

Flaying and cutting by a non-priest – **הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ בֹרֵךְ**: 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 – **מֵיָּנִין לְהַפֶּשֶׁט 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).

**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.<sup>11</sup> They are not considered services that require priests.

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?<sup>12</sup> 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.

**גמ'** תנא: הפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ שְׁוִין – בֹרֵךְ.

אמר חזקיה: מניין להפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ שְׁוִין בֹרֵךְ – שנאמר: "וְנָתַנוּ בְּיָד אֶהָרֶן הַכֹּהֵן אֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" נְתִיבַת אֵשׁ בְּעֵינֵי כֹהֵנָה, הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ – לֹא בְּעֵינֵי כֹהֵנָה.

NOTES

But that verse is needed for its own sake – **הָאֵי מִיִּבְעֵי לֵיהּ – לְגוֹפִיָּה**: 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 – **יָסַמְךָ יְדוֹ וְשַׁחֲטֵהוּ**: 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*).

The Gemara asks: But that verse about putting fire on the altar is needed for its own sake,<sup>13</sup> 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.

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 slaughter<sup>14</sup> 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.

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.

Perek II  
Daf 27 Amud a

האי מיבְעֵי לֵיהּ לְגוֹפִיָּה! אָמַר רַב שִׁמִּי בַר אֲשִׁי, אֲשֶׁרְבַחְתִּיהּ לְאַבְיִי דְהוּא מְסַבֵּר לֵיהּ לְבִרְיָהּ: "וְשַׁחֲטֵהוּ" – שְׁחִיטָה בֹרֵךְ כְּשִׁירָה. וְכִי מֵאִין בָּאֵת – מִכָּלֵל שְׁנֵאמַר: "וְיָאֵתָהּ וּבְנִיךְ אֵתְךָ תִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת כֹּהֲנֵיכֶם" שׁוּמַע אֲנִי אֶפְּלוּ שְׁחִיטָה.

תלמוד לומר "וְשַׁחֲטֵהוּ אֵת בֶּן הַבְּקָר לִפְנֵי ה' וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְנֵי אֶהָרֶן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת הַדָּם", מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילָךְ מִצְוֹת כֹּהֲנָה. "יָסַמְךָ יְדוֹ וְשַׁחֲטֵהוּ" – לִימַד עַל הַשְׁחִיטָה שְׁכִשְׁרָה בֹרֵךְ.

מִכְּדֵי, מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילָךְ מִצְוֹת כֹּהֲנָה, "וְנָתַנוּ בְּיָד אֶהָרֶן" לָמָּה לִי? לְמַעוֹטֵי הַפֶּשֶׁט וְיִתְרוֹ.

ואֶכְתִּי אִיצְטְרִיךְ, סִלְקָא דְעֵתְךָ אֲמִינָא:  
כִּיּוֹן דְּלָאוּ עֲבוּדָה דְּמַעֲכָבָא כְּפָרָה  
הִיא – לֹא תִבְעֵי כְּהוֹנָה, קָא מְשַׁמַּע  
לָן דְּבַעֵי כְּהוֹנָה!

אֵלֶּא מִהֶכָּא: "וְעֲרֹכוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים  
אֶת הַנֶּחֱסִים אֶת הָרֹאשׁ וְאֶת הַפָּדִי",  
מִכְדֵּי, מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילָךְ מִצּוֹת כְּהוֹנָה  
"וְעֲרֹכוּ" לְמָה לִּי? לְמַעוּטֵי הַפֶּשֶׁט  
וּנְהִיתוּ.

וְאִימָא לְמַעוּטֵי סִידוּר שְׁנֵי גְזֵרֵי עֲצִים!  
מִסְתַּבְּרָא: דִּיבְחָא דְכֹוֹתִיָּה מִמַּעַט.

אֲדַרְבָּה, סִידוּר דְכֹוֹתִיָּה מִמַּעַט!

לֹא סִלְקָא דְעֵתְךָ, דְאָמַר מָר: "וְהִקְרִיב  
הַכֹּהֵן אֶת הַכֹּל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" – זוּ הוֹלֵכֶת  
אֲבָרִים לְכַבֵּשׁ. הוֹלֵכֶת אֲבָרִים לְכַבֵּשׁ –  
הוּא דְבַעֵי כְּהוֹנָה, הוֹלֵכֶת עֲצִים –  
לֹא בַעֵי כְּהוֹנָה, הָא סִידוּר שְׁנֵי גְזֵרֵי  
עֲצִים – בַּעֵי כְּהוֹנָה.

"וְעֲרֹכוּ" לְמָה לִּי? לְמַעוּטֵי הַפֶּשֶׁט  
וּנְהִיתוּ. וְאִימָא הָכִי נִמְי לְגוֹפִיָּה!

The Gemara asks: **But still**, the verse about the placement of wood by priests is **necessary** for its own sake. As **it might have entered your mind to say** that since placing the wood is **not a service that is indispensable** for obtaining atonement, as atonement is achieved solely through the blood of the offering, it should **not be required** to be performed by **priests**. And one might have thought that the principle that all tasks from the collection of the blood and onward require a priest applies only to services relating to the blood. Therefore, the verse **teaches us** that nevertheless, **priesthood is required**. Consequently, it cannot be asserted that the verse is written for the purpose of excluding other services.

Rather, Hizkiya's derivation must be rejected, and the acceptability of non-priests for flaying and cutting the animal must be learned from here: It is written: "And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall lay out the pieces, the head and the fat" (Leviticus 1:8). Since, as the *baraita* above establishes, from the collection of the blood and onward is a *mitzva* exclusively of **priesthood**, why do I need the verse to specify: "And Aaron's sons shall lay out the pieces"? Since the specification of priesthood here appears superfluous, one must conclude that it is written not for its own sake but to **exclude flaying and cutting up** the animal, to teach that those acts need not be performed by a priest.

The Gemara asks: Granted, the verse comes to convey the inference that another act does not require priesthood, **but say** that it comes to **exclude the arrangement of the two logs**, to teach that this activity may be done by a non-priest. The Gemara rejects this: **It is more reasonable** that the verse, which deals with laying out the pieces of the offering on the altar, would **exclude a service that is similar to itself**, i.e., something related to the body of the sacrificial animal, such as flaying it and cutting it up, rather than the arrangement of the wood, which is not related to the animal itself.

The Gemara responds: **On the contrary**, one should say that it **excludes** something relevant to **arrangement**, i.e., the placement of the logs, **which is similar** to the laying of the pieces of the offering in that both pertain to the placement of an item on the altar. Perhaps, then, the verse is coming to convey the inference that the arrangement of the logs, unlike the arrangement of the pieces of the offering, may be performed by a non-priest.

The Gemara rejects this argument: **It cannot enter your mind** to say this, as **the Master said**: After mentioning the *mitzva* to collect the blood, the Torah states: "And the priest shall bring all of it near and burn it on the altar" (Leviticus 1:13), where bringing near is referring to **carrying the limbs to the ramp**. The specification of priesthood in this verse is not required for its own sake, since all services following the collection of blood require priesthood. Therefore, it must be that it comes to convey the inference that **it is only carrying the limbs to the ramp that requires priesthood**, but **carrying wood<sup>h</sup>** to the altar **does not require priesthood**. This, in turn, implies that the actual arrangement of the two logs, which was not excluded, **does require priesthood**.

The Gemara returns to the derivation presented above, where the question was raised: **Why do I need** the words "and Aaron's sons shall lay out the pieces"? The conclusion was that the specification of priesthood here comes to **exclude flaying and cutting up** the animal, to teach that these acts may be performed by a non-priest. The Gemara now rejects this derivation: **But say that this verse too is necessary for its own sake<sup>n</sup>**, to teach the lesson that the Gemara will shortly derive from these words (Maharsha), and one can no longer assert that the verse comes solely for the purpose of conveying the inference that other, similar acts, i.e., flaying and cutting up the animal, do not require priesthood.

**HALAKHA**

Carrying wood – הוֹלֵכֶת עֲצִים: Carrying wood to the altar is not a sacred service and may be performed by a non-priest (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 9:6).

**NOTES**

But say that this verse too is necessary for its own sake – וְאִימָא הָכִי נִמְי לְגוֹפִיָּה: The later commentaries point out that this sentence appears to be difficult. Indeed, most of the early commentaries appear not to have had this line in their text at all (see *Mishhat Aharon*).

The lamb requires six – טְלָה בְּשִׁישָׁה: The lamb of a communal burnt-offering is taken to the altar by six priests (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh Hakorbanot* 6:10).

אֵלֶּיךָ: וְהִקְטִירוּ הַכֹּהֵן אֶת הַכֹּל לְמֵאֵי אֶתָּא – לְמַעַנְטֵי הַפֶּשֶׁט וְנִיתְּוָח.

Rather, this derivation must be rejected as well, and another verse must be found from which to prove that non-priests may flay and cut up the animal. The Torah states: **“And the priest shall burn all of it on the altar”** (Leviticus 1:9). Since this is an act following the collection of the blood, the specification of priesthood is not needed for its own sake. Therefore, for what purpose does that verse come? It comes to exclude flaying and cutting up the animal, which may be performed by a non-priest.

וְהִקְרִיב הַכֹּהֵן אֶת הַכֹּל הַמְּזֻבָּחָה – זוּ הוֹלֶכֶת אֲבָרִים לְכַבֵּשׁ. הוֹלֶכֶת אֲבָרִים לְכַבֵּשׁ – הוּא דְבַעֲיָא כְּהוֹנָה, הוֹלֶכֶת יַעֲצִים – לֹא בַעֲיָא כְּהוֹנָה, הָא סְדוּר שְׁנֵי גְזִירֵי יַעֲצִים – בַּעֲיָא כְּהוֹנָה, וְנִתְּנוּ – לְגוּפֵיהּ.

The Gemara reviews the lessons taught by the other verses cited above. When the Torah writes: **“The priest shall bring all of it near...the altar”** (Leviticus 1:13), this is referring to carrying the limbs to the ramp, and the verse comes to exclude other, similar actions, teaching that although carrying the limbs to the ramp requires priesthood, carrying wood to the altar does not require priesthood. Therefore, it is derived from here as well that the arrangement of the two logs does require priesthood, as explained above. And when the Torah writes: **“The sons of Aaron shall put fire on the altar”** (Leviticus 1:7), this is necessary for its own sake, to teach that this service must be done by priests.

וְעָרְכוּ – שְׁנַיִם, בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן – שְׁנַיִם, הַכְּהֹנִים – שְׁנַיִם, לְמַדְנֵי לְטָלָה שְׁטַעוֹן שְׁשָׁה.

When the Torah states: **“And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall lay out the pieces, the head and the fat”** (Leviticus 1:8), it comes to teach the following: **“And they shall lay out,”** through the use of the plural, teaches that it must be done by two priests, as the minimum number implied by a plural word is two. **“The sons of Aaron,”** also in plural, indicates an additional two; **“the priests,”** also in plural, indicates two more. We therefore learn from this verse that the sacrificial lamb requires six<sup>H</sup> priests to carry its limbs to the altar. The flesh is taken by five priests, and the innards by one, as described in an earlier mishna.

אָמַר רַב הַמְּנוּנָא, קָשְׁיָא לִיהּ לְרַבִּי אֱלֵעָזָר: הָאִי בְּבִן הַבְּקָר כְּתִיב, וּבִן הַבְּקָר עֶשְׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה בְּעֵי! וְנִיתְּוָא לִיהּ: “עַל הַעֲצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל הָאֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר עַל הַמְּזֻבָּחַ” אִיזְהוּ דְבַר שְׁנַאֲמַר בּוּ יַעֲצִים אִשׁ וּמְזֻבָּחַ

Rav Hamnuna said that Rabbi Elazar posed a difficulty: This verse is written about a young bull, not a lamb; and a bull requires twenty-four priests. How, then, can this verse be used as the source that six priests are required to carry the limbs of a lamb? And he resolved the difficulty himself as follows: The same verse states: **“On the wood that is on the fire upon the altar”** (Leviticus 1:8),<sup>N</sup> all of which apparently teaches nothing new about the sacrifice. Therefore, it is seen as an allusion to the daily offering, which was a lamb, as what is an item about which it is stated that specially prepared wood and fire on an altar must be provided, and that pre-existing wood and fire do not suffice?

NOTES

עַל הַעֲצִים – אֲשֶׁר עַל הָאֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר עַל הַמְּזֻבָּחַ: Rashi writes that these words in the Torah are apparently superfluous, and for this reason they are seen as an allusion to the daily offering. In fact, however, all these words are expounded in the Gemara or other

exegetical *midrashim*. One could answer that this Gemara follows the Jerusalem Talmud, in which a verbal analogy is employed between Leviticus 1:8 and Leviticus 1:12, where an identical phrase appears. One of the two uses of the phrase is extraneous, and it alludes to the daily offering (*Be'er Avraham*).

HALAKHA

A non-priest who set up the arrangement of wood – וְשִׁיֵּדֵר – אֶת הַמְּעִרְכָּה: If a non-priest arranges the wood on the altar, he should dismantle it and a priest must then rearrange it, since the service is invalid if performed by a non-priest (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 9:9). This is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yoḥanan. Although Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement was rejected and revised because of Rabbi Zeira's question, it seems that the Rambam believes that Rabbi Zeira's objection was only with regard to the non-priest's liability and not to the corrective measure he mentions (*Kesef Mishne*).

הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים – זֶה טָלָה.

You must say that **this is the lamb** of the morning daily offering, concerning which the Torah commands that a new woodpile be prepared every day and that the altar must be lit anew each morning. Therefore, although the verse is ostensibly speaking of a bull, it also alludes to the lamb of the daily offering and to the fact that it should be brought by six priests.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲסִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: זֶה טָלָה שִׁיֵּדֵר אֶת הַמְּעִרְכָּה חַיִּיב. בֵּיצֵד הוּא עוֹשֶׂה – פּוֹרְקָה וְחוֹזֵר וְסוֹדְרָה. מֵאֵי אֲהֵי לִיָּהּ? אֵלָּא פּוֹרְקָה זֶר, וְסוֹדְרָה בְּהֵן.

§ Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: **A non-priest who set up the arrangement of wood<sup>H</sup> on the altar is liable** to receive the death penalty by God's hand for having performed an act that is restricted to priests, and the woodpile that he placed is invalid. **What should he do to repair the woodpile? He should dismantle it and then rearrange it.<sup>N</sup>** The Gemara is surprised at this: **What good would this do for the woodpile?** How would it help for the non-priest himself to rearrange the wood? It would be just as invalid as it was the first time. **Rather**, one must say that the **non-priest should dismantle** it, as there is nothing wrong with a non-priest dismantling the woodpile, **and a priest then rearranges it.**

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבִּי זֵירָא: וְכִי יֵשׁ לָךְ עֲבוֹדָה שְׂכֻשְׂיָרָה בְּלַיְלָה וּפְסוּלָה בְּיוֹם?

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to Rabbi Yoḥanan's teaching: **And do you have any service that is valid if performed at night and yet is invalid if performed by a non-priest?** A bona fide Temple service must be performed during the day. That the wood on the altar may be arranged while it is still nighttime shows that it is not a bona fide service, and therefore it should be permitted for non-priests to perform it.

וְלֵא? וְהָרִי אֲבָרִים וּפְדִיִּים! סוֹף עֲבוֹדָה דִּימְמָא הִיא.

The Gemara expresses wonder at Rabbi Zeira's equation of the two issues: **And** is there really **no** such thing as a service that may be performed at night but which is prohibited for a non-priest to perform? **Isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats** of offerings on the altar, which continues throughout the night, and yet it was taught earlier in this chapter that a non-priest who participates in that service incurs the death penalty? The Gemara rejects this objection: The burning of sacrificial limbs and fats, though it may be done at night, is not considered a nighttime service but **the end of the daytime service**, as it is merely the culmination of the sacrificial service that began during the day.

וְהָרִי תְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן! תְּחַלֵּת עֲבוֹדָה דִּימְמָא הִיא, דְּאָמַר רַבִּי אֲסִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: קִיֵּדֵשׁ יָדָיו לְתְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן – לְמַחַר אֵינּוּ צָרִיךְ לְקַדְּשׁ. שְׂכָבֵר קִיֵּדֵשׁ מִתְחַלֵּת עֲבוֹדָה. וְאֵלָּא קְשִׁיָּא!

The Gemara asks further: **But isn't there the removal of the ashes<sup>N</sup>** from the altar, which may be performed at night, and yet may not be done by a non-priest? The Gemara rejects this too: The removal of ashes is also not considered a nighttime service but **the start of the daytime service.**<sup>N</sup> And the proof for this is that **Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said:** If a priest has **sanctified his hands** at night by washing them **for the removal of the ashes, the next day**, i.e., after daybreak, **he need not sanctify his hands again, as he already sanctified them at the start of the service.** Rabbi Zeira's equation between services performed at night and services that may be performed by non-priests therefore remains intact. **If so**, the objection that he raised to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan remains **difficult.**

NOTES

**He should dismantle it and then rearrange it – פּוֹרְקָה וְחוֹזֵר וְסוֹדְרָה:** Some commentaries explain that the Gemara's question is what the priest should do to correct the situation, and it answers that the priest should dismantle and reassemble the wood. Then the Gemara asks what dismantling the wood achieves that should require a priest to do it. It answers that indeed a priest is not required for the dismantling, but only for the rearranging (*Hayyim Shenayim Yeshalem*).

**But isn't there the removal of the ashes – וְהָרִי תְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן:** Earlier in this chapter Rav and Levi debated the status of this service with regard to non-priests. Rav stated that a non-priest is not liable if he performs this act because it is not a service of placing but of taking away; Levi disagreed. However, the

Gemara's question here is valid even according to Rav, as even though he exonerates the non-priest for performing this service, he does not base his exoneration on the fact that it is a nighttime service but on a different reason (Ritva). According to the Jerusalem Talmud it seems that Rabbi Yoḥanan agrees with Levi's position that a non-priest is liable for removing the ashes. If so, this is certainly a valid challenge.

**Removal of the ashes is considered the start of the daytime service – תְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן תְחַלֵת עֲבוֹדָה:** One could ask: If removal of the ashes is considered the start of the daytime service, then the arranging of the wood on the altar, which is performed after that, should certainly be considered a daytime service. Some commentaries answer that the act of removing the ashes has

a fixed time and it does indeed serve as the start of the day's service. On the other hand, there is no set time to arrange wood on the altar. In fact, in the event that the previous day's wood is consumed in the middle of the night, new wood is placed there before the removal of the ashes for the purpose of burning the limbs and the fats (Ritva). Another approach argues that while removal of the ashes is performed at night, it holds a particular importance because it is the day's opening service. In that sense it is like slaughtering, which, due to its importance, is assigned through a lottery, although it may be done by a non-priest. Arranging the wood has no such importance because it does not signify the start of a service (Rashash).

It must have escaped Rava's mind – אֲשֶׁתְּמִיטָתָהּ: This remark of the Gemara is respectful toward Rava, as it suggests that he most certainly knew the teaching and it must have momentarily slipped his mind (*Hut HaShani*).

אֶלָּא כִּי אֵיתָמַר – הֲכִי אֵיתָמַר, אָמַר רַבִּי אָסִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: זֶר שְׁפִידֵר שְׁנֵי גִזְרֵי יַעֲצִים – חַיִּיב, הוֹאִיל וְעִבּוּדֵת יוֹם הִיא. מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּא: אֶלָּא מֵעַתָּה תִּיבְעֵי פִּיּוּס! אֲשֶׁתְּמִיטָתָהּ הֵיא דְתַנְיָא: מִי שְׂזָכָה בְּתְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן – זָכָה בְּסִדּוּר מַעֲרָכָה, וּבְסִדּוּר שְׁנֵי גִזְרֵי יַעֲצִים.

Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement must be revised, and one must posit that **when it was stated, this is how it was stated**. Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: **A non-priest who arranges the two logs on the altar is liable to receive the death penalty by God's hand, since it is a daytime service**. Rava strongly objects to this: **But if that is so, if arranging the two logs is a bona fide daytime service and is prohibited to non-priests on pain of death, it should require a lottery**; and yet in practice this service is not assigned by a lottery. The Gemara comments that **it must have escaped Rava's mind<sup>n</sup> that which is taught explicitly in a baraita**: The priest who was privileged to perform the removal of the ashes was also privileged with setting up the arrangement of wood on the altar and with placing the two logs.

לְמִימְרָא דְעִבּוּדֵת יוֹם בְּעֵינָא פִּיּוּס, עִבּוּדֵת לַיְלָה לֹא בְּעֵינָא פִּיּוּס? וְהָרִי אִבְרִים וּפְדָרִים! סוּף עִבּוּדָה דִּימְמָא הִיא. – וְהָרִי תְרוּמַת הַדָּשָׁן – מִשּׁוּם מַעֲשֵׂה שְׁהִיָּה.

Another difficulty is raised with regard to Rava's statement: **Is that to say that a daytime service requires a lottery and, conversely, a nighttime service does not require a lottery? Isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats on the altar, which is done at night and yet is assigned through a lottery?** The Gemara responds: That is not difficult, since the burning of the limbs and the fats is **the end of the daytime service**, as explained above. The Gemara asks: **But isn't there the removal of the ashes from the altar, which is a nighttime service and yet requires a lottery?** The Gemara answers: Indeed, a lottery should not have been required for that service, but one was instituted **due to the incident that occurred**, when the priests came to danger, as related in the mishna.

לְמִימְרָא דְעִבּוּדֵת יוֹם, וְשָׂזָר חַיִּיב עָלֶיהָ מִיתָה – בְּעֵינָא פִּיּוּס, אִין זֶר חַיִּיב עָלֶיהָ מִיתָה – לֹא בְּעֵינָא פִּיּוּס? וְהָרִי שְׁחִיטָה! שְׂאִינִי שְׁחִיטָה, דְתַחֲלַת עִבּוּדָה הִיא.

The Gemara asks further: **Is that to say that any service that is a daytime service and for which a non-priest would be liable to receive the death penalty requires a lottery, and conversely, a daytime service for which a non-priest would not be liable to receive the death penalty does not require a lottery? But isn't there the slaughtering of the daily offering, which may be performed by a non-priest and yet requires a lottery?** The Gemara rejects this point: **Slaughtering is different**, because **it is the beginning of the service** of the daily offering and is therefore considered important enough to warrant a lottery.

אָמַר מַר זוּטְרָא וְאֵיתִימָא רַב אֲשִׁי: וְהָאֵין לֹא תַנְנֵן לְהֵם הַמְמוּנָה: צָאוּ וּרְאוּ אִם הִגִּיעַ זְמַן הַשְׁחִיטָה. וְאֵילוּ זְמַן שְׁנֵי גִזְרֵי יַעֲצִים – לֹא קָתַנְיָא! הֵךְ דְלִית לָהּ תַקְנָתָא – קָתַנְיָא הֵךְ דְאֵית לָהּ תַקְנָתָא – לֹא קָתַנְיָא.

The Gemara asks with regard to the revised version of Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement: **Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said: But didn't we learn that it is not so that arranging the logs must be done during the day, as it was taught in a mishna: The appointed priest said to them: Go out and see if the time for slaughtering has arrived**. The mishna does not teach that the appointee said: **Go and see if the time for arranging the two logs has arrived**. This shows that the logs need not be placed after daybreak but may be arranged while it is still night.

לֹא קָתַנְיָא! הֵךְ דְלִית לָהּ תַקְנָתָא – קָתַנְיָא הֵךְ דְאֵית לָהּ תַקְנָתָא – לֹא קָתַנְיָא.

The Gemara rejects this argument: The reason the mishna mentions slaughtering is that it prefers to **teach** this statement with regard to **that which has no rectification** if it is done at night, such as slaughtering the offering, which is rendered irreparably invalid if done before daybreak. **It does not want to teach something that has rectification** if done at night, such as arranging the two logs, which can always be removed and replaced properly. However, the proper time for arranging the logs is indeed daytime.

וְאִיכָא דְאָמְרִי, מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבִּי זִירָא: וְכִי יֵשׁ לָךְ עִבּוּדָה שְׁיֵשׁ אַחֲרֶיהָ עִבּוּדָה, וּפְסוּלָה בְּזֶר?

**And some say** a different version of Rabbi Zeira's objection: **Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement that a non-priest who arranged the woodpile incurs the death penalty: And do you have any service that is not complete on its own but is followed by a different service, such as the arrangement of the two logs, and yet is invalid and is punishable by death if performed by a non-priest?** It was taught earlier in the chapter that a non-priest incurs the death penalty only for performing a service that is complete, i.e., a service that is not followed by other services that complete the task being performed.

NOTES

But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats, etc. – והרי – דיממא היא. והרי תרומת הדשן! תחילת עבודה דיממא היא. דאמר רבי יוחנן: קדש ידיו לתרומת הדשן – למחר אינו צריך לקדש, שכבר קדש מתחילת עבודה. אלא קשיא!

But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats, etc. – והרי – דיממא היא. והרי תרומת הדשן! תחילת עבודה דיממא היא. דאמר רבי יוחנן: קדש ידיו לתרומת הדשן – למחר אינו צריך לקדש, שכבר קדש מתחילת עבודה. אלא קשיא!

As we said – כדאמרין: According to the Maharsha, the word: Rather, should be added, so that the reading would be: Rather, it is as we have said, meaning that the Gemara is retracting the entire second version of Rabbi Zeira's question and returning to the original version. However, others interpret the Gemara differently.

Is that to say – למימרא: Rashi deletes this entire passage as well, up to the phrase: Mar Zutra, and some say: Rav Ashi said, for the same reasons he deleted the passage mentioned in a previous note.

BACKGROUND

Sanctified his hands – קדש ידיו: After a priest immerses in a ritual bath and dons the priestly garments, he must wash his hands and feet, referred to here as sanctifying one's hands.



Priests sanctifying their hands

והרי אברים ופדרים! – סוף עבודה דיממא היא. והרי תרומת הדשן! תחילת עבודה דיממא היא. דאמר רבי יוחנן: קדש ידיו לתרומת הדשן – למחר אינו צריך לקדש, שכבר קדש מתחילת עבודה. אלא קשיא!

אלא; אי אתמר – הכי אתמר, אומר רבי אסי אומר רבי יוחנן: זו שפידר שני גזירי עצים – חייב, הואיל ועבודה תמה היא.

מתקיף לה רבא: אלא מעתה תבעי פייס! ולא בעינא פייס! והתנא: מי שזכה בתרומת הדשן – זוכה בסידור שני גזירי עצים!

הכי קאמר: יפייסו לה בפני עצמה, כדאמרין.

למימרא דעבודה תמה וזו חייב עליה מיתה – בעינא פייס, אין זו חייב עליה מיתה – לא בעינא פייס? והרי שחיטה! שאני שחיטה דתחילת עבודה דיממא היא.

למימרא דעבודה תמה בעי פייס, עבודה שיש אחריה עבודה – לא בעי פייס? והרי אברים ופדרים! סוף עבודה דיממא היא. הרי תרומת הדשן? משום מעשה שהיה.

The Gemara expresses wonder at Rabbi Zeira's equation of these two issues: **But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats?**<sup>N</sup> The Gemara answers: That is not difficult, because the burning of the limbs and the fats is the end of the daytime service. The Gemara asks further: **But isn't there the removal of the ashes?** The Gemara rejects that argument: Removing the ashes is the start of the daytime service, as Rabbi Yohanan said: If a priest sanctified his hands<sup>b</sup> at night by washing them for the removal of the ashes, the next day, i.e., after daybreak, he need not sanctify his hands again, as he already sanctified them at the start of the service. Rabbi Zeira's equation between services that are incomplete by themselves and services for which a non-priest does not incur the death penalty therefore remains intact. If so, the question that he asked concerning Rabbi Yohanan's statement remains difficult.

Rather, Rabbi Yohanan's statement must be revised, and one must posit that when it was stated, this is how it was stated: **Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yohanan said: A non-priest who arranges the two logs is liable to receive the death penalty, since it is a service that is complete, i.e., it is not followed and completed by a subsequent service.** Although the burning of the limbs upon the altar follows the placement of the logs, that is considered to be an independent act, not the completion of the service of placing the logs. This is because the placing of the logs is done while still night, while the burning of the limbs cannot be done until daybreak.

Rava strongly objects to this: However, if that is so, the service of placing the two logs should require a lottery. The Gemara expresses surprise at Rava's comment: **And doesn't it require a lottery? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Whoever was privileged to perform the removal of the ashes is also privileged to perform the arrangement of the two logs?** There was in fact a lottery for arranging the two logs.

Rather, this is what Rava actually said: If placing the logs is considered a complete service and is therefore a task important enough to warrant the death penalty for a non-priest who performs it, they should hold a separate lottery for it by itself. The Gemara answers: It is as we said<sup>N</sup> at the beginning of the chapter, that the task of placing the logs was added to the lottery for the removal of ashes as an incentive for the priests to rise before dawn (Rabbeinu Hananel).

Based on Rava's comments, the Gemara asks: **Is that to say that any service that is a complete service and for which a non-priest would be liable to receive the death penalty requires a lottery, but if a non-priest would not be liable to receive the death penalty it would not require a lottery? But isn't there slaughtering, which may be performed by non-priest and yet requires a lottery?** The Gemara rejects this point: **Slaughtering is different, because it is the beginning of the daytime service, which gives it added importance.**

The Gemara asks further on Rava's statement: **Is that to say<sup>N</sup> that a service that is complete requires a lottery, whereas a service which is followed by a subsequent service that completes it does not require a lottery? But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats?** The Gemara answers: That is not difficult because the burning of the limbs and the fats is the end of the daytime service. The Gemara asks: **Isn't there the removal of the ashes?** The Gemara answers: A lottery was established for that service only due to the incident that occurred when the priests came to danger.