The Gemara poses a question with regard to Rabbi Yosei HaGelli’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 HaGelli say that these are offered first? (Rabbeinu Hananel)? 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.

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 HaGelli agree 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.

The Gemara: 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.

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 leg 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 before this, where the verse states: “The pieces, the head and the fat” (Leviticus 1:8),

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; 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.

MISHNA Before the third lottery, 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 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,

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 Hanina 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.

Both the tanna of our mishna and Rabbi Yosei HaGelli agree –よいえるうえりにตอบするには、百人を割つて行けと。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 HaGelli, 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 – כְּלָשָׁן בְּכֵן כְּלָשָׁן. The early commentators 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 — 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 (Yomam Sofer).

This is frequent and that is infrequent: According to Rashi, an offering of 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 Riva, 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 halakic instruction — Early and later commentators alike point out that many sources indicate that there were indeed teachers of Torah from other tribes, particularly from the tribe of 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 Miktav Mitiyahnu). Some say Rava’s emphasis is on the fact that specifically young scholars come from the tribes of Levi and Issachar (Binyan Ariel). Yet another approach states that representatives of other tribes taught as members of courts, but not on their own (Yefei Tura).

They did not hold a separate lottery for the daily afternoon offering — As Rambam Kesef Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin Umesofer, a new priest was assigned a corresponding task in the afternoon service. The afternoon incense, however, is assigned through a separate lottery (Rambam Kesef Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin Umesofer a.8).

**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, since it is written in the 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 the incense, is infrequent. 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 halakic instruction 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 Yoḥanan said: They did not hold a separate lottery for the slaughtering and sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering. 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 offering 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 another 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.
Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzḥak said: There is no contradiction. Here, in this last baraita, we are dealing with Shabbat, when a second lottery in the afternoon was necessary, since the priestly rotations are renewed each Shabbat. On Shabbat the outgoing watch of priests 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.

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 in the morning – here we are dealing with Shabbat – 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.

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 up 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.

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.

And if you find a tanna in a baraita who teaches that there were five lotteries for the Temple service,
Two vessels of frankincense –

Two vessels of frankincense were placed 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, Hilkhos Temidin UMusafin 10:6).

GEMARA

Rabbi Abba, and some say it was Rabbi Yehuda, as the Gemara explained earlier. On Sukkot, twelve 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 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 libration, for a total of twelve priests.

Two priests in whose hands are two logs that are placed on the altar –

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 25a, Tosafot Yehezkin).

The water libration –

The Torah contains an explicit mitzva to perform a wine libration to accompany offerings. However, the mitzva of a water libration, 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 from 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 Saducees, who rejected the Oral Law, took issue with the validity of this practice, but most of the nation followed the rabbinic traditions.
Rav Ashi said: We too have learned this in a different mishna, that the water libration was offered only in the morning, as it was taught: And they would say to the poure: Raise your hand (so everyone will see as you pour the water into the aperture on the altar, in accordance with the proper procedure. This was done because one time a Sadducee priest, who did not accept that there is a mitzva of water libation, poured the water onto his feet, whereupon all the people pelted him with their etrogim in anger. Since the episode involved etrogim, it is apparent that it took place in the morning, when people have their etrogim with them. Since the mishna mentions the fact that it was etrogim that were used to pelt the priest, it is apparently coming to teach that the water libration takes place only in the morning. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is so.

It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai says: From where is it derived that the daily afternoon offering requires that two logs be brought along with it, and that they must be brought by two priests? As it is stated with regard to the burnt-offering: “The sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar and lay out wood” (Leviticus 1:7). The word etzim is plural, which teaches that two logs are called for. If this is not applicable to the daily morning offering, as it is already written about the morning offering explicitly: “And the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and arrange the burnt-offering on it” (Leviticus 6:5), apply it to the daily afternoon offering. The verse therefore teaches us that two logs should be added before that offering.

But say that this and this, i.e., both verses cited above, are dealing with the daily morning offering, and that the Merciful One states in the Torah: Perform the arrangement of wood and then return and perform it again. In other words, perhaps the Torah’s intention is that two logs be arranged on the altar twice in the morning, and that accounts for the two verses. The Gemara rejects this possibility: If it were so, the text should use the same expression both times and say: And he shall burn wood on it, and again: And he shall burn wood on it. Since the text does not do so, but instead employs two different verbs, saying: They shall lay out wood once and: He shall burn wood the second time, this indicates that the Torah is describing two different times.

The Gemara rejects this inference: If the Merciful One had written in the Torah: And he shall burn wood on it twice, I would have said it means that one priest should arrange the wood, not two. The change of terminology to a plural verb is therefore necessary because it teaches us that one priest should perform it the first time and two priests should perform it the second time, but they are both performed in the morning.

The Gemara rejects this: If so, if this were what the Torah wished to indicate, the verse should say: And he shall burn wood in the singular, and then, in the second verse, say: And they shall burn wood, in the plural, using the same verb both times, changing only the number of the verb. Or, alternatively, the verse should say: And he shall lay out wood, in the singular, and then, in the second verse, say: And they shall lay out wood, in the plural. What is the reason the Torah uses two different verbs in the two verses, stating: And he shall burn wood and then: And they shall lay out wood? Learn from this as we have said, that the Torah in these two verses is referring to two separate times of day, and the verse: They shall lay out wood (etzim) is referring to the daily afternoon offering, mandating that at that time they, i.e., two priests, shall lay out etzim, the plural term for wood, referring to two logs.
The libations of a ram and a bull – if a single priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone; if a double priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone. The question is raised in the name of the Rambam: How is it possible that a 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 – 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 – the author of the Mishne LaMekhilah 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.

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 there are seventeen 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. 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. 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.

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 brought to fulfill a vow or an obligation, if a single priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone, 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 – when a communal ram is sacrificed as a burnt-offering, it is carried up by eleven priests (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma’aseh Ha-Korbanot 6:18). The sacrifice of an individual offering – the baraita states: 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 Ha-Korbanot 6:19).
Flaying and cutting by a non-priest – renters of the blood.

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 priest’s role is limited to placing the fire (Genavot Airi). The statement of the Gemara here is substantiated by explicit passages elsewhere in the Bible (see 2 Chronicles 30:4, 31:11), which state that during the times of Kings Hezekiah and Josiah, these tasks were performed by Levites and not by priests (Rav Yißakov Emden).

From where is it derived that flaying and cutting may be performed by a non-priest – renters of the blood?

The Gemara asks: But that verse about putting fire on the altar is needed for its own sake, 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 flaying and cutting.