

By right [*midina*] – מדינא: Some commentaries read this as *modina*, meaning: I concur in this regard (Rabbeinu Elyakim). The term *midina* can also be interpreted as: With this I agree.

דאמר רמי בר יחזקאל: ים שעשה שלמה עומד על שנים עשר בקר שלשה פונים צפונה ושלשה פונים ימה ושלשה פונים נגבה ושלשה פונים מזרחה והים עליהם מלמעלה וכל אחריהם ביתה. הא למדת שכל פינות שאותה פונה לא יהו אלא דרך דרך ימין, למורת מר אית ליה דרמי בר יחזקאל, ומר לית ליה דרמי בר יחזקאל?

As Rami bar Yehezkel said: A verse describes the sea, the basin that Solomon built, in the following terms: “It stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east; and the sea was set upon them above, and all their hinder parts were inward” (II Chronicles 4:4). From the direction in which the text lists the groups of oxen under the basin, you learn that all turns that you turn should be only to the right and to the east side. Let us say that this Sage, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, is of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel, and this Sage, Rabbi Akiva, is of the opinion that the ruling is not in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel.

לא דכולי עלמא אית להו דרמי בר יחזקאל, והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: ילפינן פנים מחוץ, ומר סבר: לא ילפינן פנים מחוץ.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, everyone is of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel, but here they disagree with regard to this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, holds: We derive the order of the rite inside the Sanctuary from the manner of the sprinkling on the outside: Just as the priest sprinkles on the corners of the outer altar in that order, he sprinkles similarly on the inner altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds: We do not derive the order of the rite inside of the Sanctuary from the rite performed outside.

ורבי עקיבא: נהי דלא יליף פנים מחוץ, אי בעי – הכי נעביד, אי בעי – הכי נעביד! אמר לך רבי עקיבא: מדינא – בההוא קרן דפגע ברישא בההוא עביד ברישא, דאמר ריש לקיש: אין מעבירין על המצות.

§ The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, although he does not derive the inside from the outside, nevertheless if the High Priest wants, let him perform the rite in this manner, and if he wants, let him perform the rite in that manner. Why must he begin specifically at the southeast corner? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva could have said to you: Indeed, by rightⁿ he should begin sprinkling by that corner of the altar that he reaches first, as Reish Lakish said: One does not pass on an opportunity to perform mitzvot. If one has the chance to perform a mitzva, he should not put it off for later but should do it immediately.

ואמאי לא עביד – משום דכתיב “ויצא אל המזבח” – עד דנפיק מבוליה מזבח, ובין דיהיב בההוא קרן – הדר אתי לההוא קרן דאיתייב למיתב ברישא.

And why does he not do so; why does the High Priest not begin the sprinkling on one of the western corners? This is due to that which is written: “He shall go out to the altar,” meaning that he does not begin until he goes out from the area of the entire altar. And since he presents the blood at that corner on the outside of the altar, he then comes to that corner on the west side where he should have presented the blood first.

Perek V
Daf 59 Amud a

ואי בעית אימא: אי סבירא לן הקפה ברגל – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי דילפינן פנים מחוץ. והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: הקפה ביד, ומר סבר: הקפה ברגל.

And if you wish, say instead: If we hold that the encircling is performed by foot, i.e., the priest walks around the inner altar, everyone agrees that we learn the method of sprinkling inside from the sprinkling outside. And here they disagree about this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that the priest stands in his place and sprinkles on all the corners from there, which means his encircling is performed by hand; and one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that the encircling is done by foot.

ואי בעית אימא: דכולי עלמא הקפה ביד, והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: ילפינן יד מרגל, ומר סבר: לא ילפינן.

And if you wish, say instead: Everyone agrees that the encircling was performed by hand, and here they disagree about this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that we derive the *halakhot* of an encircling performed by hand from those of an encircling by foot, and therefore the ritual of the inner altar is the same as that of the outer altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that we do not derive the encircling performed by hand from the encircling done by foot.

Remained from the First Temple – נִשְׁתַּיֵּרוּ בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ רִאשׁוֹן – Some versions of the Gemara omit the word: First, and likewise in the Jerusalem Talmud this statement is associated with the Second Temple. *Tosafot Yeshanim* note that according to the current version of the text, the meaning of the Gemara is unclear, as differences of opinion only arose later, during the Second Temple period. One explanation is that although disputes that arose during the First Temple period were invariably resolved by the court, this issue was never openly discussed at the time, and therefore two High Priests could remember acting in different ways.

HALAKHA

Encircling by hand and by foot – הַקְּפָה בְּיָד וּבְרֶגֶל – The Rambam rules that the encircling was performed by foot, in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the mishna. Other authorities maintain that the *halakha* is in accordance with Rabbi Akiva that the encircling is performed by hand (Rosh; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:2).

Sprinkling on the pure gold of the altar – הוֹאֶה עַל טָהוֹר – After the High Priest removed the coals and ashes from the top of the inner altar, exposing its gold surface, he sprinkled the mixed blood of the bull and the goat on the top of the altar. This was performed on the side where he finished sprinkling on the corners, its southern side (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:2).

LANGUAGE

Diagonal [*alakhson*] – אֶלְכָסוֹן – From the Greek *λοξόν*, *loxon*, meaning crooked, diagonal, oblique. The equivalent Aramaic word is apparently *karnzol*.

וסבר רבי יוסי הגלילי הקפה ביד? והא מדקתני סיפא, רבי אליעזר אומר: במקומו היה עומד ומחטא – מכלל דתנא קמא לא סבירא ליה! אלא מתורתא כדשנינן מעיקרא: מר סבר הקפה ביד, ומר סבר הקפה ברגל.

§ The Gemara asks: **And does Rabbi Yosei HaGelili hold that the encircling is performed by hand? But from the fact that it is taught in the latter clause of the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: He stood in one place and sprinkled the blood from there, it can be learned by inference that the first *tanna*, whom the Gemara identified as Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, does not maintain that the rite is performed in this manner. Rather, it is clear as we originally answered, that one Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that the encircling is performed by hand; and one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that the encircling is performed by foot.**

ואי בעית אימא: בהא קא מפלגי, מר סבר: סביב דמזבח פנימי כסביב דמזבח החיצון, ומר סבר: כוליה מזבח פנימי במקום חדא קרון דמזבח חיצון קאי.

And if you wish, say instead that they disagree about this matter: **One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that the perimeter of the inner altar is like the perimeter of the outer altar, and one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that the entire inner altar stands in place of one corner of the outer altar.** Since the entire inner altar is only one cubit by one cubit, like a single corner of the outer altar, the *halakhot* of the outer altar are not relevant to the inner altar.

תנא אמר רבי ישמעאל: שני כהנים גדולים נשתירו במקדש ראשון, זה אומר: בידי הקפתו, וזה אומר: ברגלי הקפתו. זה נתן טעם לדבריו וזה נתן טעם לדבריו.

It was taught in a *baraita* that **Rabbi Yishmael said: Two High Priests remained from the days of the First Temple.^N This one says: I encircled by hand and sprinkled, and I did not encircle the perimeter of the inner altar by foot. And that one says: I encircled by foot. This one gave a reason for his statement, and that one gave a reason for his statement.**

זה נתן טעם לדבריו, סביב דמזבח פנימי כסביב דמזבח החיצון, וזה נתן טעם לדבריו: כוליה מזבח פנימי במקום חדא קרון דחיצון קאי.

The one who said that he encircled by foot gave the following reason for his statement: **The perimeter of the inner altar is like the perimeter of the outer altar, which is encircled by foot for sprinkling. And the one who said that he encircled by hand gave the following reason for his statement: The entire inner altar stands in place of one corner of the outer altar.** Just as for one corner of the outer altar, the priest sprinkles the blood by hand, the same applies to the entire inner altar.^H

רבי אליעזר אומר במקומו היה עומד ומחטא. מתניתין מני – רבי יהודה היא. דתנא: רבי מאיר אומר, רבי אליעזר אומר: במקומו עומד ומחטא, ועל כולן היה נתן ממעלה למטה, חוץ מאותה שבאלכסון שנותן ממטה למעלה.

§ It was taught in the mishna that **Rabbi Eliezer says: He stood in one place and sprinkled the blood from there.** The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the mishna? The Gemara answers: The mishna is taught in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda**, who explained Rabbi Eliezer's ruling in the following manner. As it was taught in a *baraita*, later *tanna'im* disagreed with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. **Rabbi Meir says that Rabbi Eliezer says as follows: He stood in one place and sprinkled, and on all of the corners he presented the blood from above downward, so as not to drip blood down the sleeve of his garment, except for that corner on the diagonal [*alakhson*]^L across from him.** Since it was difficult for him to sprinkle on that corner from top to bottom, he sprinkled from below upward.

רבי יהודה אומר, רבי אליעזר אומר: במקומו עומד ומחטא, ועל כולן הוא נתן מלמטה למעלה, חוץ מזו שהיתה לפניו ממש, שנותן ממעלה למטה, כי היכי דלא ניתוסן מאניה.

Conversely, **Rabbi Yehuda says that Rabbi Eliezer says: He stood in one place and sprinkled, and on all of the corners he sprinkled from below upward, as it is more convenient to sprinkle in that manner, except for that one which was directly before him, on which he would present from above downward.** The reason is so as not to dirty his garments with blood. If he sprinkled on the corner next to him from below upward, the blood might fall on his clothes, and he would have to change garments, as dirty priestly garments may not be worn for the Temple service.

היה ממנו על טהרו של מזבח. מאי טהרו? אמר רבה בר רב שילא: פלגיה דמזבח, כדאמרי אינשי: טהרו טיהרא, והוי פלגיה דיומא.

§ The mishna taught: **He sprinkled blood on the pure gold [*tohor*] of the altar.^H** The Gemara asks: **What is the meaning of the term *tohor*?** **Rabba bar Rav Sheila said: It means half of the altar, as people commonly say: *Tehar tihara*, the light of noon shines and it is the middle of the day.** Here, too, *tohor* of the altar means half the altar, i.e., he sprinkled on the midpoint of the altar wall.

He sprinkles neither on top of the ash – אינו מזה לא על גבי – האפר: This point is derived in the Jerusalem Talmud from the phrase “and sprinkle upon it” (Leviticus 16:19), meaning upon it and not upon its ash.

The north or the south side – בצד צפוני ודרומי: In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is explained that this dispute is based on the disagreement between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis as to whether the High Priest sprinkles from one position or encircles the altar by foot. According to this interpretation, he sprinkles on the altar's top from the same side where he stood to sprinkle on the corners.

מיתבי: כשהוא מזה אינו מזה לא על גבי האפר ולא על גבי הגחלים, אלא חותה גחלים אילך ואילך, ומזה. אלא אמר רבה בר רב שילא: על גלויה דמזבת, כדכתב ויכעצם השמים לטוהר.”

תנא, הנניא אומר: בצד צפוני הוא נותן. רבי יוסי אומר: בצד דרומי הוא נותן. במאי קמיפלגי? מר סבר: פיתחא בדרום קאי, ומר סבר: פיתחא בצפון קאי.

דכולי עלמא מיהא, היכא דגמרן מתנות דקרנות – התם, יהיב על גגו. מאי טעמא? אמר קרא: “וטהרו וקדשו” – מקום שקדשו שם טיהרו.

“שירי הדם היה שופך על יסוד מערבי של מזבת החיצון.” דאמר קרא: “ואת כל דם הפר ישפוך”, וכי נפיק – בההוא פגע ברישא.

“ושל מזבת החיצון היה שופך על יסוד דרומית.” תנו רבנן: “יסוד המזבת” – זה יסוד דרומית. אתה אומר יסוד דרומית, או אינו אלא יסוד מערבית?

אמרת: ילמד ירידתו מן הכבש ליציאתו מן ההיכל, מה יציאתו מן ההיכל – בסמוך לו, ואי זה – זה יסוד מערבי, אף ירידתו מן הכבש בסמוך לו, ואי זה – זה יסוד דרומי.

תנא, רבי ישמעאל אומר: זה וזה יסוד מערבי. רבי שמעון בן יוחאי אומר: זה וזה יסוד דרומי. בשלמא רבי ישמעאל קסבר: ילמד סתום ממפורש.

The Gemara raises an objection: When he sprinkles on the inner altar, he sprinkles neither on top of the ashⁿ nor on top of the coals; rather, he rakes and removes the coals to both sides and sprinkles. This indicates that this sprinkling was performed on top of the altar, not on its side. Rather, Rabba bar Rav Sheila retracted his previous interpretation and said: On *tohor* of the altar means on the exposed area of the altar, as it is written: “And the like of the very heaven for clearness [*letohar*]” (Exodus 24:10), which shows that *tohar* is an expression of clarity.

§ It was taught in a *baraita* that Hananya says: The priest presents seven sprinklings on the north side of the altar, and Rabbi Yosei says: He presents them on the south side. The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do they disagree? The Gemara explains: One Sage, Hananya, holds that the entrance was positioned in the south, and therefore the High Priest begins the sprinklings from that side. And one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that the entrance was positioned in the north,ⁿ and he therefore begins to sprinkle on the altar from the north side.

The Gemara comments: Everyone agrees in any case that in the place where he finishes the presentations of the corners, that is where he places the blood on the altar's top. They disagree only about the location of the final presentation, whether it is on the south or the north side. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this agreement? The Gemara answers that the verse states: “And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it and sanctify it” (Leviticus 16:19), which indicates that the place he sanctified by sprinkling blood, the corner of the altar where he sprinkled last, there he shall also begin to cleanse and sprinkle on top.

§ The mishna taught: And he would pour the remainder of the blood on the western base of the outer altar. The Gemara explains: The reason is that the verse states with regard to the sin-offering bull of the High Priest during the rest of the year: “And he shall pour out all the blood of the bull at the base of the altar of burnt-offering, which is at the door of the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 4:7), and when he goes out from the Sanctuary to pour the remainder of the blood, he first reaches that western side of the base of the altar.

§ The mishna further taught: And he would pour the remaining blood after the blood of an offering was sprinkled on the outer altar, on its southern base. The Sages taught in a *baraita*: “The base of the altar” (Leviticus 4:30), which is mentioned with regard to pouring the remainder of the blood of an individual offering, is the southern base. Do you say it is the southern base? Or perhaps that is not the case, but rather it is the western base?

You said: Let his descent from the ramp of the outer altar after sprinkling blood from the sin-offerings be derived from his exit from the Sanctuary with the remaining blood in his hand: Just as upon his exit from the Sanctuary he pours the remainder of the blood on the side closest to him, and which is that, it is the western base; so too, upon his descent from the ramp of the outer altar after sprinkling blood from a sin-offering, he pours the blood on the side closest to him, and which is that? It is the southern base, as when he descends from the ramp he turns to the right, i.e., the east, which means the southern base is the one closest to him.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yishmael says: Both this and that, the blood of an inner sin-offering and that of an outer sin-offering, were spilled at the western base of the altar. Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai says: Both this and that blood were spilled at the southern base. The Gemara asks: Granted, Rabbi Yishmael maintains that the *halakha* of outer sin-offerings, which is not clarified in the Torah, is derived from the inner sin-offerings, whose *halakha* is explicit: Just as the remains of the inner sprinklings are poured at the western base, so too, the remains of the outer sprinklings are poured at the western base.

The men pulled the man – מְשֻׁבוּה גְּבְרֵי לְגִבְרָא – *Tosafot* cite a version of the mnemonic that reads: The man pulled the men. According to this version, the statement of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai was reversed. The reference to men alludes to the fact that the names of two men are included in Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai's name, whereas Rabbi Yishmael contains just the one name.

HALAKHA

Misuses by unlawfully using blood – מוֹעֵלִין בְּדָמִים – The blood that flows out with the water from the Temple and that is sold to gardeners is subject to the prohibition of misuse of consecrated property if used unlawfully. According to the Ra'avad, this prohibition is by rabbinic law (*Ra'avad*). The Rambam, who rules that the prohibition applies by Torah law, apparently interprets the dispute in the *baraita* as referring to the blood before it is presented on the altar, but not to the blood sold to gardeners (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 2:11).

אֵלֶּיָּא רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן יוֹחָאי מַאי טַעְמָא? אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: קַסְבֵּר פְּתַחַא בְּדְרוּם קַאי.

However, with regard to Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai, what is the reason that he holds that both sets of remainders of blood are spilled at the southern base? Rav Ashi said: Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai maintains that the entrance of the Sanctuary is positioned at the south side of the altar, i.e., the altar is not located in the middle of the courtyard but to the north. Consequently, the southern base of the altar is closest to the High Priest's exit from the Sanctuary.

תֵּנָּא דְבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּדֵי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן יוֹחָאי: זֶה זֶוּה יְסוּד דְּרוּמֵית. וְסִימְנָךְ: מְשֻׁבוּה גְּבְרֵי לְגִבְרָא.

The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught a different version of his opinion, which they learned in the school of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: Both this and that, the blood of an inner sin-offering and that of an outer sin-offering, were presented at the southern base. According to this version, Rabbi Yishmael changed his opinion and agreed with Rabbi Shimon. The Gemara comments: And your mnemonic to remember the shift in opinion is: The men pulled the man,ⁿ i.e., the majority overruled the individual. In this case, the numerous students of Rabbi Shimon convinced the individual Sage, Rabbi Yishmael, to accept their ruling.

“אֵלוֹ וְאֵלוֹ מִתְעַרְבִין בְּאִמְהָ וְיוֹצֵאִין” וְכוּ. תֵּנּוּ רַבְנָן: מוֹעֵלִין בְּדָמִים, דְּבֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, וְחַכְמֵי אֹמְרִים: אֵין מוֹעֵלִין בָּהֶן.

It was taught in the mishna: These remainders of blood from the outer altar and those remainders of blood from the inner altar are mixed in the canal beneath the altar and flow out with the water used to rinse the area to the Kidron River, where they are sold to gardeners. Any blood that was not redeemed was subject to the prohibition against misuse of consecrated property. The Sages taught: One who takes these remainders without redeeming them misuses property consecrated in the Temple by unlawfully using blood,ⁿ which is consecrated and is Temple property. It is prohibited to use consecrated objects for mundane purposes, and one who does so is committing the sin of misusing consecrated property. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon. And the Rabbis say: One does not misuse consecrated property by benefiting from these remainders of the blood of offerings.

Perek V

Daf 59 Amud b

עַד כָּאֵן לֹא פְּלִיגי אֵלֶּיָּא מְדַרְבְּנָן. אֲבָל מְדַאֲוֵרֵיתָא – אֵין מוֹעֵלִין בָּהֶן.

The Gemara comments: The Rabbis disagree only with regard to misuse of consecrated propertyⁿ that applies by rabbinic law,ⁿ as it was the Sages who prohibited the use of blood; however, everyone agrees that by Torah law one does not misuse consecrated property by benefiting from these remainders of blood.ⁿ Clearly, the Temple treasurers would not have sold it to gardeners *ab initio* had the Torah prohibited the use of this blood (*Tosafot*).

מֵנָּא הֵינִי מֵיִלִּי? אָמַר עוּלָא: אָמַר קָרָא “לְכֶם” – שְׁלָכֶם יְהֵא. דְּבֵי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן תֵּנָּא “לְכַפֵּר” – לְכַפֵּרָה נִתְתִּיו וְלֹא לְמַעֲלָה.

The Gemara asks: From where are these matters, that there is no misuse for blood, derived? Ulla said that the verse states: “For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls” (Leviticus 17:11). “To you” indicates that it shall be yours. It is not the property of the Temple; rather, it belongs to all of the Jewish people. The school of Rabbi Shimon likewise taught that the phrase “to make atonement” teaches that God says: I gave it for atonement and not for the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects.

NOTES

Misuse of consecrated property – מְעִילָה: The *halakha* of misuse of consecrated objects is mentioned briefly in the Torah (see Leviticus 5:14–16), while the many details of its *halakhot* are discussed extensively in tractate *Me'ila*. Misuse [*me'ila*] is any unlawful benefit derived from consecrated objects, as one may not use something that has been consecrated to God for personal gain. The prohibition of misuse is severe in that even someone who acts unwittingly or by unavoidable accident is guilty of misuse and liable to bring an offering. Furthermore, although in most situations one is not held accountable for

the actions of his agent, this principle does not apply to cases of misuse. Tractate *Me'ila* details those instances when different types of offerings and other sacred items are subject to misuse and when this prohibition does not apply.

Misuse of consecrated objects by rabbinic law – מְעִילָה: Rashi distinguishes between misuse prohibited by Torah law, which entails the payment of an additional fifth of the misused amount, and misuse by rabbinic law, in which case only the original amount must be repaid. There is a further distinction between the two levels of misuse: An individual

who violates Torah Law brings the guilt-offering for misuse of consecrated articles. This is not the case for misuse that is prohibited by rabbinic law.

Misuse of consecrated objects with regard to blood – מְעִילָה: Some commentaries claim that misuse of consecrated objects in the case of blood is possible only when the blood has left the Temple area, but not while it is still in the Temple (*Tosafot Yeshanim*). In general, rabbinic decrees, e.g., those meant to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest [*shevut*], were not enforced in the Temple.

NOTES

אין – אין – There is nothing whose mitzva has been performed – אין – לך דבר שנעשית מצותו: The early commentaries inquire into the source for this *halakha* that an object whose mitzva has been performed loses its sanctity and is no longer subject to the prohibition of misuse of consecrated objects. Indeed, according to *Tosafot Yeshanim*, it is in fact possible to claim the opposite, i.e., that an object that has been used for a mitzva is of greater sanctity. The source of the *halakha* is apparently the fact that sin-offerings that must be left to die, and will therefore not be used for a mitzva, are not subject to misuse of consecrated objects. This indicates that once an object is no longer involved in a mitzva, it is not subject to the prohibition of misuse of consecrated objects (*Tosafot Yeshanim*; *Tosefot HaRosh*).

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אמר קרא "הוא" – לפני כפרה כל אחר כפרה, מה לאחר כפרה אין בו מעילה, אף לפני כפרה אין בו מעילה.

ואימא: לאחר כפרה כלפני כפרה, מה לפני כפרה יש בו מעילה אף לאחר כפרה יש בו מעילה! אין לך דבר שנעשית מצותו ומועלין בו. ולא? והרי תרומת הדשן!

And Rabbi Yoḥanan said that this *halakha* is derived from a different phrase. The verse states: "For it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life" (Leviticus 17:11), which indicates that it retains the same status before atonement as after atonement: Just as after atonement it is not subject to the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects, as the mitzva has been performed, so too, before atonement it is not subject to misuse of consecrated objects. As the Gemara states below, there is a general principle that once the mitzva involving a certain object has been performed, the object is no longer subject to misuse of consecrated objects.

The Gemara asks: But if the status of blood before atonement is compared to its status after atonement, one can say the opposite: Just as before atonement it is subject to misuse of consecrated objects, so too, after atonement it is subject to misuse of consecrated objects. The Gemara rejects this contention: This cannot be the case, as there is a general principle: There is nothing whose mitzva has been performed^N that is still subject to misuse of consecrated property. The Gemara asks: And is there no such case? But there is the instance of the removal of the ashes of offerings burned on the altar. These ashes require burial, and yet any benefit derived from them is misuse of consecrated property, despite the fact that their mitzva has already been performed.

Perek V
Daf 60 Amud a

HALAKHA

The removal of the ashes – תרומת הדשן: Some of the ashes removed from the altar are deposited outside the city, and it is prohibited to derive benefit from them. The Ra'avad maintains that this prohibition applies only to the ashes used in the mitzva of the removal of the ashes, not the ashes taken outside the Temple (see *Kesef Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 2:15).

Priestly vestments require interment – בגדי כהונה טעונים גניזה: The worn-out garments of the High Priest, and likewise the white garments in which he serves on Yom Kippur, must be buried. It is prohibited to derive any benefit from them, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:5).

משום דהוי תרומת הדשן ובגדי כהונה שני בתובין הבאין באחד, וכל שני בתובין הבאין באחד אין מלמדו.

The Gemara answers: The reason is because the mitzva of the removal of the ashes^H and the priestly vestments, the four white garments worn by the High Priest on Yom Kippur, are both subject to the special *halakha* that misuse of consecrated objects applies to them even after their mitzva has been performed. Consequently, they are two verses that come as one,^N i.e., they share a unique *halakha* not found elsewhere. And there is a principle: Any two verses that come as one do not teach, i.e., an analogy may not be derived from these two similar cases. Instead, they are considered exceptional instances that cannot serve as models for other cases.

הניחא לרבנן, דאמרי: "והניחם שם" – מלמד שטעונין גניזה.

The Gemara raises a further difficulty: This works out well according to the opinion of the Rabbis, who say that the verse: "And he shall take off the linen garments, which he wore when he went into the sacred place, and shall leave them there" (Leviticus 16:23), teaches that the four white garments worn by the High Priest on Yom Kippur are not fit for further use, and they require interment.^H

אלא לרבי דוסא, דאמר: בגדי כהונה ראויין הן לכהן הדיוט, מאי איכא למימר?

However, according to the opinion of Rabbi Dosa, who said that these priestly vestments are fit for a common priest and do not require interment, one does not misuse consecrated property by using them, and therefore what is there to say? In his opinion, the *halakha* of misuse of consecrated objects after the performance of a mitzva applies only to the removal of ashes from the altar, not to the priestly vestments, which means it is stated in only a single case. Why, then, does this case not serve as a model for other instances in the Torah?

NOTES

Two verses that come as one – שני בתובין הבאין באחד: A *halakha* written in one case may serve as a general model for many other instances, in the absence of a restriction limiting the *halakha* to that context. This is the hermeneutical technique called an analogy [*binyan av*]. However, if the same *halakha* appears in two different contexts, the assumption is that the Torah did not intend the second case to be derived from the first, and therefore it is clearly not a general *halakha* but one that applies only in particular circumstances. If it is possible to prove that

the two cases could not be inferred from one another, either because they are too dissimilar or for some other such reason, the *halakha* in question can serve as a model for other situations. Some *tanna'im* maintain that even two verses that come as one can teach with regard to other cases, as the repetition merely serves to emphasize the general *halakha*. However, even these *tanna'im* agree that three verses that come as one cannot teach the *halakha* with regard to other situations (see *Yad Malakhi*).