tannaite authority as follows:*
 - C. Abba Saul says, “One who has immersed on the selfsame day is [8B] in the first remove so far as Holy Things are concerned.”
 - D. R. Meir says, “One who has immersed on the selfsame day renders Holy Things unclean and spoils heave offering.”
 - E. And sages say, “Just as he renders unfit liquid in the status of heave offering and foods in the status of heave-offering, so he spoils liquid in the status of Holy Things and foods in the status of Holy Things” [T. **Tohorot 1:4**].
 - F. *Said Raba, “In the opinion of Abba Saul, sages have imposed upon Holy Things a higher standard. They have treated the Tebul-Yom as in the first remove of uncleanness [concurring with Abba Saul], and they agree with R. Meir that the tebul yom is unclean in the second remove [so what he touches does not convey uncleanness to other food, such uncleanness deriving only from a source of uncleanness that is in the first remove]. In the view of our sages, since the tebul*

yom has immersed, his uncleanness is weakened; he conveys the status of invalidity but not that of uncleanness.”

II.1 A. When its blood has been tossed, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness. And sacrilege does not apply to it any longer:

- B. *It is the law of sacrilege that does not apply, but the meat still remains subject to a prohibition [so that the priests cannot eat it]. But why should this be the rule? After all, we are dealing with the property of the priests themselves.*
- C. Said R. Hanina, “The prohibition applies only to meat that was taken beyond the veils and brought back in [and the priests may not eat it; in other cases, the priests may eat it], and it represents the position of R. Aqiba, who has said, ‘Tossing the blood takes effect on meat that has been taken beyond the veils, even though it may not be eaten.’”

III.1 A. [When its blood has been tossed:] said R. Huna said Rab, “As to squeezing out the blood of a bird presented as a sin offering, [correctly doing so] is not essential to the rite [and if it is done improperly, the remainder of the rite nonetheless may be carried out].”

- B. *For Rab taught as the Tannaite formulation [of the rule before us], **When its blood has been tossed** [not, “when the blood has been properly squeezed out”].*
- C. R. Adda bar Ahbah said Rab [said], “As to squeezing out the blood of a bird presented as a sin offering, [correctly doing so] is essential to the rite [and if it is done improperly, the remainder of the rite nonetheless may not be carried out].”
- D. *For Rab taught as the Tannaite formulation, **[When] its blood has been squeezed out, [they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness. And the laws of sacrilege apply to it until it is taken out to the ash heap] [M. 2:2Df.].***
- E. *[To settle the conflict,] come and take note: “The rest of the blood in the bird’s carcass is to be squeezed out at the base of the altar; it is a [valid] sin offering” (Lev. 5: 9).*
- F. *Now there is no problem for R. Adda bar Ahbah, for that is in line with the statement of the verse, “The rest of the blood in the bird’s carcass is to be squeezed out at the base of the altar.” But as to the position of R. Huna, what is the meaning he can impute to the language, “The rest of the blood in the bird’s carcass is to be squeezed out at the base of the altar”?*
- G. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority in the household of R. Ishmael, “If there is blood remaining” [that blood is to be squeezed out].*
- H. *And how does [Huna] interpret the verse, “it is a [valid] sin offering”?*
- I. *This is to be read in the setting of the first clause of the same verse, “He shall toss some of the blood of the sin offering on the side of the altar” (Lev. 5: 9). [Haas: properly tossing some of the blood validates the offering; what happens to the rest is irrelevant.]*
- J. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, “Well, then, what about the meal offering, concerning which it is written, ‘What is left of the meal offering belongs to Aaron’*

(Lev. 2: 2). [The disposition of the remnant does bear consequence.] *Here too, the left over blood does bear consequence [and must be properly squeezed out].*

- K. *“And should you say that the present rule indeed applies to the meal offering as well, [so that the disposition of the leftover meal offering has no consequences], [9A] has it not been taught as follows on Tannaite authority:*
- L. *“He shall take a handful of its fine flour and its oil and all of its frankincense’ (Lev. 2: 2) — excluding a case in which its fine flour or oil or frankincense are lacking [that is, none of its flour or oil or frankincense should be lacking but all must be correctly disposed of]?”*
- M. *Say, in that case, the language is used, “What is left of the meal offering...,” (Lev. 2:10) which usage “what is left” is redundant, which indicates, the disposition of only the left over meal bears consequence, not left over blood.*
- N. *[To the view that the disposition of the left over blood bears no consequence] objected the Father of Samuel to R. Huna, “**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 — [with the intention] (1) to eat something which is usually eaten, (2) to burn something which is usually burned, outside of its proper place — it is invalid. And extirpation does not apply to it. [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 [M. Zeb. 6:7G-J]. Now the Tannaite formulation in any event states, 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. [The two therefore are treated as equally critical to the rite. The proper disposition of the blood bears consequence.]”***
- O. *He raised the objection and he resolved it: “The law is differentiated by the cases. [The bird’s neck must be pinched in both cases, but only the blood of the sin offering must be entirely squeezed out, the blood of the burnt offering need not be totally squeezed out.]”*

III.2. A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: It has been taught on Tannaite authority in the household of R. Ishmael, “If there is blood remaining” [that blood is to be squeezed out]. [The implication is that the offering is acceptable even if blood is left in the carcass (Haas).]*

B. *But lo, the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael maintained elsewhere that the disposition of the left over blood is essential to the rite [so that it must be properly squeezed out or the rite is null]. And in that context, said R. Pappa, “At issue is the status of a bird presented as a sin offering.”*

C. *We deal with two Tannaite traditions with respect to the position of R. Ishmael. I.1 and II.1 conduct close readings of the Mishnah’s formulation of its rule, and III.1 asks of the Mishnah’s rule a further question; No. 2 then takes up a detail of the foregoing.*

2:2-8

2:2

- A. Burnt offering of fowl —
- B. the laws of sacrilege apply to it once it has been sanctified.
- C. [When] its head has been severed, it is rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
- D. [When] its blood has been squeezed out, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
- E. And the laws of sacrilege apply to it until it is taken out to the ash heap.

2:3

- A. Cows which are to be burned and goats which are to be burned —
- B. the laws of sacrilege apply to them once they have been sanctified.
- C. [When] they have been slaughtered, they are rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul — yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
- D. [When] their blood has been tossed, they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
- E. And the laws of sacrilege apply to them in the ash heap until the meat is reduced to cinders.

2:4

- A. The burnt offering —
- B. the laws of sacrilege apply to it once it has been sanctified.
- C. [When] it has been slaughtered, it is rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
- D. [When] its blood has been tossed, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
- E. And the laws of sacrilege do not apply to its hide.
- F. But it will be taken out to the ash heap.

2:5

- A. A sin offering, and a guilt offering, and communal sacrifices of peace offerings —
- B. the laws of sacrilege apply to them once they have been sanctified.
- C. [When] they have been slaughtered, they are rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
- D. [When] their blood has been tossed, they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
- E. The laws of sacrilege do not apply to the meat.

- F. But the laws of sacrilege apply to the sacrificial parts until they are taken out to the ash heap.

2:6

- A. The Two Loaves —
B. the laws of sacrilege apply to them once they have been sanctified.
C. [When] they have formed a crust in the oven, they have been rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul — yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and to have slaughtered the animal sacrifice [which pertains to them (Lev. 23:18)] on their account.
D. [When] the blood of the lambs has been tossed, they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness,
E. But sacrilege does not apply to them.

2:7

- A. The show bread —
B. the laws of sacrilege apply to it once it has been sanctified.
C. [When] it has formed a crust in the oven, it has been rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul — yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and to be laid out on the table.
D. [When] the dishes of incense have been offered, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
E. And sacrilege does not pertain to it [any longer].

2:8

- A. Meal offerings —
B. the laws of sacrilege apply to them once they have been sanctified.
C. [When] they have been sanctified in a utensil, they are rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul — yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.
D. [When] the handful [of the meal offering] has been offered, they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.
E. And the laws of sacrilege do not apply to the residue. But the laws of sacrilege apply to the handful [of the meal offering itself] until it is taken out to the ash heap.

- I.1** A. [But the laws of sacrilege apply...until it is taken out to the ash heap:] *It has been stated:*
B. He who derives secular benefit from the ashes that are piled up on the altar [“the apple”] —
C. Rab said, “The laws of sacrilege do not apply.” [The ashes are available for secular use.]
D. R. Yohanan said, “The laws of sacrilege do apply.”
E. *As to the rule prevailing prior to the taking up of the collection of ashes from the altar [as the Torah requires, Lev. 6:3], all parties concur; there is no difference*

concerning the fact that the law of sacrilege does apply. Where there is a dispute, it concerns the rule that pertains after the collection of the ashes from the altar.

- F. Rab said, “The laws of sacrilege do not apply. Lo, the religious duty that pertains to the ashes has already been carried out.”
- G. R. Yohanan said, “[The laws of sacrilege do apply,] since it is written, ‘The priest shall don his linen garment’ (Lev. 6: 3) — *since it is necessary to put on the priestly garments, the ashes remain in their status of sanctification.*”
- H. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **And the laws of sacrilege apply to it until it is taken out to the ash heap.** That presents a problem for Rab, [since the law of sacrilege should cease to apply as soon as the ash is gathered together on the altar].*
- I. Rab may reply to you, “The meaning is, when it is ready to be taken out to the ash heap [and has been gathered together].”
- J. **[9B] An objection was raised: [What are those things which, [even] if they have gone up, should go down being removed from the altar because they are not offered at all and therefore are not appropriate to the altar? The meat [that constitutes the share of the priests] of Most Holy Things [sin offerings and guilt offerings] and the meat [that constitutes the share of the priests] of Lesser Holy Things [e.g., peace offerings], and the excess of the sheaf of first barley that is presented from Passover through Pentecost [the *omer*], and the two loaves [of Pentecost] and the show bread [Lev. 24: 5-19], and the residue of meal offerings, and the incense offering [that has been erroneously placed on the outer, rather than the inner altar to which it is appropriate] (M. Zeb. 9: 5)]. And any of them which burst from off the altar — one should not put them back. And so [is the rule for] a coal which burst from off the altar [M. Zeb. 9:6A-C].** *[With reference top the coal, if the coal burst off the fire but] stayed on the altar, they do not return it to the fire, and that poses no problem to R. Yohanan [since it continues to be holy] but it does pose a problem to Rab [since what has been removed from the fire is no longer holy].*
- K. Rab may reply to you, “The case of a goal is exceptional, for it still is substantial [which is not the case for ashes].”
- L. *There are those who state the matter from another perspective altogether, namely: the governing consideration is that the coal is substantial, but ash, which is insubstantial, even when located on the altar is not subject to the laws of sacrilege.*
- M. *That formulation then poses no problem for Rab [since ash removed from the fire is insubstantial] but it does pose a problem for R. Yohanan [who treats the ash as still sanctified and substantial].*
- N. R. Yohanan may say to you, “The same rule applies [that we put back on the altar what bursts out of the fire and onto the altar] even to ashes. The reason that coals are explicitly singled out is to indicate that even coals, which are substantial, need not be returned to the fire if they entirely burst off the altar” [but if ashes or coals remain on the altar, they are to be pushed back into the fire].

II.1 A. [The burnt offering — when its blood has been tossed, they are liable on its account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and

uncleanness... A sin offering, and a guilt offering, and communal sacrifices of peace offerings — when their blood has been tossed, they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness:]

It has been stated:

- B. He who derives secular benefit from the meat of Most Holy Things prior to the tossing of the blood or from the sacrificial portions of Lesser Holy Things after the sprinkling of the blood [neither of which is rendered permissible by the sprinkling of the blood — how is restitution made? Does the loss accrue to the Temple in general, or to the altar in particular?]
- C. Rab said, “Restitution for the benefit of secular use is to be assigned to the fund for votive offerings.”
- D. Levi said, “Let him bring something that is wholly assigned to the altar.”
- E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Levi:*
- F. In the setting of this type of sacrilege, where is the restitution assigned? The disciples before sages say, “Let him bring something that is wholly assigned to the altar. And what might that be? Incense.”
- G. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Rab:*
- H. He who derives benefit from money designated for the purchase of an animal for a sin offering or for a guilt offering — if he makes restitution prior to the offering his sin offering, he should add a fifth to the original sum and spend the whole on a sin offering; if this was before presenting his guilt offering, he should add a fifth and spend the whole on a guilt offering. But if he makes restitution after he has offered his sin offering [and thus cannot present another], he should take the money set aside for restitution and toss it into the Dead Sea, so that it will never be used for a secular purpose, and if it is after he has offered his guilt offering, the money is to go to the Temple as a votive offering, along these lines: he who derives benefit from Most Holy Things prior to the tossing of the blood, or from the sacrificial limbs of Lesser Holy Things after the tossing of the blood, — restitution for the benefit he has enjoyed should go for a votive offering: all restitution for an offering that was to be used for the altar is assigned to buy something for the altar; if it is restitution for money assigned for the upkeep of the Temple house, it is used for that purpose; if it is restitution for funds assigned for an offering for public worship, then the restitution is to go to public freewill offerings.”
- I. *Well, now, there is a contradiction in the very body of the stated rule! ...if he makes restitution prior to the offering his sin offering, he should add a fifth to the original sum and spend the whole on a sin offering...But if he makes restitution after he has offered his sin offering [and thus cannot present another], he should take the money set aside for restitution and toss it into the Dead Sea. And the Tannaite formulation proceeds, all restitution for an offering that was to be used for the altar is assigned to buy something for the altar! Then there is no distinction made between a case in which the owner of the beast has completed his atonement through a sin offering or has not completed his atonement through a sin offering!*
- J. *It represents the position of R. Simeon, who has said, “Any animal designated as a sin offering the owner of which has died is left to perish.”*

- K. **[10A]** *Then does the one clause represent R. Simeon and the other rabbis?*
- L. *[Indeed so, for] said R. Gebiha of Be Ketil to R. Ashi, "This is what Abbaye said: 'The one clause represents R. Simeon and the other rabbis.'"*

- II.2.** A. Said Raba, "All concur that if one has derived benefit from Most Holy Things that have been made unclean, or from the sacrificial limbs of Lesser Holy Things after they have been placed on the altar [and become unclean], he is exempt [from having to make restitution]."
- B. *Well, that's pretty self-evident! What loss has he caused to anybody?*
 - C. *What might you otherwise have supposed? It is that meat in the status of Most Holy Things that has contracted uncleanness nonetheless is subject to the religious duty of being burned up by the priests; the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things are still subject to the religious duty of being turned over on the fires. So we are informed that in fact there is no further obligation to deal with this unclean meat.*
 - D. *Said Raba, "Concerning that which has been said [in behalf of Rab], namely, But if he makes restitution after he has offered his sin offering [and thus cannot present another], he should take the money set aside for restitution and toss it into the Dead Sea, that rule applies in particular if the fact that he had misappropriated the originally designated funds was realized before the man offered the other sin offering; but if this was after he had offered the other sin offering, then the repayment is treated as a votive offering. How come? People do not set aside to begin with something that has to be destroyed.*

I.1 raises a question left open by the Mishnah-paragraphs, which are otherwise not discussed. II.1 once more raises a question that the Mishnah's formulation leaves open, with no. 2 glossing a detail of the foregoing.

2:9

- A. **The handful, the frankincense, the incense, the meal offerings of priests, and the meal offering of the anointed priest, and the meal offering which accompanies drink offerings [M. Zeb. 4:3] —**
- B. **the laws of sacrilege apply to them once they have been sanctified.**
- C. **[When] they have been sanctified in a utensil, they are rendered fit to be made invalid by a tebul-yom and by one whose rites of atonement have not yet been completed and by being left overnight.**
- D. **And they are liable on their account because of violation of the laws of remnant and because of violation of the laws of uncleanness.**
- E. **But the prohibition of refuse does not apply to them.**
- F. **This is the general principle: For whatever is subject to that which renders the offering permitted are they not liable on account of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness until what renders the offering permitted has been properly offered.**
- G. **And for whatever is not subject to that which renders the offering permitted, once it has been sanctified in a utensil are they liable on account of the violation of the laws of remnant, and on account of violation of the laws of uncleanness.**

H. But the law of refuse does not apply to it [at all].

- I.1. A.** [And for whatever is not subject to that which renders the offering permitted, once it has been sanctified in a utensil are they liable on account of the violation of the laws of remnant, and on account of violation of the laws of uncleanness. But the law of refuse does not apply to it at all:] *what is the source in Scripture for this rule* [that uncleanness does not pertain to what does not depend upon a prior act to become permitted as soon as having been sanctified in a utensil]?
- B. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Might one suppose that people should be liable in connection with violating uncleanness only in respect to that which is subject to the valid completion of rites that render eating permissible, in regard to both man and the altar?
- D. That proposition, after all, is a matter of logic. If liability by reason of imparting the status of refuse to an offering is incurred solely on account of an offering that is subject to the valid completion of rites that render eating permissible, in regard to both man and the altar, even though it is of fixed value, and even though liability is incurred in a single spell of awareness, and even though there is no remission from a prevailing prohibition [Freedman: the sin offering for eating refuse is fixed, it is the same for rich and poor and so of invariable value, it is incurred in one spell of awareness, so that, to be liable to the offering, it is not necessary that one should know to begin with that the meat is refuse, then forget and eat it, and then become aware of it once more, as is the rule for uncleanness; the prohibition of refuse is never remitted, even if all the sacrifices of the entire community have become refuse. In the case of uncleanness, by contrast, one is liable only if one ate unclean meat unwittingly, not having known that it was unclean, but then became aware; in the case of uncleanness, the prohibition is lifted if the entire community was unclean, and then, for instance, the Passover offering may be presented and eaten,]
- E. then it is logical that uncleanness itself should involve liability only in regard to an offering that is subject to the valid completion of rites that render eating permissible, in regard to both man and the altar, since expiation for violation of the law of uncleanness involves an offering of variable value; it requires two spells of awareness; and the prevailing prohibition of uncleanness may be remitted!
- F. So [in connection with the matter of uncleanness] Scripture states to the contrary, “Speak to Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel that the sanctify to me” (Lev. 22: 2) [and that statement extends the prohibition of uncleanness to all things that are sanctified].
- G. Might one suppose that liability is incurred forthwith?
- H. Scripture states, “Whoever he be...who approaches the Holy Things...having his uncleanness upon him — that soul shall be cut off from before me” (Lev. 22: 3).
- I. Said R. Eleazar, “But is there one who merely touches Holy Things that is then liable?” [Of course not, one is culpable only for eating Holy Things, not merely touching them.] Who then does Scripture states, ‘...who approaches...’? It is to teach that Scripture refers to meat that has been made fit to be offered.

J. “How so? If an offering is subject to the valid completion of rites that render eating permissible, in regard to both man and the altar, then one is liable only when those rites have been properly carried out; if an offering is not is subject to the valid completion of rites that render eating permissible, in regard to both man and the altar, then one is liable as soon as the dedicated material is sanctified in a consecrated utensil of service.”

The Talmud supplies a scriptural proof for one of the Mishnah's details.