



of the ways of peace. The mishna goes on to explain the status of priests with regard to the contribution of the half-shekel.

1:4 Rabbi Yehuda said that ben Bukhri testified in Yavne: Any priest who contributes the half-shekel is not considered a sinner, despite the fact that he is not obligated to do so. Rabbi Yehuda added that Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai said to ben Bukhri: Not so; rather, any priest who does not contribute the half-shekel is considered a sinner, as they are obligated like all other Jews. However, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai continued, the priests who do not contribute interpret this verse to their own advantage: “And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly made to smoke; it shall not be eaten” (Leviticus 6:16). Those priests claim as follows: Since the omer offering and the two loaves, i.e., the public offering of two loaves from the new wheat brought on the festival of Shavuot, and the shewbread placed on the sacred table in the Sanctuary each Shabbat, which are all meal-offerings, are ours, then if we contribute shekels we will have partial ownership of these communal offerings, as they are purchased with the shekels. How, then, can they be eaten? They ought to be regarded as priests’ meal-offerings, which must be wholly burnt. But since these offerings are eaten, the priests concluded that they are not obligated to contribute the half-shekel. This argument does not, however, take into account the fact that communal offerings belong to the public, which is understood as its own entity, and are not regarded as shared offerings of all who contribute to the public purse.

1:5 Although the Sages said, as stated in the previous mishna, that the court does not seize collateral from women, slaves, and minors, as they are not obligated to contribute, however, if they contributed a shekel of their own accord, the Temple treasurers accept from them. Conversely, in the case of a gentile or a Samaritan [Kuti] who contributed a shekel to participate in the communal offerings, they do not accept it from them. And likewise, they do not accept from a gentile or a Samaritan pairs of birds sacrificed in the purification ritual of a zav, pairs of birds of a zava, or pairs of birds of a woman who gave birth, all of which are brought for ritual purification, or sin-offerings or guilt-offerings. This is the principle: With regard to anything that can be brought to the altar as a vow or as a free-will offering, the priests accept it from gentiles and Samaritans, and with regard to anything that cannot be brought as a vow or as a free-will offering, they may not accept it from them. And this principle was similarly articulated by Ezra, when he recorded the Jewish leadership’s rejection of the Samaritans’ request to assist the Jews in the construction of the Second Temple, as it is stated: “But Zerubbabel, and Joshua, and the rest of the heads of fathers’ houses of Israel, said unto them: You have nothing to do with us to build a house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord the God of Israel, as King Cyrus the king of Persia has commanded us” (Ezra 4:3).

1:6 [4a] The mishna states another halakha: And these are the people who are obligated in the premium [kalbon], a small sum added to the half-shekel collected: Levites, Israelites, converts, and emancipated Canaanite slaves, but not priests, women, Canaanite slaves, or minors. One who contributes a half-shekel on behalf of a priest, on behalf of a woman, on behalf of a slave,

or on behalf of a child, is exempt from the premium, as they are exempt. But if he contributed on his own behalf and on behalf of another, i.e., he contributed one whole shekel to discharge both his own obligation and that of someone else, he is obligated in one premium. Rabbi Meir says: He must pay two premiums. The mishna further states: One who gives the collection agent a sela, i.e., a whole shekel, and takes a shekel, i.e., a half-shekel, as change is obligated in two premiums.

1:7 One who contributes a half-shekel on behalf of a poor person, on behalf of his neighbor, or on behalf of a resident of his city is exempt from the premium. The Sages did not obligate in the premium those who use their own money to fulfill the obligation of another. But if one loaned them a half-shekel, rather than paying it on their behalf, he is obligated to pay the premium. Since the recipients of the loan must repay the money, it is as though the half-shekel were paid from their property rather than the lender's. Partnered brothers, who have fully divided among themselves their late father's assets, and who, if they jointly pay a whole shekel from those assets to discharge both of their obligations, are obligated in the premium like any other two private individuals, are exempt from the animal tithe for the livestock they inherited. Since they have completely divided between them all inherited assets, they are considered purchasers of the livestock, and a purchaser is exempt from the animal tithe. But when they have not completely divided the assets, and they are therefore obligated in the animal tithe, as the livestock is considered in their father's possession, they are exempt from the premium for their joint payment, as in the case of one who pays on behalf of another. And how much is a premium? A silver ma'a. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: It is only half a ma'a.

2:1 When people who live far from Jerusalem wish to send to Jerusalem the shekels that have been levied from their community, they may combine their shekels and exchange them for darics [darkonot], which are large gold coins, due to the burden of the way. Instead of carrying large amounts of shekels, the agents who deliver the funds will bring a much lighter burden of gold coins with them. The mishna adds: Just as there were collection horns in the Temple to receive the half-shekel contributions, so too there were collection horns in the rest of the country, i.e., areas outside of Jerusalem. The local inhabitants placed their half-shekels in these horns, which were later brought to Jerusalem. § With regard to the residents of a town who sent their shekels to the Temple and they were stolen from the agent on the way or were lost, if the collection of the chamber had already been collected before these shekels arrived, the agents must take the oath of a bailee to the treasurers [gizbarin]. After the collection of the chamber, all the shekels that have been contributed become the property of the Temple, so the Temple treasurers who are in charge of this property become the opposing litigants of the agents. If the ceremony has not yet been performed and the contributions have not yet been collected into the baskets, the shekels are considered the property of the residents of the town, and therefore the agents must take an oath to absolve themselves to the residents of the town. Since those shekels are still considered the property of the residents of the town because the shekels never

reached the Temple, they have not fulfilled their obligation. Therefore, the residents of the town must contribute other shekels in their place. If, after the residents of the town contributed other shekels, the original shekels were found or the thieves returned them, both these original shekels and those newly contributed ones have the status of consecrated shekels and belong to the Temple. However, they do not count for the following year. The people cannot claim that since they contributed twice in one year they are exempt from contributing the next year.

2:2 With regard to one who gives his shekel to his fellow to contribute on his behalf by placing it in the collection horn for him, and the fellow instead contributed it for himself, if at the time that he placed the shekel in the collection horn the collection of the chamber had been collected, the fellow is guilty of misuse of consecrated property. When they perform the collection of the chamber, the treasurers also have in mind the shekels that have been contributed but are not yet in the possession of the Temple treasury, so that all those who have contributed shekels will have a part in the communal sacrifices. Therefore, when the agent gives this shekel for himself, he is considered to be deriving benefit from a consecrated item and is guilty of unintentional misuse of consecrated property. With regard to one who mistakenly contributes his shekel from consecrated money, and then the collection of the chamber was collected and an animal purchased with those funds was sacrificed as a communal offering, he is guilty of misuse of consecrated property once the animal has been offered. This is because at that point the money used to purchase the animal is transferred to non-sacred status. However, before that point, merely contributing consecrated money is not considered misuse. If one mistakenly contributed his shekel from money used to redeem the fruits of the second tithe or from money from the permitted sale of produce grown during the Sabbatical Year, he must eat non-sacred fruits besides the ones he already possesses, corresponding to the value of the shekel, and he must treat them with the sanctity of second tithes or Sabbatical Year fruits.

2:3 With regard to one who gathers together small coins and said: These are for my shekel, and subsequently discovered that it amounted to more than a half-shekel. Beit Shammai say: The leftover coins are placed in the collection horn designated for a free-will offering, as the money is consecrated property but it does not have the status of a shekel. Beit Hillel say: The leftover money is non-sacred property since, *ab initio*, he had in mind to consecrate a half-shekel and no more. An item that was consecrated by mistake does not have the status of consecrated property. However, if he originally said: I am gathering together this money so that I will bring my shekel from these, they agree that the leftover money is non-sacred property. If one who was obligated to bring a sin-offering gathered together coins and said: These are for my sin-offering, then if he had accumulated more than was needed, they agree that the leftover money must be designated as a free-will offering. However, if he originally said: That I will bring my sin-offering from these, they agree that the leftover money is non-sacred property.

2:4 Rabbi Shimon said: What is the difference between shekels and a sin-offering? Why do Beit Hillel say that the leftover money is non-sacred

property in the case of shekels, while with regard to a sin-offering they say that the leftover money is consecrated for a free-will offering? Rather, the issue is that shekels have a fixed value, a half-shekel and no more. Therefore, there is a clear amount beyond which one did not intend the money to become consecrated property. However, a sin-offering has no fixed value. Since the entire sum that one collected could have been used to purchase a sin-offering, whatever he didn't use must at least be designated for a free-will offering. Rabbi Yehuda says: Even for shekels there is no real fixed value. For when the Jewish people ascended from the exile, they would contribute darics, which are Median coins worth two shekels by Torah law. They brought these coins with them and would give a half of one to fulfill their half-shekel obligation. Later on, when the Median Empire was dissolved, they reverted to contributing with a sela, a silver coin of equal weight to the shekel mentioned in the Torah. People would contribute a half-sela for their half-shekel requirement. When the value of this currency changed later on, they reverted to contributing with a tiva, a different coin which is worth a half-shekel. Some people wished to contribute only dinars, which are half the value of the tiva, i.e., one quarter shekel in value. The Sages refused to accept it and required them to contribute at least the half-shekel mentioned in the Torah. Nevertheless, it is clear that the obligation of contributing shekels does not have a fixed value. Rabbi Shimon said in response: Even so, despite the fact that during different periods there were different amounts used to fulfill the obligation of the half-shekel, everyone has equal standing, i.e., at any particular time, everyone contributes the same amount. Therefore, any sum collected beyond that amount was not intended to be consecrated. However, a sin-offering has no fixed amount whatsoever; this person may bring an animal worth a sela, and that one may bring one worth two, and this one may bring one worth three. Therefore, it cannot be supposed that there was no intention to consecrate the whole sum.

2:5 The leftover money from what was set aside for shekels is non-sacred property, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel in the previous mishna. The mishna now discusses similar cases for other sacred items: However, with regard to the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase the tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a meal-offering and the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase offerings that he is liable to sacrifice due to ritual impurity or a sin, such as the pairs of birds of a zav, the pairs of birds of a zava, and the pairs of birds of a woman after childbirth, sin-offerings, or guilt-offerings, in these cases, its leftover money must be used for free-will offerings that are offered as repletion of the altar, i.e., burnt-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle. This is the principle: Whatever money is designated for a sin-offering or for a guilt-offering, its leftover money must be used for a free-will offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a burnt-offering that he owes, due to a vow or to volunteering, must be used for another burnt-offering that he will bring in the future. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase fine flour for a meal-offering must be used for another meal-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a peace-offering must be used for another peace-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a lamb

for his Paschal lamb is not used for another Paschal lamb, such as for the following year. Rather, it is used for purchasing a peace-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase sacrifices for a number of nazirites must be used to purchase sacrifices for other nazirites. The leftover money from what a single nazirite set aside for his own offering must be used for a free-will offering. The leftover money collected for freeing unspecified captives must be allocated to freeing captives. The leftover money collected for freeing a specific captive is given as a gift to that captive. The leftover money collected as charity for the poor must be allocated to the poor. The leftover money collected for a specific poor person is given as a gift to that poor person. The leftover money collected for burying the dead must be allocated to burying the dead. The leftover money collected to bury or provide burial shrouds for a particular deceased person is given to his heirs. Rabbi Meir says: It is uncertain what should be done, and therefore the leftover money for the deceased should be placed in a safe place until Elijah comes and teaches what should be done. Rabbi Natan says: With the leftover money collected for a deceased person they build a monument [nefesh] on his grave for him.

3:1 On three occasions during the year the ceremony of the collection of the Temple treasury chamber is performed. During the ceremony, a priest enters the treasury chamber with three containers, lifts up [torem] some of the coins, and places them in the containers. These funds, known as the collection of the chamber, are used to purchase animals for communal offerings and other needs of the Temple. These three occasions are: Half a month, fifteen days, before Passover, on the day before the first of the month of Nisan; half a month before Shavuot, on or around the twentieth of Iyar; half a month before the festival of Sukkot, on the day before Rosh HaShana. These three days are also the due dates that were established by the Sages for the setting aside of animal tithes. On each of these days one is obligated to tithe the animals that were born during the intervening period, and it is prohibited for him to eat or sell them until he does so. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Ben Azzai says that the dates established by the Sages for the setting aside of animal tithes are the twenty-ninth of Adar, the first of Sivan, and the twenty-ninth of Av. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say that the dates for the animal tithes are the first of Nisan, the first of Sivan, and the twenty-ninth of Elul. And why did Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say the twenty-ninth of Elul and not the first of Tishrei, as they said the first of Nisan and Sivan? Because the first of Tishrei is the festival of Rosh HaShana, and it is not permitted to tithe on a Festival. Therefore, the Sages advanced the day of tithing the animals born over the course of the summer to the twenty-ninth of Elul.

3:2 The funds are collected from the Temple treasury chamber with three baskets, each measuring three se'a. On the baskets is written, respectively, alef, beit, gimmel, based on the order in which the baskets are filled, to indicate from which basket coins should be taken to buy sacrifices. The coins were used in the order of their collection. Rabbi Yishmael says: The letters written on them were in Greek, alfa, beta, gamma. The one who collects the funds from the chamber must not enter while wearing a cuffed garment [hafut],

and not with a shoe, and not with a sandal, and not with phylacteries, and not with an amulet, since all of these have places into which money can be inserted. The concern is that perhaps the one collecting the funds will one day become poor, and people will say that it is because of the sin of stealing the shekels of the chamber that he became poor, as they will suspect that he stole money and hid it in those places. Or perhaps he will become rich and people will say that he became rich from stealing the funds of the chamber, even though he did not actually do so. Even though one should not suspect someone of stealing consecrated shekels, the one collecting the funds from the chamber must nevertheless take these precautions, as a person must appear justified before people just as he must appear justified before the Omnipresent [HaMakom], and it is stated: "And you shall be guiltless before the Lord and before Israel" (Numbers 32:22). From here it may be inferred that it is not enough to be innocent before God; one must also be innocent before the Jewish people. Even in situations where there is little concern that one may commit a sin, the proper course is to remain above any possible suspicion of misconduct. And the verse states: "So shall you find grace and good understanding in the sight of God and man" (Proverbs 3:4).

3:3 In order to indicate the importance that was attached to the ceremony of the collection of the Temple treasury chamber, the mishna relates that the members of the house of Rabban Gamliel desired that their shekels be the ones collected from the chamber and used for the purchase of the communal offerings. Each of them would therefore come to the Temple specifically on the day of the ceremony of the collection of the chamber, enter the chamber with his shekel between his fingers, and toss it in front of the one collecting the money so that he would see it and place it in the basket containing the money to be taken out of the chamber. Understanding what was happening, the one collecting the money from the chamber would purposely push this shekel into the basket, so that it would later be used to buy communal offerings. The one collecting the funds from the chamber may not begin to collect the money until he asks the Temple treasurers three times: Shall I collect the funds, and they say to him: Collect them, collect them, collect them, three times.

3:4 The coins were stored in the Temple treasury in three large baskets, each measuring nine se'a. In the collection of the chamber ceremony, coins were removed from these baskets and placed in smaller baskets of three se'a each that were marked with letters (see the previous mishna on daf 8a). After he collected the funds from the first large basket and put them into one of the smaller baskets labeled with the letter alef, he immediately covered with a leather cover the large basket from which he had removed the money. After collecting funds from the second large basket, he covered it with a leather cover as well. But after collecting funds from the third large basket, he did not cover it. The mishna asks: Why did he cover the first two baskets? In order to mark them as already having had funds collected from them. In this way, there was no concern that perhaps he would forget and once again collect funds from a basket from which funds had already been collected. The mishna specifies the intent of the one collecting the funds from the baskets as he does so: He collected funds from the first basket on behalf of the people living in Eretz

Yisrael; from the second basket on behalf of the people living in the cities near Eretz Yisrael; and from the third basket on behalf of the people living in Babylonia, and on behalf of the people living in Media, and on behalf of the people living in the distant countries.

4:1 At certain times of the year, half-shekels that had been donated to the Temple and stored in a chamber in the Temple were collected in order to be used for various purposes. The mishna asks: The collection of half-shekels, what would they do with it? They would purchase animals for the daily offerings, which were offered each morning and afternoon; and for the additional offerings, which were offered on Shabbat, the New Moon, and Festivals; and wine for their libations; barley for the omer meal-offering; and wheat for both the two loaves offered on Shavuot and the shewbread; and animals for all the communal offerings. § The guards of the sefihin, grain that grew without being purposely planted, during the Sabbatical Year, ensured that people did not take this ownerless grain, so that it remained available to be used for the omer and the offering of the two loaves. They collect their wages from the collection of the Temple treasury chamber. Rabbi Yosei says: One who so desires may even volunteer his services and guard the grain as an unpaid bailee. The Rabbis said to him: Even you must say that the omer and the two loaves come only from communal funds and not from any one individual. If one were to volunteer his services, he would acquire the grain for himself by guarding it and transporting it to the Temple. In that case, these offerings would have come from an individual. So that the offerings come solely from communal funds, the guards must receive payment from the half-shekels removed from the chamber.

4:2 The red heifer, the scapegoat, and the strip of crimson wool used in the process of burning the red heifer all come from the collection of the Temple treasury chamber, despite the fact that they are not sacrificial offerings. The same is true for the ramp built from the Temple Mount to the location on the Mount of Olives, where they would slaughter the red heifer; the ramp built to lead the scapegoat out of the city; the strip of crimson wool that was tied between its horns; any repairs required for the aqueduct that ran through the Temple courtyard and the walls of the city and its towers; and for all the needs of the city, such as street repairs, security, and the like. All of these come from the remains of the chamber, i.e., from the money that remained in the chamber after the three collections of money were taken to use for communal offerings. Abba Shaul says: The High Priests construct the ramp for the red heifer from their own funds.

4:3 What would they do with the leftover remains of the chamber after all the items mentioned above had been attended to? They would purchase wine, oil, and fine flour and sell them to those who needed them for their private offerings. And the profit from these sales would go to consecrated property, i.e., to the Temple treasury; this is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: One may not generate profit by selling consecrated property, neither may one profit from funds set aside for the poor.

4:4 What would they do with the leftover funds of the collection that had not been spent on communal offerings? They would purchase golden plates as a coating for the walls and floor of the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Yishmael says: The

leftover produce was used to purchase the repletion of the altar, i.e., burnt-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle. The leftover funds of the collection were used to purchase sacred vessels. Rabbi Akiva says: The leftover funds of the collection were used to purchase the animals used for the repletion of the altar, since they had originally been collected for offerings. The leftover libations were used to purchase sacred vessels. Rabbi Hananya, the deputy [segan] High Priest, says: The leftover libations were used to purchase animals for the repletion of the altar, while the leftover funds of the collection were used to purchase sacred vessels. Both this Sage, Rabbi Akiva, and that Sage, Rabbi Hananya, did not agree with Rabbi Yishmael's opinion with regard to the leftover produce.

4:5 The leftover incense from one year could not be used the following year, as it had been purchased with the shekels collected for the previous year. What would be done with it in order to make it usable? The Temple treasurers would set aside an amount of it equal to the value of the wages of the artisans who worked in the Temple. They would then desacralize that incense by transferring its sanctity to the money owed to the artisans. They would then give the incense to the artisans as their wages. Finally, they would return and buy back the incense from the artisans with funds from the new collection of shekels. If the new funds come on time, i.e., by the beginning of Nisan, they purchase the incense with funds from the new collection of shekels. And if not, they may still purchase it from the old collection, and it is valid.

4:6 One who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, his possessions are consecrated for Temple maintenance. And if among them there are items that are suitable for use as communal offerings, which may not be used for the maintenance of the Temple but only for sacrificial purposes, what is done with those items to remove their consecration for Temple maintenance, in order that they may be reconsecrated for sacrificial use? They are given to Temple artisans as their wages, and thereby they are desacralized; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Ben Azzai said to him: This is not the method to be used. Rather, the same method that is used to desacralize the leftover incense, as is described in the previous mishna, should also be used here, i.e., they set aside from the consecrated items the equivalent of the value owed to the artisans for their wages, and they desacralize them by transferring their sanctity onto the money allocated for the artisans' wages, and then they give those items, which are no longer consecrated, to the artisans as their wages. According to both opinions, once the desacralized items are in the possession of the artisans, one of Temple treasurers should repurchase those items using money from that year's new collection of half-shekels, consecrating them for sacrificial use during the coming year.

4:7 In the case of one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and among them there is an animal that is suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, male or female, what should be done with it? Rabbi Eliezer says: Since he did not specify otherwise, everything is consecrated for Temple maintenance. Therefore, any males should be sold for the needs of burnt-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such. And any females, since they cannot be brought as burnt-offerings, should be sold for

the needs of peace-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such. And their monetary value that is received from their sale is allocated with the rest of his property for Temple maintenance. Rabbi Yehoshua says: Although he did not specify for what purpose he consecrated his possessions, it may be assumed that he intended the animals to be consecrated as burnt-offerings. Therefore, any males should themselves be sacrificed as burnt-offerings, and any females, since they cannot be brought as burnt-offerings, should be sold for the needs of peace-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such, and their monetary value that is received from their sale should be used to purchase and bring burnt-offerings. According to both opinions, the rest of the possessions, which are not suitable for sacrificial use, are allocated for Temple maintenance. Rabbi Akiva said: I see the statement of Rabbi Eliezer as more correct than the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua, since Rabbi Eliezer applied his method equally to both animals and other possessions in treating both as consecrated for Temple maintenance, whereas Rabbi Yehoshua made a distinction between them. Rabbi Papeyyas said: I heard the statements of both of them applied to different situations: One who consecrates all his possessions and explicitly states that his animals are to be included, clearly intends to equate his animals with the rest of his possessions, that both should be consecrated for the same purpose, i.e., for Temple maintenance. Therefore, he should act in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. However, with regard to one who consecrates all his possessions without explicitly specifying that this includes his animals, since there is no reason to presume that he wishes them all to be consecrated for the same purpose, it is presumed that each item is consecrated for the purpose most suited to it. Therefore, he should act in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua.

4:8 In the case of one who consecrates all his possessions, and among them there were items that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, such as wines for libations, and oils for meal-offerings, and birds, e.g., turtledoves or young pigeons, Rabbi Eliezer says: They are sold for the needs of that kind of item, i.e., to individuals who will use them as such. And he should bring with their monetary value that is received from their sale burnt-offerings. And the rest of the possessions are allocated for Temple maintenance.

4:9 Once every thirty days, the prices at which the Temple supplies such as wine, flour, or oil will be purchased are set for the Temple chamber. This set price is implemented in the following way: Any merchant who undertakes to provide fine flour after the chamber set a price of four se'a per sela, even if the general market price rose and stood at three se'a per sela, he must provide fine flour based on the set price of four se'a per sela. However, if the chamber's set price was three se'a per sela, and the general market price fell to four se'a per sela, he must now provide fine flour based on the new market price of four se'a per sela. This is in order that the Temple treasury of consecrated property always has the upper hand. If the fine flour became wormy, it became wormy for the merchant, i.e., he bears the loss of the ruined fine flour and must provide new fine flour in its place. Similarly, if the wine turned to vinegar, it turned to vinegar for the merchant. This is

because the merchant only receives, i.e., earns, his money once the altar is satisfied, i.e., the transaction is only realized once the items have been sacrificed on the altar.

5:1 These are the officials who served in specific positions in the Temple: Yohanan ben Pinehas was responsible for the seals. One who paid for a specific type of sacrificial item received a seal, which he presented to the Temple official in exchange for that item. Ahiyya was responsible for the libations, i.e., the wine, oil, and flour prepared with the level of ritual purity necessary for the libation offerings and the meal-offerings, which accompanied many animal offerings. Ahiyya supplied the libations to those who presented the appropriate seal. Matya ben Shmuel was responsible for the lotteries, which were used to select priests for the various Temple services each day. Petahya was responsible for the pairs of birds, i.e., the turtledoves or pigeons, brought by a zav, a zava, a woman after childbirth, and a leper. They placed the appropriate sum of money into the horn designated for this purpose, and each day Petahya oversaw the purchase of birds from that money and their sacrifice in the proper manner. Incidentally, the Gemara mentions: Petahya is Mordecai from the book of Esther. And why was he called Petahya, which resembles the word for opening [petah]? The reason is that he would open, i.e., elucidate, difficult topics and interpret them to the people, and because he knew all seventy languages known at the time. The mishna resumes the list of officials. Ben Ahiyya was responsible for the care of the priests who suffered from intestinal disease. Nehunya was the well digger for pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem for the Festivals. Gevini was the Temple crier who would awaken the priests and the Levites for their Temple duties. Ben Gever was responsible for locking the Temple gates in the evening and for unlocking them in the morning. Ben Bevai was appointed over the shreds of garments, which were formed into wicks for the Temple candelabra. He also supervised the twisting of those wicks into the appropriate thickness for the various nights during the different seasons of the year. Ben Arza was responsible for the cymbal, which was rung as a signal that the Levites should commence their song. Hugas ben Levi was responsible for the song. He taught and conducted the singers in the Temple. The house of Garmu was responsible for the preparation of the shewbread; the house of Avtinas was responsible for the preparation of the incense; and Elazar was responsible for weaving the Temple curtains; and Pinehas was the valet, who assisted the priests in fitting their clothes and dressing themselves for their Temple service.

5:2 There must be no fewer than seven trustees [amarkolin] and three treasurers appointed over the Temple administration. And we do not appoint an authority over the public comprised of fewer than two people, except for ben Ahiyya, who was responsible for healing priests who suffered from intestinal disease, and Elazar, who was responsible for the weaving of the Temple curtains. The reason for these exceptions is that the majority of the public accepted these men upon themselves as officials who served without the assistance of even a single partner.

5:3 This mishna provides details of the functions performed by Yohanan ben Pinehas and Ahiyya, the officials mentioned in the first mishna of this

chapter, which concerns the seals and libations. There were four seals in the Temple that confirmed that the bearer had paid for the libations that accompanied his offering. And one of the following inscriptions was written on them: Calf; male, i.e., a ram; kid; and sinner, i.e., a leper, as leprosy is a punishment for one of seven sins (see Arakhin 16a). Conversely, ben Azzai says: There were five seals, and the following was written upon them in Aramaic, not Hebrew: Calf, male, kid, poor sinner, and rich sinner. The mishna explains the significance of each of the four aforementioned seals. The calf seal serves as a payment receipt for libations of cattle offerings, whether they are large or small, male or female, as all offerings from the cow family are accompanied by the same libation. The kid seal serves for libations of sheep or goat offerings, whether large or small, male or female, except for those of rams aged thirteen months and older. The ram seal, which was earlier called the male seal, serves exclusively for ram libations. The sinner seal serves for libations of the three animal offerings of a leper, for the completion of his purification.

5:4 One who seeks libations for his offering goes to Yohanan, the official who was responsible for the seals, and gives him the appropriate sum of money and receives a seal from him. With that seal he subsequently comes to Ahiyya, who was responsible for the libations, and gives him Yohanan's seal and receives his libations from him. In the evening, Yohanan and Ahiyya would get together to reconcile their accounts, and Ahiyya would take out the seals he had received and accept the money Yohanan had received in exchange for them. If the money was less than the value of the seals, they were less to him, i.e., Yohanan would bear the loss, and Yohanan would have to pay the difference to the Temple treasury from his own property. And if there was some money left over, i.e., the total money was greater than the value of the seals, they were left over to the benefit of the Temple treasury of consecrated property, as the Temple treasury always has the upper hand.

5:5 With regard to one who lost his seal that he purchased from Yohanan, Yohanan and Ahiyya would wait to resolve his problem until the evening. And when they added their accounts in the evening, if they found for him a surplus of money equivalent to the value of his seal, they would give him the corresponding libations. And if not, they would not give him libations. And the name of the day of the week was written upon the seals because of the cheats. They might try to use old seals that had been lost by the Temple officials or by someone who had brought an offering at an earlier date, so as to receive libations in a deceitful manner.

5:6 There were two special chambers in the Temple, one called the chamber of secret gifts and the other one called the chamber of vessels. The mishna explains the purpose of these chambers. In the chamber of secret gifts, sin-fearing people put money secretly and poor people of noble descent support themselves from it secretly. With regard to the chamber of vessels, anyone who donates a vessel to the Temple drops it inside that chamber, and once every thirty days the treasurers open it. And any vessel that they found for it a use for Temple maintenance, they leave it for that purpose, and the rest are sold, and their monetary value is allocated to Temple maintenance.

6:1 There were thirteen collection horns, narrow at the top and wide at the bottom, into which were placed the shekels that were collected for the various needs of the Temple. There were also thirteen tables for various purposes, and thirteen prostrations in the Temple. The members of the household of Rabban Gamliel and the members of the household of Rabbi Hananya, the deputy High Priest, would prostrate themselves in fourteen places. And where was this extra location? It was facing the wood depository, as there was a tradition handed down to them from their fathers that the Ark was sequestered there.

6:2 The mishna relates that there was an incident involving a certain priest who was going about his duties and saw a certain flagstone that was different from the others. He noticed that one of the stones was slightly raised above the others, indicating that it had been removed and returned to its place. The priest understood that this was the opening to an underground tunnel where the Ark was concealed. He came and said to his fellow that he had noticed this deviation in the floor. He did not manage to conclude relating the incident before his soul left him, i.e., he died. Following this event, they knew with certainty that the Ark was sequestered there and that God had prevented that priest from revealing its location.

6:3 The previous mishna mentioned that there were thirteen prostrations in the Temple. Where were these prostrations? There were four in the north of the courtyard, four in the south, three in the east and two in the west, as the thirteen prostrations were facing the thirteen gates of the Temple courtyard. The thirteen gates were as follows: The southern ones, listed in order, beginning with the one adjacent to the western side, were the Upper Gate, and the topography of the courtyard was such that there was an incline on the east-west plane, therefore the gate farthest to the west was higher than the other gates; the Gate of Kindling, through which the priests would bring the wood for the arrangement of fire on top of the altar; the Gate of the Firstborn, through which priests would bring the ritually pure firstborn animals to be sacrificed, as it is permitted to slaughter firstborn animals on the southern side of the courtyard; and the Gate of Water. The mishna elaborates: And why was it named the Gate of Water? Since through it they would bring in the vial of water for the water libation on the festival of Sukkot, as they would ceremoniously draw the water from the Pool of Siloam and bring it to the altar through this gate. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: There was a different reason for this name. It was called the Gate of Water because through it the water would trickle [mefakim], and in the future this water will increase and go out from under the threshold of the House. Facing these gates were the ones in the north, listed in order from the one closest to the west: The Gate of Jeconiah; the Gate of the Offering, through which they would bring the offerings of the most sacred order, as these could be slaughtered only in the northern part of the courtyard; the Gate of Women, where women would enter the courtyard to place their hands on the heads of their offerings; and the Gate of Song, through which they would bring the musical instruments into the courtyard. The mishna asks: And why was it called the Gate of Jeconiah? The reason is that through it Jeconiah went out to his exile. Before Jeconiah was exiled by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon he came to take leave of the Temple, and he

left through this gate. The mishna resumes the list with the gates that are in the east: the Gate of Nicanor, which was named after Nicanor, who brought the doors of this gate from Egypt (see Yoma 38a). And the Gate of Nicanor had two wickets [pishpeshin], one on its right and one on its left. And there were two gates in the west that did not have a name, making a total of thirteen gates.

6:4 This mishna details the exact location and purpose of the thirteen tables in the Temple. There were thirteen tables in the Temple. Eight of them were made of marble and were located in the slaughtering area, north of the altar, where the priests would slaughter the offerings of the most sacred order. Upon these tables they would wash the innards of the offerings, as the marble was cool and preserved the freshness of the meat. And there were two more tables on the western side of the ramp, south of the altar, one of marble and one of silver. On the table of marble they would place the limbs before they were sacrificed, and from there the priests would bring them up to the altar. On the table made of silver they would place the ninety-three sacred vessels brought out from the Chamber of Vessels each morning for the services of that day. And there were two tables in the Entrance Hall to the Sanctuary, on the inside of the Entrance Hall, near the opening to the Temple, one of marble and one of gold. On the table of marble they would put the shewbread before its entrance to the Sanctuary after it was baked on the eve of Shabbat. And they would place the old shewbread on the table of gold upon its exit from the Sanctuary, to be divided among the priests. The reason the shewbread was placed on a marble table before being brought into the Sanctuary and on a golden one upon when removed from there is that one elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade. Since it had been placed on the golden Shewbread table all week inside the Sanctuary, upon its removal it could not be derogated to a marble table and so was placed on a different golden table in the Entrance Hall. Finally, there was one table of gold inside the Sanctuary, i.e. the Shewbread table, upon which the shewbread was placed always.

6:5 There were thirteen collection horns in the Temple, and the intended use of the funds was written upon each one, as follows: New shekels, old shekels, pairs of birds, fledglings designated for burnt-offerings, wood for the arrangement on the altar, frankincense that accompanied meal-offerings, and gold donated for the Ark cover. The remaining six horns were designated for communal free-will offerings. The horn labeled new shekels was designated for the half-shekel donation that was brought every year for the needs of that year. The horn labeled old shekels was for one who did not bring his half-shekel the previous year, who would contribute his shekel for the following year. The funds in the horn labeled pairs of birds are designated for the turtledoves used for bird-offerings, and the one labeled fledglings for burnt-offerings are used to purchase young pigeons as burnt-offerings. All of these, i.e., the funds in both horns, were used exclusively for voluntary burnt-offerings. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And the Rabbis say: The funds in both the horn labeled pairs of birds and the horn labeled fledglings were for young pigeons and turtledoves. The distinction between them is that the funds in the horn labeled pairs of birds were designated for the obligatory offerings of a zav, a zava, a woman after childbirth, and a leper. These

offerings included a pair of birds, one brought for a sin-offering, and the other one brought for a burnt-offering. Conversely, the funds in the horn labeled fledglings for burnt-offerings were all used exclusively for voluntary burnt-offerings.

6:6 One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate wood to the Temple, must donate no fewer than two logs for the arrangement on the altar. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate frankincense, must donate no less than a handful of frankincense, the amount brought with a meal-offering. One who says: It is incumbent upon me to donate gold, must donate no less than a dinar of gold. It was stated that six horns were designated for communal free-will offerings. The Mishna asks: With regard to the money designated for communal free-will offerings, what would they do with this money? The Mishna answers that they used it to purchase animals for burnt-offerings, as the meat from these offerings was offered on the altar to God and the hides were given to the priests. This midrash was taught by Jehoiada the High Priest: There is an apparent contradiction between two verses. With regard to the guilt-offering, the verse states: "It is a guilt-offering; he is certainly guilty before the Lord" (Leviticus 5:19). This verse indicates that the guilt-offering goes to God, not the priests. However, a different verse states: "As is the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering; there is one law for them; the priest who makes atonement with it, he shall have it" (Leviticus 7:7). This verse indicates that the offering is designated for the priests alone. How can these two verses be reconciled? The Mishna explains that this is the principle: Any funds that come due to a sin-offering or due to a guilt-offering, i.e., leftover coins designated for one of these offerings, they should be used for the purchase of animals for a voluntary burnt-offering, as the meat will be offered on the altar to God, and the hides will go to the priests. In this manner the two verses are found to be fulfilled, as it is both a guilt-offering to God as well as a guilt-offering to the priest. And this halakha also explains the verse that says: "The guilt-offering money and the sin-offering money was not brought into the House of the Lord; it was for the priests" (II Kings 12:17). This verse is understood to refer to the hides given to the priests.

7:1 If money was found on the floor of the Temple between one of the collection horns marked shekels and the collection horn marked free-will offerings, that is to say, between the first and the thirteenth collection horns, in which funds contributed to the Temple were stored, the following distinctions apply: If the money was found closer to the horn marked shekels, it is allocated to the shekels; if it was found closer to the horn marked free-will offerings, it is allocated to free-will offerings; and if it was equidistant from the horn marked shekels and the horn marked free-will offerings, it is allocated to free-will offerings. If the money was found between the horn marked wood and the horn marked frankincense, that is, between the fifth and sixth horns, if it was closer to the horn marked wood, it is allocated to wood; if it was closer to the horn marked frankincense, it is allocated to frankincense; and if it was found equidistant from both, it is allocated to frankincense. If the money was found between the horn marked pairs of bird-offerings and the horn marked doves

for burnt-offerings, i.e., between the third and the fourth horns, if it is closer to the horn marked pairs of bird-offerings, it is allocated to pairs of bird-offerings; if it was found closer to the horn marked doves for burnt-offerings, it is allocated to doves for burnt-offerings; and if it was found equidistant from both, it is allocated to doves for burnt-offerings. And similarly, if money was found anywhere else between a container for ordinary, non-sacred money and one containing second-tithe money, the following distinctions apply: If the money was found closer to the non-sacred money, it is allocated to the non-sacred money; if it was found closer to second-tithe money, it is allocated to second-tithe money; and if it was found equidistant from both, it is allocated to second-tithe money. This is the principle: In cases of doubt, the ruling follows whichever is closer, even if this involves being lenient, but if the money was found equidistant from both, the ruling follows whichever allocation involves being stringent.

7:2 This mishna considers other situations in which something is found and its source is unknown. Money found before animal merchants in Jerusalem is always presumed to be second-tithe money. The presumption is based on the fact that in Jerusalem, most of the animals are bought with second-tithe money and sacrificed as peace-offerings. And money found on the Temple Mount is presumed to be non-sacred money. And with regard to money found in the rest of Jerusalem, the following distinction applies: If it was found during the rest of the days of the year, it is presumed to be non-sacred money, but if it was found during the time of a pilgrim Festival, it is all presumed to be second-tithe money, because most of the money found in Jerusalem at the time of a Festival is second-tithe money.

7:3 The mishna continues: With regard to meat that was found in the Temple courtyard, and it is not known from whence it came, the halakha is as follows: If it is whole limbs of the animal, in the manner that burnt-offerings are brought to the altar, it is presumed to be burnt-offerings. And if it is in small pieces, it is presumed to be sin-offerings. And if the meat, in whatever form, is found in the city of Jerusalem, as opposed to the courtyard, it is presumed to be the meat of peace-offerings, as most of the meat in Jerusalem is the meat of peace-offerings. Since it is possible that the time during which it is permitted to eat any of it has already passed, both this and that, whether it is determined to be the meat of burnt-offerings or the meat of peace-offerings, its form must be allowed to decay, i.e., it must be left until it is definitely disqualified, and then it must be taken out to the place of burning, where offerings that have become disqualified are burned. With regard to meat found in the outlying areas, outside of Jerusalem, if it is in the form of whole limbs, the meat presumably comes from carcasses of animals that were not properly slaughtered, for meat unfit for eating was generally cut up into full limbs, to be fed to dogs or sold to gentiles. But if it is in small pieces, it is presumably kosher and permitted to be eaten, as kosher meat was ordinarily cut up into small pieces. And if meat is found at the time of a Festival, when meat is plentiful, so that it is generally not cut up into small pieces, then even whole limbs are permitted to be eaten.

7:4 If an animal that is fit for the altar was found straying, from Jerusalem

and as far as Migdal Eder, and similarly if it was found within that distance from Jerusalem in any other direction, it is presumed that the animal came from Jerusalem. Most of the animals in Jerusalem were designated for offerings, and presumably this one was as well. Males are presumed to be burnt-offerings, as only males are brought as burnt-offerings. Females are presumed to be peace-offerings, as it is permitted to bring a female peace-offering. Rabbi Yehuda says: An animal that is fit for the Paschal offering, i.e., a one-year-old male lamb or kid, is presumed to be a Paschal offering, provided that it was found within thirty days before the Festival of Passover.

7:5 Originally, the court would seize collateral from one who found such an animal, as security until he would bring with it the libations associated with this offering, as if the found animal were his own and he had committed himself to bring the libations. This brought about a situation in which those who found the animals began leaving them where they found them, and absconding, so as not to become liable for the libations. The court therefore instituted that the libations accompanying these offerings would come from public funds, that is, from the Temple treasury.

7:6 Rabbi Shimon said: The court instituted seven ordinances with regard to the financial aspects of offerings and consecrations. And this ordinance, namely, that the cost of the libations accompanying the sacrifice of a found animal is borne by the public, is one of them. These are the other ordinances: If a gentile sent his burnt-offering from abroad, outside Eretz Yisrael, and he sent with it money for the purchase of the libations that must accompany it, the libations are offered at his expense. And if the gentile did not cover the cost of the libations, it is a condition of the court that the libations are sacrificed at the public's expense, with funds taken from the Temple treasury. And likewise, in the case of a convert who died without heirs and left animals that he had designated as offerings. If he has the libations, i.e., if he also had set aside libations or money for that purpose, the libations are sacrificed from his estate. And if he did not do so, the libations are sacrificed from public funds. And another ordinance: It is a condition of the court with regard to a High Priest who died, and a new High Priest had not yet been appointed in his place, that his meal-offering, i.e., the griddle-cake offering that the High Priest would bring each day from one-tenth of an ephah of flour, would be sacrificed from public funds. Rabbi Yehuda says: It was brought from the property of the High Priest's heirs, i.e., his estate, and not from public funds. In any event, the offering was not brought as it would have been brought by the High Priest himself were he still alive, half in the morning and half in the evening, but rather it was sacrificed all at once, from a whole one-tenth of an ephah.

7:7 The fourth ordinance was about the salt in the Temple that was designated for salting the offerings, and the fifth was about the wood that was used for the burning of the offerings. These ordinances decreed that the priests may use them also to prepare the meat of the offerings that they eat. And the sixth ordinance concerned the red heifer: that deriving benefit from its ashes is not considered misusing consecrated property. And the seventh ordinance was about disqualified pairs of bird-offerings: It ruled that their replacements should

come from public funds. Rabbi Yosei disagreed and says: The expense does not fall upon the public, but rather upon whoever supplies all the pairs of bird-offerings to the Temple; he must also supply, at no additional charge, the replacements for the disqualified birds.

8:1 The mishna discusses the ritual purity of items found either in the Temple or in Jerusalem and its environs, in continuation of the previous chapter's discussion of found money, animals, or meat. All the spittle that is found in Jerusalem is ritually pure. Since neither ritually impure people nor gentiles were commonly present in Jerusalem, the Sages decreed an exception to the rule that spittle that is found is ritually impure since it presumably comes from one of those groups. This is the case except for spittle found in the upper marketplace, where gentiles and ritually impure Jews were likely to be present. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: On all the other days of the year, i.e., any day that is not on one of the three pilgrim Festivals, Passover, Shavuot, and Sukkot, spittle that is found in the middle of the street is ritually impure, and spittle that is found on the sides of the street is ritually pure. According to Rabbi Yosei, it was common for people who were ritually impure to be present in the streets of Jerusalem. They would be careful to walk in the middle of the street, while the ritually pure who wished to remain so would walk on the sides. Therefore, it is reasonable to presume that spittle found in the middle of the street is from one who is impure, while spittle found on the side of the street is from one who is pure. But during the time of the Festival, when most of the people in Jerusalem were there for the Festival and were ritually pure, the spittle found in the middle of the street was ritually pure, and that found on the sides of the street was ritually impure. The difference is due to the fact that at the time of the Festival, the ritually impure minority moves to the sides of the streets.

8:2 The mishna continues: All the vessels that are found in Jerusalem on the way down into the bathhouse, wherein one purifies vessels in a ritual bath, are ritually impure, and those that are found on the way up are ritually pure. The mishna explains: Their descent into the bathhouse is not by the same route as their ascent out of it, and it can be assumed that those found on the way down have not yet been immersed, while those found on the way up have been. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. However, Rabbi Yosei says: They are all ritually pure, except for the basket, and the shovel, and the meritza, which are specifically used for graves, to gather up the bones of the dead. These tools must be presumed to be ritually impure, but in general, vessels are presumed to be pure.

8:3 The mishna continues with another ruling about ritual purity: One may slaughter immediately with a knife that was found on the fourteenth of Nisan, i.e., the day the Paschal lamb is slaughtered, and need not be concerned that it is ritually impure. Presumably it was immersed the day before so that it could be used to slaughter the Paschal offering. If he found it on the thirteenth of Nisan, he immerses it again. Perhaps its owners had not yet immersed it, since they still had time to do so before the evening. If one finds a cleaver [kofitz], which is used to slaughter an animal and break its bones, whether it was on this day, i.e., the fourteenth, or on that day, i.e.,

the thirteenth, he immerses it again out of doubt. Since breaking the bones of the Paschal lamb is prohibited, its owners would have no need for it on the fourteenth, and it cannot be presumed that it has already been immersed to make it ritually pure. However, if the fourteenth occurs on Shabbat, he may slaughter with the cleaver immediately. Since immersing a vessel is prohibited on Shabbat, and presumably the owner of the cleaver wants it to be ritually pure on the fifteenth, one can assume that he immersed it already on Friday, the thirteenth of Nisan. It is therefore ritually pure. If the cleaver was found on the fifteenth of Nisan, i.e., if it was found on the Festival itself, he may slaughter with it immediately. The owners of the cleaver would have immersed it so that they could use it on the fifteenth to cut up the bones of a Festival peace-offering. If the cleaver was found attached to a knife, it is like a knife, i.e., if it was found on the thirteenth of Nisan it is presumed impure, and if it was found on the fourteenth he may slaughter with it immediately, as it was certainly immersed on the day before.

8:4 With regard to a curtain that became ritually impure from a secondary source of impurity, since its ritual impurity is by rabbinic law and not Torah law, there is no need to remove it from the Temple. Rather, it is immersed inside the Temple. And if it were removed to outside the courtyard in order to immerse it, it can be brought back into the courtyard immediately. Since it is ritually impure only by rabbinic law, there is no need to wait until sunset before returning it. But if it became impure from a primary source of impurity, e.g., it came into contact with the carcass of one of the eight creeping animals that confer impurity by Torah law, it is immersed outside the courtyard and is spread out to dry on the rampart. This is the low wall surrounding the Temple courtyard and the buildings within it, which has a lower level of holiness than the courtyard. The reason for this policy is because the sun needs to set on it. Immersion does not confer ritual purity on an item that became impure by Torah law until after the sun has set. And if this curtain were new, it is spread out to dry on top of the bench [itztabba], a prominent place on the Temple Mount, so that the people will see its craftsmanship and perceive its beauty.

8:5 The Gemara discusses the aforementioned curtain that separated the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says in the name of Rabbi Shimon the son of the deputy High Priest: The curtain has the thickness of a handbreadth, and it is woven from seventy-two strands of yarn. And each and every strand from those seventy-two is made from twenty-four threads. The curtain was made from four materials: Sky-blue wool, purple wool, scarlet wool, and fine linen, and a strand was made up of six threads of each type of material. And with regard to the dimensions of the curtain, its length was forty cubits, as the height of the ceiling of the Sanctuary; and its width was twenty cubits, to match the width of the entrance; and it was made from eighty-two ten-thousands, i.e., 820,000 golden dinar. And they used to make two new curtains every year. And the curtain was so heavy that they needed three hundred priests to carry it when they would immerse it.

8:6 With regard to the flesh of offerings of the most sacred order that became impure, whether it became impure from a primary source of impurity or from a

secondary source of impurity, whether it became impure inside the courtyard or outside, it must be burned. There is a dispute among the tanna'im with regard to where it is burned. Beit Shammai say: It all should be burned inside the Temple courtyard, except for that which became impure from a primary source of ritual impurity outside, as under such circumstances, it is not appropriate to bring it inside the Temple. Beit Hillel say: It all should be burned outside the Temple courtyard, except for that which became ritually impure by a secondary source of impurity inside. In such a case the flesh need not be removed from the courtyard and is burned there.

8:7 Rabbi Elazar says: Flesh from offerings of the most sacred order that became ritually impure from a primary source of ritual impurity, whether it became so inside the courtyard or outside, is burned outside. Since its ritual impurity is of the most stringent type, it is not to be brought into the courtyard, or allowed to remain there. However, an item that became ritually impure from a secondary source of ritual impurity, whether it became ritually impure outside or inside, is burned inside. Since its ritual impurity is of a lenient type, it can be brought into the courtyard in order to be burned. Rabbi Akiva says: The place of its impurity is where its burning should occur. Therefore, regardless of whether the source is primary or secondary, such flesh is burned wherever it presently is.

8:8 The limbs of the daily offering were not placed directly on the altar fire. Instead, after cutting up the offering, its limbs were placed first on the ramp of the altar, from the halfway point and below, on the lower sixteen cubits of the ramp, on its western side. Limbs of the additional offerings of the Shabbat and Festivals were placed on the ramp from the halfway point and below on its eastern side. Additional New Moon offerings were placed on top of the upper part of the edge [karkov] of the altar. Another law: The obligation to give half-shekels each year and to offer the first fruits is practiced only in the presence of the Temple, as fulfillment of these mitzvot is only possible then. But the mitzvot of produce tithes and grain tithes and of animal tithes and of the sanctified firstborn animals are practiced whether one is in the presence of the Temple, or one is not in the presence of the Temple. Although animal tithes and firstborn cannot be sacrificed without a Temple, once they develop a blemish, they may be eaten by their owners. If, in the present time when there is no Temple, one consecrates shekels for the mitzva of the half-shekel or fruits for the mitzva of first fruits, they are consecrated, and it is prohibited to derive benefit from them. Rabbi Shimon says: One who declared first fruits to be consecrated, in the present time, does not give them that status and they are not consecrated.