



substitutes from the herd and the sanctity takes effect upon animals from the flock. And one substitutes from the sheep and the sanctity takes effect upon the goats, and from the goats upon the sheep; and from the males upon the females, and from the females upon the males; and from the unblemished animals upon the blemished animals, and from the blemished animals upon the unblemished animals. The source for this is as it is stated: “He shall neither exchange it, nor substitute it, good for bad, or bad for good” (Leviticus 27:10). And which is the case of good for bad where the substitution takes effect? It is a case where one substitutes for blemished animals whose consecration preceded their blemish. But if an animal was consecrated after it was blemished, substitution for it does not take effect. One substitutes one non-sacred animal for two consecrated animals and two non-sacred animals for one consecrated animal, and one substitutes one non-sacred animal for one hundred consecrated animals and one hundred non-sacred animals for one consecrated animal. Rabbi Shimon says: One substitutes only one non-sacred animal for one consecrated animal, as it is stated: “Then both it and its substitute shall be sacred” (Leviticus 27:10). Just as “it” indicates one specific animal, so too, its substitute can be only one specific animal.

1:3 One does not substitute non-sacred limbs for consecrated fetuses, i.e., if one says that a certain limb of a non-sacred animal is substituted for a fetus in the womb of a consecrated animal, it is not consecrated. And likewise, one does not substitute non-sacred fetuses for consecrated limbs. And one substitutes neither non-sacred limbs nor fetuses for whole consecrated animals nor non-sacred whole animals for consecrated limbs or fetuses. Rabbi Yosei says: One substitutes non-sacred limbs for whole consecrated animals, but not whole animals for consecrated limbs. Rabbi Yosei said: But isn't it so with regard to sacrificial animals, that if one says: The hind leg of this animal is a burnt offering, the entire animal is a burnt offering? So too, when he says: The non-sacred hind leg of this animal is in exchange for that animal, the entire animal is a substitute in exchange for it.

1:4 If teruma, the portion of the produce designated for the priest, was intermingled with non-sacred produce, and it is impossible to distinguish between them, if the ratio of non-sacred produce to teruma was less than one hundred to one, the teruma is not nullified and all the produce is forbidden to those for whom teruma is forbidden. If the mixture was then intermingled with other non-sacred produce, that mixture renders it a mixture of teruma only according to the calculation of the percentage of the original teruma produce in the entire mixture. And dough that was leavened with a teruma leavening agent is forbidden to those for whom teruma is forbidden even if the ratio between the non-sacred and the teruma is greater than one hundred to one. If a portion of that dough was intermingled with non-sacred dough, it leavens only according to the calculation of the percentage of the original leavening agent in the entire dough, and the second dough is forbidden only if the quantity of the original teruma leavening agent inside it is sufficient to leaven it. And if three log of drawn water were poured into a ritual bath with less than forty se'a to complete the requisite forty se'a, the ritual bath is invalidated. But drawn water invalidates the ritual bath only according to calculation, as

explained in the Gemara.

1:5 And the water of purification of the red heifer becomes water of purification only with the placement of the ashes into the water, but not by placement of water onto the ashes. And one beit haperas does not create another beit haperas. The Sages decreed ritual impurity on a field in which a grave was plowed, scattering the bones throughout the field. This field is called a beit haperas. That impurity extends to the area of one hundred cubits surrounding the grave. Nevertheless, they did not decree impurity on the second field if one plowed from that field into another field. And there is no teruma after teruma. Once one designates produce from his crop as teruma, if he then designates additional produce from that crop as teruma, it is not teruma. And a substitute animal that was consecrated when it was substituted for a consecrated animal does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute; rather, it remains non-sacred. And the offspring born of a consecrated animal that was not consecrated itself does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute. Rabbi Yehuda says: The offspring renders a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute. The Sages said to him: A consecrated animal renders a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute, but the offspring does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute.

1:6 The birds sacrificed as offerings, i.e., doves and pigeons, and the meal offerings do not render non-sacred items exchanged for them substitutes, as only the term “an animal” is stated with regard to substitution, in the verse: “And if he substitutes an animal for an animal” (Leviticus 27:10). A consecrated animal belonging to the community or to partners does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute, as it is stated in the same verse: “He shall neither exchange it nor substitute it.” One derives from the singular pronoun in the verse that an individual renders a non-sacred animal a substitute, but the community and partners do not render a non-sacred animal a substitute. Items consecrated for Temple maintenance do not render non-sacred items exchanged for them substitutes. Rabbi Shimon said: The fact that animals belonging to the community or partners do not render animals exchanged for them substitutes is derived as follows: The animal tithe was included in the category of all offerings, and why was it singled out in the verse: “And all the tithe of the herd or the flock, whatever passes under the rod, the tenth shall be sacred unto the Lord. He shall not inquire whether it is good or bad, neither shall he substitute for it; and if he substitutes it, then both it and that for which it is substituted shall be sacred” (Leviticus 27:32–33)? Rabbi Shimon explains: It was singled out to juxtapose substitution to the animal tithe, to tell you: Just as the animal tithe is brought exclusively as an individual offering, so too, all offerings that render their substitutes sacred are individual offerings, excluding communal offerings and the offerings of partners from the halakha of substitution. And just as the animal tithe is an offering sacrificed on the altar, so too, all offerings that render their substitutes sacred are offerings sacrificed on the altar, excluding items consecrated for Temple maintenance from the halakha of substitution.

2:1 There are halakhot in effect with regard to offerings of an individual that are not in effect with regard to communal offerings; and there are halakhot in effect with regard to communal offerings that are not in effect with regard to offerings of an individual. The mishna elaborates: There are halakhot in effect with regard to offerings of an individual that are not in effect with regard to communal offerings, as offerings of an individual render a non-sacred animal exchanged for the offering a substitute, and communal offerings do not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for the offering a substitute. Offerings of an individual apply to, i.e., can be brought from, both males and females, but communal offerings apply only to males. If offerings of an individual were not brought at the appropriate time, one is obligated to bring their compensation and compensation for their accompanying meal offering and libations at a later date, but if communal offerings were not brought at the appropriate time, one is obligated to bring neither their compensation nor compensation for their accompanying meal offering and libations at a later date. But one is obligated to bring compensation for their accompanying meal offering and libations once the offering is sacrificed. There are halakhot in effect with regard to communal offerings that are not in effect with regard to offerings of an individual, as communal offerings override Shabbat, in that they are sacrificed on Shabbat, and they override ritual impurity, i.e., they are sacrificed even if the priests are impure with impurity imparted by a corpse; and offerings of an individual override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity. Rabbi Meir said: But aren't the High Priest's griddle-cake offerings and the bull of Yom Kippur offerings of an individual, and yet they override Shabbat and ritual impurity. Rather, this is the principle: Any offering, individual or communal, whose time is fixed overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity, whereas any offering, individual or communal, whose time is not fixed overrides neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity.

2:2 There is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai that there are five sin offerings that are unfit for sacrifice on the altar and have no remedy and are therefore left to die. They are: The offspring of a sin offering; the substitute for a sin offering; a sin offering whose owner died; a sin offering whose owner achieved atonement with another sin offering, when the original sin offering was lost or stolen and later recovered; and a sin offering whose year has passed. The mishna continues the discussion of the distinction between individual and communal offerings. An individual sin offering whose owner achieved atonement with another sin offering after it was lost is left to die, but in the case of a communal sin offering it is not left to die. Rabbi Yehuda says: Even a communal sin offering shall be left to die. Rabbi Shimon says: Just as we found with regard to the offspring of a sin offering, and with regard to the substitute for a sin offering, and with regard to a sin offering whose owner died, that these matters apply to an individual sin offering and not to a communal sin offering, so too, in the cases of a sin offering whose owner achieved atonement with another sin offering, and a sin offering whose first year has passed, the matters are stated with regard to an individual sin offering, and not with regard to a communal sin offering.

2:3 There is greater stringency with regard to sacrificial animals than there

is with regard to a substitute, and greater stringency with regard to a substitute than there is with regard to sacrificial animals. The Mishna explains: There is greater stringency with regard to sacrificial animals than there is with regard to a substitute, as sacrificial animals render a non-sacred animal exchanged for them a substitute, but a substitute does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute. Furthermore, the community and the partners consecrate animals as offerings, but they do not substitute non-sacred animals for their offerings. And one consecrates fetuses in utero and one can consecrate an animal's limbs, but one cannot substitute non-sacred animals for them. There is greater stringency with regard to a substitute than there is with regard to sacrificial animals, as, if one substituted a non-sacred blemished animal for an unblemished sacrificial animal, then the animal with a permanent blemish is imbued with inherent sanctity, which is not the case with regard to consecration. And in addition, those blemished animals consecrated through substitution do not emerge from their consecrated status to assume non-sacred status by means of redemption, in terms of it being permitted to shear its wool and to perform labor with it. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says that there is an additional stringency that applies to substitution but not to consecration: The Torah rendered the status of one who acts unwittingly like that of one who acts intentionally with regard to substitution, as in both cases the substitute is consecrated. But it did not render the status of one who acts unwittingly like that of one who acts intentionally with regard to consecrated items, since unwitting consecration is ineffective. Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a tereifa, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a tumtum animal, and a hermaphrodite animal are not sacred through consecration, and if they were sacred beforehand, e.g., one consecrated an animal and it subsequently became a tereifa, they do not sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution.

3:1 These are the sacrificial animals for which the halakhic status of their offspring and substitutes is like their own halakhic status: The offspring of peace offerings, and their substitute animals, and even the offspring of their offspring or their substitute animals, and even the offspring of their offspring, until the end of all time [ad sof kol ha'olam]. They are all endowed with the sanctity and halakhic status of peace offerings, and therefore they require placing hands on the head of the animal, and libations, and the waving of the breast and the thigh in order to give them to the priest. Although the previous mishna stated plainly that the offspring of a peace offering is itself sacrificed as a peace offering, its status is actually subject to a dispute between the tanna'im. Rabbi Eliezer says: The offspring of a peace offering is not sacrificed on the altar as a peace offering; rather it is sequestered and left to die. And the Rabbis say: It is sacrificed as a peace offering. Rabbi Shimon said: Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis do not disagree with regard to the status of the offspring of the offspring of a peace offering or with regard to the status of the offspring of the offspring of the substitute of a peace offering. In those cases, they all agree that the animal is not sacrificed on the altar as a peace offering. With regard to what case do they disagree? They disagree about the case of the offspring of a peace

offering itself. Rabbi Eliezer says: It is not sacrificed as a peace offering, whereas the Rabbis say: It is sacrificed. Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Pappeyas testified about the offspring of a peace offering that it is sacrificed as a peace offering. Rabbi Pappeyas said: I testify that we ourselves had a cow that was a peace offering, and we ate it on Passover, and we ate its offspring as a peace offering on a different Festival.

3:2 The offspring of a thanks offering and the substitute of a thanks offering, and the offspring of the offspring and its substitute, and the offspring of their offspring until the end of all time, they are all like thanks offerings, with the only difference being that they do not require the accompanying loaves, unlike the thanks offering itself. With regard to the substitute of a burnt offering, the offspring of the substitute, e.g., if one substituted a female animal for a burnt offering, and it gave birth to a male, and the offspring of the offspring of its offspring until the end of all time, they are all like burnt offerings and therefore they require flaying and cutting into pieces and must be burned completely in the fire.

3:3 In the case of one who designates a female animal as a burnt offering, which may be brought only from males, and that female gave birth to a male, although it is a male, it is left to graze until it becomes unfit [sheyista'ev] and then it is sold, and he brings a burnt offering with the money received for its sale. Rabbi Elazar says: The male offspring itself is sacrificed as a burnt offering. In the case of one who designates a female animal for a guilt offering, which may be brought only from males, it is left to graze until it becomes blemished and then it is sold, and he brings a guilt offering with the money received for its sale. And if in the interim, he designated a male animal and his guilt offering was already sacrificed, so that a guilt offering is no longer needed, the money received for the sale of the blemished female is allocated for communal gift offerings. Rabbi Shimon says: Since a female is unfit to be sacrificed as a guilt offering, its halakhic status is like that of a blemished animal in the sense that it does not become inherently sacred; rather, its value alone becomes sacred. Therefore, it may be sold without a blemish, and a guilt offering is purchased with the money received for its sale. With regard to the substitute of a guilt offering, the offspring of that substitute, their offspring and the offspring of their offspring, until the end of all time, they are all left to graze until they become unfit, and then they are sold, and the money received for the sale is allocated for communal gift offerings. Rabbi Eliezer says: These animals are not left to graze; rather they are left to die. And Rabbi Elazar says: Communal gift offerings are not purchased with the money from the sale; rather, the owner should bring an individual burnt offering with the money received for its sale. These tanna'im similarly disagree about the following case: A guilt offering whose owner died, and a guilt offering that was lost and its owner gained atonement with another animal, graze until they become unfit, and then they are sold, and the money received for the sale is allocated for communal gift offerings. Rabbi Eliezer says: These animals are left to die. Rabbi Elazar says: The owner must bring an individual burnt offering with the money received for its sale.

3:4 The mishna objects: But even according to the Rabbis, isn't a gift offering also a burnt offering? And what then is the difference between the statement of Rabbi Elazar and the statement of the Rabbis? Rather, the Rabbis are referring to a communal burnt offering and Rabbi Elazar is referring to an individual burnt offering, and there are several differences between these two offerings: When the animal comes as an individual burnt offering, the owner places his hands upon it and brings the accompanying meal offering and libations, and its libations come from his own property. If the owner of the animal was a priest, the right to perform its Temple service and the right to its hide are his. And when it is a communal gift offering, the owner of the animal that was sold does not place his hands upon it, as there is no placing of hands for communal offerings, and he does not bring its libations; rather, its libations are brought from the property of the community. Furthermore, although the owner of the animal that was sold is a priest, the right to perform its Temple service and the right to its hide are divided among the members of the priestly watch serving in the Temple that week.

3:5 With regard to the substitute of a firstborn offering and the substitute of an animal tithing offering, and the offspring of those substitutes and the offspring of their offspring until the end of time, the halakhic status of these animals is like that of a firstborn offering and like that of an animal tithing offering in that they must be treated with sanctity: They graze until they become blemished, and at that point they may be eaten in their blemished state, the substitute of the firstborn by the priests and the substitute of the animal tithing by their owners. They are not sacrificed upon the altar like the original firstborn and animal tithing offerings. What is the practical difference between a firstborn offering and an animal tithing offering and all the other sacrificial animals? The difference is that all the other sacrificial animals that were blemished and redeemed are sold in the butchers' market [ba'itliz], and slaughtered in the butchers' market, and weighed and sold by the litra, in the manner that non-sacred meat is slaughtered and sold. This is the case with regard to all consecrated animals except for the firstborn and animal tithing offerings, which are sold only from the home and not by the litra. And in addition, all sacrificial animals that became blemished are subject to redemption through sale, at which point the money becomes sacred and the animal becomes non-sacred, and their substitutes are also subject to redemption through sale. This is true for all consecrated animals, except for the firstborn and animal tithing offerings, which are not subject to redemption. And all sacrificial animals come to be sacrificed in the Temple even from outside of Eretz Yisrael, except for the firstborn and animal tithing offerings, which should not be brought from outside Eretz Yisrael ab initio. But if they came unblemished, they are sacrificed in the Temple like a regular firstborn or animal tithing offering coming from Eretz Yisrael; and if they are blemished animals, they may be eaten in their blemished state, the firstborns by the priests and the animal tithings by their owners. Rabbi Shimon says: What is the reason for this last difference between them? It is that the firstborn and animal tithing offerings have a remedy in their place outside Eretz Yisrael, as they can graze until they become blemished and then can be eaten there. It is

not necessary to bring them to Eretz Yisrael in order to eat them. But with regard to all other sacrificial animals, even if a blemish develops in them, these animals remain in their sanctity, and one must redeem them and bring another offering with the money of their redemption. Therefore, when they are unblemished it is proper to bring these animals themselves to Eretz Yisrael.

4:1 The offspring of a sin offering and the substitute for a sin offering, and a sin offering whose owner has died shall be sequestered and left to die. And with regard to a sin offering that is unfit for sacrifice because its first year from birth has passed, and a sin offering that was lost and when it was found, it was blemished, if it was after the owner achieved atonement through sacrifice of another animal as a sin offering, the blemished animal shall die, and it does not render a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute. Furthermore, one may not derive benefit from any of these sin offerings ab initio, but if one derived benefit from them, after the fact, he is not liable to bring a sin offering for misuse of consecrated items. And if the lost animal was found and discovered to be unfit before the owner achieved atonement for his sin with a different animal, it shall graze until it becomes blemished, and then it shall be sold. And he must bring another sin offering with the money received from the sale. And this animal renders a non-sacred animal exchanged for it a substitute, and one who derives benefit from this animal is liable for misusing it.

4:2 In the case of one who designates a sin offering, and the animal was lost, and he designated another in its stead and sacrificed it, and thereafter the first animal was found; that is a sin offering whose owner achieved atonement with another animal, and it shall be left to die. In the case of one who designates money for purchase of his sin offering, and the money was lost, and he designated an animal as a sin offering in its stead, and he sacrificed it, and thereafter, the money was found, it is prohibited to derive benefit from the money, as the money attains the halakhic status of the sin offering that was to be purchased with it, and that sin offering would be left to die because the owner achieved atonement with another animal. Therefore, he must take the money and cast it into the Dead Sea, from where it cannot be recovered.

4:3 In the case of one who designates money for purchase of his sin offering, and the money was lost, and he designated other money in its stead, and he did not manage to purchase a sin offering with that money before the original money was found, he should bring a sin offering from a combination of this original money and that money designated in its stead, and the remainder shall be allocated for communal gift offerings. In the case of one who designates money for purchase of his sin offering, and the money was lost, and he designated an animal as a sin offering in its stead, and he did not manage to sacrifice the animal before the money was found, and the animal that he designated as a sin offering is blemished, the animal shall be sold; and he brings a sin offering from a combination of this original money and that money received for the sale of the blemished animal, and the remainder shall be allocated for communal gift offerings. In the case of one who designates a sin offering and the animal was lost, and he designated money in its stead, and he did not manage to purchase a sin offering with that money before his sin offering was found, and the animal

is blemished, the animal shall be sold; and he brings a sin offering from a combination of this money that he designated and that money received for the sale of the blemished animal, and the remainder shall be allocated for communal gift offerings. In the case of one who designates his sin offering and the animal was lost, and he designated another animal in its stead, and he did not manage to sacrifice the sin offering before the first sin offering was found, and both of the animals are blemished, the animals shall be sold; and he brings a sin offering from a third animal that he buys with a combination of the money from the sale of this animal and from the sale of that animal, and the remainder shall be allocated for communal gift offerings. In the case of one who designates his sin offering and the animal was lost, and he designated another animal in its stead, and he did not manage to sacrifice the sin offering before the first sin offering was found, and both of the animals are unblemished and fit for sacrifice, one of them shall be sacrificed as a sin offering and the other shall be left to die; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: A sin offering is not left to die unless it was found after its owner achieved atonement; and the money is not taken to the Dead Sea unless it was found after its owner achieved atonement.

4:4 In the case of one who designates a sin offering and the animal is blemished, he sells the animal and must bring another sin offering with the money received in its sale. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: If the second animal is sacrificed before the first is slaughtered for non-sacred consumption, the first animal shall be left to die. Although it was sold and rendered non-sacred, its status is now that of a sin offering whose owner already achieved atonement with another animal.

5:1 How may one employ artifice to circumvent the obligation to give the firstborn to the priest and utilize the animal for a different offering that he is obligated to bring? The owner approaches an animal that is going to give birth to its firstborn while that animal was still pregnant, and says: That which is in the womb of this animal, if it is male, is designated as a burnt offering. In that case, if the animal gave birth to a male, it will be sacrificed as a burnt offering. And in a case where he says: If it is female, it is designated as a peace offering, if the animal gave birth to a female, it will be sacrificed as a peace offering. In a case where the owner says: If it is male it is designated as a burnt offering, and if it is female it is designated as a peace offering, and the animal gave birth to a male and a female, the male will be sacrificed as a burnt offering and the female will be sacrificed as a peace offering.

5:2 If the animal gave birth to two males, one of them will be sacrificed as a burnt offering and the second will be sold to those obligated to bring a burnt offering, who will sacrifice it as a burnt offering; and the money received from its sale is non-sacred. If the animal gave birth to two females, one of them will be sacrificed as a peace offering and the second will be sold to those obligated to bring a peace offering, who will sacrifice it as a peace offering, and the money received from its sale is non-sacred. If the animal gave birth to a tumtum, whose gender is unknown, or a hermaphrodite, which has both male and female sexual organs, both of which are unfit for sacrifice,

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: They are not imbued with sanctity.

5:3 One who says: The offspring of this non-sacred animal is a burnt offering and the animal itself is a peace offering, his statement stands, i.e., is effective. If he says: The animal itself is a peace offering and its offspring is a burnt offering, then since consecration of the mother preceded consecration of the offspring, it is the offspring of a peace offering, whose halakhic status is that of a peace offering; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei said: If that was his intent from the outset, to designate the offspring as a burnt offering when he designated the mother as a peace offering, then since it is impossible to call it by two designations simultaneously, his statement stands, and the mother is a peace offering and the offspring a burnt offering. And if it was only after he said: This animal is hereby a peace offering, that he reconsidered and said: Its offspring is a burnt offering, that offspring is a peace offering, as before he reconsidered, the offspring had already assumed the status of the offspring of a peace offering.

5:4 If one had two animals standing before him, one a burnt offering and the other a peace offering, and he said with regard to a third, non-sacred animal: This animal is hereby the substitute of the burnt offering, the substitute of the peace offering, that animal is the substitute of the burnt offering. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Once he designated it as the substitute of the burnt offering, his initial statement takes effect and the animal assumes the sanctity of the burnt offering. Rabbi Yosei said: If that was his intent from the outset, when he said that the animal is the substitute of the burnt offering, to state that the animal is also the substitute of the peace offering, then since it is impossible to call two designations simultaneously, i.e., one must first say one designation and then the other, his statement stands, and the animal is half a burnt offering and half a peace offering. And if it was only after he said: This animal is hereby the substitute of the burnt offering, that he reconsidered and said: The substitute of the peace offering, that entire animal is the substitute of the burnt offering.

5:5 This mishna discusses the language that serves to effect substitution. If one said: This non-sacred animal is hereby in place of that consecrated animal, or if he said: It is the substitute of that consecrated animal, or if one said: It is the exchange for that consecrated animal, that non-sacred animal is a substitute. If he said: This consecrated animal is desacralized, with its sanctity transferred to that non-sacred animal, that non-sacred animal is not a substitute. And if the consecrated animal was blemished, and he said: This consecrated animal is desacralized, with its sanctity transferred to that non-sacred animal, the consecrated animal is desacralized and assumes non-sacred status, by Torah law. By rabbinic law, the owner is required to conduct an appraisal to ascertain the relative value of the two animals. If the consecrated animal was worth more than the non-sacred animal, he must pay the difference to the Temple treasury.

5:6 If one said: This non-sacred animal is hereby in place of a burnt offering, or: It is in place of a sin offering, he has said nothing, as he did not say that it was in place of a specific offering. If he said: It is in place of this

sin offering, or: It is in place of this burnt offering, or if he said: It is in place of a sin offering that I have in the house, or: It is in place of a burnt offering that I have in the house, and he had that offering in his house, his statement stands, i.e., is effective. If he said with regard to a non-kosher animal and with regard to a blemished animal: These animals are hereby designated as a burnt offering, he has said nothing. If he said: These animals are hereby designated for a burnt offering, the animals should be sold, and he brings a burnt offering purchased with the money received from their sale.

6:1 With regard to all animals whose sacrifice on the altar is prohibited, if they are intermingled with animals whose sacrifice is permitted, they prohibit the entire mixture of animals in any amount, regardless of the ratio of permitted to prohibited animals. These are the animals whose sacrifice is prohibited: An animal that copulated with a person, and an animal that was the object of bestiality, and the set-aside, and one that was worshipped, and an animal that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, or an animal crossbred from 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. Which is the animal that is set-aside? It is an animal that is set aside for idol worship. The animal itself is prohibited, but that which is upon it, e.g., its jewelry and garments, is permitted to be sold in order to purchase an animal to be sacrificed. And which is the animal that was worshipped? It is any animal that a person worships as an object of idol worship. In this case, the sacrifice of both the animal itself and an animal purchased using the money from the sale of that which is upon it is prohibited. And the consumption of both this, the animal designated for idol worship, and that, the animal worshipped, is permitted.

6:2 And which is the case of an animal used as payment to a prostitute, which is prohibited as a sacrifice? It is the case of one who says to a prostitute: Here is this lamb as your fee. Even if they were one hundred lambs that he gave her, all of them are considered as payment to a prostitute and are prohibited. And likewise, in the case of one who says to another: Here is this lamb and in return your maidservant will lie with my slave and engage in intercourse with him, Rabbi Meir says: Its halakhic status is not that of payment to a prostitute, and the Rabbis say: Its halakhic status is that of payment to a prostitute.

6:3 And which is the case where an animal has the halakhic status of the price of a dog, and it is therefore prohibited to sacrifice the animal on the altar? It is the case of one who says to another: Here is this lamb in place of a dog. And likewise, this prohibition applies in the case of two partners who divided their common property, which included nineteen lambs and one dog, and one took ten lambs and the other one took nine lambs and a dog. Sacrifice of the ten lambs taken by the partner in exchange for the nine lambs and the dog is prohibited, and sacrifice of the nine lambs that were taken by the partner with the dog is permitted. With regard to lambs given as payment to another for engaging in intercourse with his dog, or as the price of a prostitute to purchase her as his maidservant, their sacrifice is permitted, as it is stated:

“As both of them are an abomination to the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 23:19), from which it is inferred: Two are prohibited, payment to a prostitute and the price of a dog, and not four, i.e., the additional two cases of payment for intercourse with a dog and the price of a prostitute, which are permitted. Furthermore, with regard to the two prohibited cases of payment to a prostitute and the price of a dog, sacrifice of their offspring is permitted, as it is stated “them,” and not their offspring.

6:4 If one gave money to a prostitute as her payment, it is permitted to purchase an offering with that money, as the money itself is not sacrificed. If he paid her with wine, or oil, or flour, or any other item the like of which is sacrificed on the altar, sacrifice of those items is prohibited. If he gave her consecrated items for her services, their sacrifice is permitted. Since they were already consecrated, they do not belong to him, and one cannot prohibit an item that is not his. If he paid her with non-sacred birds, their sacrifice is prohibited. The mishna elaborates: As, by right, it should be inferred a fortiori: If in the case of consecrated items, which a blemish disqualifies, the prohibition of payment to a prostitute and the price of a dog do not take effect with regard to them; with regard to a bird, which a blemish does not disqualify, is it not right that the prohibition of payment to a prostitute and the price of a dog should not take effect with regard to them? Therefore, the verse states: “You shall not bring the payment of a prostitute, or the price of a dog, into the House of the Lord your God for any vow” (Deuteronomy 23:19). This serves to include the bird in the prohibition.

6:5 The mishna adds a principle: With regard to all animals whose sacrifice on the altar is prohibited, sacrifice of their offspring is permitted. Rabbi Eliezer says: The offspring of an animal with a wound that will cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa] shall not be sacrificed on the altar. But the Rabbis say: It shall be sacrificed. Rabbi Hanina ben Antigonus says: A kosher animal that suckled from a tereifa is disqualified from sacrifice on the altar. With regard to all sacrificial animals that became tereifot, one may not redeem them and render them non-sacred, as their consumption is forbidden and one does not redeem sacrificial animals to feed them to dogs, as this is considered a degradation of sacrificial animals.

7:1 There are elements that apply to animals consecrated for the altar that do not apply to items consecrated for Temple maintenance, and there are elements that apply to items consecrated for Temple maintenance that do not apply to animals consecrated for the altar. One element exclusive to animals consecrated for the altar is that animals consecrated for the altar render an animal exchanged for them a substitute, and items consecrated for Temple maintenance do not render an animal exchanged for them a substitute. In addition, if one slaughters an animal consecrated for the altar with the intention to eat it beyond its designated time, or if he ate the offering after its designated time, or if he ate the offering while ritually impure, he is liable to receive karet for eating it due to violation of the prohibitions of piggul, notar, and eating while ritually impure, respectively. If animals consecrated for the altar became pregnant and then became blemished and gave birth after redemption, their offspring and their milk are forbidden after their

redemption. And one who slaughters them outside the Temple courtyard is liable to receive karet. And the Temple treasurer does not give compensation to craftsmen from money designated for purchasing animals consecrated for the altar. And in all these instances, that is not so with regard to money consecrated for Temple maintenance.

7:2 There are elements that apply to items consecrated for Temple maintenance that do not apply to animals consecrated for the altar, in that unspecified consecrations are designated for Temple maintenance; consecration for Temple maintenance takes effect on all items; and one is liable to bring a guilt offering and pay an additional payment of one-fifth for misuse of consecrated property, not only for the items themselves, but for their by-products, e.g., milk of a consecrated animal or eggs of a consecrated chicken; and there is no benefit for the owner from items consecrated for Temple maintenance, in contrast to some animals consecrated for the altar, e.g., a peace offering, from which there is benefit for the owner.

7:3 While the previous mishna enumerated differences between consecration for the altar and consecration for Temple maintenance, this mishna enumerates halakhot that apply to both. With regard to both animals consecrated for the altar and items consecrated for Temple maintenance, one may not alter their designation from one form of sanctity to another form of sanctity. But one may consecrate animals already consecrated for the altar by a consecration of their value, and that value is donated to the Temple treasury for maintenance. And one may dedicate them for the purpose of giving their value to the priests. And if animals consecrated either for the altar or for Temple maintenance died, they must be buried. Rabbi Shimon says: Although that is the halakha with regard to animals consecrated for the altar, if animals consecrated for Temple maintenance died, they can be redeemed.

7:4 And these are the items that are buried from which deriving benefit is forbidden: In the case of a sacrificial animal that miscarried, the fetus shall be buried. If the animal miscarried a placenta, the placenta shall be buried. And the same halakha applies to an ox that is stoned for killing a person; and a heifer whose neck is broken when a corpse is found between two cities and the killer is unknown; and the birds brought by a leper for purification; and the hair of a nazirite who became ritually impure, who shaves his head before beginning a new term of naziriteship. And the same halakha applies to the firstborn of a donkey that, if it is not redeemed with a sheep, has its neck broken; and a forbidden mixture of meat cooked in milk; and non-sacred animals that were slaughtered in the Temple courtyard. Rabbi Shimon says: Non-sacred animals that were slaughtered in the Temple courtyard shall be burned, like sacrificial animals that were disqualified in the courtyard. And likewise, an undomesticated animal that was slaughtered in the Temple courtyard, although it is not similar to the animals sacrificed in the Temple, shall be burned by rabbinic decree.

7:5 And these are the items that are burned: Leavened bread on Passover shall be burned. And the same halakha applies to ritually impure teruma. And with regard to the fruit that grows on a tree during the three years after it was planted [orla], and diverse kinds of food crops sown in a vineyard, those items

whose appropriate manner of destruction is to be burned, e.g., foods, shall be burned; and those items whose appropriate manner of destruction is to be buried, e.g., liquids, shall be buried. And one may ignite a fire with bread and with oil of impure teruma, even though the priest derives benefit from that fire.

7:6 And with regard to all sacrificial animals that were slaughtered with the intent to sacrifice or consume them beyond their designated time or outside their designated place, those animals shall be burned. With regard to a provisional guilt offering brought by one who is uncertain as to whether he committed a sin that renders him liable to bring a sin offering, if he discovers that he did not sin, the offering shall be burned, as its legal status is like that of an unfit offering. Rabbi Yehuda says: It shall be buried. A sin offering of the bird that comes due to an uncertainty, e.g., in the case of a woman who miscarried and she is uncertain whether it was a fetus, shall be burned, as it may not be eaten due to the uncertainty and because the nape of its neck was pinched and it was not slaughtered. Rabbi Yehuda says: One should cast it into the Temple courtyard drain, as the young bird will decompose and be drawn into the stream outside the Temple. The principle is: All items that are buried shall not be burned, and all items that are burned shall not be buried. Rabbi Yehuda says: If one wished to impose a stringency upon himself by burning items that are to be buried, he is permitted to burn them. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: One is not permitted to change the method of destruction, as this could lead to a leniency, since it is permitted to derive benefit from the ashes of items that require burning, whereas it is not permitted to derive benefit from the ashes of items that require burial.