

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 אחרינא** – 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 דבשרא, ומר אזיל בתר
שמנא דבשרא.

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 agreeⁿ 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 נפיש 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 אחרינא

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 fatⁿ 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: ביצד 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,ⁿ 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' הפינים השלישי: חדשים
לקטרת באו והפיסו. והרביעי: חדשים
עם ישנים, מי מעלה אברים מן הכבש
למזבח.

MISHNA Before the third lottery,ⁿ 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 lotteryⁿ 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 – **הפינים 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 – **הפינים 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.

Also make the same assertion concerning a burnt-offering – עולה נמי – According to *Tosafot Yeshanim*, it is possible that only the combination of both actions, burning the incense and performing the sacrifice of the burnt-offering, would cause the priest to become wealthy (*Hatam Sofer*).

This is frequent and that is infrequent – הא שביחא והא – לא שביחא: Rashi explains that burnt-offerings, since they may be offered by a private individual, are offered frequently, and it is not logical to say that all the priests involved in this offering would attain wealth. The Ritva, however, writes that besides the issue of wealth, there is a reason that both the burning of the incense and the sacrifice of a burnt-offering should be performed by new priests: Since both of these are burnt completely on an altar, they are considered to be of superlative importance. They should therefore be brought by new priests, full of excitement and alacrity, who have not yet become jaded by having performed the service many times. The Gemara's answer is that because there are so many burnt-offerings, it would not be possible to limit the service only to new priests as it is with the once-a-day incense.

A young Torah scholar who gives halakhic instruction – צורבא מרבנן דמורי: Early and later commentaries alike point out that many sources indicate that there were indeed teachers of Torah from other tribes, particularly from Judah. Most of the solutions given suggest that Rava's statement was not meant exclusively, and that there were of course individuals of other tribes who became teachers, either due to their superb personal traits, such as modesty, or because of their positions of leadership, as kings and the heads of the Sanhedrin were from Judah (see *Mikhtav MiHizkiyahu*). Some say Rava's emphasis is on the fact that specifically young scholars come from Levi and Issachar (*Binyan Ariel*). Yet another approach states that representatives of other tribes taught as members of courts, but not on their own (*Yefe Toar*).

HALAKHA

They did not hold a separate lottery for the daily afternoon offering – אין מפייסין על תמיד של בין הערבים – There is no separate lottery held for the daily afternoon offering. Rather, the priest who wins a particular privilege for the morning offering wins the privilege for the corresponding task in the afternoon service. The afternoon incense, however, is assigned through a separate lottery (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:8).

אמר ליה רב פפא לאבאי: מאי טעמא? אילימא משום דכתבי: "ישמו קטורה באפך" וכתבי בתריה: "ברך ה' חילו", אי הכי עולה נמי, הכתיב: "ובליל על מבחך"!

אמר ליה: הא – שביחא, והא – לא שביחא.

אמר רבא: לא משפחת צורבא מרבנן דמורי אלא דאתי משבט לוי או משבט יששכר, לוי – דכתיב "וורו משפטיוך ליעקב", יששכר דכתיב: "ובני יששכר יודעי בינה לעתים לדעת מה יעשה ישראל". ואימא יהודה נמי, דכתיב: "יהודה מחוקקי" אסוקי שמעתא אליבא דהילכתא קאמינא.

אמר רבי יוחנן: אין מפייסין על תמיד של בין הערבים; אלא בהן שזכה בו בשחרית – זוכה בו ערבית. מיתבי: בשם שמפייסין שחרית כך מפייסין בין הערבים! כי תנא ההיא – בקטורת.

והתנא: בשם שמפייסין לו שחרית – כך מפייסין לו ערבית! אימא: לה.

והתנא: בשם שמפייסין לו שחרית, כך מפייסין לו ערבית, וכשם שמפייסין לה שחרית כך מפייסין לה ערבית!

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: What is the reason for this assertion that the one who burns the incense becomes wealthy? If we say it is because it is written: "They shall put incense before You and whole burnt-offerings on Your altar" (Deuteronomy 33:10), and it is written immediately after that: "Bless, O Lord, his substance" (Deuteronomy 33:11), if so, we should also make the same assertion concerning those who perform the sacrifice of a burnt-offering,ⁿ since it is written in that same verse: "And whole burnt-offerings on Your altar."

Abaye said to him: There is a difference between the two: This, the sacrifice of a burnt-offering, is frequent, and that, the burning of incense, is infrequent.ⁿ There were many burnt-offerings, both obligatory and voluntary, brought during the course of a day, whereas the incense was burned only twice a day. It is logical to assume that the blessing of riches was not extended to the many priests who participated in the burnt-offerings, but to the few priests who performed the burning of the incense.

Apropos this passage in Deuteronomy, Rava said: You do not find a young Torah scholar who gives halakhic instructionⁿ unless he comes from the tribe of Levi or from the tribe of Issachar. The assertion with regard to the tribe of Levi is as it is written: "They shall teach Jacob Your ordinances and Israel Your law" (Deuteronomy 33:10). And the assertion with regard to the tribe of Issachar is as it is written: "And of the children of Issachar, men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel should do" (1 Chronicles 12:33). The Gemara asks: And say that scholars come from the tribe of Judah also, as it is written: "Judah is my lawgiver" (Psalms 60:9). Rava answers: While it is true that the tribe of Judah also taught Torah, in my statement I was speaking only of those who can draw conclusions according to the halakha. Although Judah produces great scholars, men capable of translating abstract analysis of the Torah into legal principles come from the two tribes mentioned.

§ Rabbi Yohanan said: They did not hold a separate lottery for the slaughtering and sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering.^h Rather, the same priest who won a particular privilege for the morning offering wins the privilege for the corresponding task in the evening, i.e., for the afternoon service. In this way, the morning lottery covered both services. The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: Just as they hold a lottery in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery in the afternoon. This shows that there was a separate lottery for the daily afternoon offering. The Gemara answers: When that *baraita* was taught, it referred only to the incense, which, as stated above, was given to a different priest each time it was offered.

The Gemara asks: But wasn't it taught in a *baraita*: Just as they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the afternoon. The masculine pronoun *lo* indicates that it is not referring to the incense, which is a feminine noun in Hebrew, but to the daily afternoon offering, which is described by a masculine noun. The Gemara answers: Change the wording of the *baraita* and say: *Lah*, using the feminine pronoun instead of the masculine *lo*, so that it is indeed referring to the incense.

The Gemara asks further: But wasn't it taught in another *baraita*: Just as they hold a lottery for it [lo] the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the afternoon; and just as they hold a lottery for it [lah] in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lah] in the afternoon. This *baraita* makes the statement twice, once using the masculine pronoun and once using the feminine pronoun, which shows that there was a separate lottery in the afternoon not only for the incense but also for the daily offering.

The lottery procedure for Shabbat – סדר הפייסות בשבת – On Shabbat additional services are performed, and the priestly rotation switches on this day. The morning lottery determines which priests of the outgoing watch will sacrifice the daily morning offering and the additional offering of Shabbat. A second lottery was held in the afternoon with the priests of the incoming watch, who performed the service of the daily afternoon offering (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:9).

All the priests would come in the morning – מייתי כולהו – A new lottery is held in the afternoon for the burning of the incense. However, if there are no priests of the priestly family serving on that day who have never performed this service, the priest who won the right to burn the incense in the morning is given the same privilege in the afternoon (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:8).

אמר רב שמואל בר רב יצחק: הכא בשבת עסקינן, הואיל ומשמרות מתחדשות.

Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzhak said: There is no contradiction. Here, in this last *baraita*, we are dealing with Shabbat,^N when a second lottery in the afternoon was necessary, since the priestly rotations are renewed each Shabbat.^H On Shabbat the outgoing watch of priests performs the morning service, and the incoming watch performs the afternoon service. Therefore, the same priest could not perform the service of both the morning and afternoon offerings, necessitating a second lottery on that day to designate priests for the various afternoon tasks.

ולמאי דסליק אדעתין מעיקרא נפישו להו פייסות! – מייתי כולהו מצפרא אתו, דזכי ביה שחרית – זכי, דזכי בערבית – זכי.

The Gemara asks: And according to what we thought initially, that there was a separate lottery each day for the daily afternoon offering, there would be too many lotteries, as the mishna states that there were just four lotteries daily. How was it conceivable even to consider such a possibility? The Gemara answers: The thought was that all the priests would come and assemble just once, in the morning,^{HN} for both lotteries, and the priest who would win the lottery for sacrificing the daily morning offering would win that privilege for the morning only, and the priest who would win the lottery for sacrificing the daily afternoon offering would win the privilege for the afternoon.

”הרביעי חדשים עם ישנים” וכו’. מתמתין דלא פרבי אליעזר בן יעקב. דתנן, רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אומר: המעלה איברים לכבש הוא מעלה אותן למזבח.

§ The mishna states: The fourth lottery 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 to the altar. The Gemara states: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov. As we learned in a mishna in tractate *Tamid* that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov says: The priest who takes the limbs up to the ramp is the one who takes them up from the ramp to the altar. In contrast, according to the mishna discussed here, it is implied that a different priest won the privilege for the latter service in the lottery.

במאי קמיפלגי? מר סבר: “ברב עם הדרת מלך”, ומר סבר: מקום שכינה לא אורח ארעא.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what do they disagree? One Sage, the *tanna* of the mishna discussed here, holds that it is proper to follow the verse: “In the multitude of people is the king’s glory” (Proverbs 14:28). It is a glorification of God for many priests to participate in the service, so different priests were assigned the task of taking the limbs to the ramp, and others were tasked with carrying them up the ramp to the altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, holds that it is not proper conduct in the place of the Divine Presence to have two sets of priests for these tasks, as it gives the appearance that the first set does not want to be bothered to take the limbs up to the altar.

אמר רבא: לא רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אית ליה דרבי יהודה, ולא רבי יהודה אית ליה דרבי אליעזר בן יעקב – דאם בן בצרו להו פייסות.

Rava said: Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, who holds that the same priest who brought the limbs to the ramp also brought them up to the altar, is not of the same opinion as Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that there is no separate lottery for the privilege of carrying the coal pan for the incense. And conversely, Rabbi Yehuda is not of the same opinion as Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov. As, if it would be so that these two Sages agreed with each other, there would be too few lotteries; there would be only three lotteries rather than four. Rather, one must say that according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, who maintains that there was no lottery held for taking the limbs up to the altar, there was a fourth lottery to determine who would carry the coal pan; and according to Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that there was no lottery for carrying the coal pan, there must have been a lottery for carrying the limbs up to the ramp.

ואי משפחת תנא דתני חמש – And if you find a *tanna* in a *baraita* who teaches that there were five lotteries for the Temple service,

NOTES

Here we are dealing with Shabbat – תבא בשבת עסקינן – *Tosafot Yeshanim* point out that this statement in the Gemara should have begun with the word: Rather, as this approach nullifies all the previous attempts to resolve the difficulty. However, according to the Rambam and others, it appears that this last answer does not void the previous resolutions given by the Gemara.

All the priests would come in the morning – מייתי כולהו מצפרא אתו – The Rambam apparently interprets this passage as follows:

The afternoon lottery was not a fixed practice in the Temple but was held only in the event that there were no new priests to bring the incense. If there were no such novices, the priest who performed the service in the morning repeated it in the afternoon. Because this afternoon lottery was not an everyday occurrence, it was not listed in the mishna among the regular lotteries (see *Sifah Yitzhak*). And when the Gemara claims that no priest ever performed the incense service twice, it means on two separate days.

BACKGROUND

Two vessels of frankincense – שְׁנֵי בִּזְיָכֵי לְבוֹנָה – When the priests arranged the shewbread on the table on Shabbat, they would place two bowls of frankincense on it as well. The following Shabbat, when they removed the bread, they would offer the frankincense and divide the shewbread among the priests. There are many disputes among the commentaries as well as among modern researchers as to the components of the incense, yet there are some elements about which there is almost no argument. One of these is the *levona*, frankincense, also used with most of the meal-offerings, which is identified as the sap derived from *Boswellia sacra*, or frankincense, trees.



Frankincense tree

HALAKHA

The time of the water libation – זְמַן נִסּוּךְ הַמַּיִם: A water libation was poured on the altar on *Sukkot* during the sacrifice of the daily morning offering. This is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yohanan (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 10:6).

הָיָה דָּלָא כְּרַבֵּי אֶלְיָעוּר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב וְדָלָא כְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה.

מתני' תמיד קרב בתשעה, בעשרה, באחד עשר, בשנים עשר, לא פחות ולא יותר. מיצד? עצמו בתשעה, בחג ביד אחד צלוחית של מים – הרי כאן עשרה.

בין הערבים באחד עשר, הוא עצמו – בתשעה, ושנים בידים שני גזירי עצים. בשבת באחד עשר; הוא עצמו בתשעה, ושנים בידים שני ביוכי לבונה של לחם הפנים. ובשבת שבתוך החג – ביד אחד צלוחית של מים.

גמ' אמר רבי אבא ואיתימא רמי בר חמא ואיתימא רבי יוחנן: אין מנסכין מים בחג אלא בתמיד של שחר. ממאי – מדקתני "ובשבת שבתוך החג ביד אחד צלוחית של מים." ואי סלקא דעתך בתמיד של בין הערבים מנסכין – בחול נמי משבחת לה!

the opinion of that *tanna* would be in accordance with neither the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov nor the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as these five lotteries would include one for carrying the coal pan and another one for taking the limbs up to the altar.

MISHNA The daily offering is sacrificed and its limbs are carried by nine priests, as mentioned in a previous mishna. These nine carry the limbs and the accompanying libations and meal-offerings. Occasionally, the service is performed by ten priests, occasionally by eleven, and sometimes by twelve priests; no fewer than nine and no more than twelve. How so? The daily offering itself is sacrificed by nine priests, as explained earlier. On the festival of *Sukkot* a priest in whose hand is a jug of water for the water libation is added, and there are ten priests. On *Sukkot*, a water libation is poured on the altar in addition to the standard wine libation.

In the daily afternoon offering, eleven priests participate in the service. How so? The daily offering itself is sacrificed by nine, and there are an additional two priests in whose hands are two logs that are placed on the altar.^N The mitzva of placing the two logs in the morning was assigned in the first lottery, as the Gemara explained earlier. On Shabbat, eleven priests participate. How so? The daily morning offering itself is performed by nine, and there are an additional two priests in whose hands are two vessels of frankincense^B that accompany the shewbread. This frankincense is burned on Shabbat. And on Shabbat that occurs within the festival of *Sukkot* there is an additional priest in whose hand is a jug of water for the water libation,^N for a total of twelve priests.

GEMARA Rabbi Abba, and some say it was Rami bar Hama, and some say it was Rabbi Yohanan, said: On the festival of *Sukkot* they pour the water libation only during the sacrifice of the daily morning offering and not in the afternoon.^H From where is this derived? It is derived from the fact that it is taught in the mishna: And on Shabbat that occurs within the festival of *Sukkot* there is a priest in whose hand is a jug of water, bringing the number of participating priests to twelve. And if it should enter your mind to say that they pour water during the daily afternoon offering also, if so, you find that there were twelve priests on a weekday as well, that is, during the intermediate days of the Festival: Nine priests for the daily offering, two to carry the logs, and one to pour the water.

NOTES

Two priests in whose hands are two logs that are placed on the altar – וּשְׁנַיִם בְּיָדֵם שְׁנֵי גִזְרֵי עֵצִים: The mishna does not mention the priest who brought the two logs in the morning, because it is dealing only with those services that were apportioned through the second lottery. The task of placing two logs in the morning was determined by the first lottery; the priest who won the privilege of removing the ashes from the altar also brought this wood, as the Gemara stated earlier (*daf* 22a; *Tosafot Yeshanim*).

The water libation – נִסּוּךְ הַמַּיִם: The Torah contains an explicit mitzva to perform a wine libation to accompany offerings. However, the mitzva of a water libation, wherein water is poured on the altar on *Sukkot* in addition to wine, does not appear in the Torah; rather, it is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. The description of the water being drawn from the Pool of Siloam and the procedure of this mitzva appear in tractate *Sukka*. The Sadducees, who rejected the Oral Law, took issue with the validity of this practice, but most of the nation followed the rabbinic traditions.

But wasn't it taught that sometimes there are seventeen – **וְהִתְנִיחַ שְׁבַע עָשָׂר**: The commentaries find this passage difficult, especially the claim that the *baraita* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov but with that of Rabbi Yehuda (see Rashi and *Tosafot*). Most early commentaries accept the interpretation of Rabbeinu Hananel along with his version of the text (see *Gevurat Ari*).

A ram is sacrificed by eleven priests – **אֵיל קָרֵב בְּאַחַד עָשָׂר**: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that this was all done to fulfill the verse: "In the multitude of people is the king's glory." When a particular service was required, it was inappropriate to economize with regard to the number of participants. On the contrary, an effort was made to include more priests.

A bull is sacrificed by twenty-four priests – **פָּר קָרֵב בְּעֶשְׂרִים – וְאַרְבָּעָה**: The question is raised in the name of the Ra'avad: How is it possible that a bull was cut into more pieces than a sheep, considering that the Gemara (*Hullin* 11a) teaches that pieces of a burnt-offering may not be cut further into smaller pieces? The suggested answer (see *Tosefot Rid* and Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura) is that the bull was not divided into more pieces than was the sheep, but since the pieces of the bull were so much larger, several priests were required to carry some of them. Others explain that since a bull is so large, it may be cut up in a manner different from that of the other animals at the outset, thus producing more pieces (see *Yad David*).

The libations of a ram and a bull – **נִסְכֵי אֵיל וּפָר**: The Torah lists the amounts of meal-offerings and wine libations that accompany the different kinds of animal offerings: One-tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a sheep, two-tenths of an ephah for a ram, and three-tenths of an ephah for an ox. One quarter of a *hin* of wine, equal to three *log*, is brought for a sheep, four *log* for a ram, and six *log* for an ox. The number of priests employed in bringing up these items depends on how many tenths of an ephah were offered for each particular animal.

If a single priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone – **אִם רָצָה לְהַקְרִיב מִקְרִיב**: The author of the *Mishne LaMelekh* asks: How was it determined which priest sacrificed an offering brought by an individual? According to Rashi the donor of the offering chose the priest to perform the service, whereas *Tosafot* (see comments of the *Noda Bihuda*) maintain that there was a lottery or a different system in place to assign this privilege.

תָּנִי רַבִּי חֵיִיא: פִּיּוּס פְּעֻמִּים שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר פְּעֻמִּים אַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר פְּעֻמִּים חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר פְּעֻמִּים שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר.

וְהִתְנִיחַ שְׁבַע עָשָׂר!

הֲהִיא דְלָא כְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אֱלָא כְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

מתני' אֵיל קָרֵב בְּאַחַד עָשָׂר, הַבָּשָׂר בְּחֲמִשָּׁה, הַקְּרָבִיִּים וְהַסּוֹלֹת וְהַיַּיִן בְּשָׁנִים שְׁנַיִם, פָּר קָרֵב בְּעֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה: הָרֹאשׁ וְהָרֵגֶל, הָרֹאשׁ – בְּאַחַד, וְהָרֵגֶל – בְּשָׁנִים. הָעוֹקֵץ וְהָרֵגֶל: הָעוֹקֵץ – בְּשָׁנִים, וְהָרֵגֶל – בְּשָׁנִים. הַחֹזֶה וְהָגֵרָה; הַחֹזֶה – בְּאַחַד, וְהָגֵרָה – בְּשָׁלֹשָׁה. שְׁתֵּי יָדַיִם בְּשָׁנִים, וְשְׁתֵּי דַפְנוֹת בְּשָׁנִים. הַקְּרָבִיִּים וְהַסּוֹלֹת וְהַיַּיִן בְּשָׁלֹשָׁה שְׁלֹשָׁה.

בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים – בְּקָרְבָּנוֹת צִיבוּר, אֲבָל בְּקָרְבַּן יְחִיד אִם רָצָה לְהַקְרִיב מִקְרִיב. הַפְּשִׁיטָן וְנִיתוּחָן שֶׁל אֵילוֹ וְאֵילוֹ שְׁוִיין.

Rabbi Hiyya taught: Sometimes thirteen priests were involved in sacrificing the daily offering, all these tasks being assigned in the second lottery, as the mishna taught earlier. But sometimes fourteen priests are chosen in this manner to participate, since on *Sukkot* an additional priest is chosen to pour the water libation. And sometimes fifteen priests are chosen, on Shabbat, when two priests are tasked with burning the frankincense in the vessels. And sometimes sixteen priests are chosen, on Shabbat that occurs during *Sukkot*, when three extra priests are added: One to pour the water and two to burn the frankincense.

The Gemara asks with regard to Rabbi Hiyya's statement: **But wasn't it taught** in a *baraita* that sometimes there are seventeen^N priests involved in the daily offering?

The Gemara responds: **That baraita is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov but is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.** The seventeenth task of the daily morning offering referred to in the *baraita* is taking up the pieces of the offering from the ramp to the altar. According to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, this task was not assigned to a new priest but was performed by the same priests who had brought the pieces to the ramp. The *baraita*, which does assign this task to a seventeenth priest, is therefore not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. As the Gemara explained earlier, the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov are mutually exclusive; consequently, since the *baraita* contradicts the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, it must be in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Hiyya, however, adopted the view of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, and for this reason he taught that the maximum number of tasks assigned through the second lottery is only sixteen.

MISHNA A ram that is brought for a communal burnt-offering is sacrificed by eleven priests.^{NH} The flesh on the various limbs is taken by five priests, as in the case of the sheep of the daily offering. The intestines, and the fine flour of the meal-offering, and the wine of the libation are carried by two priests each, because the meal-offering and wine libation that accompany a ram are larger than those that accompany a sheep. A bull is sacrificed by twenty-four priests.^{NH} How so? The head and the right leg are sacrificed first, but due to its size the head is carried by one priest and the leg by two. The tail and the left leg are carried as follows: The tail is sacrificed by two and the leg by two. The breast and the neck are carried as follows: The breast is offered by one and the neck by three priests. The two forelegs are carried by two priests, and the two flanks are carried by two. The intestines and the fine flour and the wine are carried by three each, because the meal-offering and wine libation that accompany a bull are larger than those that accompany a ram.^N

In what case is this statement said, that this is the sequence followed? It is in the case of communal offerings. However, in the case of an individual offering^H brought to fulfill a vow or an obligation, if a single priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone,^N or if he chooses he may include other priests in the service. With regard to the flaying and the cutting of both these, individual offerings, and those, communal offerings, they are equal, as will be explained in the Gemara.

HALAKHA

A ram that is brought for a communal burnt-offering is sacrificed by eleven priests – **אֵיל קָרֵב בְּאַחַד עָשָׂר**: When a communal ram is sacrificed as a burnt-offering, it is carried up by eleven priests (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:17).

A bull is sacrificed by twenty-four priests – **פָּר קָרֵב בְּעֶשְׂרִים – וְאַרְבָּעָה**: A bull of a communal burnt-offering is sacrificed by

twenty-four priests (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:18).

The sacrifice of an individual offering – **הַעֲלֹאת קָרְבַּן יְחִיד**: The fixed number of priests involved in sacrificing a burnt-offering is limited to communal offerings. A greater or lesser number of priests may participate in the sacrifice of an individual's offering, as needed (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:19).

הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ בֹרֵךְ – Flaying and cutting by a non-priest: The flaying and cutting of offerings may be performed by non-priests (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 9:6).

NOTES

From where is it derived that flaying and cutting may be performed by a non-priest – **הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ בֹרֵךְ**... מניין להפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ בֹרֵךְ... The question is raised: Since the Torah does not specify anywhere that priests should perform these tasks, why would it need a special verse to teach that non-priests can perform them? Perhaps the Gemara feels that since only priests are involved with the sacrifice from the moment after the animal has been slaughtered, one might have thought that all actions from that point are restricted to them. This is why the Gemara cites a verse that shows that the priests' role is limited to placing the fire (*Gevurat Ari*). The statement of the Gemara here is substantiated by explicit passages elsewhere in the Bible (see II Chronicles 29:34, 35:11), which state that during the times of Kings Hezekiah and Josiah, these tasks were performed by Levites and not by priests (Rav Ya'akov Emden).

NOTES

But that verse is needed for its own sake – **הָאֵי מִיִּבְעֵי לֵיהּ** – לגופיה: The question is raised: Even if the verse were needed for its own sake, one could still say that since priests are mentioned in the context of placing wood on the altar, the implication is that those activities that preceded this, such as flaying and cutting up the animal, did not yet require priests. The question is answered as follows: One might have thought that the requirement of priests, appearing in the verse about carrying the blood, which precedes the verse about flaying, applies to flaying as well, since it is an activity performed directly on the sacrificial animal. The placing of wood, on the other hand, is not an activity performed directly on the animal, and therefore the requirement of priesthood in the verse about carrying the blood does not extend to it. Consequently, a specific verse is needed to show that flaying need not necessarily be performed by a priest (*Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosefot HaRosh*).

And he shall place his hands upon the head of the burnt-offering... and he shall slaughter – **וְיָשַׁחט יְדוֹ וְשַׁחט**: The commentaries question why the Gemara included this seemingly superfluous point, since the principle that non-priests may slaughter has already been derived from the fact that priests are not mentioned until the verse about carrying the blood. Some claim that this line is not actually part of the *baraita* brought by Abaye, as it is indeed absent from the parallel texts in tractate *Zevahim* and elsewhere. Rather, it represents part of Abaye's teaching to his son. Abaye taught him that since it was taught in the *baraita* that priests are required from the time the blood is collected, one can conclude that a non-priest may perform the slaughter and that the subject of the phrase "he shall place his hands" is the same as that of the phrase "he shall slaughter"; both refer to the donor of the offering (*Siah Yitzhak*).

גַּמְרָא: תנא: הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ שְׂוִין – בֹרֵךְ.

GEMARA A Sage taught in the *Tosefta*: The individual offerings and communal offerings are equal with regard to **their flaying and cutting**, in that these may be performed by a **non-priest**.¹⁴ They are not considered services that require priests.

אָמַר חִזְקִיָּה: מִנֵּיין לְהַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ שְׂוִין בֹרֵךְ – שְׂנַאֲמַר: "וְנָתַנוּ בְּיַד אֶהְרֹן הַכֹּהֵן אֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" נִתְיַנַּת אֵשׁ בְּעֵינֵי כַהֲנָנָה, הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ – לֹא בְּעֵינֵי כַהֲנָנָה.

Hizkiya said: From where is it derived that they are equal with regard to **their flaying and cutting**? From where is it derived that flaying and cutting of offerings, whether individual or communal, may be performed by a **non-priest**?¹⁴ At first it is stated with regard to the burnt-offering: "And he shall flay the burnt-offering and cut it into its pieces" (Leviticus 1:6), and following that it is stated: "The sons of Aaron the priest shall place fire on the altar" (Leviticus 1:7). The fact that the sons of Aaron are mentioned in the verse about putting fire on the altar but not in the verse about flaying and cutting teaches that **placing fire on the altar requires priesthood**, i.e., it must be performed by priests, but **flaying and cutting do not require priesthood**.

Perek II

Daf 27 Amud a

הָאֵי מִיִּבְעֵי לֵיהּ לְגוֹפִיָּה! אָמַר רַב שִׁימִי בַר אֲשִׁי, אֲשׁוּבַחְתִּיהָ לְאֲבִי דְהָהּ מִסְבֵּר לֵיהּ לְבָרִיָּה: "וְשַׁחט" – שְׁחִיטָה בֹרֵךְ כְּשִׁירָה. וְכִי מֵאִין בָּאתָ – מִכָּלל שְׂנַאֲמַר: "וְיָאֲתָהּ וּבְנִיךְ אֲתָךְ תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת כַּהֲנָתְכֶם" שׁוּמַע אֲנִי אֶפְּלוּ שְׁחִיטָה.

The Gemara asks: But that verse about putting fire on the altar is needed for its own sake,¹⁵ to teach that the wood must be brought by a priest; it should not be interpreted as an inference that other services, such as flaying and cutting, may be performed by non-priests. Rav Shimi bar Ashi said: I found Abaye explaining Hizkiya's derivation to his son based on the following *baraita*. It is written: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord" (Leviticus 1:5), with no mention of a priest, which teaches that **slaughter by a non-priest is acceptable**. The *baraita* continues: **Now, from where would you come to think otherwise? Why would one even suspect that a priest should be required to slaughter the offering, so that a specific verse is required to tell us otherwise? From the fact that it is stated: "And you and your sons with you shall keep your priesthood" (Numbers 18:7), I would derive that no part of the sacrificial service may be performed by a non-priest, not even slaughtering.**

תְּלַמּוּד לּוֹמַר "וְשַׁחט אֶת בֶּן הַבְּקָר לִפְנֵי ה' וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת הַדָּם", מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילֶךְ מִצְוֹת כַּהֲנָנָה. "וְיָשַׁחט יְדוֹ וְשַׁחט" – לִימּוּד עַל הַשְּׁחִיטָה שְׂכַשְׁרָה בֹרֵךְ.

The *baraita* continues: Therefore, the verse states: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord, and the sons of Aaron... shall sacrifice the blood" (Leviticus 1:5), from which it is inferred that **from the sacrificing of blood, which begins with the collection of the blood, and onward is a mitzva exclusively of priesthood**. Just prior to this the Torah states: "And he shall place his hands upon the head of the burnt-offering... and he shall slaughter¹⁶ the bull before the Lord" (Leviticus 1:4–5). In this verse the Torah is referring to the donor of the offering when it says: He shall place his hands, and therefore when it continues: And he shall slaughter, it is also referring to the donor. The Torah thereby taught that **the slaughter of the offering is acceptable if performed by a non-priest**.

מִכְדֵּי, מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילֶךְ מִצְוֹת כַּהֲנָנָה, "וְנָתַנוּ בְּיַד אֶהְרֹן" לָמָּה לִּי לְמַעוֹטֵי הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ.

Abaye asked: Since, as this *baraita* establishes, **from the collection of the blood and onward is a mitzva exclusively of priesthood, why do I need the Torah to say afterward: "The sons of Aaron shall put fire on the altar" (Leviticus 1:7)?** Since the verse about putting the fire on the altar follows the verse about collection of blood, it is clear that it must be done by priests, and the verse's stipulation of this fact appears superfluous. This is why Hizkiya concluded that the verse is not required for its own sake but is needed to teach the following inference: It is only the placing of fire on the altar that requires priests, **to the exclusion of flaying and cutting up the animal, which may be performed by a non-priest**.