



1:3 With regard to the Paschal offering that one slaughtered on the morning of the fourteenth of Nisan, the day when the Paschal offering should be slaughtered in the afternoon, if he did so not for its sake, Rabbi Yehoshua deems it fit as though it were slaughtered on the thirteenth of Nisan. An animal consecrated as a Paschal offering that was slaughtered not at its designated time for the sake of a different offering is fit for sacrifice as a peace offering. Ben Beteira deems it unfit as though it were slaughtered in the afternoon of the fourteenth. Shimon ben Azzai said: I received a tradition from seventy-two elders, as the Sanhedrin deliberated and decided on the day that they installed Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya at the head of the yeshiva and ruled that all the slaughtered offerings that are eaten that were slaughtered not for their sake are fit, but these offerings did not satisfy the obligation of the owner, except for the Paschal offering and the sin offering. Based on that version, ben Azzai added to the halakha cited in the first mishna only the burnt offering, which is not eaten, and the Rabbis disagreed and did not concede to him.

1:4 With regard to the Paschal offering and the sin offering, where one slaughtered them not for their sake, or where he collected their blood in a vessel, conveyed this blood to the altar, or sprinkled this blood on the altar not for their sake, or where he performed one of these sacrificial rites for their sake and not for their sake, or not for their sake and for their sake, in all these cases the offerings are unfit. How are these rites performed for their sake and not for their sake? In a case where one slaughtered the Paschal offering for the sake of a Paschal offering and for the sake of a peace offering. How are these rites performed not for their sake and for their sake? In a case where one slaughtered the Paschal offering for the sake of a peace offering and for the sake of a Paschal offering. The offering is unfit because a slaughtered offering is disqualified due to prohibited intent in four matters: In the performance of the sacrificial rites of slaughtering the animal, in collecting the blood, in conveying the blood, and in sprinkling the blood. Rabbi Shimon deems the offering fit if the prohibited intent was during the rite of conveying the blood, as he would say: It is impossible to sacrifice an offering without slaughtering the animal, or without collection of the blood, or without sprinkling the blood, but it is possible to sacrifice an offering without conveying the blood to the altar. How so? If one slaughters the animal alongside the altar and sprinkles the blood, the blood does not need to be conveyed. Therefore, the rite of conveying the blood is not significant enough to cause the offering to be disqualified due to prohibited intent while performing it. Rabbi Eliezer says: With regard to one who conveys the blood in a situation where he is required to convey it, prohibited intent while conveying it disqualifies the offering. If he conveys the blood in a situation where he is not required to convey it, prohibited intent while conveying it does not disqualify the offering.

2:1 With regard to all slaughtered offerings, if the one who collected their blood was a non-priest; or a priest who was an acute mourner, i.e., one whose relative has died and has not yet been buried; or one who was ritually impure who immersed that day and is waiting for nightfall for the purification process

to be completed; or one who has not yet brought an atonement offering, e.g., a zav or leper after the seventh day of the purification process; or a priest lacking the requisite priestly vestments; or one who did not wash his hands and feet from the water in the Basin prior to performing the Temple service; or an uncircumcised priest; or a ritually impure priest; or if the one who collected the blood was sitting; or if he was standing not on the floor of the Temple but upon vessels, or upon an animal, or upon the feet of another, he has disqualified the offering. If he collected the blood with his left hand, he disqualified the blood for offering. In this last case, Rabbi Shimon deems it fit. If the blood spilled on the floor before the priest managed to collect it into a vessel, and the priest then collected it from the floor into a vessel, it is disqualified. If the priest placed the blood upon the ramp leading up to the altar, or if he placed it on the wall of the altar in an area that is not opposite the base of the altar, i.e., in those parts of the altar where there is no foundation; or if he placed the blood that is to be placed below the red line that runs along the middle of the altar, e.g., the blood of a burnt offering, above the red line, or if he placed the blood that is to be placed above the red line, e.g., the blood of a sin offering, below the red line; or if he placed the blood that is to be placed inside the Sanctuary, i.e., on the golden altar or in the Holy of Holies, outside the Sanctuary on the external altar, or if he placed the blood that is to be placed outside the Sanctuary inside the Sanctuary, in all these cases the offering is disqualified. Nevertheless, there is no liability for karet for one who partakes of these offerings.

2:2 With regard to one who slaughters the offering with intent to sprinkle its blood outside the Temple or to sprinkle part of its blood outside the Temple, to burn its sacrificial portions outside the Temple or to burn part of its sacrificial portions outside the Temple, to partake of its meat outside the Temple or to partake of an olive-bulk of its meat outside the Temple, or to partake of an olive-bulk of the skin of the tail outside the Temple, in all of these cases the offering is disqualified, and there is no liability for karet for one who partakes of it. But if one had intent to sprinkle its blood the next day or part of its blood the next day, to burn its sacrificial portions the next day or to burn part of its sacrificial portions the next day, to partake of its meat the next day or to partake of an olive-bulk of its meat the next day, or to partake of an olive-bulk of the skin of the tail the next day, the offering is piggul, and one is liable to receive karet for burning or partaking of it.

2:3 This is the principle: With regard to anyone who slaughters the animal, or who collects the blood, or who conveys the blood, or who sprinkles the blood, with intent to partake of an item whose typical manner is such that one partakes of it, e.g., the meat of the offering, or to burn an item whose typical manner is such that one burns it on the altar, if his intent was to partake of or to burn the measure of an olive-bulk outside its designated area, the offering is disqualified, but there is no liability for karet for burning or partaking of it. If his intent was to do so beyond its designated time, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for burning or partaking

of it, provided that the permitting factor, the blood, is sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva.

2:4 How is the permitting factor sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva? If one slaughtered the animal in silence with no specific intent, and he collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn or partake of the offering beyond its designated time; or if one slaughtered it with intent to burn or partake of the offering beyond its designated time, and he collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood in silence; or if one slaughtered the animal and collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn or partake of the offering beyond its designated time, that is the case where one sacrifices the permitting factor in accordance with its mitzva. How is the permitting factor not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva? If one slaughtered the animal with intent to burn it or partake of it outside its designated area, and he collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn it or partake of it beyond its designated time; or if one slaughtered the animal with intent to burn it or partake of it beyond its designated time, and collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn it or partake of it outside its designated area; or if one slaughtered the animal and collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn it or partake of it outside its designated area, these are cases in which the permitting factor is not sacrificed in accordance with the mitzva.

Similarly, in the case of the Paschal offering and the sin offering that one slaughtered not for their sake, and one collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood with intent to burn it or partake of it beyond its designated time; or if one slaughtered the Paschal offering or sin offering with intent to burn it or partake of it beyond its designated time, and he collected and conveyed and sprinkled the blood not for their sake; or that one slaughtered the Paschal offering or sin offering and collected and conveyed and sprinkled their blood not for their sake, that is the case of an offering whose permitting factor is not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva.

2:5 If one performed one of the sacrificial rites with the intent to eat an olive-bulk outside its designated area and an olive-bulk the next day, or an olive-bulk the next day and an olive-bulk outside its designated area, or half an olive-bulk outside its designated area and half an olive-bulk the next day, or half an olive-bulk the next day and half an olive-bulk outside its designated area, the offering is disqualified and there is no liability for karet for burning or partaking of it. Rabbi Yehuda said that this is the principle: In any case where the intent with regard to the time preceded the intent with regard to the area, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for burning or partaking of it. And if the intent with regard to the area preceded the intent with regard to the time, the offering is disqualified and there is no liability for karet for burning or partaking of it. And the Rabbis say: In both this case and that case, the offering is disqualified and there is no liability for karet for burning or partaking of it. If his intent was to eat half an olive-bulk and to burn half an olive-bulk not at the appropriate time or in the appropriate area, the offering is fit because eating and burning do not join together.

3:1 With regard to all those who are unfit for Temple service who slaughtered an offering, their slaughter is valid, as the slaughter of an offering is valid ab initio when performed even by non-priests, by women, by Canaanite slaves, and by ritually impure individuals. And this is the halakha even with regard to offerings of the most sacred order, provided that the ritually impure will not touch the flesh of the slaughtered animal, thereby rendering it impure.

Therefore, these unfit individuals can disqualify the offering with prohibited intent, e.g., if one of them intended to partake of the offering beyond its designated time or outside its designated area. And with regard to all of them, in a case where they collected the blood with the intent to offer it beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, if there is blood of the soul that remains in the animal, the priest fit for Temple service should again collect the blood and sprinkle it on the altar.

3:2 If the priest fit for Temple service collected the blood in a vessel and gave the vessel to an unfit person, that person should return it to the fit priest. If the priest collected the blood in a vessel in his right hand and moved it to his left hand, he should return it to his right hand. If the priest collected the blood in a sacred vessel and placed it in a non-sacred vessel, he should return the blood to a sacred vessel. If the blood spilled from the vessel onto the floor and he gathered it from the floor, it is valid. If an unfit person placed the blood upon the ramp or on the wall of the altar that is not opposite the base of the altar, or if he placed the blood that is to be placed below the red line above the red line, or if he placed the blood that is to be placed above the red line below the red line, or if he placed the blood that is to be placed inside the Sanctuary outside the Sanctuary or the blood that is to be placed outside the Sanctuary inside the Sanctuary, then if there is blood of the soul that remains in the animal, the priest fit for Temple service should again collect the blood and sprinkle it on the altar.

3:3 In the case of one who slaughters an offering with the intent to eat, beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, an item whose typical manner is such that one does not partake of it, e.g., the portions of the offering consumed on the altar, or with the intent to burn, beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, an item whose typical manner is such that one does not burn it on the altar, e.g., the meat of the offering, the offering is fit, and Rabbi Eliezer deems it unfit. One who slaughters an offering with the intent to eat, beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, an item whose typical manner is such that one does partake of it, or with the intent to burn, beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, an item whose typical manner is such that one does burn it on the altar, but his intent was to partake or burn less than an olive-bulk, the offering is fit. If his intent was to eat half an olive-bulk and to burn half an olive-bulk beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, the offering is fit, because eating and burning do not join together.

3:4 In the case of one who slaughters an offering with the intent to eat, beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, an olive-bulk from the hide, or from the gravy, or from the spices that amass at the bottom of the pot together with small amounts of meat, or from a tendon in the neck, or from

the bones, or from the tendons, or from the horns, or from the hooves, the offering is fit and one is not liable to receive karet for it, neither due to the prohibition of piggul, if the sacrificial rites were performed with the intent to partake of the offering beyond its designated time, nor due to the prohibition of leftover meat beyond the designated time, nor due to the prohibition against partaking of the meat while ritually impure.

3:5 In the case of one who slaughters sacrificial female animals with the intent to eat the fetus of those animals or their placenta outside the designated area, he has not rendered the offering piggul. Likewise, in the case of one who pinches doves, i.e., slaughters them for sacrifice by cutting the napes of their necks with his fingernail, with the intent to eat their eggs that are still in their bodies outside the designated area, he has not rendered the offering piggul. This is because the fetus, the placenta, and the eggs are not considered part of the body of the animal or the bird. For the same reason, one who consumes the milk of sacrificial female animals or the eggs of doves is not liable to receive karet for it, neither due to the prohibition of piggul, nor due to the prohibition of notar, nor due to the prohibition against partaking of the meat while ritually impure.

3:6 If one slaughters the animal in order to leave its blood or its sacrificial portions for the next day, or to remove them outside the designated area, but not in order to sacrifice them the next day, Rabbi Yehuda deems the offering unfit, and the Rabbis deem it fit. In the case of one who slaughters the animal in order to place the blood upon the ramp or on the wall of the altar that is not opposite the base of the altar, or in order to place the blood that is to be placed above the red line below the red line, or to place the blood that is to be placed below the red line above the red line, or the blood that is to be placed inside the Sanctuary outside the Sanctuary, or the blood that is to be placed outside the Sanctuary inside the Sanctuary; and likewise, if he slaughtered the animal with the intent that ritually impure people will partake of it, or that ritually impure people will sacrifice it, or that uncircumcised people will partake of it, or that uncircumcised people will sacrifice it; and likewise, with regard to the Paschal offering, if he had intent during the slaughter to break the bones of the Paschal offering, or to eat from the meat of the Paschal offering partially roasted, or to mix the blood of an offering with the blood of unfit offerings, in all these cases, although he intended to perform one of these prohibited acts, some of which would render the offering unfit, the offering is fit. The reason is that intent does not render the offering unfit except in cases of intent to eat or to burn the offering beyond its designated time and outside its designated area, and in addition, the Paschal offering and the sin offering are disqualified by intent to sacrifice them not for their sake.

4:1 Beit Shammai say: With regard to all the offerings whose blood is to be placed on the external altar, even those that require that the blood be sprinkled on two opposite corners of the altar so that it will run down each of its four sides, in a case where the priest placed the blood on the altar with only one placement, he facilitated atonement. And in the case of a sin offering, which requires four placements, one on each of the four corners of

the altar, at least two placements are necessary to facilitate atonement. And Beit Hillel say: Even with regard to a sin offering, in a case where the priest placed the blood with one placement, he facilitated atonement after the fact. Therefore, since the priest facilitates atonement with one placement in all cases other than a sin offering according to Beit Shammai, and even in the case of a sin offering according to Beit Hillel, if he placed the first placement in its proper manner, and the second with the intent to eat the offering beyond its designated time, he facilitated atonement. Since the second placement is not indispensable with regard to achieving atonement, improper intent while performing that rite does not invalidate the offering. And based on the same reasoning, if he placed the first placement with the intent to eat the offering beyond its designated time and he placed the second placement with the intent to eat the offering outside its designated area, the second of which does not render an offering piggul, the offering is piggul, an offering disqualified by improper intention, and one is liable to receive excision from the World-to-Come [karet] for its consumption. This is because the intent that accompanied the second placement does not supersede the piggul status of the offering.

4:2 All this applies to those offerings whose blood is to be placed on the external altar. But with regard to all the offerings whose blood is to be placed on the inner altar, if the priest omitted even one of the placements, it is as though he did not facilitate atonement. Therefore, if he placed all the placements in their proper manner, and one placement in an improper manner, i.e., with the intent to eat the offering beyond its designated time, the offering is disqualified, as it is lacking one placement; but there is no liability for karet for one who partakes of the offering, as the improper intention related to only part of the blood that renders the offering permitted for consumption, and an offering becomes piggul only when the improper intention relates to the entire portion of the offering that renders it permitted for consumption.

4:3 And these are the items for which one is not liable to receive karet due to violation of the prohibition of piggul. One is liable to receive karet only if he partakes of an item that was permitted for consumption or for the altar by another item. As for the items listed here, either nothing else renders them permitted for consumption or for the altar, or they themselves render other items permitted. They are as follows: The handful of flour, which permits consumption of the meal offering; the incense, which is burned in its entirety, without another item rendering it permitted for the altar; the frankincense, which is burned together with the handful of the meal offering; the meal offering of priests, from which no handful of flour is removed and which is burned in its entirety (see Leviticus 6:16); the meal offering of the anointed priest, which is sacrificed by the High Priest each day, half in the morning and half in the evening; the blood, which permits all the offerings; and the libations that are brought by themselves as a separate offering and do not accompany an animal offering; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: The same halakha applies even with regard to libations that are brought with an animal offering. With regard to the log of oil that accompanies

the guilt offering of a recovered leper, Rabbi Shimon says: One is not liable for consuming it due to violation of the prohibition of piggul, because it is not permitted by any other item. And Rabbi Meir says: One is liable for consuming it due to violation of the prohibition of piggul, as the blood of the guilt offering of the leper permits its use, as only after the blood's sacrifice is the oil sprinkled and given to the priests. And the principle is: With regard to any item that has permitting factors, either for consumption by a person or for burning on the altar, one is liable for eating it due to violation of the prohibition of piggul.

4:4 The mishna elaborates: The burnt offering, its blood permits its flesh to be burned on the altar and its hide to be used by the priests. The bird burnt offering, its blood permits its flesh and its skin to be burned on the altar. The bird sin offering, its blood permits its meat for consumption by the priests. Bulls that are burned, e.g., the bull for an unwitting communal sin, and goats that are burned, e.g., the goats sacrificed for an unwitting communal sin of idol worship, their blood permits their sacrificial portions to be sacrificed on the altar. Rabbi Shimon says: Those bulls and goats are not subject to piggul because their blood is presented in the Sanctuary, and in the case of any offering whose blood is not presented on the external altar like that of a peace offering, with regard to which the halakha of piggul was stated in the Torah, one is not liable for eating it due to violation of the prohibition of piggul.

4:5 With regard to offerings consecrated by gentiles for sacrifice to God, one is not liable for eating them, neither due to violation of the prohibition of piggul if the sacrificial rites were performed with the intent to eat the offering beyond its designated time, nor due to violation of the prohibition of notar, nor due to violation of the prohibition against eating the meat while ritually impure. And one who slaughters them outside the Temple courtyard is exempt; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. And Rabbi Yosei deems him liable. Even with regard to those items enumerated in the previous mishna (42b) for which one is not liable for eating them due to violation of the prohibition of piggul, e.g., the handful, the frankincense, and the incense, one is, nevertheless, liable for eating them due to violation of the prohibition of notar, and due to violation of the prohibition against eating consecrated food while ritually impure, except for the blood. Rabbi Shimon deems one liable for an item whose typical manner is such that one eats it. But with regard to the wood, the frankincense, and the incense, one is not liable for eating them due to violation of the prohibition against eating a consecrated item while ritually impure.

4:6 The slaughtered offering is slaughtered for the sake of six matters, and one must have all of these matters in mind: For the sake of the particular type of offering being sacrificed; for the sake of the one who sacrifices the offering; for the sake of God; for the sake of consumption by the fires of the altar; for the sake of the aroma; for the sake of the pleasing of God, i.e., in fulfillment of God's will; and, in the cases of a sin offering and a guilt offering, for the sake of atonement for the sin. Rabbi Yosei says: Even in the case of one who did not have in mind to slaughter the offering for the sake of

any one of these, the offering is valid, as it is a stipulation of the court that he should not state any intent ab initio. This is necessary because the intent follows only the one performing the sacrificial rite, and therefore if the one who slaughters the animal is not careful and states the wrong intent, the offering would be disqualified through his improper intent.

5:1 What is the location of the slaughtering and consumption of offerings? The principle is that with regard to offerings of the most sacred order, their slaughter is in the north of the Temple courtyard. Specifically, with regard to the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur, their slaughter is in the north and the collection of their blood in a service vessel is in the north, and their blood requires sprinkling between the staves of the Ark in the Holy of Holies, and upon the Curtain separating the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and on the golden altar. Concerning all those sprinklings, failure to perform even one placement of their blood disqualifies the offering. As to the remainder of the blood, which is left after those sprinklings, a priest would pour it onto the western base of the external altar. But if he did not place the remainder of the blood on the western base, it does not disqualify the offering.

5:2 With regard to bulls that are burned and goats that are burned, their slaughter is in the north of the Temple courtyard, and the collection of their blood in a service vessel is in the north, and their blood requires sprinkling upon the Curtain separating the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and upon the golden altar, and failure to perform even one placement of their blood disqualifies the offering. As for the remainder of the blood that is left after those sprinklings, a priest would pour it onto the western base of the external altar, but if he did not pour the remainder it does not disqualify the offering. These, the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur, and those, the bulls and the goats that are burned, are then burned in the place of the ashes, a place outside of Jerusalem where the priests would bring the ashes from the altar.

5:3 These are the halakhot of the communal and the individual sin offerings. These are the communal sin offerings: Goats of the New Moon and of the Festivals. Their slaughter is in the north of the Temple courtyard, and the collection of their blood in a service vessel is in the north, and their blood requires four placements on the four corners of the altar. How did the priest do so? He ascended the ramp of the altar and turned right to the surrounding ledge and he continued east, and he came to the southeast corner and sprinkled the blood of the sin offering there and then to the northeast corner and sprinkled the blood there, and then to the northwest corner and sprinkled the blood there, and the southwest corner, where he performed the fourth sprinkling and descended from the altar. He would pour the remainder of the blood on the southern base of the altar. And the meat portions of the offering are eaten within the curtains, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, by the males of the priesthood. And they are eaten prepared in any form of food preparation, on the day the offering is sacrificed and during the night that follows, until midnight.

5:4 The burnt offering is an offering of the most sacred order. Its slaughter is in the north of the Temple courtyard and the collection of its blood in a service vessel is in the north, and its blood requires two placements that are

four, and it requires flaying of its carcass and the cutting of the sacrificial animal into pieces, and it is consumed in its entirety, with the exception of its hide, by the fire of the altar.

5:5 These are the halakhot of communal peace offerings and guilt offerings. These are guilt offerings: The guilt offering for robbery, brought by one from whom another demanded payment of a debt and he denied it and took a false oath (see Leviticus 5:20–26); the guilt offering for unwitting misuse of consecrated property (see Leviticus 5:14–16); the guilt offering of an espoused maidservant, brought by one who engaged in sexual intercourse with a Canaanite maidservant betrothed to a Hebrew slave (see Leviticus 19:20–22); the guilt offering of a nazirite who became impure via contact with a corpse (see Numbers 6:12); the guilt offering of a leper, brought for his purification (see Leviticus 14:12); and the provisional guilt offering, brought by one who is uncertain as to whether he committed a sin that requires a sin offering (see Leviticus 5:17–18). Concerning all of these, their slaughter is in the north of the Temple courtyard and collection of their blood in a service vessel is in the north, and their blood requires two placements that are four. And the meat portions of the offering are eaten within the curtains, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, by male priests. And they are eaten prepared in any manner of food preparation, on the day the offering was sacrificed and during the night that follows, until midnight.

5:6 The thanks offering and nazirite's ram are offerings of lesser sanctity. Their slaughter is anywhere in the Temple courtyard, and their blood requires two placements that are four, and they are eaten throughout the city of Jerusalem, by every person, i.e., any ritually pure Jew, prepared in any manner of food preparation, on the day the offering was sacrificed and during the night that follows, until midnight. The status of the portion that is separated from them and given to the priests is similar to theirs; but the portion that is separated is eaten by the priests, by their wives, and by their children, and by their slaves.

5:7 Peace offerings are offerings of lesser sanctity. Their slaughter is anywhere in the Temple courtyard, and their blood requires two placements that are four, and they are eaten throughout the city of Jerusalem, by every person, i.e., any ritually pure Jew, prepared in any manner of food preparation, for two days and one night, i.e., the day on which they are slaughtered, the following day, and the intervening night. The status of the portion that is separated from them and given to the priests is similar to theirs; but the portion that is separated is eaten by the priests, by their wives, and by their children, and by their slaves.

5:8 The firstborn offering, the animal tithe offering, and the Paschal offering are offerings of lesser sanctity. Their slaughter is anywhere in the Temple courtyard, and their blood requires one placement, provided that the priest places it so that the blood goes on the base of the altar. The halakha differs with regard to their consumption. The firstborn offering is eaten by the priests, and the animal tithe offering is eaten by any person, i.e., any ritually pure Jew. And they are eaten throughout the city of Jerusalem, prepared in any manner of food preparation, for two days and one night. The

Paschal offering is eaten only at night, and it is eaten only until midnight, and it is eaten only by its registrants, i.e., those who registered in advance to partake of the offering, and it is eaten only roasted, not prepared in any other manner.

6:1 It was taught in the previous chapter that offerings of the most sacred order are to be slaughtered in the northern section of the Temple courtyard. With regard to offerings of the most sacred order that one slaughtered atop the altar, Rabbi Yosei says: Their status is as though they were slaughtered in the north, and the offerings are therefore valid. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: The status of the area from the halfway point of the altar and to the south is like that of the south, and offerings of the most sacred order slaughtered in that area are therefore disqualified. The status of the area from the halfway point of the altar and to the north is like that of the north. Handfuls were removed from the meal offerings in any place in the Temple courtyard and were consumed within the area enclosed by the curtains by males of the priesthood, prepared in any form of food preparation that he chooses, e.g., roasted or boiled, for one day and night, until midnight.

6:2 The sacrificial rite of a bird sin offering would be performed at the southwest corner of the altar. And if its sacrificial rite was performed in any place on the altar, the offering was deemed valid; but that corner was its designated place. And there were three matters for which the portion of that corner below the red line that served as the demarcation between the upper and lower portions of the altar served as the proper location, and there were three matters for which the portion of that corner above the red line served as their proper location. The following rites were performed below the red line: Sacrificing a bird sin offering, and bringing meal offerings near the altar before removal of the handful, and pouring out the remaining blood. And the following rites were performed above the red line: The wine libation that is brought together with animal offerings or as an offering by itself, and the water libation on the festival of Sukkot, and sacrificing a bird burnt offering when they were numerous and it was impossible to perform the rite in the east, i.e., the southeastern corner where the bird burnt offering was sacrificed.

6:3 All those who ascend the ramp to the altar ascend via the right side of the ramp toward the southeast corner and circle the altar until reaching the southwest corner and descend via the left side of the ramp, except for one who ascends for one of these three matters, where they would ascend directly to the southwest corner of the altar, and descend by turning on their heels and retracing the path by which they ascended rather than circling the altar.

6:4 The sacrifice of the bird sin offering, how was it performed? The priest would pinch off the bird's head by cutting opposite its nape with his thumbnail and would not separate the bird's head from its body. And he sprinkles from its blood on the wall of the altar below the red line. The remaining blood would be squeezed out from the body of the bird on the base of the altar. The altar has only its blood and the entire bird goes to the priests for consumption.

6:5 The sacrifice of the bird burnt offering, how was it performed? The priest ascended the ramp and turned to the surrounding ledge and came to the southeast

corner of the altar. He would then pinch off the bird's head by cutting at its nape with his thumbnail and separate the bird's head from its body, and would squeeze out its blood on the wall of the altar. He took the head and neared the place of its pinching, i.e., its nape, to the altar in order to squeeze the blood from the head. He would then absorb the remaining blood with salt and throw the head onto the fire on the altar. He then arrived at the body and removed the crop and the feather attached to it and the innards that emerge with them and he tossed them to the place of the ashes. He then ripped the bird lengthwise and did not separate the two halves of the bird; but if he separated them, the offering is valid. He would then absorb the remaining blood with salt and throw the body of the bird onto the fire on the altar.

6:6 If he neither removed the crop, nor the feather and the innards that emerge with them, nor absorbed the blood with salt, with regard to any detail that he changed in the sacrificial rites after he squeezed out its blood, the offering is valid. If he separated the head from the body in sacrificing the sin offering, or if he did not separate the head from the body in sacrificing the burnt offering, the offering is disqualified. In a case where he squeezed out the blood of the head and did not squeeze out the blood of the body, it is disqualified. If he squeezed out the blood of the body and did not squeeze out the blood of the head, the offering is valid.

6:7 In the case of a bird sin offering that the priest pinched not for its sake, or if he squeezed out its blood not for its sake, or if he did so for its sake and then not for its sake, or not for its sake and then for its sake, it is disqualified, like all other sin offerings that are disqualified when performed not for their sake (see 2a). A bird burnt offering sacrificed not for its sake is valid; it is just that it did not satisfy the obligation of the owner. With regard to both a bird sin offering and a bird burnt offering where the priest pinched its nape or squeezed out its blood with the intent to partake of an item whose typical manner is such that one partakes of it, or to burn an item whose typical manner is such that one burns it on the altar, outside its designated area, the offering is disqualified. But there is no liability to receive karet for one who partakes of the offering. If his intent was to eat it or burn it beyond its designated time, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for partaking of the offering, provided that the permitting factor, the blood, was sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. How is the permitting factor sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva? If one pinched the nape in silence, i.e., with no disqualifying intent, and squeezed out its blood with the intent to partake of the parts typically eaten or to burn the portions that are to be burned on the altar, beyond its designated time; or in the case of one who pinched with the intent to partake of the offering or burn it on the altar beyond its designated time, and squeezed out its blood in silence; or in the case of one who pinched and squeezed out the blood with the intent to partake of the offering or burn it on the altar beyond its designated time, that is the case of a bird offering where the permitting factor is sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. How is the permitting factor not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva? If the priest pinched the nape of the bird with the intent to partake of it or burn it outside its

designated area and squeezed out its blood with the intent to partake of it or burn it beyond its designated time, or he pinched with the intent to partake of it or burn it beyond its designated time and squeezed out its blood with the intent to partake of it or burn it outside its designated area, or if the priest pinched and squeezed out the blood with the intent to partake of it or burn it outside its designated area, or in the case of a bird sin offering where one pinched its nape not for its sake and squeezed out its blood with the intent of consuming it or burning it beyond its designated time, or in a case where he pinched its nape with the intent to consume it or burn it beyond its designated time and squeezed out its blood not for its sake, or in a case where he pinched its nape and squeezed out its blood not for its sake, that is a case of a bird offering whose permitting factor is not sacrificed in accordance with its mitzva. If one pinched the nape of the bird and squeezed out its blood with the intent to eat an olive-bulk of the offering outside its designated area and an olive-bulk the next day, or an olive-bulk the next day and an olive-bulk outside its designated area, or half an olive-bulk outside its designated area and half an olive-bulk the next day, or half an olive-bulk the next day and half an olive-bulk outside its designated area, the offering is disqualified and it does not include liability to receive karet. Rabbi Yehuda disagreed and said that this is the principle: If the improper intent with regard to the time preceded the intent with regard to the area, the offering is piggul and one is liable to receive karet for eating it. And if the intent with regard to the area preceded the intent with regard to the time, the offering is disqualified and it does not include liability to receive karet. And the Rabbis say: In both this case where the intent with regard to time came first and that case where the intent with regard to area came first, the offering is disqualified and it does not include liability to receive karet. If his intent was to eat half an olive-bulk and to burn half an olive-bulk not at the appropriate time or in the appropriate area, the offering is valid, because eating and burning do not join together.

7:1 If the priest sacrificed a bird sin offering in its designated place below the red line, and he sacrificed it according to the procedure of a sin offering with pinching, i.e., cutting from the nape with a fingernail, and sprinkling, and he sacrificed it for the sake of a sin offering, the offering is fit. This is the manner in which a priest is to sacrifice a sin offering ab initio. If the priest sacrificed the bird sin offering below the red line in the middle of the altar and according to the procedure of a sin offering, but he sacrificed it for the sake of a burnt offering; or if he sacrificed it according to the procedure of a burnt offering, even if he sacrificed it for the sake of a sin offering; or if he sacrificed it according to the procedure of a burnt offering for the sake of a burnt offering; in all these cases the sin offering is disqualified. If one sacrificed a bird sin offering above the red line according to the procedure of any of the offerings, it is disqualified, because he did not sacrifice it in its designated place.

7:2 A bird burnt offering that one sacrificed in its designated place above the red line according to the procedure of a burnt offering and for the sake of a burnt offering is fit. This is the manner in which a priest is to sacrifice a

burnt offering ab initio. If he sacrificed a bird burnt offering above the red line according to the procedure of the burnt offering but for the sake of a sin offering, the offering is fit, but it did not satisfy the obligation of its owner. If the priest sacrificed a bird burnt offering according to the procedure of a sin offering for the sake of a burnt offering, or according to the procedure of a sin offering for the sake of a sin offering, the offering is disqualified. If he sacrificed it below the red line according to the procedure of any of the offerings, it is disqualified, because he did not sacrifice it in its designated place.

7:3 And all of the offerings enumerated in the previous mishna, even those that are disqualified and may not be eaten or sacrificed, still differ from carcasses of unslaughtered kosher birds in that they do not render one who swallows their meat ritually impure when the meat is in the throat. This is because the pinching of the napes of bird offerings, like the slaughter of animals, prevents them from assuming the status of a carcass. But nevertheless, since they are forbidden to the priests, one who derives benefit from any of them is liable for misusing consecrated property. This is the halakha in all cases except for the bird sin offering that one sacrificed below the red line according to the procedure of the sin offering and for the sake of a sin offering. Since it was sacrificed properly and it is permitted for priests to partake of a fit sin offering, there is no liability for misuse of consecrated property.

7:4 In the case of a bird burnt offering that one improperly sacrificed below the red line according to the procedure of the sin offering, and one did so for the sake of a sin offering, Rabbi Eliezer says: One who derives benefit from it is liable for misusing consecrated property, as it remains a burnt offering, whose meat is never permitted to the priests. Rabbi Yehoshua says: One who derives benefit from it is not liable for misusing consecrated property. Since the entire sacrificial process was conducted according to the procedure of a sin offering, the offering assumes the status of a sin offering in this regard. The mishna recounts the dispute between the tanna'im. Rabbi Eliezer said: And if in the case of a sin offering that was sacrificed for its sake, one is not liable for misusing it, and nevertheless, when one changed its designation and sacrificed it not for its sake, one is liable for misusing it, then in the case of a burnt offering, where one is liable for misusing it even when it was sacrificed for its sake, when one changed its designation and sacrificed it not for its sake is it not right that he is liable for misusing it? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No, that a fortiori inference is not correct, as if you said with regard to a sin offering for which one changed its designation and sacrificed it for the sake of a burnt offering that there is liability for misuse, this is reasonable, because he changed its designation to an item for which there is liability for misuse. Would you say in the case of a burnt offering for which one changed its designation and sacrificed it for the sake of a sin offering that there is liability for misuse, as in that case he changed its designation to an item for which there is no liability for its misuse? Rabbi Eliezer said to him: The case of offerings of the most sacred order that one slaughtered in the south of the Temple courtyard and slaughtered for the sake of offerings of

lesser sanctity, will prove that the fact that one changed the offering's designation to an item that is not subject to the halakhot of misuse is not a relevant factor. As in this case, one changed their designation to an item that is not subject to the halakhot of misuse and, nevertheless, one is liable for misusing them. You too should not be puzzled about the burnt offering, concerning which even though one changed its designation to an item that is not subject to the halakhot of misuse, the halakha is that one would be liable for misusing it. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No, that is no proof, as if you said with regard to offerings of the most sacred order that one slaughtered in the south of the Temple courtyard, and slaughtered them for the sake of offerings of lesser sanctity, that one is liable for misusing them, that is reasonable. The reason is that one who slaughtered them changed their designation to an item for which there are both prohibited and permitted elements as offerings of lesser sanctity. Although one is not liable for misuse of their flesh, after the blood is sprinkled one is liable for misuse of the portions consumed on the altar. Would you say the halakha is the same in the case of a burnt offering for which one changed its designation to an item that is permitted in its entirety, i.e., a bird sin offering, which is eaten by the priests and none of it is burned on the altar?

7:5 If a priest pinched it with the thumbnail of his left hand, or if he pinched it at night, or if he slaughtered a non-sacred bird inside the Temple courtyard or a sacrificial bird outside the Temple courtyard, in all these cases, although it is prohibited to consume these birds, they do not render one ritually impure when they are in the throat, as the halakhic status of pinching is like that of slaughtering. If he pinched with a knife and not with his thumbnail; or if he pinched a non-sacred bird inside the Temple courtyard or a sacrificial bird outside the Temple courtyard; or if he pinched doves whose time of fitness for sacrifice has not yet arrived, as they are too young to be sacrificed; or if he pinched pigeons whose time of fitness has passed, as they are too old; or if he pinched the nape of a fledgling whose wing was withered, or whose eye was blinded, or whose leg was severed; in all these cases, although the bird's nape was pinched, it renders one who swallows it ritually impure when it is in the throat. This is the principle: The meat of any bird that was initially fit for sacrifice and whose disqualification occurred in the course of the service in the sacred Temple courtyard does not render one who swallows it ritually impure when it is in the throat. The meat of any bird whose disqualification did not occur in the sacred area, but rather was disqualified before the service began, renders one ritually impure when it is in the throat. With regard to any of those people disqualified from performing the Temple service who pinched the nape of a bird offering, their pinching is not valid, but the offering's meat does not render one who swallows it ritually impure when it is in the throat, as would the meat of a kosher bird that was not ritually slaughtered.

7:6 If the priest pinched the nape of the bird's neck properly and then it was found to be a tereifa, and it was therefore disqualified from being sacrificed and forbidden for consumption by a priest, Rabbi Meir says: An olive-bulk of its meat does not render one who swallows it ritually impure when

it is in the throat, as the pinching prevents it from assuming the status of a carcass. Rabbi Yehuda says: Its status is like any other carcass of an unslaughtered kosher bird, and its meat renders one who swallows it ritually impure. Rabbi Meir said: My opinion can be inferred a fortiori. If an animal carcass transmits impurity to a person through touching it and through carrying it, and nevertheless the slaughter of an animal purifies it, even if it is a tereifa, from its impurity, i.e., its slaughter prevents it from assuming the impurity status of a carcass, then with regard to a bird carcass, which possesses a lesser degree of impurity, as it does not transmit impurity to a person through touching it and through carrying it, but only through swallowing it, is it not logical that its slaughter should purify it, even if it is a tereifa, from its impurity? And once it is established that slaughter renders a bird that is a tereifa pure, it can be inferred that just as we found with regard to its slaughter that it renders a bird fit for consumption and purifies a bird, even if it is a tereifa, from its impurity, so too its pinching, which renders a bird offering fit with regard to consumption, should purify it, even if it is a tereifa, from its impurity. Rabbi Yosei says: Although one can derive from the case of an animal that slaughter renders even a bird that is a tereifa pure, that derivation cannot be extended to pinching. The same restriction that applies to every a fortiori inference, namely, that a halakha derived by means of an a fortiori inference is no more stringent than the source from which it is derived, applies here: It is sufficient for the halakhic status of the carcass of a bird that is a tereifa to be like that of the carcass of an animal that is a tereifa; its slaughter renders it pure, but its pinching does not.

8:1 All the offerings that were intermingled with animals from which deriving benefit is forbidden, e.g., sin offerings left to die, or with an ox that was sentenced to be stoned, even if the ratio is one in ten thousand, deriving benefit from them all is prohibited and they all must die. If the offerings were intermingled with animals whose sacrifice is forbidden but deriving benefit from them is not, the halakha is different. Examples of this are an ox with which a transgression was performed, which disqualifies it from being sacrificed as an offering, or an ox that is known to have killed a person based on the testimony of one witness or based on the admission of the owner. Had two witnesses testified, deriving benefit from the ox would have been prohibited. Additional examples include when an offering is intermingled with an animal that copulated with a person; or an animal that was the object of bestiality; or with an animal that was set aside for idol worship; or one that was worshipped as a deity; or with an animal that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, as it is written: "You shall not bring the payment of a harlot, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 23:19). Additional examples include an offering that was intermingled with an animal born of a mixture of diverse kinds, e.g., the offspring of a ram and a goat, or with an animal with a wound that will cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa], or with an animal born by caesarean section. In all these cases the animals that are intermingled shall graze until they become unfit for sacrifice and then they shall be sold. And from the money

received in the sale, the owner shall bring another offering of the monetary value of the highest-quality animal among them, of the same type of offering that the intermingled offering was. The mishna continues: If sacrificial animals were intermingled with unblemished, non-sacred animals, which, if consecrated, are fit for sacrifice, the non-sacred animals shall be sold for the purpose of purchasing offerings of the same type as the offering with which they were intermingled.

8:2 In a case where sacrificial animals were intermingled with other sacrificial animals, if it was an animal of one type of offering with animals of the same type of offering, one shall sacrifice this animal for the sake of whoever is its owner and one shall sacrifice that animal for the sake of whoever is its owner, and both fulfill their obligation. In a case where sacrificial animals were intermingled with other sacrificial animals, where an animal of one type of offering was intermingled with animals not of the same type of offering, e.g., two rams, where one is designated as a burnt offering and one as a peace offering, they shall graze until they become unfit for sacrifice and then they shall be sold. And from the money received in the sale, the owner shall bring another offering of the monetary value of the highest-quality animal among them as this type of offering, and another offering of the monetary value of the highest-quality animal among them as that type of offering, and he will lose the additional expense of purchasing two highest-quality animals, when he had sold only one highest-quality animal, from his own assets. In a case where sacrificial animals were intermingled with a firstborn offering or with an animal tithe offering, they shall graze until they become unfit for sacrifice and they shall both be eaten as a firstborn offering or as an animal tithe offering. All offerings can become indistinguishably intermingled with each other, except for a sin offering and a guilt offering, as the Gemara will explain.

8:3 In the case of a guilt offering that was intermingled with a peace offering, Rabbi Shimon says: Both of them should be slaughtered in the north of the Temple courtyard, as a guilt offering must be slaughtered in the north while a peace offering may be slaughtered anywhere in the courtyard. And they both must be eaten in accordance with the halakha of the more stringent of them, i.e., the guilt offering, with the following halakhot: They may be eaten only in the courtyard rather than throughout Jerusalem; by male priests and not by any ritually pure Jew; and on the day they were sacrificed and the following night, and not on the day they were sacrificed, the following day, and the intervening night. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Shimon: One may not limit the time of the consumption of an offering, as one may not bring sacrificial animals to the status of unfitness. According to Rabbi Shimon's opinion, the peace offering becomes leftover, notar, the morning after it is sacrificed, and not at the end of that day, as is the halakha concerning peace offerings. Rather, the owner shall wait until these animals become blemished, redeem them, and bring an offering of each type that is worth the monetary value of the higher-quality animal among them. The mishna adds: Even according to the opinion of the Rabbis, if pieces of the meat of one offering were intermingled with pieces of the meat of another offering, e.g., meat from offerings of the

most sacred order with meat from offerings of lesser sanctity; or if pieces of meat from offerings eaten for one day and the following night were intermingled with pieces of meat from offerings eaten for two days and one night, since in that case the remedy with regard to offerings that were intermingled cannot be implemented, they both must be eaten in accordance with the halakha of the more stringent of them.

8:4 In the case of the limbs of a sin offering, which are eaten by priests and may not be burned on the altar, that were intermingled with the limbs of a burnt offering, which are burned on the altar, Rabbi Eliezer says: The priest shall place all the limbs above, on the altar, and I view the flesh of the limbs of the sin offering above on the altar as though they are pieces of wood burned on the altar, and not as though they are an offering. And the Rabbis say: One should wait until the form of all the intermingled limbs decays and they will all go out to the place of burning in the Temple courtyard, where all disqualified offerings of the most sacred order are burned.

8:5 In a case where limbs of burnt offerings fit for sacrifice were intermingled with limbs of blemished burnt offerings, Rabbi Eliezer says: Although all the limbs are unfit for sacrifice, if the head of one of them was sacrificed all the heads shall be sacrificed, as the head that was sacrificed is assumed to have been that of the unfit animal in the mixture. Likewise, if one sacrificed the legs of one of them all the legs shall be sacrificed. And the Rabbis say: Even if all the limbs were sacrificed except for one of them, there is a concern that the remaining limb is the unfit limb, which may not be sacrificed. Rather, all of the limbs must go out to the place of burning in the Temple courtyard.

8:6 In the case of blood of an offering fit for sacrifice that was mixed with water, if the mixture has the appearance of blood it is fit for sprinkling on the altar, even though the majority of the mixture is water. If the blood was mixed with red wine, one views the wine as though it is water. If that amount of water would leave the mixture with the appearance of blood it is fit for presentation. And likewise if the blood was mixed with the blood of a non-sacred domesticated animal or the blood of a non-sacred undomesticated animal, one considers the non-sacred blood as though it is water. Rabbi Yehuda says: Blood does not nullify blood. Therefore, the priest presents the blood of the mixture on the altar.

8:7 If blood fit for presentation was mixed with the blood of unfit offerings, there is no remedy. Therefore, the entire mixture shall be poured into the drain running through the Temple courtyard. Likewise, if blood fit for presentation was mixed with blood of exudate, i.e., that exudes from the neck after the initial spurt following its slaughter concludes, which is unfit for presentation, the entire mixture shall be poured into the Temple courtyard drain. Rabbi Eliezer deems this mixture fit for presentation. Even according to the first tanna, if the priest did not consult the authorities and placed the blood on the altar, the offering is fit.

8:8 If the blood of unblemished offerings was mixed with the blood of blemished animals unfit for sacrifice, the entire mixture shall be poured into the Temple courtyard drain. This is the halakha when the fit and unfit blood were mixed in

one vessel. By contrast, if a cup of the blood of a blemished offering was intermingled with cups of blood fit for offering and it is unclear which blood is in the cup, Rabbi Eliezer says: Although it is prohibited to present all the blood due to the uncertainty, if it happened that a priest already sacrificed, i.e., presented, one cup, the blood in all the other cups shall be sacrificed, as the blood that was presented is assumed to have come from the unfit cup in the mixture. And the Rabbis say: Even if the blood in all the cups was sacrificed except for one of them, the remaining blood shall be poured into the Temple courtyard drain.

8:9 With regard to blood that is to be placed below the red line circumscribing the altar, e.g., blood of a burnt offering, a guilt offering, or a peace offering, that was mixed with blood that is to be placed above the red line, e.g., blood of a sin offering, Rabbi Eliezer says: The priest shall initially place the blood of the mixture above the red line for the sake of the sin offering, and I view the blood that was to be placed below that was in fact placed above as though it is water, and the priest shall again place blood from the mixture below. And the Rabbis say: It shall all be poured into the Temple courtyard drain. Even according to the Rabbis, if the priest did not consult the authorities and placed the blood above the red line, the offering is fit, and he should then place the remaining blood below the red line.

8:10 In a case of the blood of an offering that is to be placed on the altar with one placement that was mixed with the blood of another offering that is to be placed on the altar with one placement, e.g., the blood of a firstborn offering with the blood of another firstborn offering or the blood of an animal tithe offering, the blood shall be placed with one placement. In a case of the blood of an offering that is to be placed on the altar with four placements that was mixed with the blood of another offering that is to be placed on the altar with four placements, e.g., the blood of a sin offering with that of another sin offering, or the blood of a burnt offering with that of a peace offering, the blood shall be placed with four placements. If the blood of an offering that is to be placed on the altar with four placements was mixed with the blood of an offering that is to be placed on the altar with one placement, Rabbi Eliezer says: The blood shall be placed with four placements. Rabbi Yehoshua says: The blood shall be placed with one placement, as the priest fulfills the requirement with one placement after the fact. Rabbi Eliezer said to Rabbi Yehoshua: According to your opinion, the priest violates the prohibition of: Do not diminish, as it is written: "All these matters that I command you, that you shall observe to do; you shall not add thereto, nor diminish from it" (Deuteronomy 13:1). One may not diminish the number of required placements from four to one. Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rabbi Eliezer: According to your opinion, the priest violates the prohibition of: Do not add, derived from the same verse. One may not add to the one required placement and place four. Rabbi Eliezer said to Rabbi Yehoshua: The prohibition of: Do not add, is stated only in a case where the blood is by itself, not when it is part of a mixture. Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rabbi Eliezer: Likewise, the prohibition of: Do not diminish, is stated only in a case where the blood is by itself. And Rabbi Yehoshua also said: When you placed four placements, you transgressed the

prohibition of: Do not add, and you performed a direct action. When you did not place four placements but only one, although you transgressed the prohibition of: Do not diminish, you did not perform a direct action. An active transgression is more severe than a passive one.

8:11 Blood that is to be placed on three locations inside the Sanctuary, i.e., between the staves, on the Curtain, and on the golden altar, that was mixed with blood that is to be placed outside the Sanctuary on the external altar in the Temple courtyard, has no remedy, as one may not change the location of the placement of the blood of one to fulfill his obligation with the other type of blood. Therefore, all the blood shall be poured into the Temple courtyard drain. If the priest, on his own initiative, placed the mixture of blood outside the Sanctuary and again placed the mixture of blood inside the Sanctuary, the offering is fit. If the priest, on his own initiative, placed the mixture of blood inside the Sanctuary and again placed the mixture of blood outside the Sanctuary, Rabbi Akiva deems the blood placed outside disqualified, and the Rabbis deem it fit. As Rabbi Akiva says: Any blood that is to be presented outside that entered to atone in the Sanctuary is disqualified; but the Rabbis say: That is the halakha with regard to the blood of an external sin offering alone, as it is written: “And any sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the Tent of Meeting to atone in the Sanctuary, shall not be eaten” (Leviticus 6:23). Rabbi Eliezer says: The status of a guilt offering is like that of a sin offering as well, as it is stated: “As is the sin offering, so is the guilt offering” (Leviticus 7:7), i.e., there is one halakha for them. That is not the case with regard to the blood of other offerings.

8:12 In the case of a sin offering whose blood placement is on the external altar whose blood the priest collected in two cups, if one of them left the Temple courtyard and was thereby disqualified, the cup that remained inside the courtyard is fit to be presented. If one of the cups entered inside the Sanctuary and was thereby disqualified, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili deems the blood in the cup that remained outside the Sanctuary, in the courtyard, fit to be presented, and the Rabbis deem it disqualified from being presented. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili said in support of his opinion: The halakha is that if one slaughters an offering with the intent that its blood be presented outside of the Temple courtyard, the offering is disqualified, but if his intention was that the blood be presented inside the Sanctuary, the offering is not disqualified. Just as in a case where part of the blood reached a place where the intent to present the blood there disqualifies the offering, i.e., outside the Temple courtyard, and yet when some of the blood is taken there it does not render the status of the remaining blood disqualified like that of blood that leaves the courtyard, so too, in a case where part of the blood reached a place where the intent to present the blood there does not disqualify the offering, i.e., inside the Sanctuary, is it not logical that we will not deem the status of the remaining blood like that of blood that entered the Sanctuary? The mishna continues: If all of the blood of a sin offering whose blood placement is on the external altar entered the Sanctuary to atone through sprinkling, despite the fact that the priest did not actually sprinkle the blood to atone,

the offering is disqualified; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Shimon says: The offering is disqualified only when he atones and sprinkles the blood in the Sanctuary. Rabbi Yehuda says: If he took the blood into the Sanctuary unwittingly, the blood remains fit to be presented. With regard to all the blood disqualified for presentation that was placed on the altar, the frontplate effects acceptance only for offerings sacrificed that are ritually impure. Although it is written with regard to the frontplate worn on the forehead of the High Priest: "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, and Aaron shall bear the iniquity committed in the sacred matters" (Exodus 28:38), this does not apply to all disqualifications of offerings. This is because the frontplate effects acceptance for offerings sacrificed that are ritually impure but does not effect acceptance for offerings that leave the courtyard.

9:1 Certain unfit items, once they have been placed on the altar, are nevertheless sacrificed. The mishna teaches: The altar sanctifies only items that are suited to it. The tanna'im disagree as to the definition of suited for the altar. Rabbi Yehoshua says: Any item that is suited to be consumed by the fire on the altar, e.g., burnt offerings and the sacrificial portions of other offerings, which are burned on the altar, if it ascended upon the altar, even if it is disqualified from being sacrificed ab initio, it shall not descend. Since it was sanctified by its ascent upon the altar, it is sacrificed upon it, as it is stated: "It is the burnt offering on the pyre upon the altar" (Leviticus 6:2), from which it is derived: Just as with regard to a burnt offering, which is suited to be consumed by the fire on the altar, if it ascended it shall not descend, so too, with regard to any item that is suited to be consumed by the fire on the altar, if it ascended it shall not descend. Rabban Gamliel says: With regard to any item that is suited to ascend upon the altar, even if it is not typically consumed, if it ascended, it shall not descend, even if it is disqualified from being sacrificed ab initio, as it is stated: "It is the burnt offering on the pyre upon the altar," from which it is derived: Just as with regard to a burnt offering, which is fit for the altar, if it ascended it shall not descend, so too, any item that is fit for the altar, if it ascended it shall not descend. The mishna comments: The difference between the statement of Rabban Gamliel and the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua is only with regard to disqualified blood and disqualified libations, which are not consumed by the fire but do ascend upon the altar, as Rabban Gamliel says: They shall not descend, as they are fit to ascend upon the altar, and Rabbi Yehoshua says: They shall descend, as they are not burned on the altar. Rabbi Shimon says: Whether the offering was fit and the accompanying libations were unfit, e.g., if they became ritually impure or they were brought outside their designated area, or whether the libations were fit and the offering was unfit, rendering the accompanying libations unfit as well, and even if both this and that were unfit, the offering shall not descend, as it was sanctified by the altar, but the libations shall descend.

9:2 These are the items that even if they were disqualified, if they ascended the altar they shall not descend: Blood, sacrificial portions, or limbs of a burnt offering, any of which were left overnight off the altar, or that emerge

from the Temple courtyard, or that become ritually impure, or that came from an animal that was slaughtered with the intent to sacrifice it beyond its designated time or outside its designated area, or an offering that people unfit to perform the Temple service collected and then sprinkled its blood. Rabbi Yehuda says: In the case of a sacrificial animal that was slaughtered at night, or one whose blood was spilled on the floor of the Temple without its being collected in a vessel, or one whose blood emerged outside the curtains, i.e., outside the Temple courtyard: Even if it ascended upon the altar it shall descend. Rabbi Shimon says: In all these cases, if it ascended it shall not descend, because its disqualification occurred in sanctity. As Rabbi Shimon says: With regard to any unfit offering whose disqualification occurred in sanctity, i.e., in the course of the Temple service, the sacred area renders the offering acceptable, and if it ascended onto the altar it shall not descend. But with regard to any offering whose disqualification did not occur in sanctity but rather was unfit initially, the sacred area does not render the offering acceptable.

9:3 And these are the offerings whose disqualification did not occur in sanctity: An animal that copulated with a person, and an animal that was the object of bestiality, and an animal that was set aside for idol worship, and an animal that was worshipped as a deity, and an animal that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, and an animal born of a mixture of diverse kinds, and an animal with a wound that will cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa], and an animal born by caesarean section, and blemished animals. Rabbi Akiva deems blemished animals fit in the sense that if they ascended they shall not descend. Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, says: My father would reject blemished animals from upon the altar.

9:4 Concerning those animals that, if they ascended, do not descend, just as if they ascended the altar they shall not descend, so too, if they descended they shall not then ascend. And all of them that if they ascend they do not descend, if they ascended to the top of the altar alive they descend, as an animal is fit for the altar only after it is slaughtered. A burnt offering that ascended to the top of the altar alive shall descend, as one does not slaughter an animal atop the altar ab initio. But if one slaughtered the animal at the top of the altar, he should flay it and cut it into pieces in its place, and it is not removed from the altar.

9:5 And these are the items that if they ascended upon the altar they descend, because they are completely unfit for the altar: The meat of offerings of the most sacred order, i.e., a guilt offering and a sin offering, the meat of which is eaten by priests; and the meat of offerings of lesser sanctity, which is eaten by the owners; and the surplus of the omer meal offering brought on the second day of Passover after the handful was removed and burned on the altar; and the two loaves meal offering brought on the festival of Shavuot; and the shewbread; and the remainder of the meal offerings after the handful was removed, which are all eaten by the priests; and the incense that ascended upon the external altar and not the golden altar where it should be burned. With regard to the wool that is on the heads of the sheep brought as burnt offerings, and the hair that is in the beard of goats that were sacrificed, and

the bones, and the tendons, and the horns, and the hooves: When they are attached to the flesh of the offering they shall ascend upon the altar and be sacrificed with the offering, as it is stated: “And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar” (Leviticus 1:9). If they separated from the flesh of the offering they shall not ascend, as it is stated: “And you shall offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood” (Deuteronomy 12:27), and nothing else.

9:6 And all of those disqualified offerings with regard to which it was taught (84a) that if they ascended they do not descend, in a case where they were dislodged from upon the altar, the priest does not restore them to the altar. And likewise, with regard to an ember that was dislodged from upon the altar, the priest does not restore it to the altar. As for limbs of a fit burnt offering that were dislodged from upon the altar, if they were dislodged before midnight, the priest should restore them to the altar and one is liable for misusing them. But if they were dislodged after midnight, the priest does not restore them and one is not liable for misusing them, as one is not liable for misuse of consecrated property after it has fulfilled the purpose for which it was designated.

9:7 With regard to unfit items that if they ascended do not descend, just as the altar sanctifies items that are suited to it, so too, the ramp sanctifies items that are suited to it. Just as the altar and the ramp sanctify items that are suited to them, so too, the service vessels sanctify items that are placed in them. The mishna elaborates on the halakha taught in the previous mishna (86a) that service vessels sanctify items placed in them. The service vessels used for liquids sanctify only liquids used in the service, and the service vessels that serve as dry measures sanctify only dry items used in the service. The service vessels used for liquids do not sanctify dry items, and the service vessels used for dry items do not sanctify liquids. With regard to sacred vessels that were perforated, if one continues to utilize them for a use similar to the use for which they would utilize them previously when they were whole, they continue to sanctify their contents. And if not, they do not sanctify their contents. And all of these vessels sanctify items only when they are in the sacred area, i.e., the Temple courtyard.

10:1 Any offering that is more frequent than another precedes the other offering. Therefore, the daily offerings precede the additional offerings, which are sacrificed only on certain days. When Shabbat and the New Moon coincide, the additional Shabbat offerings precede the additional New Moon offerings. Likewise, the additional New Moon offerings precede the additional New Year offerings. The mishna cites the source for the principle that the frequent precedes the less frequent: As it is stated with regard to the additional offerings of the first day of Passover: “Besides the burnt offering of the morning, which is for a daily burnt offering, you shall offer these” (Numbers 28:23). The verse indicates that the daily offering is sacrificed first, and then the additional offerings are sacrificed.

10:2 Any offering that is more sacred than another precedes the other offering. The mishna elaborates: If there is blood of a sin offering and blood of a burnt offering to be presented, the blood of the sin offering precedes the blood of

the burnt offering because it effects acceptance, i.e., atonement, for severe transgressions punishable by karet. Likewise, if there are limbs of a burnt offering and portions of a sin offering to be burned on the altar, the burning of the limbs of the burnt offering precedes the portions of the sin offering, because the burnt offering is entirely burned in the flames on the altar, whereas only part of the sin offering is burned. Similarly, although both effect atonement, a sin offering precedes a guilt offering due to the fact that its blood is placed on the four corners of the altar and the remnants of its blood are poured on the base of the altar, whereas the blood of the guilt offering is sprinkled on only two corners of the altar. A guilt offering precedes a thanks offering and the nazirite's ram due to the fact that it is an offering of the most sacred order, and the others are offerings of lesser sanctity. A thanks offering and a nazirite's ram precede a peace offering due to the fact that they are eaten for one day, like offerings of the most sacred order, whereas a peace offering is eaten for two days, and the thanks offering and nazirite's ram require loaves to be brought with them, four types with the thanks offering and two types with the nazirite's ram. Sacrifice of the peace offering precedes sacrifice of the firstborn offering due to the fact that the peace offering requires placing the blood on the altar, in the form of two placements that are four, and placing hands on the head of the offering, and libations, and the wavings of the breast and the thigh by the priest and the owner; none of which is required for the firstborn offering.

10:3 The firstborn offering precedes the animal tithing offering because it is sanctified from the womb, i.e., unlike the animal tithing offering it does not require consecration, and it is eaten by the priests, whereas everyone may partake of the animal tithing offering. The animal tithing offering precedes bird offerings due to the fact that it requires slaughtering, whereas the bird's nape is pinched; and there are two elements of the animal tithing offering that have the status of offerings of the most sacred order: Its blood that is presented on the altar and its portions that are burned on the altar, whereas with regard to bird offerings only the blood is presented on the altar.

10:4 The bird offerings precede meal offerings due to the fact that they are types whose blood is presented, and atonement is effected by the blood. The meal offering of a sinner precedes a voluntary meal offering due to the fact that it comes to atone for a sin. For the same reason the sacrifice of the bird sin offering precedes the sacrifice of the bird burnt offering, and likewise with regard to its consecration, the sin offering takes precedence.

10:5 All the sin offerings mandated by the Torah take precedence over the guilt offerings, as explained in the previous mishna (89a), except for the guilt offering of a leper, because it comes to render one fit. One who has been cured of leprosy must undergo a process through which he is rendered ritually pure before coming into contact with consecrated items. Although he must also bring a sin offering, his guilt offering is more central to that process of purification and therefore it takes precedence over the sin offering. All the guilt offerings mandated by the Torah come as rams in their second year, and come worth two silver shekels, except for the guilt offering of a nazirite and the guilt offering of a leper, as they come from sheep in their first year, and

do not need to come worth two silver shekels, as they have no fixed value.

10:6 Just as the more sacred offerings precede other offerings with regard to their sacrifice, as taught in the previous mishna (89a), they also precede the others with regard to their consumption. If one has a peace offering from yesterday and a peace offering from today, the peace offering from yesterday precedes the peace offering from today. If one has a peace offering from yesterday and a sin offering or a guilt offering from today, the peace offering from yesterday precedes the others; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: The sin offering precedes the peace offering, due to the fact that it is an offering of the most sacred order. Likewise, the guilt offering precedes the peace offering, as it is also of the most sacred order.

10:7 And with regard to all of the offerings that are eaten, the priests are permitted to alter the manner of their consumption and eat them as they choose. Therefore, the priests are permitted to eat them roasted, or boiled, or cooked, and to place in the cooking pot non-sacred spices or teruma spices. This is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Meir says: One may not place teruma spices in it, so that he will not bring the teruma to a state of disqualification. Consumption of consecrated foods is permitted only for a limited period, after which they are disqualified and burned. Adding teruma spices might cause those spices to be similarly disqualified.

10:8 Rabbi Shimon said: If you saw oil that is being distributed in the Temple courtyard for consumption by the priests and you seek to ascertain its nature, you do not need to ask what it is. Rather, it is left over from the oil of the wafers of the meal offerings of Israelites after they smeared a bit of oil on them, or it is left over from the log of oil of a leper after a small amount of the oil was placed on him. If you saw oil that is placed on the flames of the altar in the manner of an offering, you do not need to ask what it is. Rather, it is left over from the oil of the wafers of the meal offering of priests, or it is the leftover oil from the meal offering of the anointed priest, which requires a great deal of oil and which is burned in its entirety on the altar. The mishna adds: One can-not say that the oil distributed to priests or burned on the altar was brought as a gift offering, as one may not contribute oil as a gift offering. Rabbi Tarfon says: One may contribute oil as a gift offering.

11:1 In the case of the blood of a sin offering designated for presentation that was sprayed on a garment, that garment requires laundering, as is stated with regard to a sin offering: “And when any of its blood shall be sprinkled on a garment, you shall launder that on which it shall be sprinkled in a sacred place” (Leviticus 6:20). Although the verse is speaking only of sin offerings that are eaten and whose blood is presented on the outer altar, as it is stated: “In a sacred place shall it be eaten” (Leviticus 6:19), the principle is not exclusive to eaten sin offerings. With regard to the blood of both the sin offerings that are eaten and the sin offerings that are wholly burned and not eaten and whose blood is presented on the inner altar, garments sprayed with blood from each of these offerings require laundering. As it is stated at the start of that passage: “This is the law of the sin offering” (Leviticus 6:18), it is understood: There is one law for all the sin offerings.

11:2 That is the halakha with regard to sin offerings fit for sacrifice. With

regard to a disqualified sin offering, its blood does not cause a garment to require laundering whether the offering had a period of fitness when its blood was fit for presentation or whether it did not have a period of fitness. Which offering is the disqualified sin offering that had a period of fitness? It is one that was left overnight and then became disqualified; or it is one that became ritually impure; or it is one that emerged from of the Temple courtyard. Which offering is the disqualified sin offering that did not have a period of fitness? It is one that was slaughtered with the intent to eat it or present its blood beyond its designated time or outside its designated area; or it is one whose blood was collected by people disqualified for Temple service and they sprinkled its blood.

11:3 If the blood of a sin offering sprayed from the neck of the animal onto a garment, the garment does not require laundering. If the blood was collected in a vessel and sprinkled on the altar and sprayed from the corner or from the base of the altar onto the garment, the garment does not require laundering, as the blood was already sprinkled and its mitzva was fulfilled. If the blood spilled from the neck onto the floor before it was collected in a vessel, and the priest collected the blood and it sprayed on a garment, the garment does not require laundering. It is only with regard to blood that was received in a sacred vessel and is fit for sprinkling that the garment requires laundering. Apropos laundering the blood of a sin offering from garments onto which it sprayed, the mishna discusses what is considered a garment. If the blood of a sin offering sprayed onto the hide of an animal before it was flayed from the animal, the hide does not require laundering, because its status is not that of a garment, which is susceptible to ritual impurity. If the blood sprayed onto the hide after it was flayed, it requires laundering; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar says: Even if the blood sprayed onto the hide after it was flayed, it does not require laundering until it is crafted into a vessel or garment that is actually susceptible to ritual impurity. This is the principle with regard to laundering: A garment must be laundered only in the place where the blood was sprayed, and only if it is an item that is fit to become ritually impure, and only if it is an item fit for laundering.

11:4 With regard to the garment mentioned explicitly in the Torah, and the sackcloth, and the hide, all of these require laundering. And the laundering must be performed in a sacred place, the Temple courtyard, and the breaking of an earthenware vessel in which a sin offering was cooked must be performed in a sacred place, and scouring and rinsing of a copper vessel in which a sin offering was cooked must be performed in a sacred place. With regard to this matter, a stringency applies to a sin offering more than it applies to offerings of the most sacred order.

11:5 With regard to a garment upon which the blood of a sin offering was sprayed that went outside the curtains, i.e., the Temple courtyard, before being laundered, the garment reenters the courtyard and one launders it in a sacred place. If the garment became ritually impure outside the curtains, one tears the garment in order to render it ritually pure, enters the courtyard with it, and launders it in a sacred place. With regard to an earthenware vessel in which a sin offering was cooked that went outside the curtains, the

vessel reenters the courtyard and one breaks it in a sacred place. If the vessel became ritually impure outside the curtains, one punctures the vessel to render it ritually pure, and one enters the courtyard with it and breaks it in a sacred place.

11:6 With regard to a copper vessel in which a sin offering was cooked that went outside the curtains, the vessel reenters the courtyard, and one scours it and rinses it in a sacred place. If the vessel became ritually impure outside the curtains, one breaks the vessel by boring a large hole in it to render it ritually pure and enters the courtyard with it and scours and rinses it in a sacred place.

11:7 Whether with regard to a copper vessel in which one cooked the meat of an offering or whether with regard to one into which one poured the boiling meat of an offering, whether the meat is from offerings of the most sacred order or whether it is from offerings of lesser sanctity, such vessels require scouring and rinsing. Rabbi Shimon says: Vessels in which offerings of lesser sanctity were cooked or poured do not require scouring and rinsing. Rabbi Tarfon says: If one cooked a sin offering in a copper vessel from the beginning of the pilgrimage Festival, one may cook in it for the entire pilgrimage Festival; he need not scour and rinse the vessel after every use. And the Rabbis say: One may not continue using it in this manner; rather, one must perform scouring and rinsing before the end of the period during which partaking of the particular cooked offering is permitted. Scouring is like the scouring of the inside of a cup, the cleaning done when wine sticks to the cup, and rinsing is like the rinsing of the outside of a cup. Scouring is performed with hot water, and rinsing with cold water. With regard to the spit and the metal grill [askela], one purges them in hot water.

11:8 If one cooked in one vessel sacrificial meat and non-sacred meat, or the meat of offerings of the most sacred order and the meat of offerings of lesser sanctity, the status of the food depends upon the taste of the stringent substance. If there is enough of the more sacred meat to impart flavor to the less sacred or non-sacred meat, then the lenient components of the mixtures must be eaten in accordance with the restrictions of the stringent components therein, insofar as who may partake of them, as well as the time when and the place where they may be eaten. And the copper vessels in which the lenient components were cooked do not require scouring and rinsing, and the lenient components do not disqualify pieces of meat through contact. With regard to these principles, the lenient components do not assume the status of the stringent components. In the case of a fit wafer that touched an unfit wafer or a piece of sacrificial meat that touched an unfit piece of sacrificial meat, neither all the wafers nor all the pieces of meat are forbidden. No part is forbidden other than that which is in the place where the item absorbed taste from the unfit wafers or pieces.

12:1 A priest who was ritually impure who immersed that day and is waiting for nightfall for the purification process to be completed, and a priest who has not yet brought an atonement offering to complete the purification process, e.g., a zav and a leper who did not bring their requisite atonement offerings, who are not yet permitted to partake of sacrificial meat, do not receive a

share of sacrificial meat along with the other members of the patrilineal priestly family serving in the Temple that day, in order to partake of it in the evening after the offerings were sacrificed, even though after nightfall he would be permitted to partake of the offerings. A priest who is an acute mourner, i.e., if one of his relatives for whom he is obligated to mourn died that day, is permitted to touch sacrificial meat, as he is not ritually impure. But he may not sacrifice offerings, and he does not receive a share of sacrificial meat in order to partake of it in the evening. Blemished priests, whether they are temporarily blemished or whether they are permanently blemished, receive a share and partake of the offerings with their priestly brethren, but do not sacrifice the offerings. The principle is: Any priest who is unfit for the service that specific day does not receive a share of the sacrificial meat, and anyone who has no share of the meat has no share in the hides of the animals, to which the priests are entitled as well. Even if the priest was ritually impure only at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the offering and he was pure at the time of the burning of the fats of that offering, he still does not receive a share of the meat, as it is stated: "He that sacrifices the blood of the peace offerings and the fat, from among the sons of Aaron, shall have the right thigh for a portion" (Leviticus 7:33). One who cannot sprinkle the blood does not receive a share in the meat.

12:2 In the case of any burnt offering for which the altar did not acquire its flesh, e.g., if it was disqualified prior to the sprinkling of its blood, the priests did not acquire its hide, as it is stated with regard to the burnt offering: "And the priest that sacrifices a man's burnt offering, the priest shall have to himself the hide of the burnt offering that he has sacrificed" (Leviticus 7:8), indicating that the priest acquires only the hide of a burnt offering that satisfied the obligation of a man. Nevertheless, in a case of a burnt offering that was slaughtered not for its sake but for the sake of another offering, although it did not satisfy the obligation of the owner, its hide goes to the priests. In addition, although the verse states: "A man's burnt offering," in the case of both the burnt offering of a man and the burnt offering of a woman, their hides go to the priests.

12:3 The hides of offerings of lesser sanctity belong to the owners; the hides of offerings of the most sacred order belong to the priests. The right of priests to hides of offerings of the most sacred order is derived via an a fortiori inference: If for a burnt offering, for which the priests do not acquire its flesh, as it is burned in its entirety, they acquire its hide, then for other offerings of the most sacred order, for which the priests acquire its flesh, is it not right that they should acquire its hide? And there is no room to contend that the altar will prove that this is not a valid inference, as it acquires the flesh of a burnt offering but not its hide, since it does not have the right to the hide of an offering in any place.

12:4 If any offerings of the most sacred order were disqualified prior to their flaying, their hides do not go to the priests; rather, they are burned together with the flesh in the place of burning. If they were disqualified after their flaying, their hides go to the priests. Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, said: In all my days, I never saw a hide going out to the place of burning.

Rabbi Akiva said: From the statement of Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, we learned that in a case where one flays the firstborn offering, and the animal is later discovered to have a wound that would have caused it to die within twelve months [tereifa], the halakha is that the priests may derive benefit [sheye'otu] from its hide. And the Rabbis say: The claim: We did not see, is no proof; rather, if after flaying it is discovered that the animal was unfit before it was flayed, the hide goes out to the place of burning.

12:5 With regard to bulls that are burned, i.e., the bull of Yom Kippur, the bull of the anointed priest, and the bull brought for an unwitting communal sin, which are burned after their blood is sprinkled and their sacrificial portions burned on the altar, and goats that are burned, i.e., the goat of Yom Kippur and the goat brought for the unwitting communal transgression of the prohibition against idol worship, when they are burned in accordance with their mitzva, they are burned in the place of the ashes (see Leviticus 4:12) outside of Jerusalem, and they render the garments of the priests who tend to their burning impure (see Leviticus 4:25). And if these offerings are not burned in accordance with their mitzva because they were disqualified, and offerings that are disqualified are also burned, they are burned in the place of burning in the bira, and they do not render the garments of the priests who tend to their burning impure.

12:6 The priests would carry the bulls and the goats that are burned suspended on poles. When the first priests, carrying the front of the pole, emerged outside the wall of the Temple courtyard and the latter priests did not yet emerge, the first priests render their garments impure, and the latter priests do not render their garments impure until they emerge. When both these and those priests emerged, they render their garments impure. Rabbi Shimon says: They do not render their garments impure, as this halakha applies only to those who burn the offerings. And even then their garments do not become ritually impure until the fire is ignited in the majority of the offerings. Once the flesh is completely scorched, with no moisture remaining, one who then burns the remains does not render his garments impure.

13:1 One who slaughters an offering outside the Temple courtyard and one who offers it up outside the Temple courtyard is liable for the slaughter and liable for the offering up, as each act involves an independent prohibition. If done intentionally, he is liable to receive excision from the World-to-Come [karet] for each act, and if done unwittingly, he is liable to bring a sin offering for each act. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: If he slaughtered an offering inside the courtyard and then offered it up outside the courtyard, he is liable. But if he slaughtered it outside, thereby rendering it unfit, and then he offered it up outside, he is exempt for the offering up, as he offered up only an item that is unfit, and one is liable only for offering up an item that is fit to be offered up inside the Temple. The Rabbis said to him: According to your reasoning, even in a case where he slaughters it inside and offers it up outside, he should be exempt, since the moment that he took it outside the courtyard, he thereby rendered it unfit. Yet, in such a case, he is certainly liable for offering it up. So too, one who slaughters an offering outside and then offers it up outside is liable.

13:2 One who is ritually impure who ate sacrificial food, whether it was ritually impure sacrificial food or ritually pure sacrificial food, is liable to receive karet if he did so intentionally and to bring a sliding-scale offering if he did so unwittingly. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: An impure person who ate pure sacrificial food is liable. But an impure person who ate impure sacrificial food is exempt, as he merely ate an impure item, and the prohibition against eating sacrificial food while one is impure applies only to pure sacrificial food. The Rabbis said to him: According to your logic, this halakha would apply even in a case of an impure person who ate what had been pure sacrificial food, because once he touched it, he thereby rendered it ritually impure. Yet, in such a case, he is certainly liable for eating it. So too, an impure person who ate impure sacrificial food is liable. And a pure person who ate impure sacrificial food is exempt, as one is liable for eating sacrificial food in impurity only due to the impurity of one's body, but not due to the impurity of the food.

13:3 There is a greater stringency with regard to slaughtering outside the Temple courtyard than with regard to offering up outside, and there is a greater stringency with regard to offering up outside than with regard to slaughtering outside. The mishna elaborates: The greater stringency with regard to slaughtering outside is that one who slaughters an offering outside the Temple courtyard even for the sake of an ordinary purpose, not for the sake of God, is liable. But one who offers up an offering outside the courtyard for the sake of an ordinary purpose is exempt. The greater stringency with regard to offering up outside is that two people who grasped a knife and together slaughtered an offering outside the courtyard are exempt. But if two grasped a limb from an offering and together offered it up outside, they are liable. If one unwittingly offered up part of an offering outside the courtyard and then in a different lapse of awareness offered up other parts of that offering and then again, in another lapse of awareness, offered up yet other parts, he is liable to bring a sin offering for each act of offering up; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yosei says: He is liable to bring only one sin offering. Rabbi Yosei adds: And one is liable for offering up an offering outside the courtyard only once he offers it up at the top of an altar that was erected there. Rabbi Shimon says: Even if he offered it up on a rock or on a stone, not an altar, he is liable.

13:4 With regard to both fit sacrificial animals, and unfit sacrificial animals whose disqualification occurred in sanctity, i.e., in the course of the Temple service, and one sacrificed them outside the Temple courtyard, he is liable. One who offers up outside the courtyard an olive-bulk made up of the flesh of a burnt offering and of its sacrificial portions is liable. If there is a meal offering from which a handful was not removed, and one sacrificed it outside the Temple courtyard, he is exempt from liability, because until the handful is actually removed it is not fit to be burned on the altar inside the Temple. But if a priest took a handful from it and then returned its handful into the remainder of the meal offering, and one sacrificed the entire mixture outside the courtyard, he is liable, as once the handful has been removed it is fit to be burned on the altar inside the Temple, and one is liable for offering it up

outside even though it is mixed into the remainder. With regard to the handful of a meal offering, the frankincense, the incense, the meal offering of priests, the meal offering of the anointed priest, and the meal offering brought with the libations that accompany animal offerings, in a case where one sacrificed even an olive-bulk from any one of these, which should be sacrificed on the altar, outside the Temple, he is liable, as the burning of an olive-bulk is considered a proper burning. Rabbi Eliezer deems him exempt unless he sacrifices the whole of any one of these items outside the Temple. But Rabbi Eliezer concedes that with regard to any of them that one sacrificed inside the courtyard but left over an olive-bulk from them and then sacrificed that olive-bulk outside the courtyard, he is liable. And with regard to any of these offerings that were lacking any amount, if one sacrifices it outside the courtyard, he is exempt.

13:5 One who sacrifices sacrificial meat, which is eaten, and sacrificial portions, i.e., those that are to be burned on the altar, outside the courtyard, is liable for the sacrifice of the sacrificial portions. But he is not liable for sacrificing the meat. If there is a meal offering from which a handful was not removed, and one sacrificed it outside the Temple courtyard, he is exempt from liability, because until the handful is actually removed it is not fit to be burned on the altar inside the Temple. But if a priest took a handful from it and then returned its handful into the remainder of the meal offering, and one sacrificed the entire mixture outside the courtyard, he is liable, as once the handful has been removed it is fit to be burned on the altar inside the Temple, and one is liable for offering it up outside even though it is mixed into the remainder.

13:6 The burning of both the handful and the frankincense permits the consumption of the remainder of the meal offering by the priests. With regard to the handful and the frankincense, in a case where one sacrificed only one of them outside the Temple courtyard, he is liable. Rabbi Eliezer exempts from liability one who burns only one of them until he also sacrifices the second. Since the remainder of the meal offering becomes permitted only once both have been burned, he considers each one alone to be an incomplete offering, and he holds one is not liable for sacrificing only one of them. Rabbi Eliezer concedes that if one sacrificed one inside the courtyard and one outside the courtyard, he is liable. The burning of two bowls of frankincense permits the consumption of the shewbread. With regard to the two bowls of frankincense, in a case where one sacrificed only one of them outside the courtyard, he is liable. Rabbi Eliezer exempts from liability one who burns only one of them until he also sacrifices the second, since the shewbread becomes permitted only once both bowls of frankincense are burned. Rabbi Eliezer concedes that if one sacrificed one inside the courtyard and one outside the courtyard, he is liable. One who sprinkles part of the blood of an offering, e.g., one sprinkling instead of four, outside the Temple courtyard is liable. Rabbi Elazar says: So too, one who pours as a libation water consecrated for the libation of the festival of Sukkot, during the Festival, outside the courtyard, is liable. Rabbi Nehemya says: For the remainder of the blood of an offering that was supposed to be poured at the base of the altar and that instead one

sacrificed outside the courtyard, one is liable.

13:7 One who pinches the nape of a bird offering inside the Temple courtyard and then offers it up outside the courtyard is liable. But if one pinched its nape outside the courtyard and then offered it up outside the courtyard he is exempt, as pinching the nape of a bird outside the courtyard is not considered valid pinching. One who slaughters, with a knife, a bird offering inside the courtyard and offers it up outside the courtyard is exempt, as slaughtering a bird offering in the Temple courtyard disqualifies it as an offering. But if one slaughtered a bird offering outside the courtyard and then offered it up outside, he is liable. Evidently, the manner of its preparation inside the courtyard, i.e., pinching, effects its exemption outside the courtyard, and the manner of its preparation outside the courtyard, i.e., slaughter, effects its exemption inside the courtyard. Rabbi Shimon says: With regard to any act of killing an animal concerning which, when it was performed outside the courtyard, one is liable for subsequently offering it up outside the courtyard, one is also liable for having offered the animal up outside the courtyard after performing a similar act of killing inside the courtyard. This is the halakha except with regard to one who slaughters a bird inside the courtyard and offers it up outside the courtyard; he is exempt.

13:8 With regard to a sin offering where one collected its blood in one cup, if he first placed its blood on an altar outside the courtyard and then placed the remaining blood on the altar inside the courtyard, or if he first placed its blood on the altar inside the courtyard and then placed the remaining blood on an altar outside the courtyard, in both cases he is liable for placing the blood outside the courtyard, as the blood in its entirety is fit to be placed on the altar inside the courtyard. If one collected its blood in two cups and placed the blood from both of them on the altar inside the courtyard he is exempt as he acted appropriately. If he placed the blood from both of them on an altar outside the courtyard, he is liable, as both are fit to be placed inside. If he first placed the blood from one cup inside and then placed the blood from the other one outside, he is exempt. By using the blood of the first cup to perform the mitzva of placing the blood on the altar, he thereby rendered the blood in the second cup unfit to be placed on the altar; therefore, there is no liability for placing it on an altar outside. If he first placed the blood from one cup outside and then placed the blood from the other one inside, he is liable for the external placement as that blood was fit to be placed inside, and the internal placement atones for the transgression for which the sin offering was brought. To what is this matter comparable? It is comparable to a case where one separated an animal for his sin offering and it was lost, and he separated another animal in its place, and thereafter, the first animal was found. In that case, both of them stand before him and he must sacrifice one as his sin offering. If he slaughtered both of them inside the courtyard, he is exempt. If he slaughtered both of them outside the courtyard, he is liable, as each was fit to be slaughtered in the courtyard. If he first slaughtered one inside and then slaughtered the other one outside he is exempt from liability for slaughtering the second, as he has already fulfilled his obligation with the first, thereby rendering the second one unfit for

sacrifice. If he first slaughtered one outside and then slaughtered the other one inside he is liable for slaughtering the external animal outside the courtyard, as it was fit to be slaughtered inside, and the internal animal atones for the transgression for which the sin offering was brought. The mishna adds: In a case where one slaughtered both inside the courtyard, just as placing the blood of the first animal exempts one who consumes its meat from liability for misuse of consecrated property, so too, it exempts one who consumes the meat of its counterpart, the second animal, from liability.

14:1 With regard to the red heifer of purification that one burned outside its pit, the pit being an excavation on the Mount of Olives opposite the entrance to the Sanctuary designated for its slaughter and its burning, and likewise the scapegoat that one sacrificed outside the Temple courtyard rather than casting it off a cliff as prescribed, he is exempt from punishment for violating the transgression of slaughtering and sacrificing outside the Temple courtyard. The source for this is as it is stated with regard to slaughter of sacrificial animals outside the courtyard: “Whatever man...that slaughters outside the camp, and to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting he did not bring it, to present it as an offering to the Lord before the Tabernacle of the Lord” (Leviticus 17:3–4). From that verse it is derived: For any offering that is not fit to come to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting for sacrifice on the altar, e.g., the red heifer and the scapegoat, one is not liable for its slaughter and sacrifice outside its place.

14:2 With regard to an animal that actively copulated with a person, or an animal that was the object of bestiality, or an animal that was set aside for idol worship, or an animal that was worshipped as a deity, or an animal given as the price of a dog that was purchased, or an animal that was given as payment to a prostitute, or an animal born of a mixture of diverse kinds, or an animal with a wound that will cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa], or an animal born by caesarean section, any of which one sacrificed outside the Temple courtyard, he is exempt. The source for this is as it is stated: “And to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting he did not bring it to present it as an offering to the Lord before the Tabernacle of the Lord.” From this verse, it is derived: For any animal that is not fit to come to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting for sacrifice on the altar, one is not liable for its slaughter and sacrifice outside the courtyard. For blemished animals, whether they are permanently blemished or whether they are temporarily blemished, which one sacrificed outside the Temple courtyard, one is exempt. Rabbi Shimon says: For permanently blemished animals one is exempt; for temporarily blemished animals one is liable for violation of a prohibition, but it is not the type of prohibition for which he will receive karet, because ultimately the animal will be fit for sacrifice. With regard to doves whose time of fitness for sacrifice has not arrived, as they are fit for sacrifice only when they are older, after their wings assume a golden hue; and pigeons whose time of fitness has passed, as they are fit only when they are young and their wings did not yet assume a yellowish tint, that one sacrificed outside the Temple courtyard, he is exempt. Rabbi Shimon says: For pigeons whose time of fitness has passed one is exempt, and for doves whose time of fitness has not yet arrived he is in violation of a

prohibition. With regard to an animal itself and its offspring that were slaughtered on the same day, where one violates a prohibition for slaughtering the second, and an animal whose time has not yet arrived, if one sacrificed it outside the Temple courtyard he is exempt. Rabbi Shimon says: For an animal whose time has not yet arrived, that person is in violation of a mere prohibition, as Rabbi Shimon says: With regard to any sacrificial animal that is fit to come and be sacrificed after the passage of time, if one sacrificed it outside the courtyard, that person is in violation of a prohibition but there is no liability for karet. And the Rabbis say: In any case in which there is no liability for karet there is no violation of a prohibition.

14:3 The mishna adds: An animal is defined as one whose time has not yet arrived, whether it is intrinsically premature, e.g., doves whose wings have not yet assumed a golden hue or an animal less than seven days old (see Leviticus 22:27), or whether it is premature for its owner. Which is the animal whose time has not yet arrived because it is premature for its owner? It is the animal of a man who experiences a gonorrhoea-like discharge [zav], and a woman who experiences a discharge of uterine blood after her menstrual period [zava], and a woman after childbirth, and a leper whose period of impurity is not yet complete, where these owners, who are ritually impure, sacrificed their sin offerings or guilt offerings outside the Temple courtyard. In this case they are exempt, as they are neither obligated nor permitted to bring those offerings. But if they sacrificed their burnt offerings or their peace offerings outside the courtyard they are liable, as those offerings may be brought as gift offerings even if their owner is ritually impure. One who offers up outside the Temple courtyard a portion of the meat of a sin offering that is eaten; of the meat of a guilt offering; of the meat of other offerings of the most sacred order that are eaten, e.g., the sheep sacrificed on the festival of Shavuot, or of the meat of offerings of lesser sanctity, is exempt, as all these are eaten by the priests and not sacrificed on the altar. And for the same reason, one who sacrificed a portion of the surplus of the omer offering, a measure of barley brought as a communal offering on the sixteenth of the Hebrew month of Nisan, after the handful was removed; or the two loaves, i.e., the public offering on Shavuot of two loaves from the new wheat; or the shewbread arranged on the Table each Shabbat in the Sanctuary; or the remainder of meal offerings, is also exempt. And likewise with regard to one who pours oil onto a meal offering; and one who breaks the loaves of a meal offering into pieces; and one who mixes oil into the flour of a meal offering; and one who salts a meal offering or other offerings; and one who waves a meal offering; and one who brings a meal offering to the corner of an altar, if he performs these actions outside the courtyard; and one who arranges shewbread on the table outside the Sanctuary; and one who removes the ashes from the lamps of the Candelabrum; and one who removes a handful from a meal offering; and one who collects the blood of an offering in a vessel, if he did so outside the Temple courtyard: In all of these cases he is exempt. This is because one is liable only if he performs an action similar to sacrifice that completes the sacrificial service, while all of these actions are ones that are normally followed by additional sacrificial rites. And one is likewise not liable for

any of these actions, neither due to the prohibition against a non-priest performing the Temple service, nor due to the prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of ritual impurity, nor due to the prohibition against a priest lacking the requisite priestly vestments while performing the Temple service, nor due to the prohibition against performing the Temple service without washing one's hands and feet.

14:4 Until the Tabernacle was established, private altars were permitted and the sacrificial service was performed by the firstborn. And from the time that the Tabernacle was established, private altars were prohibited and the sacrificial service was performed by the priests. Offerings of the most sacred order were then eaten within the curtains surrounding the courtyard of the Tabernacle in the wilderness and offerings of lesser sanctity were eaten throughout the camp of Israel.

14:5 When the Jewish people arrived at Gilgal private altars were permitted, offerings of the most sacred order were then eaten within the curtains, and offerings of lesser sanctity were eaten anywhere.

14:6 When they arrived at Shiloh, private altars were prohibited. And there was no roof of wood or stone there, i.e., in the Tabernacle in Shiloh; rather there was only a building of stone below and the curtains of the roof of the Tabernacle were spread above it. And the period that the Tabernacle was in Shiloh was characterized in the Torah as "rest" in the verse: "For you have not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God has given you" (Deuteronomy 12:9). Offerings of the most sacred order were then eaten within the curtains in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting, and offerings of lesser sanctity and second tithe were eaten in any place that overlooks Shiloh.

14:7 When Shiloh was destroyed (see I Samuel 4:18), the Jewish people arrived with the Tabernacle at Nov, and later at Gibeon, and private altars were permitted. Offerings of the most sacred order were then eaten within the curtains in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting, and offerings of lesser sanctity were eaten in all the cities of Eretz Yisrael.

14:8 When the Jewish people arrived at Jerusalem and built the Temple during the reign of Solomon, private altars were prohibited, and private altars did not have a subsequent period when they were permitted. And the Temple in Jerusalem was characterized as "inheritance" in the verse: "For you have not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God has given you." Offerings of the most sacred order were then eaten within the curtains, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, and offerings of lesser sanctity and second tithe were eaten within the walls of the city, whose legal status was that of the Israelite camp in the wilderness.

14:9 With regard to all offerings that one consecrated during a period of prohibition of private altars and sacrificed during a period of prohibition of private altars, if he sacrificed them outside their designated area, for these animals he is in violation of both the positive mitzva to sacrifice the offering in the place chosen by God and the prohibition against sacrificing them on a private altar, and he is liable to receive karet for doing it. If one consecrated the animals during a period of permitting of private altars and

sacrificed them during a period of prohibition of private altars, outside their designated area, for these animals he is in violation of a positive mitzva and a prohibition, but he is not liable to receive karet for sacrificing them. If he consecrated the animals during a period of prohibition of private altars and sacrificed them during a period of permitting of private altars, outside their designated area, for these animals he is in violation of a positive mitzva for failure to bring it to the Tabernacle, but these animals are not subject to a prohibition, as it is permitted to sacrifice on a private altar.

14:10 And these are the sacrificial items that are sacrificed only in the Tabernacle even when private altars are permitted: Sacrificial animals that were presumed to be consecrated for sacrifice in the Tabernacle. Therefore, communal offerings are sacrificed in the Tabernacle, but offerings of an individual may be sacrificed on a private altar. In addition, with regard to offerings of an individual that were consecrated expressly for sacrifice in the Tabernacle, one must sacrifice them in the Tabernacle. But if he sacrificed them on a private altar, he is exempt. And what is the difference between the private altar of an individual and the public altar at the site of the Tabernacle when it was located in Gilgal, Nov, and Gibeon? It is that on a private altar there is no placing of hands on the head of an offering, no slaughter in the north, no placement of blood around all sides of the altar in offerings for which this is required, no waving of meal offerings, and no bringing of meal offerings to the corner of the altar prior to removal of the handful. Rabbi Yehuda says: There is no meal offering sacrificed on an altar outside the Temple. And requiring a member of the priesthood to perform the sacrificial rites, the priestly service vestments, the service vessels, the pleasing aroma to God, the partition for the blood, i.e., the red line dividing the upper and lower halves of the altar, and the priest's washing of hands and feet before his service all do not apply to sacrifice on private altars, as the service there need not be performed by priests nor follow all the protocols of the Temple service. But the intent to sacrifice or partake of the offering beyond its designated time, which renders the offering piggul; the halakha of portions of the offering left over [notar] beyond the time it may be eaten; and the prohibition against eating consecrated meat while ritually impure are equal in this, a private altar, and that, a public altar.