

They gave the priests over to the attendants, etc. – מסרון לחזנין וכו': After the lottery the winners would set out to perform the day's service. Attendants took the clothes off the other priests, leaving them in trousers, at which point they put on their non-sacred clothes before removing the sacred trousers and putting all the clothes back in their place. This ruling is in accordance with the mishna and Rav Sheshet's interpretation of it (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:2).

רב נחמן אמר: בגדי חול דאי אמרת בגדי קדש – איכא בעלי זרועות דחמסי ועבדי. רב ששת אמר: בגדי קדש, דאי אמרת בגדי חול – אגב חביבותיה מיקרו ועבדי.

The Gemara explains the two approaches. Rav Nahman said: The priests were dressed in **non-sacred garments**, because if you say the lottery was to be held when they were dressed in their sacred garments, there are strong-armed men who might act with force and perform the service even if they did not win the lottery. Since they were already wearing the sacred garments, they would simply force their way into performing the service. Rav Sheshet said: They were wearing the sacred garments, as, if you say they wore their non-sacred garments, due to the fact that the service was so beloved to them, in their excitement over having been granted the privilege to perform the service, it may happen that they would perform the service immediately, forgetting to don their sacred garments, thereby disqualifying the service.

אמר רב נחמן: מנא אמינא לה – דתנן: מסרון לחזנין, והיו מפשיטין אותן את בגדיהן ולא היו מניחין עליהן אלא מכנסים בלבד.

Rav Nahman said: From where do I state my opinion? As we learned in a mishna: After the lottery they gave the priests over to the attendants, and they would take their clothes off them and they would leave only their trousers on them.

Perek II
Daf 25 Amud a

מאי לאו – באותן שזכו לפיים! אמר רב הונא בר יהודה אמר רב ששת: לא, באותן שלא זכו לפיים.

What, is this not talking about those priests who won the lottery, describing how their non-sacred garments were removed from them before they were dressed in the priestly garments? Rav Huna bar Yehuda said that Rav Sheshet said, rejecting that interpretation: No, it is possible to explain that all the priests at the lottery were wearing sacred garments and that, on the contrary, the mishna speaks about those priests who did not win the lottery. The text describes how the sacred garments they wore during the lottery were removed from them.

הכי נמי מסתברא, דאי סלקא דעתך באותן שזכו לפיים – לא היו מניחין עליהן אלא מכנסים בלבד? והתנא: מניין שלא יהא דבר קודם למכנסים – תלמוד לומר: "וימכנסו בד יהיו על בשרו".

The Gemara supports this latter interpretation: So too, it is reasonable to follow Rav Sheshet's interpretation of the mishna. As, if it were to enter your mind to say that the mishna is dealing with those who won the lottery and describes how their non-sacred garments were removed and sacred garments put on, how would one understand the statement: They would leave only their trousers on them? One would have to explain that the priests subsequently donned the sacred clothes on top of the non-sacred trousers; then they would remove the non-sacred trousers and replace them with the sacred trousers. But wasn't it taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that nothing should precede the trousers when the priest dresses? The verse states: "And he shall have linen trousers upon his flesh" (Leviticus 16:4)? However, according to the proposed interpretation of the mishna, the priests donned the other sacred garments and put on the trousers after them.

ואיך? הא לא קשיא: הכי קתני: עד שעודן עליהן בגדי חול מלבישין אותן מכנסים קדש, והיו מפשיטין אותן בגדי חול, ולא היו מניחין אלא מכנסים בלבד.

The Gemara asks: And how would the other one, Rav Nahman, resolve this difficulty? He would respond that this is not difficult, as this is what the mishna is teaching: While the non-sacred garments are still on them they put the sacred trousers on them, and then they remove from them the non-sacred clothes, and they left them wearing only the sacred trousers. Therefore, it is possible to interpret the mishna either way.

Basilica [*basileki*] – בסילקי: From the Greek βασιλική, *basilikè*, meaning a large royal building. The *basilikè* had a unique design: It was built upon rows of columns. The central part of the building had a higher roof than the rest, to allow sunlight to stream in between the two levels.



Ruins of a basilica in Khoms, Libya, dating back to the second century

Bracelet [*bekholiyar*] – בכוליאור: The proper reading of the second word appears to be *kokhliyar*, from the Greek κοχλιάριον, *kokhliarion*, meaning a spiral, snail-like shape. Accordingly, the priests did not stand in a perfect circle but in a spiral to make it difficult for anyone to calculate where the count would end.



Spiral snail shells

HALAKHA

The Chamber of Hewn Stone – לשכת הגזית: The Chamber of Hewn Stone was built half in the sacred area of the Temple and half in the non-sacred area. It had two doorways, one opening into the sacred area and one opening into the non-sacred area. The non-sacred part of the chamber was the seat of the Sanhedrin. This is in accordance with Abaye's statement in the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 5:17).

אמר רב ששית: מנא אמינא לה – דתניא: לשכת הגזית כמין בסילקי גדולה היתה, פייס במזרחתה, וזקן יושב במערבה. והכהנים מוקפין ועומדין כמין בכוליאור, והמונה בא ונוטל מצנפת מראשו של אחד מהן, ויודעין שצממו פייס מתחיל. ואי סלקא דעתך בבגדי חול – מצנפת בבגדי חול מי איכא?

Rav Sheshet said: From where do I say that the priests wore sacred garments when the lottery was held? As it was taught in a *baraita*: **The Chamber of Hewn Stone was built in the style of a large basilica** [*basileki*];¹ the lottery is held in the east of the chamber, and an Elder of the court sits in its west^N to provide instruction and adjudicate any doubtful cases. And the priests stand in a circle in the shape of a bracelet [*bekholiyar*],¹ and the appointed priest comes and removes the mitre from the head of one of them, and everyone thereby knew that the count began from him. And if it were to enter your mind to say that the priests wore non-sacred garments during the lottery, is there such a thing as a mitre among one's non-sacred garments? This shows that the priests were wearing their sacred garments when the lottery took place.

אין, כדתני רב יהודה, ואיתימא רב שמואל בר יהודה: כהן שעשטה לו אמו בתונת – עובד בה עבודת יחיד.

The Gemara rejects this reasoning: Yes, indeed, there is such a thing as a mitre that one wears as non-sacred apparel, as Rav Yehuda, and some say it was Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda, taught:^N A priest whose mother made a tunic for him, to show her love for her son and her love for mitzvot, may perform an individual service with it on, but not communal services. Therefore, it is possible that the priests had non-sacred mitres in the style of the sacred mitres, just as they sometimes had non-sacred tunics.

אמר אביי: שמע מינה לשכת הגזית חציה בקדש, וחציה בחול. ושמע מינה: שני פתחים היו לה, אחד פתוח בקדש ואחד פתוח בחול, דאי סלקא דעתך כולה בקדש – זקן יושב במערבה? והאמר מר: אין ישיבה בעזרה אלא למלכי בית דוד בלבד!

Apropos the *baraita* that was just cited, Abaye said: Conclude from this *baraita* that the Chamber of Hewn Stone^H was built half in the sacred area, within the consecrated Temple grounds, and half in the non-sacred part of the Temple grounds. And conclude from it as well that the chamber had two doorways, one that opened to the sacred area of the Temple and one that opened to the non-sacred area. Abaye explains these inferences: As, were it to enter your mind that the Chamber of Hewn Stone stood entirely in the sacred area, how could one say that an Elder sat in its west? Didn't the Master say: There is no sitting allowed in the Temple courtyard except for kings of the house of David^N alone? The Elder must therefore have been sitting in an area external to the Temple courtyard area.

NOTES

An Elder of the court sits in its west – זקן יושב במערבה: From the words of the Rambam it appears that there was no particular Elder sitting on the west side of the chamber; rather, the intention is to state that the western part of the Chamber of Hewn Stone was the area where the Elders of the Sanhedrin convened. These Elders did not participate in the lottery; they are mentioned here only to teach that this was the chief function of the Chamber of Hewn Stone (see *Sifah Yitzhak*). The author of the *Me'iri*, on the other hand, maintains that there was a particular Sage stationed there, and that this individual played a role in the lottery process, as he chose the random number used in the count. The appointed priest, however, would decide with which priest the count would begin.

As Rav Yehuda... taught – כדתני רב יהודה: It is understood from this *baraita* that some priests had clothes that were

not full-fledged sacred priestly garments but could be used for the sacrifice of individual offerings. These are the garments that Rav Nahman referred to when he said that the priests wore non-sacred garments for the lottery. Another view, however, is that Rav Nahman was referring to garments that were completely non-sacred, which fully resembled the priestly sacred garments. The priests would wear these garments in order to be accustomed to their identical sacred clothing (*Sifah Yitzhak*).

There is no sitting allowed in the courtyard except for kings of the house of David – אין ישיבה בעזרה אלא למלכי בית דוד: In the Jerusalem Talmud another opinion is cited that even the kings of the House of David were not permitted to sit in the Temple courtyard.

The sanctity of the chambers – קדושת הלשכות: In the case of chambers that were built in the Rampart, a stepped embankment surrounding the Temple, if their sole doorway opened to the sacred area of the courtyard, their entire interior was considered sacred. Conversely, in the case of chambers that were built in the sacred area, if they opened solely into a non-sacred area, their interiors were considered non-sacred (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 6:7–8).

The second lottery – הפינים השני: The second lottery in the Temple was held in order to apportion the tasks of the morning service: Slaughtering the daily morning burnt-offering; sprinkling the blood; removing the ashes from the inner altar and the candelabrum; and bringing up the limbs of the animal, along with its attendant meal offering and wine libation, to the altar's ramp. In total, thirteen priests won the privilege to serve based on this lottery, and the sequence of their actions is as listed in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:6).

NOTES

Who slaughters...and who removes the ashes – מי שוחט...ומי מְדַשֵּׁן: Even though in practice the clearing of the ashes preceded the slaughtering of the daily offering, the latter is listed first, since it is the most important service of the day (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

The limbs of the daily offering – איברי התמיד: The daily offering is a burnt-offering, and as such it was cut into large pieces that were brought up to the altar for burning. The details of this facet of the service, such as how the animal was cut up, which parts of the animal went with which parts, e.g., that the hooves were brought up together with the intestines, and how the priests held the parts as they ascended to the altar, are not explained in detail in the Gemara here but in tractate *Tamid*, which is devoted to such matters.



Priests bringing the limbs to the altar

ואי סלקא דעתך כולה בחול – פנים במזרח? והא בעינן: "בבית אלהים נהלך בגוש" וליכא, אלא שמע מינה: חצייה בקדש וחצייה בחול.

ואי סלקא דעתך פתח אחד יש לה ופתוח לקודש – זקן וישב במערבה? והתנן: הלשכות הבנויות בחול ופתוחות לקדש – תוכן קודש! ואי סלקא דעתך פתוח לחול, פנים במזרח? והתנן: בנויות בקדש ופתוחות לחול – תוכן חול! אלא לאו שמע מינה: שני פתחים היו לה, אחד פתוח בקדש ואחד פתוח לחול.

מתני' הפינים השני: מי שוחט, מי זורק מי מְדַשֵּׁן מִזְבַּח הַפְּנִימִי, ומי מְדַשֵּׁן אֶת הַמְנוּרָה, ומי מַעֲלֵה אֲבָרִים לַכֶּבֶשׂ.

הראש והרגל, ושתי הידים, העוקץ והרגל, והחזה והגרה, ושתי הדפנות, והקרבים, והסלת והחביתין, והיין, שלשה עשר בהנים וכו' בו.

אמר בן עזאי לפני רבי עקיבא משום רבי יהושע: דרך הלוחו היה קרב.

גמ' איבעיא להו: כשהן מפייסין, לעבודה אחת מפייסין, או דילמא לכל עבודה ועבודה הן מפייסין? תא שמע: ארבע פייסות היו שם. ואי סלקא דעתך לכל עבודה הן מפייסין – טובא הווי! אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק, הכי קאמר: ארבע פעמים נכנסין להפיס, ולכל תדא ותדא היו בה טובא פייסות.

And if it were to enter your mind to say the opposite, that the chamber stood entirely in the non-sacred area, how could the lottery be held in the east? Aren't we required to fulfill the verse: "In the House of God we walked with the throng" (Psalms 55:15), from where it was derived earlier that it is desirable that the lotteries cause a commotion in the House of God, i.e., in the sacred area of the Temple? If the lottery were held in a non-sacred area, there would not be a fulfillment of this verse. Rather, one must conclude from this *baraita* that the chamber was situated half in the sacred area of the Temple and half in the non-sacred area.

Abaye continues: And were it to enter your mind that the chamber had just one doorway, which opened to the sacred area, how could the Elder sit in its west? Didn't we learn in a mishna: Chambers that are built in the non-sacred area of the Temple Mount, but that open up into the sacred area, their interior is considered entirely sacred, despite the fact that they also occupy land outside the sacred area? And if, on the other hand, it were to enter your mind that the chamber had just one doorway, which opened to the non-sacred area, how could the lottery be held in its east? Didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to chambers that are built in the sacred area but which open up into the non-sacred area, the space within them is considered entirely non-sacred, despite the chambers' location on sacred territory. Rather, isn't it correct to conclude from this that the Chamber of Hewn Stone had two doorways, one that opened up into the sacred area and one that opened into the non-sacred area?

MISHNA The second lottery^h conducted daily among the priests determines the following: Who slaughters the daily morning offering, who sprinkles its blood, who removes the ashes from the inner altar, and who removes the ashesⁿ and burnt wicks from the candelabrum, and who takes the limbs of the daily offeringⁿ up to the ramp to be burned later.

This is how the limbs were divided before taking them up to the altar: The head and the right leg were carried by one priest, and the two forelegs were carried by a second priest. The tail, including the lower vertebrae of the spinal column and the fat tail, and the left leg were carried by a third priest. And the breast and the throat and some of the inner organs attached to it were carried by a fourth priest. And the two flanks were taken by a fifth priest, and the intestines by a sixth priest. And the fine flour of the meal-offering accompanying the daily offering was carried by a seventh priest. And the High Priest's daily griddle-cake offering was carried by an eighth priest, and the wine for libation was carried by a ninth priest. Altogether thirteen priests prevailed in this lottery: Nine priests who carried the daily offering and its accompanying elements, and four who performed the slaughter, sprinkling, and removal of ashes from the inner altar and the candelabrum.

Ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: That was not the sequence of taking the limbs up to the ramp; rather, the order in which it was sacrificed was according to the way it walks when alive, as will be explained in the Gemara.

GEMARA A dilemma was raised before the Sages: When the priests performed the lottery, did they perform a lottery for just one service, such as the slaughtering, and the other twelve tasks were divided among the priests adjacent to the chosen one; or perhaps they performed a separate lottery for each and every service of the thirteen acts listed? The Gemara answers: Come and hear a proof from that which was taught in the mishna: There were four lotteries there. And if it were to enter your mind that they performed a lottery for each and every service separately, there would be many more than four lotteries. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: That is not a conclusive proof, because one could argue that this is what the mishna is saying: The priests gathered four times for a lottery, but each gathering involved many lotteries for many individual services.

תָּא שְׁמַע, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: לֹא הָיָה פִּיּוּס לְמַחְתָּהּ, אֲלֵא כִּהֵן שְׂזֵכָה בְּקִטְרֵת אֹמֵר לֹזֶה שְׁעָמוּ "זֵכָה עָמוּ בְּמַחְתָּהּ!"

Come and hear a proof from a *baraita*: Rabbi Yehuda says: When the third lottery was held to determine who would perform the burning of the incense, **there was no separate lottery held for carrying the coal pan**, although a second priest was required to rake up coals from the outer altar, carry them in a coal pan, and put them on the inner altar, where the priest assigned the task of burning the incense would then place the incense onto the coals. **Rather, the priest who won the privilege of the incense said to the one who was next to him: Be privileged along with me with the task of carrying the coal pan.** This shows that each individual service did not have its own lottery; rather, the other priests adjacent to the winner of the lottery were automatically chosen for the ancillary tasks.

שְׂאֵנִי מַחְתָּהּ וְקִטְרֵת דְּחָדָא עֲבוּדָה הִיא.

The Gemara rejects this proof: **The tasks of carrying the coal pan and burning the incense are different, because together they are considered as a single service**, so that a single lottery determined the participants for the two tasks.

אִיכָא דְאָמְרִי: דְּוָקָא מַחְתָּהּ וְקִטְרֵת דְּחָדָא עֲבוּדָה הִיא, אֲבָל שְׂאֵר עֲבוּדוֹת – בְּעֵי פִּיּוּס.

There are those who say that this *baraita* was brought to derive the opposite conclusion: It was **specifically** concerning the case of carrying the coal pan and burning the incense, which are considered as two parts of one and the same service, that Rabbi Yehuda said one lottery can be used to assign the two tasks. **However**, the implication is that **other services**, which are not interrelated in this manner, **require a lottery** for each and every separate task. If Rabbi Yehuda had meant this to be a general principle, why did he mention the specific example of the coal pan and the incense?

מַחְתָּהּ אֲצִטְרִיכָא לִיה, סְלִקָא דְעֵתְךָ אֲמִינָא: הוֹאִיל וְלֹא שְׂבִיחָא, וּמְעַתְרָא – נִתְקִין לָהּ פִּיּוּס בְּפִי עֲצֻמָּה, קָא מְשַׁמְעֵ לָן.

This argument is rejected: That is not a proof that other services require their own lotteries. The reason Rabbi Yehuda mentioned this specific example is that **it was necessary for him** to teach explicitly that the coal pan and the burning of the incense do not have separate lotteries but a single, combined lottery. It might **have entered your mind to say that since** the burning of incense **is infrequent**, being performed only twice a day, unlike other offerings, which may be donated by private individuals and brought many times a day, **and also since it brings about wealth** for whoever performs it, as the Gemara teaches later, **we should institute a separate lottery for bringing in the coal pan itself**, as many priests wished to perform this task. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda **teaches us** that despite this, the bringing in of the coal pan does not have its own lottery. Consequently, there is no proof either way from this *baraita*.

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּתַנִּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: לֹא לְכָל עֲבוּדָה וְעֲבוּדָה מְפִיִּסִין, אֲלֵא כִּהֵן שְׂזֵכָה בְּתַמִּיד שְׁנַיִם עֶשְׂרֵי אַחֵיו הַכֹּהֲנִים נִמְשָׁבִין עִמוּ. שְׁמַע מִינָהּ.

Come and hear a proof from what Rabbi Hiyya taught explicitly in a *baraita*: **A lottery is not held for each individual service; rather, beginning with the priest who won the lottery of the daily offering, twelve of his fellow priests**, those standing next to him, **are drawn in along with him**^{NH} to perform the other acts of the daily offering. The Gemara concludes: **Learn from this** that it is so.

"פִּיּוּס הַשְּׁנַיִם" וְכו'. אִיבְעִיא לָהּ: מִי מְקַבֵּל? שׁוֹחֵט מְקַבֵּל, דְּאִי אֲמַרְתָּ זֶרֶק מְקַבֵּל – אֲגַב חֲבִיבוּתִיהָ לֹא מְקַבֵּל לִיה לְכוּלִּיהָ דָם.

It was taught in the mishna: **The second lottery determines** who slaughters, who sprinkles the blood, etc. The task of collecting the blood in a vessel, which is between slaughtering and sprinkling, is not mentioned. Therefore, it must be assumed that either the priest who slaughtered or the priest who sprinkled the blood was assigned this task as well. **A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Who collects the blood?**^N Is it the one who slaughters the offering who also collects the blood? The reason to support this conclusion is **that if you say** that the one who sprinkles the blood is the one who collects it, a situation might arise in which, **due to his enthusiasm and his love** for the mitzva of sprinkling, a service that is considered more important than collecting because it directly involves the altar, the priest might **not collect all the blood**^N as the *halakha* requires but would hurry to go on and sprinkle it after he has collected only some of the blood.

NOTES

Twelve of his fellow priests are drawn in along with him – שְׁנַיִם עֶשְׂרֵי אַחֵיו הַכֹּהֲנִים נִמְשָׁבִין עִמוּ: In the Jerusalem Talmud the question is raised as to whether the twelve priests are chosen from those who had already been counted in the course of the lottery, or from those who had not yet been counted. It is concluded that the twelve who serve are those who had already been counted, regardless of whether the lottery had proceeded from the right or from the left.

Who collects the blood – מִי מְקַבֵּל: The commentaries point out that the Gemara might have posed an additional question: Who carries the blood to the altar for sprinkling? After all, carrying the blood is a sacred service and requires a priest no less than the collection of the blood; and carrying, like collection, is not mentioned in the mishna. Some answer that the assumption is that the priest who sprinkles the blood also carries it for that purpose, as it would be unfair for one priest to be given three tasks, i.e., slaughtering, collecting, and carrying, while the next priest would have only the job of sprinkling the blood (*Gevurat Ari*). Others suggest that the assumption is that whichever priest is holding the vessel after he collects the blood continues to carry it to the altar (*Zikhron She'erit Yosef*).

Due to his love for the mitzva of sprinkling, the priest might not collect all the blood – אֲגַב חֲבִיבוּתִיהָ לֹא מְקַבֵּל לִיה: The question is raised: Why is there no similar concern that one who is slaughtering might not complete the slaughter properly because he is anxious to perform the mitzva of collecting the blood? The answer given is that cutting short the slaughtering process will only lessen the efficacy of the mitzva of blood collection, as a lesser amount of blood will flow out as a result. On the other hand, when a priest is assigned the two tasks of collecting the blood and sprinkling it, there is concern that he might cut the collection process short, as the sprinkling can be done with less blood just as well as with more blood. Therefore, we are concerned lest he cut short the collection in order to go on to the more important task of sprinkling (*Sifah Yitzhak*).

HALAKHA

His fellow priests are drawn in along with him – אַחֵיו אֲחֵיו הַכֹּהֲנִים נִמְשָׁבִין עִמוּ: When a priest wins the lottery, those priests standing next to him are privileged with the other services associated with that lottery (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:6).

BACKGROUND

Twelve spigots – שנים עשר דד: On the left side of this rendering is the laver, which had twelve spigots.



Laver

HALAKHA

The one who sprinkles collects the blood – זורק מקביל – The priest who wins the privilege of sprinkling the blood of the daily offering also collects the blood and carries it to the altar, where he sprinkles it (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:6).

או דילמא: זורק מקביל, דאי אמרת שוחט מקביל – זימנין דשחית זר.

Or perhaps one should draw the opposite conclusion, that it is the one who sprinkles that collects the blood, as, if you say that the one who slaughters is the one who collects, this principle could not be universally applied, as sometimes a non-priest slaughters the offering. Slaughtering offerings is not a sacred service and may be performed by anyone, unlike the collection of the blood, which is performed by a priest. In those cases when a non-priest slaughtered the daily offering, he would not be able to collect the blood.

תא שמע: בן קטין עשה שנים עשר דד לכיור בדי שיהיו שנים עשר אחיו הכהנים העסוקין בתמיד מקדשין ידיהו ורגליהו בבת אחת.

The Gemara cites a source as evidence for one side of the argument: **Come and hear** from that which was taught in a mishna: **Ben Katin made twelve spigots⁸ for the large laver to replace the original two spouts that were there, so that his twelve fellow priests who were engaged in the sacrifice of the daily offering could all sanctify their hands and feet at one time.** Although there are thirteen participants listed in the mishna, the slaughterer of the offering was not required to sanctify his hands and feet because, as mentioned above, slaughtering is not a sacred service. Therefore, only twelve spigots were needed.

ואי סלקא דעתך שוחט מקביל, תליסר הוי! אלא לאו שמע מינה: זורק מקביל, שבע מינה.

And if it should enter your mind to say that the one who slaughters is the one who collects the blood, then **there are** sometimes **thirteen** participants, so thirteen spigots should be needed. On those occasions when a non-priest slaughtered the daily offering, an extra priest would be required to come and collect its blood. Since the collection of blood is a sacred service, it too requires sanctification of the hands and feet. **Rather**, since there were only twelve spigots, **isn't it correct to conclude from this** that it is the one who sprinkles, and not the one who slaughters, who collects the blood?⁹ The Gemara concludes: **Conclude from this** that it is so.

אמר ליה רב אחא בריה דרבא לרב אשי, אף אנו נמי תמנא: שחט השוחט, וקביל המקביל, ובא לו לזרוק. שמע מינה.

Rav Aha, son of Rava, said to Rav Ashi: **We too have learned** a support for this conclusion in a mishna that gives the sequence of the services for the daily offering: **The slaughterer of the offering slaughtered, the collector of its blood collected, and he then comes to sprinkle** the blood. The wording indicates that the one who collects the blood is also the one who subsequently sprinkles it. The Gemara concludes: **Conclude from this** that it is so.

”אמר בן עזאי לפני רבי עקיבא” וכו'. תנו רבנן: כיצד דרך הליכו? הראש והרגל, החזה והגרה, ושתי ידים, ושתי דפנות, העוקץ והרגל. רבי יוסי אומר: דרך הפשוטו היה קרב. כיצד דרך הפשוטו? הראש והרגל, העוקץ והרגל, ושתי דפנות, ושתי הידים, החזה והגרה.

S The mishna states that **ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva** in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua that the sequence for carrying up the animal's limbs was based on the way it walks when alive, meaning that its front parts are taken up first. **The Sages taught** in the *Tosefta*: **In what manner** is the animal brought up according to the way it walks? It is in this manner: **The head and the right hind leg** are brought up first. The other parts follow this sequence: **The breast and the neck, and then the two forelegs, and then the two flanks, then the tail and the left hind leg.** Rabbi Yosei says: **It was sacrificed according to the way it was skinned. In what manner** is the animal brought up according to the way it was skinned? It is in this manner: **The head and the right leg** are brought first, then **the tail and the left leg together, then the two flanks, and then the two forelegs, then the breast and the neck.**

רבי עקיבא אומר: דרך ניתוחו היה קרב. כיצד דרך ניתוחו? הראש והרגל, ושתי ידים, החזה והגרה, ושתי דפנות, והעוקץ והרגל. רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: דרך עליו היה קרב. כיצד דרך עליו? הראש והרגל, החזה והגרה, ושתי הדפנות, והעוקץ והרגל, ושתי הידים.

Rabbi Akiva says: **It was sacrificed according to the way it was cut up** into limbs after the skinning. **In what manner** is the animal brought up according to the way it was cut up? It is in this manner: **The head and the right leg** first, and then **the two forelegs, then the breast and the neck, and then the two flanks, and then the tail and the left leg.** Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: **It was sacrificed according to the quality** of its various sections, so that the best pieces were taken up first. **In what manner** is the animal brought up according to the quality of the pieces? It is in this manner: **The head and the right leg, then the breast and the neck, and then the two flanks, then the tail and the left leg, and then the two forelegs.**

Both the *tanna* of our mishna and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili agree – **בין תנא דידן ובין רבי יוסי** – The Gemara was compelled to say this because the *baraita* cites several opinions that disagree with the *tanna* of this mishna, and it provides explanations for all the approaches except for that of the *tanna* of this mishna. Consequently, Rava explains that the *tanna* here agrees in principle with Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, and they disagree only with regard to the technical application of that principle (Ritva).

Because the head has much bone in it, the leg is offered with it – **משום דרישא נמי ביה עצמות, קרבא רגל בהדיה** – Rashi (*Tamid* 31b) and others write that since the head is mostly bone and the leg is mostly meat, the two pieces complement each other. Others explain that the head is full of bones, as is the leg, which is why they should be sacrificed together (*Me'iri*; Rabbi Meir Arik, *Tal Torah*).

In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that according to ben Azzai, who maintains that the animal is brought up the way it walks when it is alive, the head and right leg are brought up first because when an animal walks, it first extends its head forward and then moves its leg.

And the other mention of fat – **ואידך פדר אחרניא** – Even though the term head is mentioned again in that verse as well, the Gemara does not ask about its purpose, since it is used elsewhere in the Gemara (*Hullin* 27a) to derive a *halakha* with regard to the flaying of the animal (Ritva).

והכתוב: "כל נתח טוב ירך וכתף!"
היא בכחושה.

The Gemara poses a question with regard to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili's position: **But isn't it written: "Every good piece, the thigh and the shoulder"** (Ezekiel 24:4), indicating that these are the best cuts of the animal? Why doesn't Rabbi Yosei HaGelili say that these are offered first (Rabbeinu Ḥananel)? The Gemara answers: **That verse is speaking of a lean sheep, whose thigh and shoulder are indeed the best pieces. However, in the sheep brought for the daily offering, which were of the finest quality, there were other parts that were of higher quality.**

אמר רבא: בין תנא דידן ובין רבי יוסי –
בתר עילויה דבשרא אולינן, מר אזיל
בתר איברא דבישרא, ומר אזיל בתר
שמנא דבישרא.

The Gemara explains the reason behind the order of the pieces in the mishna. **Rava said: Both the *tanna* of our mishna and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili agree^N that we follow the relative quality of the meat in the various pieces. The difference in opinion between them is that one Sage, the *tanna* of this mishna, follows the limb, i.e., the amount, of the meat; the other Sage, Rabbi Yosei, follows the fattiness of the meat.**

מאי טעמא סלקא רגל בהדי
רישא – משום דרישא נמי ביה
עצמות, קרבא רגל בהדיה.

The Gemara asks: According to all opinions, **what is the reason that the right leg goes up to the altar together with the head?** What is the connection between these two pieces? The Gemara explains: **Because the head has much bone in it, the leg is offered with it.^N**

דכולי עלמא מיהת ראש קרב ברישא,
מנא לן? דתנא: מניין לראש ופדר
שקודמין לכל האברים – תלמוד לומר:
"את ראשו ואת פדרו וערך." ואידך
פדר אחרניא

The Gemara asks further: Although the Sages disagree as to the order of bringing up the various pieces, **at any rate everyone agrees that the head is sacrificed first. From where do we derive this?** As it was taught in a *baraita*: **From where is it derived that when sacrificing an animal the head and the fat precede all the other limbs? The verse states: "And he shall cut it up into its pieces and its head and its fat, and the priest shall arrange them on the wood that is on the fire upon the altar"** (Leviticus 1:12). The Gemara asks: **And the other mention of fat^N before this, where the verse states: "The pieces, the head and the fat"** (Leviticus 1:8),

Perek II

Daf 26 Amud a

למאי אתא – לכדתנא: ביצר היה
עושה – נותן את הפדר אבית
השחיטה ומעלהו, וזה הוא דרך כבוד
של מעלה.

what does that come to teach us? The Gemara explains: **As it was taught in a *baraita*: In what manner would the priest placing the pieces on the altar do so? He would place the fat right over the place of slaughter,^H that is, on the cut neck, and bring it up that way, and that is the most respectful way toward the Most High, that the bloody point of slaughter not be exposed.**

מתני' הפנים השלישי: חדשים
לקטורת באו והפסו. והרביעי: חדשים
עם ישנים, מי מעלה אברים מן הכבש
למזבח.

MISHNA Before the third lottery,^H the appointee declared: Let only those priests who are new to offering the incense come and participate in the lottery for the incense. The fourth lottery^H was open to those new to the service along with those old hands who had already performed it, to determine who would take the limbs up from the ramp,^N where they had been placed earlier, to the altar.

גמ' תנא: מעולם לא שנה אדם בה.
מאי טעמא? אמר רבי חנינא: מפני
שמעשרת.

GEMARA A Sage taught in the *Tosefta*: **No person ever performed the service of the incense twice, as a new priest was always found for this service. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that they were insistent that no priest should be assigned this task more than once in his life? Rabbi Ḥanina said: It is because it brings wealth to the one who performs it. Since bringing the incense was a blessing for wealth, it was decided that as many different priests as possible should have an opportunity to do this service.**

HALAKHA

He would place the fat right over the place of slaughter – **נותן את הפדר אבית השחיטה**: When the head of the sacrificial animal is carried to the ramp, it is held with its cut throat facing up and covered with the fat (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:11).

The third lottery – **הפנים השלישי**: For the third lottery the appointee says to the members of the priestly family serving on that day: Whoever has never burned the incense should come and participate in the lottery (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:7).

The fourth lottery – **הפנים הרביעי**: The fourth lottery includes all the members of the priestly family serving on that day and determines which individuals will merit the right to carry the animal's limbs up the ramp to the altar (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:8).

NOTES

מי מעלה – **מי מעלה** – The early commentaries debate this point. According to Rashi and *Tosafot*, it appears that a single priest carried all the limbs up the ramp to the altar. However, the Ritva and others are of the opinion that six priests won the privilege of performing the service of carrying the limbs up to the altar, just as six priests carried them to the ramp.