

X

BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER TEN

FOLIOS 89B-92A

10:1

A. [89B] Whatever is [offered] more often than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow:

(1) Daily whole offerings take precedence over additional offerings.

(2) The additional offerings of the Sabbath take precedence over the additional offerings of the new moon.

(3) The additional offerings of the new moon take precedence over the additional offerings of the New Year [which also is a new moon],

B. since it is said, “In addition to the morning burnt offering which is for a daily whole offering you will prepare these” (Num. 28:23).

I.1 A. *How do we know this?*

B. *How do we know this? It is in line with the scriptural proof that is explicitly stated: “In addition to the morning burnt offering which is for a daily whole offering you will prepare these” (Num. 28:23)!*

C. *But perhaps the daily whole offerings in particular take precedence over the Additional Offering, because they are routine. How do we know that additional offerings take precedence over less routine additional offerings? [Freedman: since even the more frequent additional offerings are not really routine, perhaps we disregard their greater frequency.]*

D. Said R. Eleazar, “Said Scripture, ‘Like these you shall offer daily for seven days’ (Num. 28:24). It could have said ‘these,’ but rather says, ‘like these.’” [Freedman: like those mentioned in the preceding verse. As those that are more frequent take precedence, so the festival additional offerings that are more frequent take precedence over the less frequent.]

E. *But is not that usage is required to make its own point?*

F. *If so, Scripture could as well have written, “These you shall offer daily.”*

G. *If Scripture had written, “These you shall offer daily for seven days,” I might have come to the conclusion that these [seven lambs of Num. 28:19] are offered [not day by day but only] over the seven day period.*

- H. *What is written is, “daily.”*
- I. *Still, I might say, “These are offered for the day,” but as to the remaining days, I might not have known how many [lambs] are required [if Scripture had not said, “like these].*
- J. *Scripture said, “You shall offer...,” meaning, all your actions in this regard must be the same.*
- K. *Abbayye said, “The rule is to be derived from the verse of Scripture itself [‘In addition to the morning burnt offering which is for a daily whole offering you will prepare these’]. For if it is so that the verse refers solely to the daily whole offerings, Scripture should have said, ‘In addition to the morning burnt offering,’ and then fallen silent. What need to I have for the further language, which is for a daily whole offering? It is to indicate that any that is presented more regularly takes precedence.*

10:2-4

10:2

- A. **And whatever is more holy than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow:**
 - (1) **The blood of the sin offering takes precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, because it makes atonement [for a sin].**
 - (2) **The limbs of the burnt offering take precedence over the sacrificial parts of a sin offering, because they are wholly given over to the fires [to be burned up].**
 - (3) **The sin offering takes precedence over the guilt offering, because its blood is placed on the four corners [of an altar] and on the foundation.**
 - (4) **The guilt offering takes precedence over the thank offering and the ram of the Nazir, because it is Most Holy Things.**
 - (5) **The thank offering and the ram of the Nazir take precedence over peace offerings, because they are eaten for one day [unlike peace offerings which are eaten for two days] and require bread [Lev. 7:12-13].**
 - (6) **The peace offerings take precedence over the firstling, because they require [two placings which are] four placings [of blood], and laying of hands, and drink offerings, and waving of the breast and thigh.**

10:3

- A. **(7) The firstling takes precedence over tithe of cattle, because it is sanctified from the womb, and it is eaten [only] by priests.**
- B. **(8) The tithe of cattle takes precedence over fowl [even though the latter falls within Most Holy Things],**
- C. **because it is an animal sacrifice [killed with a knife, unlike fowl], and there pertain to it [traits that classify an offering as] Most Holy Things: its blood and its sacrificial parts [which are placed on the altar].**

10:4

- A. **(9) Fowl take precedence over meal offerings, because they fall [within the class] of [that which produces] blood [for atonement].**

- B. The meal offering of a sinner [Lev. 5:13] takes precedence over the free will meal offering, because it comes on account of sin.
- C. The sin offering of fowl takes precedence over the burnt offering of fowl,
- D. and so [too it takes precedence over the burnt offering] when [the two birds] are dedicated [for an offering, Lev. 5: 7].

I.1 A. [89B] *What is the scriptural basis for these rulings?*

- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And a second young bullock you shall take for a sin offering” (Num. 8: 8) [in connection with the consecration of the Levites].
- D. Now, if the purpose of this verse of Scripture is to teach that they are to be two, lo, it already is stated, “And you shall offer the one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering” (Num. 8: 8).
- E. So why say, “And a second young bullock you shall take for a sin offering” (Num. 8: 8)?
- F. For one might have thought that [because the sin offering is mentioned verse,] the sin offering should take precedence in all aspects prior to the rite of the burnt offering. So Scripture says, “And a second young bullock you shall take for a sin offering” (Num. 8: 8), [indicating that that is not so].
- G. But if Scripture had said only, “And a second young bullock you shall take for a sin offering” (Num. 8: 8), one might have thought that the burnt offering should take precedence in all aspects prior to the rite of the sin offering. So Scripture says, “And you shall offer the one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering” (Num. 8: 8).
- H. How so? Sprinkling the blood of the sin offering takes precedence over sprinkling the blood of the burnt offering, because it achieves atonement.

II.1 A. **The limbs of the burnt offering take precedence over the sacrificial parts of a sin offering, because they are wholly given over to the fires [to be burned up]:**

- B. *But why should this be the rule? Let the initial tossing of the blood, which is the one that achieves atonement, take precedence, but not the rest of the preparation?*
- C. *Said Rabina, “Here we are addressing the case of the sin offering that is presented in behalf of the Levites at their consecration, and even though it is comparable to a burnt offering, Scripture nonetheless has said that it should take precedence.”* [Freedman: hence its precedence does not cease when atonement has been made, since here there was no atonement.”]
- D. *In the West they say, “Since he has begun the applications of the blood of the sin offering, he concludes them.”*

II.2. A. *The question was raised: as between the blood of the sin offering and the limbs of the burnt offering, which of them takes precedence?*

- B. Does the blood of the sin offering takes precedence, because it propitiates? or perhaps the limbs of the burnt offering take precedence, because they are burned up on the fires on the altar?
- C. *Come and take note: **The blood of the sin offering takes precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, because it makes atonement [for a sin]. It takes***

precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, but it does not take precedence over the limbs of the burnt offering.

D. *But to the contrary, draw on the evidence of what follows: **The limbs of the burnt offering take precedence over the sacrificial parts of a sin offering, because they are wholly given over to the fires [to be burned up].** So it is only the sacrificial parts of the sin offering over which they take precedence, but they do not take precedence over the blood of the sin offering.*

E. *So there is no conclusion to be drawn on the basis of the available evidence.*

II.3. A. *The question was raised: as between the blood of the burnt offering and the sacrificial parts of the sin offering, which of them takes precedence?*

B. *Is it the blood of the burnt offering that takes precedence, because it derives from an offering that is wholly burned on the fires, or perhaps the sacrificial parts of the sin offering takes precedence, because they derive from an offering that propitiates?*

C. *Come and take note: **The blood of the sin offering takes precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, because it makes atonement [for a sin].** It is the blood of the sin offering that takes precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, but it does not take precedence over the limbs of the burnt offering.*

D. *But to the contrary, draw on the evidence of what follows: **The limbs of the burnt offering take precedence over the sacrificial parts of a sin offering, because they are wholly given over to the fires [to be burned up].** So it is only the limbs of the burnt offering which they take precedence over the sacrificial parts of the sin offering, but not the blood of the sin offering.*

E. *So there is no conclusion to be drawn on the basis of the available evidence.*

II.4. A. *The question was raised: as between the blood of the sin offering and the blood of the guilt offering, which of them takes precedence?*

B. *Should the blood of the burnt offering take precedence, because it is presented by reason of an offering that is burned up on the altar fires, or perhaps the blood of the guilt offering takes precedence, because it propitiates?*

C. *Come and take note: **The blood of the sin offering takes precedence over the blood of the burnt offering, because it makes atonement [for a sin],** but not the blood of the burnt offering.*

D. *But it is a matter of reason that the Tannaite framer of the passage should have included the blood of a guilt offering, but because he proposes later on to set forth the rule, **The limbs of the burnt offering take precedence over the sacrificial parts of a sin offering, because they are wholly given over to the fires [to be burned up],** [he did not do so]. For had he set forth the rule that they take precedence over the sacrificial parts of the guilt offering, I would have maintained that it is only the sacrificial parts of the guilt offering over which they take precedence, but not the sacrificial parts of a sin offering.*

E. *On that account, he made reference solely to the sin offering.*

F. *Come and take note: **The sin offering takes precedence over the guilt offering, because its blood is placed on the four corners [of an altar] and on the foundation.** So it is only a sin offering that takes precedence over a guilt*

offering, but a burnt offering does not take precedence. Now surely that speaks of the blood!

- G. *No, it speaks of the sacrificial parts. And you may prove that fact from the language of the passage itself, for the framer further states, **because its blood is placed on the four corners [of an altar] and on the foundation**, [and he does not state, 'because it is applied' (Freedman)].*
- H. *That is decisive proof.*

III.1 A. The sin offering takes precedence over the guilt offering, because its blood is placed on the four corners [of an altar] and on the foundation:

- B. *To the contrary, a guilt offering should take precedence, because of the consideration that [unlike the sin offering,] it has a fixed value [Lev. 5:15]!*
- C. *Even so, the fact that it involves a greater number of rites on the altar is the more important consideration.*

IV.1 A. The guilt offering takes precedence over the thank offering and the ram of the Nazir, because it is Most Holy Things.

- B. *To the contrary, a thank offering and the ram presented by the Nazirite should take precedence, because of the consideration that those offerings must include loaves of bread!*
- C. *Even so, the fact that it falls into the classification of Most Holy Things is the more important consideration.*

V.1 A. The thank offering and the ram of the Nazir take precedence over peace offerings, because they are eaten for one day [unlike peace offerings which are eaten for two days] and require bread [Lev. 7:12-13].

- B. *To the contrary, the peace offering should take precedence, because of the consideration that it is offered in behalf of the community and not only in behalf of an individual [traits of the thank offering and the Nazirite's ram]!*
- C. *Even so, the fact that the time-span assigned for eating the meat is only a day and a night is the more important consideration.*

V.2. A. The question was raised: as between the thank offering and the ram of the Nazir, which of the two takes precedence?

- B. *Perhaps the thank offering should take precedence, because it must be accompanied by four different classifications of loaves of bread, or perhaps the Nazirite's ram takes precedence, because it is accompanied by other offerings altogether [sin offering, burnt offering]?*
- C. *Come and take note: the thank offering takes precedence over the Nazirite's ram, because it must be accompanied by four different classifications of loaves of bread, while the other is accompanied by only two.*

VI.1 A. The peace offerings take precedence over the firstling, because they require [two placings which are] four placings [of blood], and laying of hands, and drink offerings, and waving of the breast and thigh

- B. *To the contrary, the firstling should take precedence, **because it is sanctified from the womb, and it is eaten [only] by priests!***
- C. *Even so, the greater number of rites that are required for the peace offering are the more important consideration.*

VII.1 A. The firstling takes precedence over tithe of cattle, because it is sanctified from the womb, and it is eaten [only] by priests:

- B. To the contrary, the beast declared tithe should take precedence, because of the consideration that if there is a miscount, then the sanctity of the tenth beast extends to the ninth and the eleventh [should they be called “tenth” erroneously]!
- C. *Even so, the consideration of having been sanctified from the womb is the more important.*

VIII.1 A. The tithe of cattle takes precedence over fowl [even though the latter falls within Most Holy Things]: because it is an animal sacrifice [killed with a knife, unlike fowl], and there pertain to it [traits that classify an offering as] Most Holy Things: its blood and its sacrificial parts [which are placed on the altar]:

- B. To the contrary, fowl should take precedence, because of the consideration that they fall into the classification of Most Holy Things!
- C. *Even so, the manner of killing the creature is the more important consideration [and pinching the neck is less important than slaughter with a knife].*

VIII.2. A. Said Rabina bar Shila, “If the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things are taken out of the Temple courtyard prior to the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial beast from which they derive, they are invalidated. *Our Tannaite authority sustains this view when he says, because it is an animal sacrifice [killed with a knife, unlike fowl], and there pertain to it [traits that classify an offering as] Most Holy Things: its blood and its sacrificial parts [which are placed on the altar]. Now as for the consideration of sacrificial parts, there is no problem, for while these are not found in birds. But as to blood, there still is blood that is put on the altar. [But then why mention blood, since in this respect birds and animals fall into the same classification (Freedman)?] But then what he wishes to tell us is the following: the sacrificial parts are comparable to the blood. Just as the blood, prior to being sprinkled, falls into the classification of Most Holy Things, so the sacrificial parts, before the blood is sprinkled, fall into the classification of Most Holy Things, but only then are they in that classification; and just as the blood is disqualified through being taken out of the courtyard, so the sacrificial parts are disqualified through being taken out of the courtyard.”*

- B. *May we say that the following supports the proposition just now proposed: the meat of Lesser Holy Things that was taken out of courtyard prior to the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial beast from which they derive —*
- C. R. Yohanan says, “It is fit.”
- D. R. Simeon b. Laqish says, “It is invalid.”
 - E. R. Yohanan says, “It is fit.” in any event the meat is going to be taken out one way or the other.
 - F. R. Simeon b. Laqish says, “It is invalid.” this is not the time for taking the meat outside.
- G. *Now the dispute concerns only the meat, but not the sacrificial parts [which proves the point that if the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things are taken out of the Temple courtyard prior to the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial beast from which they derive, they are invalidated].*

- H. *Not at all, in fact the disagreement concerns the sacrificial parts as well, and the reason that the dispute is stated only about the meat is to tell you how far R. Simeon b. Laqish is willing to go, specifically, even the meat, that will be taken out one way or the other, is invalid in his view, for he holds that nonetheless this is not the time for taking the meat outside.*
- I. *May one say that there is a parallel dispute among Tannaite formulations of the matter?*
- J. *As to the sacrificial parts of Lesser Holy Things that were taken out of the Temple courtyard prior to the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrificial beast from which they derive —*
- K. *R. Eliezer says, “The laws of sacrilege do not pertain to them, [90A] and no liability is incurred in their regard on considerations of refuse, left-over, or uncleanness.”*
- L. *R. Aqiba says, “The laws of sacrilege do pertain to them, and liability is incurred in their regard on considerations of refuse, left-over, or uncleanness.”*
- M. *Is not the point at issue a case in which they were taken back in [prior to the sprinkling of the blood], and this is what is at issue: one authority takes the view that, by being taken outside of the courtyard, they have been invalidated, and the other maintains that they have not been invalidated when they were taken out of the courtyard?*
- N. *Said R. Pappa, “If they were taken back in, there is no dispute [that the sprinkling is effective]. But here what is at issue is a case in which they are still outside of the courtyard [when the blood is sprinkled]. And this is what is at issue in the dispute: one authority maintains the view that the act of sprinkling is null with regard to what has been taken outside of the courtyard, and the other authority holds that the act of sprinkling is entirely effective even concerning what has been taken outside of the courtyard.”*
- O. *But lo, it is R. Pappa himself who has said, “If the limbs are outside of the courtyard, there is no disagreement at all! Where there is a disagreement it concerns a case in which they were brought back into the courtyard.”*
- P. *That statement concerns only the Two Loaves of bread, which do not form part of the actual sacrifice, but since the sacrificial parts indeed do form part of the sacrifice, there is a disagreement concerning the rule that governs when the sprinkling takes place while the parts are outside of the Temple courtyard.*

IX.1 A. Fowl take precedence over meal offerings, because they fall [within the class] of [that which produces] blood [for atonement]:

- B. *To the contrary, meal offerings should take precedence, because of the consideration that they are offered for the community as much as for the individual.*
- C. *Even so, the fact that **they fall [within the class] of [that which produces] blood [for atonement]** is the more important consideration.*

X.1 A. The meal offering of a sinner [Lev. 5:13] takes precedence over the free will meal offering, because it comes on account of sin:

- B. To the contrary, the votive meal offering should take precedence, because of the consideration that it requires oil and frankincense [and so is a more costly offering]!
- C. *Even so, the fact that it comes on account of sin is the more important consideration, since it achieves expiation for sin.*

X.2. A. The question was raised: as between the meal offering presented by a woman accused of adultery and the meal offering presented as a free will offering, which takes precedence?

- B. Should the meal offering presented as a free will offering take precedence, because of the consideration that it requires oil and frankincense [and so is a more costly offering]? *Or perhaps* the meal offering presented by the wife accused of adultery should take precedence, between it is presented so as to clarify whether or not a transgression has taken place?
- C. *Come and take note:* **The meal offering of a sinner [Lev. 5:13] takes precedence over the free will meal offering** — *it is in particular the meal offering of a sinner that takes precedence over the free will meal offering. Lo, the meal offering of a woman accused of adultery does not.*
- D. *But does the framer specify, because it makes atonement? What he specifically taught is, because it comes on account of sin?! And this offering also is presented on account of sin!*
- E. *Come and take note:* This takes precedence over that, because this derives from wheat, and that from barley [which is inferior grain]. *Surely that means that the meal offering presented in fulfillment of a vow takes precedence over the meal offering presented in behalf of the woman accused of adultery?*
- F. No, the meaning is that the meal offering presented by a sinner takes precedence over the meal offering presented by a woman accused of adultery [which is of barley].
- G. *Then derive that conclusion from the fact that the one achieves atonement, and the other does not achieve atonement!*
- H. *Then what? Does it refer to a meal offering brought in fulfillment of a vow? Then infer the rule from the fact that the meal offering brought in fulfillment of a vow requires an additional offering of oil and frankincense, while the one brought in behalf of the woman accused of the adultery does not.*
- I. *Rather, one or another of these two considerations is in play [as the case may be].*

XI.1 A. The sin offering of fowl takes precedence over the burnt offering of fowl, and so [too it takes precedence over the burnt offering] when [the two birds] are dedicated [for an offering, Lev. 5: 7].

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this rule?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “And he shall first offer that which is designated as the sin offering” (Lev. 5: 8) —

- E. What is the point of Scripture's making that statement? It cannot be that that is offered first of all, for that is already covered by the implications of the further statement: "And he shall prepare the second for a burnt offering" (Lev. 5: 8)! Rather, this is meant to serve as the generative analogy for all sin offerings, indicating that they take precedence over any burnt offering that is presented along with them, whether it is a sin offering prepared of fowl along with burnt offering of fowl, or sin offering prepared of a beast for a burnt offering prepared of a beast, and even a sin offering prepared of a bird along with a burnt offering prepared of a beast.
- F. Therefore, it follows, **the sin offering of fowl takes precedence over the burnt offering of fowl**, deriving from the statement, "and he shall prepare the second for a burnt offering."
- G. *As to a sin offering prepared of an animal taking precedence over a burnt offering prepared of an animal, it is because the All-Merciful has extended the rule through the additional language; and the sin offering prepared of a bird precedes the burnt offering prepared of a beast because of the generative analogy.*
- H. *Come and take note of the following:* R. Eliezer says, "In any situation in which a sin offering is exchanged for another, the sin offering of fowl takes precedence [over the burnt offering of a bird] [Freedman: where a sin offering prepared of a beast is prescribed in the first place but Scripture permits a poor person to give two birds instead, one as a sin offering and one as a burnt offering, the sin offering prepared of a bird takes precedence over the burnt offering prepared of a bird]. But in the case of a woman after childbirth, the burnt offering of the bird takes precedence [Freedman: because she is liable to a burnt offering prepared of an animal, and by reason of poverty she may bring two birds, one as a burnt offering, the other as a sin offering]. In any passage in which both birds are presented in place of a single sin offering, the sin offering takes precedence, but in the case of the woman after childbirth, they do not take the place of a single sin offering, so the burnt offering takes precedence." [Freedman: this contradicts the rule of the Mishnah that a bird sin offering takes precedence over an animal burnt offerings, while in this case the woman brings the animal burnt offering before the bird sin offering.]
- I. Said Raba, "Scripture has accorded it precedence so far as designating it." [Freedman: one must first designate the animal or bird for the burnt offering, and then the bird for the sin offering, but the latter is offered first.]
- J. *Come and take note of the following:* **Bullocks take precedence over rams, rams over sheep, sheep over he-goats** [T. Zeb. 10:5A]. Now [90B] does that not speak of those of the Festival of Tabernacles [the he goats then were sin offerings, the lambs, burnt offerings, yet lambs take precedence (Freedman)]?
- K. No, the sense is that, in the case of an offering brought in fulfillment of a vow, in which case we deal with burnt offerings, bullocks take precedence over rams, because they are accompanied with more elaborate libations, and for the same reason rams take precedence over lambs, but lambs take precedence over he goats, because they are more substantial as offerings, since the fat-tail is offered as well.

- M. *Come and take note of the following:* The bullock of the anointed priest takes precedence over the bullock presented by the community on account of inadvertent sin; the bullock presented by the community on account of inadvertent sin takes precedence over the bullock presented on account of idolatry; the bullock presented on account of idolatry takes precedence over the he-goats presented by reason of idolatry. [Note the following: **Whatever is offered more regularly than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow, and whatever is more holy than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow. If a bullock of an anointed priest and a bullock of the congregation are standing awaiting sacrifice — the one of the anointed high priest takes precedence over the bullock of the congregation in all rites pertaining to it (M. Hor. 3:6A-C).**] *And that is so even though the bullock presented because of idolatry is a burnt offering, and the he goats presented because of idolatry are sin offerings!*
- N. *But why not present the opening clause in evidence: [in support of the Mishnah's rule, rather than the second in opposition to it:]* the bullock presented by the community on account of inadvertent sin takes precedence over the bullock presented on account of idolatry?
- O. *We do not speak of a case in which both sacrifices are of a single species; there a sin offering certainly takes precedence. We raise the case in which they are of two species [and we wish to prove that the sin offering prepared of a bird takes precedence over an animal offering prepared as a burnt offering], and yet even here we find the case of a burnt offering taking precedence over a sin offering!*
- P. *In the West they say in the name of Raba bar Mari, "When Scripture refers [at Num. 15:24] to the sin offering that is presented in connection with idolatry, it is written out lacking the ordinarily-included silent letter, A [which is an exception and identifies the rule as exception]."*
- Q. *Rabina said, "In the context of offerings presented on account of idolatry, 'according to the ordinance' is written' (Num. 15:24)" [Freedman: this implies that they must be offered in the same order as they are prescribed, and the burnt offering here is mentioned first].*
- R. Now that you have come to this point, you may even say that the prior passage does refer to the bullocks of the Festival of Tabernacles, for in that connection the language "according to the ordinance" is written [at Num. 29:33].

- XI.2.** A. *The question was raised:* where [awaiting sacrifice] are a burnt offering prepared of a bird, a burnt offering prepared of a beast, and tithe of the herd, which takes precedence?
- B. *Should the burnt offering prepared of a bird take precedence? But there is the tithe of the herd, which takes precedence.*
- C. *Should the tithe of the herd come first? But the burnt offering prepared of a beast is there, and that takes precedence.*
- D. *Should the burnt offering prepared of a beast take precedence? But there is the sin offering prepared of a bird, which takes precedence!*
- E. *Here they took the view that an offering that is sacrificed [in the normal way,] by an act of slaughter takes precedence [thus the tithe, then the bird prepared as a sin offering, then the animal prepared as a burnt offering].*

- F. *There in the West they said, "The priority of a burnt offering prepared of an animal [over the tithe] takes charge for the sin offering prepared of a bird and gives it priority over the tithe."* [Freedman: since the burnt offering accompanies the sin offering, the higher importance of the former over tithe, that is Most Holy Things and is altogether burned, invests the sin offering with the same superiority over tithe; hence the sin offering must be sacrificed first, then the burnt offering, and finally the tithe.]

10:5-7

10:5

- A. All sin offerings which are [mentioned] in the Torah take precedence over guilt offerings [listed at M. 5:5 = M. 10:2A3],
- B. except for the guilt offering of the person afflicted by the skin ailment of Lev. 13,
- C. because [in line with Lev. 14] it comes to render [him] fit [to enter the Temple and eat Holy Things].
- D. All guilt offerings which are [mentioned] in the Torah come from animals in their second year and must be two shekels in value,
- E. except for the guilt offering of the Nazir and the guilt offering of the person afflicted with the skin ailment,
- F. which are offered in their first year and do not have to be two shekels in value.

10:6

- A. Just as they [the above-mentioned offerings, more holy than some other, M. 10:2-4] take precedence in being offered up, so they take precedence in being eaten.
- B. Peace offerings of yesterday and peace offerings of today — those of yesterday take precedence,
- C. "Peace offerings of yesterday and a sin offering and a guilt offering of today — those of yesterday take precedence," the words of R. Meir.
- D. And sages say, "The sin offering takes precedence, because it is Most Holy Things."

10:7

- A. And in the case of all of them [which are eaten], the priests are permitted to vary the manner of eating them: to eat them (1) roasted, (2) seethed, or (3) cooked.
- B. "And to put in them unconsecrated spices or spices of heave offering," the words of R. Simeon,
- C. R. Meir says, "He should not put into them spices of heave offering, so that he not bring heave offering to the state of invalidity."

- I.1** A. *The question was raised: as between that which is more frequent and that which is more holy, which takes precedence? Does that which is more frequent take precedence, because it is more frequent, or does that which is more holy take precedence, because it is more holy?*

- B. *Come and take note: **Daily whole offerings take precedence over additional offerings.** [91A] Now that is so even though additional offerings are more holy [Freedman: for they are brought on the Sabbath and festivals, while the daily whole offerings are also brought on weekdays].*
- C. *Not at all. Does the Sabbath impart greater sanctity to the additional offerings but not to the daily whole offering? [Surely not, it affects both equally and imparts sanctity to each.]*
- D. *Come and take note: **The additional offerings of the Sabbath take precedence over the additional offerings of the new moon.***
- E. *Does the New Moon impart greater sanctity to its own additional offerings but not to the additional offerings of the Sabbath? [Surely not, it affects both equally and imparts sanctity to each.]*
- F. *Come and take note: **The additional offerings of the new moon take precedence over the additional offerings of the New Year [which also is a new moon] — although the New Year is holier!***
- G. *Does the New Year impart greater sanctification to its own additional offerings but not to the additional offerings of the New Moon?*
- H. *Come and take note: **Another matter: the benediction over the wine is routine, while the benediction for the day is not routine [but only on the Sabbath]. As between what is routine and what is only occasional, what is routine takes precedence [T. Ber. 5:25G]. And that is the rule even though the blessing over the Sabbath day is the more holy.***
- I. *But then does the Sabbath imparts its sanctification to the blessing over the day but not to the blessing over the wine?*
- J. *Come and take note: for R. Yohanan said, “The decided law is that a person recites the Prayer for the twilight service and afterward that for the Additional Service [the former being the more routine, the later the more holy].*
- K. *But then does the Sabbath imparts its sanctification to the additional service but not to the Prayer at twilight?*
- L. *Come and take note: **Peace offerings of yesterday and a sin offering and a guilt offering of today — those of yesterday take precedence — then lo, if this and that both were prepared today, the sin offering and guilt offering take precedence, even though the peace offering is the more routine!***
- M. *Said Raba, “But your evidence concerns what is merely more commonly offered, while what we have asked concerns what is the more routine and not about what is merely the more common!”*
- N. *Said R. Huna bar Judah to Raba, “But is not what is the more common not pretty much the same thing as what is the more routine? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘I shall except the case of the Passover, which is not routine, but I shall not except the case of circumcision, which is routine’?”*
- O. *But what is the sense, here, of ‘routine’? It is, the more routine as far as the religious duties are concerned; or if you prefer, circumcision is more routine in comparison with the Passover offering.*

I.2. A. *The question was raised: In the case of that which is the more routine and that which is the less, if the priest went ahead and slaughtered first of all the less*

routine, what is the law? Do we say that, since the priest has slaughtered the beast designated for the less routine classification, he should now go ahead and offer it? Or perhaps he should hand over the blood to another priest to stir the blood until he offers the more routine, and then he goes back and offers the less routine animal's blood?

- B. *Said R. Huna of Sura, "Come and take note: **Peace offerings of yesterday and a sin offering and a guilt offering of today — those of yesterday take precedence of those of today.** Lo, if it were a peace offering killed today analogous to one of yesterday — and what would be a case? if he slaughtered the peace offering first — then the sprinkling of the blood of the sin offering and of the guilt offering would take precedence. [But if both were brought today and the peace offering was wrongly slaughtered first, the slaughtering of the sin offering and guilt offering must precede the sprinkling of the blood of the peace offering, so when one sacrifice is more holy than another, and the latter was slaughtered first, the former still must be slaughtered and its blood sprinkled before the blood of the latter is sprinkled (Freedman)].*
- C. *Not at all, perhaps the meaning of the case of a peace offering of yesterday and a sin offering and guilt offering of today is, he slaughtered both [in which case he sprinkles the blood of the more holy first], but where he did not slaughter both, you have a question.*
- D. *Come and take note: **Another matter: the benediction over the wine is routine, while the benediction for the day is not routine [but only on the Sabbath]. As between what is routine and what is only occasional, what is routine takes precedence [T. Ber. 5:25G].** [Freedman: this is analogous to slaughtering the less routine first, and as here the blessing of the wine must be recited first, by analogy the blood of the more routine must be sprinkled first.]*
- E. *Here too, since the wine is in hand, the analogy is to a case in which both of the animals have been killed.*
- F. *Come and take note: for R. Yohanan said, "The decided law is that a person recites the Prayer for the twilight service and afterward that for the Additional Service [the former being the more routine, the later the more holy].*
- G. *Here too, since the time for reciting the Prayer of twilight has arrived, the analogy is to a case in which both of the animals have been killed.*
- H. *Said R. Aha b. R. Ashi to Rabina, "[Come and take note:] 'if one killed the animal designated as a Passover offering before noon, it is unfit, because the language "at dusk" is used in that connection (Exo. 12: 6). If he killed it before the Daily Whole Offering of the evening has been killed, it is fit, but one stirs the blood until he sprinkles the blood of the Daily Whole Offering.'" [Freedman: this proves that when one sacrifice is killed earlier than it should be, the sprinkling still has to wait.]*
- I. *With what sort of case do we deal here? It is one in which he had first slaughtered the beast designated as the Daily Whole Offering.*
- J. *Said R. Aha the Elder to R. Ashi, "The Tannaite-passage yields the same point, since it teaches, until he sprinkles the blood of the Daily Whole Offering, and not, 'until he slaughters and then sprinkles the blood....'"*

K. *That is decisive.*

II.1 A. And in the case of all of them [which are eaten], the priests are permitted to vary the manner of eating them: to eat them roasted, seethed, or cooked:

B. *What is the scriptural basis for this rule?*

C. “Even all the Holy Things...to you have I given them for a consecrated portion” (Num. 18: 8) — as a mark of majesty, they can be eaten as kings eat their food [which is, any way they like it].

10:8

A. **Said R. Simeon, “If you have seen oil spread about in the Temple court [divided up among the priests], you do not have to ask, ‘What is it?’ For [one may take for granted that] it is the residue of the meal offering wafers of Israelites or of the log of oil of a person healed of the skin ailment.**

B. **“If you have seen oil put on top of the altar fires, you do not have to ask, ‘What is it?’ But it is the residue of the meal offering wafers of priests or the meal offering of the anointed priest.”**

C. **For: they do not offer oil as a freewill offering.**

D. **R. Tarfon says, “They do offer oil as a freewill offering.”**

I.1 A. [91B] Said Samuel, “In the opinion of R. Tarfon, if a person makes a freewill offering of oil by itself, he removes a handful thereof and burns it on the altar, and the residue of the oil is eaten. *What is the scriptural basis for this view?* Scripture has said, ‘And when any one brings a meal offering’ (Lev. 2: 1) — this teaches that one can make a freewill offering of oil on its own, and that the offering of oil is analogous to a meal offering. Just as in the case of a meal offering, he removes a handful thereof and burns it on the altar, and the residue of the meal offering is eaten, so in the case of a donation of oil, he removes a handful thereof and burns it on the altar, and the residue of the oil is eaten.”

B. *Said R. Zira, “So too we have learned the same point in the Mishnah: Said R. Simeon, “If you have seen oil spread about in the Temple court [divided up among the priests], you do not have to ask, ‘What is it?’ For [one may take for granted that] it is the residue of the meal offering wafers of Israelites or of the log of oil of a person healed of the skin ailment...For they do not offer oil as a freewill offering. So it follows that from the perspective of him who holds that they do offer oil, the oil also may be divided.”*

C. *Said to him Abbaye, “But look at the latter part of the same statement: If you have seen oil put on top of the altar fires, you do not have to ask, ‘What is it?’ But it is the residue of the meal offering wafers of priests or the meal offering of the anointed priest. For they do not offer oil as a freewill offering. So it follows that from the perspective of him who holds that they offer oil, all of it is to be presented as an offering made by fire.”*

D. *So for Abbaye the opening clause represents a contradiction, and for R. Zira, the closing one.*

E. *For R. Zira, in point of fact, the closing one poses no problem, since the first clause speaks of the residue, the latter, to the handful itself. But from the perspective of Abbaye, there really is a problem!*

- F. *The Tannaite authority has presented the opening clause only to balance the closing one.* [Freedman: the first clause is irrelevant to the controversy as to whether oil can be donated or not, for even if it could be donated, it would still not be shared out to the priests, and oil that is would only be residue on all views. It is included only as a parallel to the second clause, where it is only on the view that oil cannot be donated that one need not doubt; for on the view that oil can be donated, one might not know what this oil is, since a votive offering of oil too is burnt on the altar.]
- G. *Well, there is no problem in holding that the latter clause is included only by way of symmetry with the former; but does one present an opening clause so as to provide symmetry with a later one?*
- H. *Yes, they really do, for they have said in the West, "The clause is included so as to provide symmetry with a later one."*
- I. [Contradicting Samuel's thesis, A:] *come and take note: As to wine, in the opinion of R. Aqiba, it is for the basins; as for oil, in the view of R. Tarfon, it is for the fires [T. Men. 12:10A-B].* [Freedman: In Aqiba's view wine can be offered by itself, oil cannot. One wine is presented on its own, it is put in basins as a drink offering but it is not sprinkled on the fires. Since Tarfon concurs, there is no reason to mention Aqiba's name in particular. The clause that follows is only in accord with Tarfon, since Aqiba does not hold the view assigned to Tarfon.] *Now since the entirety of the wine is for basins, surely the entirety of the oil is to be burned!*
- J. *Why say so? This is subject to its law, and that is subject to its law.*
- K. *Said R. Pappa, "The same dispute is represented in the following Tannaite formulation: If someone vows to bring oil, he should present no smaller a volume than a log. Rabbi says, "Three logs" [M. Men. 13:5B-C]."*
- L. *Now what is at issue between them?*
- M. *Rabbis stated before R. Pappa, "At issue between them is the principle, '[Freedman's translation:] judge from it and all from it, or judge from it but place the deduction on its own basis.'* [Freedman: whether an analogy must be carried through on all points, so that the case deduced agrees throughout the the case from which the deduction has started; or whether the deduction won by analogy be regulated by the rules of the original case.] [Freedman:] *Rabbis take the view, 'judge from it and all from it,' so that, just as a meal offering can be donated on its own, so oil can be donated on its own; 'and all from it' means, just as a meal offering requires a log of oil, so here too a log of oil is required; just as in the case of a meal offering a handful is removed and the rest is eaten, so in the case of a donation of oil alone, a handful is removed and the rest is eaten. The other party derives the rule from the analogy of the meal offering [but not in all respects, thus} just as a meal offering can be contributed on its own, so oil is contributed on its own. They however treat the deduction in its own terms: it is comparable to a drink offering of wine, and since a drink offering requires three logs, so oil must be an offering of three logs; as the whole of a drink offering is for basis, so the whole of the oil is for the fires."*
- N. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, "Now if Rabbi had derived the rule from the case of a meal offering, then all parties would concur that the operative principle is, 'judge*

from it and all from it.’ But Rabbi derives the rule from the analogy of the ‘homeborn.’”

- O. *Said R. Huna b. R. Nathan to R. Pappa, “But can you say this? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “a meal offering” — this teaches that one may make a donation of oil on its own, and how much? It must be three logs.’ Now whom do you know who holds that it must be three logs in volume? It is Rabbi. And yet he deduces the rule from the analogy of the meal offering.”*
- P. *He said to him, “If that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority, then that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority.”*
- I.2. A. *Said Samuel, “One who makes a freewill offering of wine brings it and sprinkles it on the fires. What is the scriptural basis for this view? Scripture says, ‘And you shall present for a drink offering half a hin of wine, for an offering made by fire, of a sweet smell to the Lord’ (Num. 15:10).”*
- B. *But if he does so, he will put the fire out!*
- C. *Putting out just part of the fire is not classified as putting out the altar fires.*
- D. *Is that so? But has not R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said, “He who takes a coal from the altar and puts it out is liable”?*
- E. *That rule applies when there is only that one coal.*
- F. *Or if you prefer, I shall say, putting out the fire on account of carrying out a religious duty is subject to a different rule.*
- G. *Come and take note, for R. Eliezer b. Jacob repeated as a Tannaite formulation, “Since Torah has given permission to take up the ashes, might one suppose that one may put out the flame and collect the ashes? You must say that one may not do so.”*
- H. *That case is different, since it is possible to sit and wait until the fire goes out.*
- I. *Come and take note: **As to wine, in the opinion of R. Aqiba, it is for the basins; as for oil, in the view of R. Tarfon, it is for the fires [T. Men. 12:10A-B].** And it has furthermore been taught on Tannaite authority: **As to wine, it is for the basins.** But perhaps that is not the case, and perhaps it is for the fires? Should it not say: he must not extinguish the fire?*
- J. *That poses no challenge, since the one formulation accords with the position of R. Judah, the other with R. Simeon [about the effect of an act done on the Sabbath without intention; Judah forbids doing so, Simeon permits; here extinguishing the flame is not intentional; the rule that wine may not be sprinkled on the fire concurs with Judah, Samuel with Simeon (Freedman)].*
- K. *Then are we to conclude that Samuel concurs with R. Simeon? But surely Samuel has said, “People may extinguish a lump of fiery metal in the street so that it will not do any harm to the public, [92A] but not a burning piece of wood.” Now if you take the view that he is in accord with R. Simeon, then he should permit extinguishing even a coal of burning wood.*
- L. *In respect to a matter in which there is no intentionality he concurs with R. Simeon, but in respect to an act of labor which is not required for its own sake he concurs with R. Judah [and that is why he permits the unintentional putting out of fire on the altar but forbids unintentionally putting out a burning piece of wood (Freedman)].*

- I.3.** A. Said R. Huna, “Drink offerings of wine that were made unclean — one makes a wood pile for that wine by itself and then burns the wine, in line with this verse: ‘And every sin offering...in the holy place...shall be burned with fire’ (Lev. 6:23).”
- B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Blood, oil, meal offerings, and drink offerings that have been made unclean — one makes a wood pile for that wine by itself and then burns the wine.”
- D. *Said Samuel to R. Hana of Baghdad, “Bring ten men to me and I shall say to you in their presence: ‘Drink offerings of wine that were made unclean — one makes a wood pile for that wine by itself and then burns the wine.’”*