

JUDAISM

The Talmud

Yoma

A massive, multi-volume compendium of rabbinic debates and commentary on the Torah that forms the basis of Jewish religious law, ethics, and practice. Presents all 37 tractates with Gemara, via Sefaria's William Davidson Talmud (the Koren Talmud Bavli translation, CC BY-NC), plus Avot and Eduyot (which have no Gemara) via Michael L. Rodkinson's 1896-1918 translation.

Presented by Earth's Sacred Texts — blackbetty.space

Contents

Yoma

Yoma

Chapter 1

¹ MISHNA: Seven days prior to Yom Kippur the Sages would remove the High Priest, who performs the entire Yom Kippur service, from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin, a room in the Temple designated specifically for the High Priest during that period. And they would designate another priest in his stead to replace him lest a disqualification due to impurity or another circumstance beyond his control prevent him from entering the Temple on Yom Kippur.

² Rabbi Yehuda says: The Sages would even designate another wife for him lest his wife die, as it is stated in the Torah portion of the Yom Kippur service: “And it will atone for him and for his house” (Leviticus 16:6); the Sages interpreted the term: His house, that is his wife. The priest must be married in order to fulfill this commandment. Due to the concern lest his wife die, another wife was designated to address that possibility. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: If so, that this is a concern, there is no end to the matter, as what if the designated replacement wife dies? This possibility need not be a source of concern.

³ GEMARA: The halakha of sequestering the High Priest prior to his performance of the Temple service on Yom Kippur is comparable to the sequestering of the priest designated to burn the red heifer. Therefore, the Gemara cites that which we learned in a mishna there, in tractate Para: Seven days prior to the burning of the red heifer, the Sages would remove the priest who burns the heifer from his house to the chamber that was before the bira at the northeast corner of the courtyard on the Temple Mount. And that chamber was called the Chamber of the Stone House. The Gemara explains: And why was it called the Chamber of the Stone House? It is because all the actions associated with the red heifer were performed in dung vessels, stone vessels, and earth vessels, which are vessels that cannot become ritually impure.

⁴ The Gemara asks: What is the reason that they were so stringent with regard to the purity of the heifer? The Gemara explains: It is since a priest who immersed that day is fit for service and may perform the ritual of the heifer after immersion, even before sunset, as we learned in a mishna: They would intentionally render the priest who burns the heifer ritually impure and immerse him immediately, to remove a misconception from the hearts of the Sadducees by means of a public display of disregard for their ruling. As the Sadducees would say: Only by those for whom the sun set was the heifer ritual performed. The Sadducees believed that it is prohibited for priests who began the purification process with immersion during that day to burn the red heifer until sunset, when the purification process is completed.

⁵ That mishna continues: Since they would intentionally render the priest who burned the heifer ritually impure, the Sages in turn instituted the stringencies of utilizing dung vessels, stone vessels, and earth vessels, which do not have the capacity to become ritually impure, lest people come to treat

the ritual with contempt and perform it in ritual impurity after seeing that the red heifer ritual was performed by one who immersed that day.

⁶ Apropos the mishna in tractate Para, the Gemara asks: What is different about the chamber located in the northeast corner of the Temple courtyard that led the Sages to house the priest performing the red heifer ritual specifically in that chamber? The Gemara answers: It is different since it is a sin-offering, as the red heifer is referred to as a sin-offering in the Torah, and the slaughter and sprinkling of the blood of a sin-offering must be performed north of the altar; and since it is written with regard to the red heifer: “And sprinkle it before the opening of the Tent of Meeting” (Numbers 19:4), and before the Tent of Meeting means on its eastern side. Therefore, the Sages established a chamber in the northeast so that the ritual of the red heifer will have a distinctive indicator; this will cause the administering priest to be vigilant in its performance.

⁷ The Gemara asks with regard to the terminology of the mishna: What is the meaning of the term bira cited there? Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There was a place on the Temple Mount and its name is bira, and the Chamber of the Stone House was adjacent to it. And Reish Lakish said: The entire Temple is called bira, as it is stated in the prayer of David: “To Solomon my son grant a wholesome heart, to observe your commandments, your admonitions, and your statutes, to fulfill them all, and to build the bira for which I have made provision” (I Chronicles 29:19).

⁸ § With regard to the halakhot of sequestering the High Priest prior to performance of the Yom Kippur service, and of sequestering the priest designated to burn the heifer prior to performance of the red heifer ritual, the Gemara asks: From where in the Torah are these matters derived? Rav Minyomi bar Ḥilkiya said that Rabbi Maḥseya bar Idi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said they are derived from Aaron and his sons, who remained in the Tabernacle for seven days prior to performing the service in the Tabernacle on the eighth day of their inauguration, as the verse states: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 8:34), meaning that this mitzva of sequestering was not limited to the days prior to the dedication of the Tabernacle; rather, it applies to future generations as well. The verse is interpreted homiletically: “To do”; these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer for which the priest performing the ritual is sequestered seven days in advance; “to make atonement”; these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur, before which the High Priest is sequestered seven days.

⁹ The Gemara asks: Granted, the entire verse is not established as referring exclusively to the red heifer, as: “To atone,” is written, and the heifer is not capable of facilitating atonement; rather, it facilitates ritual purity. Rather, say that the entire verse is written with regard to Yom Kippur, as the rites performed to achieve atonement on Yom Kippur are similar to those performed during the days of the inauguration. What, then, is the source for sequestering the priest who is to perform the red heifer ritual?

¹⁰ The Sages say in response: Derive it from a verbal analogy between the terms commanded and commanded. It is stated here, with regard to the days of the inauguration: “The Lord commanded to do,” and it is stated there, with regard to the red heifer: “This is the statute of the Torah that the Lord commanded, saying” (Numbers 19:2). Just as the term commanded there refers to the heifer, so too here, the phrase: “The Lord commanded to do” written in the context of the days of the inauguration refers to the heifer. And just as here, with regard to the inauguration, there is the principle of

sequestering prior to performing the service, so too there, in the context of the halakhot of the heifer, sequestering is required prior to performance of the mitzva.

¹¹ The Gemara asks: And say that there is indeed a verbal analogy; however, it is not between the red heifer and the inauguration of the priests, but between the term commanded in the context of the inauguration and the term commanded in the context of Yom Kippur, as it is written: “And this will be an everlasting statute for you, to atone for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year; and he did as the Lord commanded Moses” (Leviticus 16:34). In that case, only the sequestering prior to Yom Kippur can be derived. The Gemara rejects this, as a verbal analogy is derived only between functionally similar phrases. One derives commanded that is stated before performance, as in the portion of the heifer, from commanded that is stated before performance in the portion of the inauguration; and one does not derive commanded that is stated after performance in the portion of Yom Kippur from commanded that is stated before performance.

¹² Again the Gemara asks: And say that there is a verbal analogy between the term commanded in the context of the inauguration and the term commanded with regard to offerings, as it is written: “On the day that He commanded [tzavoto] the children of Israel to sacrifice their offerings” (Leviticus 7:38). The result would be that any priest sacrificing a communal offering would require sequestering for seven days. The Gemara rejects this: One derives the term commanded from the identical term commanded, and one does not derive the term that he commanded [tzavoto] from the term commanded [tziva].

¹³ The Gemara raises a difficulty: What is the practical difference between the two terms? Didn’t the school of Rabbi Yishmael teach a verbal analogy with regard to leprosy of houses between the verse: “And the priest shall return [veshav]” (Leviticus 14:39) and the verse: “And the priest shall come [uva]” (Leviticus 14:44)? From that verbal analogy it is derived that this is the halakha with regard to returning, i.e., it is after seven days; and this is the same halakha with regard to coming, i.e., it is also after seven days. Obviously, the less pronounced difference in grammatical forms between tziva and tzavoto should not prevent the teaching of a verbal analogy.

¹⁴ The Gemara rejects this argument: This applies only where there are no terms that are identical to it; however, where there are terms that are identical to it, we derive the verbal analogy from terms that are identical to it, rather than from terms that are merely similar.

¹⁵ § The Gemara analyzes the verbal analogy from which the sequestering of the High Priest is derived. The Gemara states with regard to the phrase “to make atonement,” written in the context of the inauguration: These are the actions performed on Yom Kippur. The Gemara suggests: And say that it refers to the atonement of offerings in general, such that any priest engaged in sacrificing atonement offerings must be sequestered seven days beforehand.

¹⁶ The Gemara seeks to reject this suggestion from a practical perspective. Do we know in advance which priest will happen to sacrifice a given offering, and who would consequently require sequestering? The Sages say: Why not? There are certainly ways to do so. Each of the twenty-four priestly watches has set weeks during which it serves in the Temple, and the patrilineal families that constitute that watch have set days during that week on which each serves in the Temple. We could require sequestering for the entire patrilineal family of the priestly watch designated to serve on that day the following week. The Gemara rejects the suggestion that all priests should be sequestered prior to sacrificing an atonement offering. We derive a matter that has a fixed time during the year,

Yom Kippur, from a matter that also has a fixed time, the inauguration of the priests for service in the Tabernacle, to the exclusion of offerings that are sacrificed every day.

¹⁷ Again the Gemara asks: And say that one derives from the phrase “to make atonement” the principle of sequestering prior to sacrificing atonement offerings on the Festivals, which have fixed times. The Gemara rejects this: We derive a matter that is performed once a year, the service of Yom Kippur, from a matter that is performed once a year, like the inauguration, which was a one-time event, to the exclusion of the service on the Festivals, which is not performed once a year; rather, it is performed three times a year.

¹⁸ The Gemara asks: And say that the service on one Festival of the three, which is performed once a year, should require sequestering. And if you say: We do not know which of them is the most significant and requires sequestering, since one could suggest that it is Passover, with which the verse opened, as the Torah always lists it first among the Festivals; or one could suggest that it is Sukkot, since its mitzva is to bring numerous offerings, many more than the number brought on the other Festivals.

¹⁹ Rather, the Gemara rejects this possibility and explains: One derives sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, Yom Kippur, from sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, the inauguration. And one does not derive sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for seven days, a Festival, from sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, the inauguration. Therefore, atonement offerings on Festivals are not derived from the inauguration.

²⁰ The Gemara asks: And say that the sequestering for seven days is prior to the festival of the Eighth Day of Assembly, as that would also be sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day. The Gemara rejects this: One derives a matter before which there is not sanctity, Yom Kippur, which is preceded by weekdays, from a matter before which there is not sanctity, the day of the inauguration, which was also preceded by weekdays. And we do not derive a matter before which there is sanctity, the Eighth Day of Assembly, which is preceded by the seven days of Sukkot, from a matter before which there is not sanctity.

²¹ The Gemara challenges this: And is it not an a fortiori inference? Now, if a matter before which there is not sanctity requires sequestering, due to its sanctity, then with regard to a matter before which there is sanctity, all the more so is it not clear that it should require sequestering? Rav Mesharshiyya said in rejection of this challenge: No, there is no a fortiori inference here, as the verse: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 8:34), is written to emphasize specifically a day like this day; precisely as it was for the inauguration, and not in any other situation.

²² Rav Ashi said: There is another reason why it could not be that sequestering is required prior to the Eighth Day of Assembly. Is there any matter where the primary Festival, the first day of Sukkot, does not require sequestering, as was already proven, while that which is secondary to it requires sequestering? Since the Eighth Day of Assembly is an addendum to Sukkot, could its sanctity and stringency be greater than that which is associated with the primary Festival? And even according to the one who said: The Eighth Day of Assembly is a Festival in and of itself and is not part of the festival of Sukkot, that applies only to the matter of

²³ Peh, zayin, reish, kuf, shin, beit, an acronym for: Lottery [pays], as a new lottery is performed on that day to determine which priests will sacrifice the offerings that day, and the order established on Sukkot does not continue; the blessing of time [zeman]: Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time, is recited just as it is recited at the start of each Festival; Festival [regel], as it is considered a Festival in and of itself and there is no mitzva to reside in the sukka (see Tosafot); offering [korban], as the number of offerings sacrificed on the Eighth Day is not a continuation of the number offered on Sukkot but is part of a new calculation; song [shira], as the Psalms recited by the Levites as the offerings were sacrificed on the Eighth Day are not a continuation of those recited on Sukkot; blessing [berakha], as the addition to the third blessing of Grace after Meals and in the Amida prayer (see Tosafot) is phrased differently than the addition recited on Sukkot.

²⁴ However, despite all these differences, with regard to compensation for failure to sacrifice the Festival offerings at the earliest opportunity, everyone agrees that it is a day of compensation for obligations not met during the first Festival, as didn't we learn in the mishna: One who did not celebrate on the first Festival day of Sukkot by sacrificing the Festival offering may celebrate and sacrifice the Festival offering throughout the whole Festival in its entirety, including the last Festival day of the festival of Sukkot. Apparently, the Eighth Day of Assembly is considered the last Festival day of Sukkot and is appended to it with regard to its obligations.

²⁵ The Gemara challenges further: And say that the priest should be sequestered before the festival of Shavuot, which is a Festival preceded by weekdays, as there too it is a matter of sequestering of seven days for one day. Rabbi Abba said: There is a distinction between the inauguration and Shavuot, as one derives an instance where the obligatory offering is one bull and one ram, Yom Kippur, from an instance where the obligatory offering is one bull and one ram, the inauguration, to the exclusion of Shavuot, when they are two rams that are offered.

²⁶ The Gemara challenges: This works out well according to the one who said that the obligatory offering on Yom Kippur is one ram; however, according to the one who said that they are two rams that are sacrificed on Yom Kippur, what is there to say? According to that opinion, Yom Kippur is not comparable to the inauguration. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: One ram is the one that is mentioned here; as it is written: "With this Aaron will come into the Sanctuary, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 16:3), and it is the same one that is mentioned in the book of Numbers: "And on the tenth day of the seventh month you will have a sacred gathering when you will afflict your souls; you will not do any labor, and you will offer a burnt-offering to the Lord for a sweet aroma: One young bull, one ram..." (Numbers 29:7-8). Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: They are two rams offered on Yom Kippur, one mentioned here in the book of Leviticus and one mentioned in the book of Numbers.

²⁷ The Gemara rejects this solution: Even if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, and two rams are brought on Yom Kippur, a distinction remains between Yom Kippur and Shavuot. There, with regard to Yom Kippur, one ram, mentioned in the book of Leviticus, is for the obligation of the day, the atonement of Yom Kippur; and one ram, mentioned in the book of Numbers, is for the additional offerings. This is to the exclusion of the halakha with regard to Shavuot, where both rams are obligations of the day. Therefore, there is no basis for deriving the halakha with regard to Shavuot from the inauguration.

²⁸ The Gemara asks: And say that the requirement derived is to sequester the priest prior to Rosh HaShana, as there, too, it is sequestering of seven days for one day. The days before Rosh HaShana are weekdays, and as in the inauguration, a bull and a ram are sacrificed. Rabbi Abbahu said that this too is rejected: One derives a bull and a ram that the High Priest brings from his own property on Yom Kippur from a bull and a ram that Aaron brought from his own property at the inauguration. This is to the exclusion of Shavuot and Rosh HaShana, when the bull and the ram sacrificed are from community property and not owned by the priest. The Gemara asks: This works out well according to the one who said that every time the Torah utilizes the phrase: Take you, it means from your own property,

²⁹ and similarly, when the Torah states: Make you, it means from your own property. However, according to the one who said that when the Torah states both phrases it means from communal property, what is there to say to distinguish between Yom Kippur and the other days?

³⁰ As it was taught in a baraita that when the Torah states: Take you, it means from your own property, and when it states: Make you, it means from your own property; however, when the Torah states: And they will bring to you, it means from community property. This is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya. Rabbi Yonatan says that both when the Torah states: Take you, and when the Torah states: And they will bring to you, it means from community property. And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: Take you, which seems to mean from your own property? It should be understood, as it were, that God said to Moses: I desire that it come from your property more than I desire it from theirs. Therefore, the taking was attributed to Moses even though it was actually from community property.

³¹ Abba Ḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Elazar that one verse says: “And make you an ark of wood” (Deuteronomy 10:1), indicating that it should be from your own property; and one verse says on the same subject: “And they shall make an ark of acacia wood” (Exodus 25:10), meaning from the Jewish people. How can this contradiction be resolved? Here, the verse is referring to a time when the Jewish people perform the will of God and they are credited with building the Ark of the Covenant. There, it is referring to a time when the Jewish people do not perform the will of God, and construction of the Ark is attributed to Moses alone. According to that opinion, there is no difference between the offerings of Yom Kippur and other offerings.

³² The Gemara rejects this: They disagree only with regard to instances of taking in general and instances of making in general: Instances of taking in general are as in the verse: “Take you spices” (Exodus 30:34); and instances of making in general are as in the verse: “Make you two silver trumpets” (Numbers 10:2). However, in these cases of inauguration and of Yom Kippur the verses explicitly teach that the offerings must be from your own property. With regard to the inauguration, now, since it is written: “And to the children of Israel you will speak, saying: Take a goat kid for a sin-offering and an unblemished year-old calf and lamb for burnt-offerings” (Leviticus 9:3), with regard to the verse: “And he said to Aaron: Take you a young calf for a sin-offering” (Leviticus 9:2), why do I need this clear difference between the formulation of the command to the Jewish people and the formulation of the command to Aaron? Learn from it that in this context the phrase: Take you, means from your own property.

³³ And with regard to Yom Kippur, now, since it is written: “With this Aaron will come into the Sanctuary, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 16:3), with

regard to the verse: “And from the congregation of the children of Israel he will take two goat kids for a sin-offering and one ram for a burnt-offering and Aaron will offer his young bull as a sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:5–6), why do I need the emphasis that the goats come from the property of the children of Israel? Learn from it that this term: His, written with regard to the calf, means it is from his own property.

³⁴ Rav Ashi stated another reason that distinguishes Yom Kippur from Rosh HaShana and Shavuot. One derives the bull for a sin-offering and ram for a burnt-offering written with regard to Yom Kippur from the bull for a sin-offering and ram for a burnt-offering written with regard to the inauguration, to the exclusion of Rosh HaShana and Shavuot, on which both of them, the bull and the ram, are burnt-offerings.

³⁵ Ravina stated another distinction: One derives a matter that is restricted to the service performed by the High Priest, Yom Kippur, from a matter that is restricted to the service performed by the High Priest, the inauguration, which was performed by Aaron, to the exclusion of all the difficulties raised from the beginning of the discussion, as on the other potential days raised, they are not restricted to service performed by the High Priest; rather, the service on those days may be performed by any priest.

³⁶ And some say that Ravina said: One derives a matter that is an initial service from an initial service, to the exclusion of all these that are not initial services. That statement of Ravina is unclear, and the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of initial service? If we say that initial service means one performed by the High Priest; that is identical to the first version of Ravina’s statement. Rather, it may be understood as follows: One derives the initial service performed in the place, the Holy of Holies, on Yom Kippur, from the initial service performed in the place, the Tabernacle, on the eighth day of the inauguration. Therefore, it is the service of Yom Kippur alone that is derived from the inauguration.

³⁷ § When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: Rabbi Yoḥanan taught one case derived from the inauguration, while Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi taught two. The Gemara elaborates. Rabbi Yoḥanan taught one: To do, to make atonement; these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur that require sequestering beforehand, like the inauguration. And Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi taught two: To do, these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer; to atone, these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur. Both require sequestering.

³⁸ The Gemara asks: And did Rabbi Yoḥanan teach only one case derived from the inauguration, i.e., Yom Kippur? Didn’t we learn explicitly in the mishna: Seven days prior to Yom Kippur, and in another mishna: Seven days prior to the burning of the heifer, the Sages would remove the priest from his home? Apparently, there are two cases in which the priest is sequestered. The Gemara answers: With regard to sequestering the priest prior to the burning of the heifer, the Sages merely established a higher standard. They issued a decree to underscore the sanctity of the ritual after they permitted its performance by a priest who immersed that day. There is no Torah source for the sequestering of the priest in that case.

³⁹ The Gemara asks: But didn’t Rabbi Minyomi bar Ḥilkiya say that Rabbi Maḥseya bar Idi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said that the verse states: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 8:34), from which it is derived: To do, these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer; to make atonement, these are the actions

performed on Yom Kippur? Apparently, even Rabbi Yoḥanan taught two cases derived from inauguration. The Gemara resolves the difficulty: That is the opinion of his teacher; however, he himself disagrees. As when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: To do, these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer; to atone, these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur. That which Rabbi Manyumei cited in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan was the opinion of his teacher, Rabbi Yishmael.

⁴⁰ § With regard to the sequestering of the priest, Reish Lakish said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: From where did you derive this principle of sequestering? You derived it from the inauguration. If so, just as with regard to the inauguration, failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates it, so too here, with regard to Yom Kippur, failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the Yom Kippur service. All the halakhot of sequestering must be precisely observed.

⁴¹ And if you say: Indeed, that is so; didn't we learn in the mishna: And they would designate another priest in his stead, and it is not taught with regard to the designated priest: Seven days before Yom Kippur they remove him from his house, although ultimately he may perform the Yom Kippur service. Apparently, failure to sequester the priest does not invalidate the service. And if you say in response: What is the meaning of: They would designate? It means: They would remove; that is implausible. Were that so, let the mishna teach either with regard to both this High Priest and that designated replacement: They would designate; or with regard to both this High Priest and that designated replacement: They would remove.

⁴² Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Reish Lakish: Rather, from where do you, Master, derive the halakha of sequestering before Yom Kippur? Reish Lakish said to him: I derive it from Sinai, as it is written: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai and the cloud covered him [vaykhasehu] six days, and He called to Moses on the seventh day from the midst of the cloud" (Exodus 24:16). The masculine suffix hu in vaykhasehu can be interpreted either as him, referring to Moses, or as it, referring to the mountain. Now, since it states: "And He called to Moses on the seventh day," what is derived from the previous explicit mention of six days? These six days are mentioned as a paradigm, from which a general principle is derived that anyone who enters the camp of the Divine Presence, the site of the revelation at Mount Sinai, or the place where the Divine Presence rests, the Holy of Holies, requires prior sequestering for six days of sanctification.

⁴³ The Gemara asks: Wasn't it seven, not six, days of sequestering that we learned in the mishna? Reish Lakish answered: The mishna that requires sequestering for seven days is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira, who is concerned

⁴⁴ about the ritual impurity of the priest's home, i.e., his wife. This is done lest he become impure through relations with a menstruating woman, which is ritual impurity lasting seven days. Therefore, he is removed from his home for seven days.

⁴⁵ Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Reish Lakish: Granted, according to my opinion, that I derive the halakha of sequestering from the inauguration, that explains that which is taught in the baraita: With regard to both this priest engaged in the burning of the red heifer and that High Priest prior to Yom Kippur, one sprinkles upon him for all seven days the purification water mixed with ashes from samples from all the previous red heifer sin-offerings that were safeguarded there in the Temple. The reason for this practice is that there was also sprinkling during the inauguration. However, according to your

opinion, that you derive it from Sinai, was there in fact sprinkling at Sinai? According to your opinion, why are the priests sprinkled?

⁴⁶ Reish Lakish said to him: And according to your reasoning, does it work out well? At the inauguration, the sprinkling was with blood; here, the sprinkling was with water. Rabbi Yoḥanan answered: That is not difficult, as Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Water replaced blood, but both have the status of sprinkling. However, according to your reasoning, at Sinai, was there sprinkling at all? Reish Lakish said to him: The Sages merely established a higher standard, and this sprinkling is not a requirement.

⁴⁷ § The Gemara comments: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan that the sequestering is derived from the inauguration; and a baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish that it is derived from Sinai. The Gemara elaborates: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan: It was stated with regard to the inauguration: “With this Aaron will come into the Sanctuary, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 16:3). To what is the term: With this, referring? It is referring to that which is stated in the matter. What is the matter? It is the matter of the inauguration. In the manner that the priest was prepared for the inauguration, so too is he prepared for Yom Kippur. And what is stated in the matter of the inauguration? It is that Aaron the priest withdrew for seven days and served one day, and Moses transmitted the Torah guidelines to him all seven days in order to train him in the Sanctuary service.

⁴⁸ And throughout the generations as well, the High Priest withdraws seven days prior to Yom Kippur and serves one day. And two Torah scholars from among the students of Moses, to the exclusion of Sadducees, who are not students of Moses, transmit the Torah guidelines to him all seven days in order to train him in the Sanctuary service.

⁴⁹ From there the Sages said in the mishna: Seven days prior to Yom Kippur the Sages would remove the High Priest, who performs the entire Yom Kippur service, from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin; and just as the Sages would remove the High Priest, so do they remove the priest who burns the heifer, from his house to the chamber that was before the bira at the northeast corner of the courtyard on the Temple Mount. And with regard to both this priest whom the Sages sequester prior to Yom Kippur and that priest whom the Sages sequester prior to engaging in the burning of the heifer, one sprinkles upon him, for all seven days of sequestering, the purification water with ashes from all the previous red heifer sin-offerings that were safeguarded there in the Temple.

⁵⁰ And if you say that at the inauguration the sprinkling was with blood, and here the sprinkling was with water, you said: Water replaced blood. And it says in the verse: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 8:34). To do, these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer; to make atonement, these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur. This baraita, then, is proof for the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

⁵¹ The Gemara analyzes the baraita. But the term: With this [bezot], is required for the meaning of the verse itself; the priest is required to bring a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering. The Sages say in response: If the term comes to teach only with regard to the offerings, let the verse say: With this [bezeh], in the masculine, referring to the bull, or: With these [be’elleh], referring to the bull and the ram. What, then, may be derived from the use of the feminine term

bezot, which refers to neither the bull nor the ram? Learn from it two conclusions; one with regard to the offerings and one with regard to sequestering.

⁵² The Gemara continues its analysis of the baraita. What is the meaning of the term: And it says? Why does the baraita cite an additional proof from another verse? Why wasn't the first proof sufficient? And if you say that it is on the first Yom Kippur when Aaron performed the service that the High Priest requires sequestering, as we find in the inauguration when the priests were sequestered before being consecrated as priests, but on Yom Kippur in general, no, subsequent High Priests do not require sequestering; or alternatively, if you say: It is the first High Priest who requires sequestering, as did all the priests during the inauguration, but subsequent High Priests in general, no, they do not require sequestering before Yom Kippur; then come and hear that which it says in the verse: "As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do," meaning that this is a mitzva for all generations.

⁵³ § And a baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish that sequestering is derived from Sinai: Moses ascended in the cloud, and was covered in the cloud, and was sanctified in the cloud, in order to receive the Torah for the Jewish people in sanctity, as it is stated: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai and the cloud covered him six days, and He called to Moses on the seventh day from the midst of the cloud" (Exodus 24:16). This was an incident that occurred after the revelation of the Ten Commandments to the Jewish people, and these six days were the beginning of the forty days that Moses was on the mountain (see Exodus 24:18); this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili. The opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili corresponds to that of Reish Lakish; Moses withdrew for six days before receiving permission to stand in the presence of God.

⁵⁴ Rabbi Akiva says: This incident occurred before the revelation of the Ten Commandments to the Jewish people, and when the Torah says: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai," it is referring to the revelation of the Divine Presence that began on the New Moon of Sivan, which was six days before the revelation of the Ten Commandments.

⁵⁵ And that which is written: "And the cloud covered him," means the cloud covered it, the mountain, and not him, Moses. "And He called to Moses"; Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing at the foot of the mountain and listening, and if God did not mean that Moses was to climb the mountain, why did He call him? The verse comes only to accord deference to Moses, as the entire nation heard God address him. Rabbi Natan says: Moses was in fact called to enter the cloud; however, his entrance was not for the purpose of sequestering and purifying him, rather, the verse comes only to cleanse the food and drink that was in his intestines, to render him like the ministering angels who require neither food nor drink.

⁵⁶ Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash says: The verse calling Moses into the cloud comes only to intimidate Moses, to instill in him a sense of awe of the Creator, so that the Torah would be delivered with reverence, with quaking and with trembling, as it is stated: "Serve the Lord with awe, and rejoice with trembling" (Psalms 2:11). Apropos the end of the verse, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of "and rejoice with trembling"? Joy and trembling seem contradictory. Rav Adda bar Mattana said that Rav said: Where there is the joy of fulfilling a mitzva, there will be the trembling of the awe of Heaven there.

⁵⁷ § Apropos the interpretation of the verse with regard to revelation, the Gemara asks: With regard to what do Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva disagree? The Gemara explains that their dispute

is parallel to the dispute between these other tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: On the sixth day of the month of Sivan, the Torah, the Ten Commandments, was given to the Jewish people. Rabbi Yosei says: It was on the seventh day of the month. According to the one who said that it was on the sixth, the Torah was given on the sixth, which is the day of the revelation of the Ten Commandments, and on the seventh day of the month Moses ascended the mountain, as it is written: "And He called to Moses on the seventh day" (Exodus 24:16). According to the one who said that the Torah was given on the seventh of the month, it was given on the seventh and Moses ascended on the seventh, as it is written: "And he called to Moses on the seventh day."

⁵⁸ The Gemara proceeds to link the two disputes. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds in accordance with the opinion of the first tanna in the baraita, who said that it was on the sixth of the month that the Torah was given; therefore, this incident occurred after the revelation of the Ten Commandments. That is why he explains the verse "And the glory of the Lord abode on Mount Sinai and the cloud covered him for six days" to mean that the cloud covered Moses, and He called to Moses on the seventh day to receive the rest of the Torah. As, should it enter your mind to interpret the verse as follows: "And the glory of the Lord abode" from the New Moon of Sivan; "And the cloud covered it," the mountain; "And He called to Moses on the seventh day," to receive only the Ten Commandments; didn't they already receive the Ten Commandments on the sixth of the month, and the cloud that was on the mountain already departed on the sixth of the month?

⁵⁹ And Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that on the seventh of the month the Torah was given to the Jewish people. That is why Moses was summoned on the seventh of the month immediately after the revelation of the Ten Commandments. The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the Torah was given on the seventh of Sivan and Moses then proceeded to climb the mountain and remain there for forty days, that explains the calculation that you find: On the seventeenth of Tammuz the tablets were shattered, according to the standard tradition. How so? Calculate twenty-four days until the end of Sivan and sixteen days of Tammuz; they total the forty days that he was on the mountain. On the seventeenth of Tammuz he descended from the mountain and came and shattered the tablets.

⁶⁰ However, according to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, who said: There were six days of sequestering after the Torah was given and an additional forty days that Moses was on the mountain, the tablets were not shattered until the twenty-third of Tammuz, contrary to the standard tradition. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili could have said to you: The forty days that Moses was on the mountain include the six days of sequestering.

⁶¹ § The Master said in that baraita cited above that when the Torah says: "And He called to Moses," it means that Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing and listening. The Gemara suggests that this supports the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, as Rabbi Elazar said that when the Torah says: "And He called to Moses," it means that Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing and listening and the verse comes only to accord deference to Moses. From Rabbi Elazar's statement it is clear that all of Israel heard the voice of God.

⁶² The Gemara raises an objection: The Torah states: "And when Moses went into the Tent of Meeting that He might speak with him, then he heard the voice speaking unto him from above the Ark cover that was upon the Ark of the Testimony, from between the two cherubs; and He spoke unto him" (Numbers 7:89). The Torah could have said: He heard the voice speaking to him; however,

instead the verse said: He heard the voice speaking unto him, indicating that the voice reached him alone. Moses alone heard God's voice and all of the Jewish people did not hear it. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This case, where everyone heard God's voice, was at Sinai. That case, where Moses alone heard God's voice, was at the Tent of Meeting. Or if you wish, say instead an alternative resolution. This is not difficult; when God addressed Moses by calling to him, everyone heard; that which God subsequently communicated by speaking, Moses alone heard.

⁶³ Rabbi Zerika raised a contradiction between verses before Rabbi Elazar, and some say that Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Elazar raised a contradiction: It is written in one place: "And Moses was not able to enter into the Tent of Meeting because the cloud dwelt on it" (Exodus 40:35), as Moses was unable to enter the cloud. And it is written elsewhere: "And Moses came into the cloud" (Exodus 24:18). This teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, grabbed Moses and brought him into the cloud since he could not enter on his own.

⁶⁴ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: There is a verbal analogy that resolves this contradiction. It is stated here: "And Moses came into the cloud," and it is stated below, in another verse: "And the children of Israel went into the sea on dry land" (Exodus 14:22); Just as below, there was a path within the sea, as it is written: "And the water was a wall for them" (Exodus 14:22), here too, there was a path through the cloud, but Moses did not actually enter the cloud.

⁶⁵ The verse says: "And He called unto Moses, and the Lord spoke unto him from within the Tent of Meeting, saying" (Leviticus 1:1). Why does the verse mention calling before speaking, and God did not speak to him at the outset? The Torah is teaching etiquette: A person should not say anything to another unless he calls him first. This supports the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina, as Rabbi Ḥanina said: A person should not say anything to another unless he calls him first. With regard to the term concluding the verse: "Saying," Rabbi Musya, grandson of Rabbi Masya, said in the name of Rabbi Musya the Great: From where is it derived with regard to one who tells another some matter, that it is incumbent upon the latter not to say it to others until the former explicitly says to him: Go and tell others? As it is stated: "And the Lord spoke to him from within the Tent of Meeting, saying [lemor]." Lemor is a contraction of lo emor, meaning: Do not say. One must be given permission before transmitting information.

⁶⁶ § After digressing to interpret the verses with regard to Mount Sinai, the Gemara resumes its discussion of the statements of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish. Based on the question Reish Lakish addressed to Rabbi Yoḥanan and the fact that Rabbi Yoḥanan accepted the premise of that question, we learn by inference that both maintain that with regard to the inauguration, failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration. As it is stated: Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina disagree. One said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration. And one said: A matter that invalidates offerings throughout the generations invalidates the inauguration; a matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration.

⁶⁷ Conclude that Rabbi Yoḥanan is the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration. This may be concluded from the fact that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish says to Rabbi Yoḥanan: Just as with regard to the inauguration, failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, so too is the halakha with

regard to Yom Kippur, and Rabbi Yoḥanan did not respond and did not say anything, indicating that he agreed. The Gemara states: Conclude that this indeed is the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

⁶⁸ The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina?

⁶⁹ Rav Yosef said: The practical difference between them relates to the question of placing hands on the head of an animal brought as an offering. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard, including details that do not invalidate offerings throughout the generations, invalidates the inauguration, failure to perform the placing of hands on the head of the animal also invalidates the inauguration. According to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to perform the placing of hands on the head of the animal does not invalidate the inauguration.

⁷⁰ And with regard to the halakhot of offerings that apply throughout the generations the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to place hands on the head of the animal does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita that the verse states: “And he shall place his hand on the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to atone on his behalf” (Leviticus 1:4). Does the placing of hands atone for one’s sins? Isn’t atonement accomplished only by the sprinkling of the blood, as it is stated: “For it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life” (Leviticus 17:11)?

⁷¹ And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: “And he shall place...and it shall be accepted”? It teaches that if one deemed the ritual of placing hands to be a peripheral aspect of the mitzva and consequently failed to perform it, the verse ascribes to him status as though he did not achieve optimal atonement; and nevertheless, the offering atones for his sins. Apparently, failure to lay hands on the head of the offering does not invalidate the offering throughout the generations, as atonement can be achieved without it. Nevertheless, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, failure to lay hands on the offering invalidates the offerings brought during the inauguration.

⁷² Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The issue of waving the offering is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to wave the offering also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to wave the offering does not invalidate the inauguration.

⁷³ And with regard to the halakhot of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to wave the offering does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita that the verse says: “He shall take one male lamb as a guilt-offering to be waved to make atonement for him” (Leviticus 14:21). Does waving the offering atone for one’s sins? Isn’t atonement accomplished only by the sprinkling of the blood, as it is stated: “For it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life” (Leviticus 17:11)? And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: To be waved to make atonement? It teaches that if one deemed the ritual of waving to be a peripheral aspect of the mitzva and therefore failed to perform it, the verse ascribes to him status as though he did not achieve optimal atonement; and nevertheless, the offering atones for his sins on his behalf.

⁷⁴ Rav Pappa said: The issue of sequestering the priest for seven days is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to sequester the priest for seven days also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to sequester the priest for seven days does not invalidate the inauguration.

⁷⁵ And with regard to the halakhot of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to sequester the priest for seven days does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: It is derived from the fact that it is taught in the mishna: And they would designate another priest in his stead, and it is not taught: The Sages remove the designated priest from his house, despite the possibility that ultimately he might replace the High Priest and perform the Yom Kippur service. Apparently, sequestering is not essential.

⁷⁶ Ravina said: The issue of the priest performing the service with the multiple garments of the High Priest for seven days and serving with anointment for seven days is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days does not invalidate the inauguration.

⁷⁷ And with regard to the halakhot of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita: For what purpose does the verse state: “And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to serve in his father’s stead shall make the atonement” (Leviticus 16:32)? If it comes to teach that all service must be performed by the High Priest, it is already written with regard to the Yom Kippur service that it must be performed by Aaron, the High Priest.

⁷⁸ Since it is stated: “Seven days shall the son that is priest in his stead do them” (Exodus 29:30), I derive only that one who donned the multiple garments of the High Priest for seven days and was anointed seven days assumes the position of High Priest and may perform the service on Yom Kippur. However, with regard to whether one who donned the multiple garments for seven days and was anointed for one day, or one who donned the multiple garments for one day and was anointed for seven days is thereby inaugurated as High Priest, from where are those cases derived? Therefore, the verse states: “Who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated”; in any case he is appointed High Priest, even if either anointment or donning the garments did not continue for seven days.

⁷⁹ The Gemara asks: We found a source for the fact that when the High Priest is appointed, there is a requirement of donning multiple garments for seven days *ab initio*; however, from where do we derive the requirement of anointment for seven days *ab initio*? According to Ravina, there is a requirement to anoint the priest on each of the seven days *ab initio*, even though failure to do so does not invalidate the offering throughout the generations. From where is that requirement derived?

⁸⁰ If you wish, say: It is derived from the fact that the verse: “And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to serve in his father’s stead shall make the atonement,” is necessary to

exclude requirements derived from other sources, i.e., that both donning multiple garments and anointment must be for seven days. Apparently, anointment for seven days is required *ab initio*. And if you wish, say instead that it is derived from that which the verse states: “And the sacred garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him, to be anointed in them and to be consecrated in them” (Exodus 29:29). Anointment is juxtaposed in this verse to donning multiple garments: Just as donning multiple garments is required for seven days *ab initio*, so too, anointment is required for seven days *ab initio*.

⁸¹ § After ascertaining the halakhic distinctions between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina with regard to the inauguration, the Gemara proceeds to analyze the rationales for those opinions. What is the reason for the opinion of the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration? Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Bisna said that the verse states: “And so shall you do to Aaron and to his sons according to all that I have commanded you, seven days shall you consecrate them” (Exodus 29:35). The term: So, teaches that failure to perform the ritual precisely in this manner invalidates the inauguration. The Gemara asks: That works out well as a source that all

⁸² matters that are written in the context of this topic of inauguration in the book of Exodus invalidate the inauguration. However, with regard to matters that are not written in that context, but are written in the portion of the inauguration in Leviticus, from where do we derive that they invalidate the inauguration?

⁸³ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: One derives a verbal analogy between the word opening that appears in the two portions of the inauguration. It is written in the command concerning the inauguration: “The opening of the Tent of Meeting” (Exodus 29:32), and in its fulfillment it is written: “The opening of the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 8:31). Failure to perform the matters written in both portions invalidates the inauguration. Rav Mesharshiyya said: The verbal analogy is unnecessary, as the conclusion can be derived directly from the verse written with regard to the implementation of the inauguration: “And keep the charge of the Lord, that you not die, for so I am commanded” (Leviticus 8:35). The emphasis on this being the charge of the Lord comes to teach that failure to perform all the details mentioned in the implementation of the command invalidates the inauguration. Rav Ashi says: The phrase: For so I am commanded, is the source from which it is derived that all the details written in both portions invalidate the inauguration.

⁸⁴ Apropos that phrase, the Gemara cites a related halakhic midrash. The Sages taught: In the context of the implementation of the inauguration, three variations of the phrase appear: “For so I am commanded” (Leviticus 8:35); “as I commanded” (Leviticus 10:18); and “as God has commanded” (Leviticus 10:15). What does this repetition teach? From the phrase: “For so I am commanded,” it is derived that even in a state of acute mourning, on the first day after the death of a relative, one must eat the offering. God stated the verse: “As I commanded,” at the time of the incident just after the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, when Aaron and his sons were in a state of acute mourning. And when Moses states: “As God commanded,” he is saying: The command is from God and it is not from my own initiative that I am saying it.

⁸⁵ Apropos the matters mentioned that are not explicit in the portion, the Gemara cites that which Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina said: Trousers are one of the priestly vestments worn during the inauguration, but they are not written in the Torah portion. When the verse says: “And this is the

matter that you shall do for them to sanctify them for My service” (Exodus 29:1), the superfluous word: And, which appears at the beginning of the verse, comes to add to that which was written previously and to include trousers and the tenth of an ephah offered by a priest on the day that he begins his service.

⁸⁶ The Gemara asks: Granted, trousers can be derived, as the verse is written in the context of the matter of priestly garments detailed adjacent to the portion of the inauguration. However, with regard to the tenth of an ephah, from where do we derive that there is an obligation to offer it during the inauguration? The Gemara answers: It is derived by means of a verbal analogy between the word this that appears in one verse and the word this that appears in another. It is written: “This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord in the day when he is anointed, a tenth of an ephah” (Leviticus 6:13). And in the verse cited above in the context of the inauguration it says: “And this is the matter that you shall do for them,” which teaches that there is an obligation to offer a tenth of an ephah during the inauguration.

⁸⁷ Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: From where is it derived that even failure to read the Torah portion of the inauguration invalidates the inauguration? The verse states: “And Moses said to the assembly: This is the matter [davar] that God has commanded to be done” (Leviticus 8:5), teaching that even failure to perform the recitation [dibbur] of the Torah portion to the people invalidates the inauguration.

⁸⁸ § Apropos the inauguration of the priests, the Gemara asks: How, i.e., in what order, did Moses dress Aaron and his sons in the priestly vestments? The Gemara wonders: In what order did he dress them? That is an irrelevant question, as what was, was. The order in which Moses dressed the priests has no practical ramifications. Rather, the question must be: How will Moses dress the priests in the future, following the resurrection of the dead, when the Temple service will be restored? The Gemara rejects this question as well: In the future, too, when Aaron and his sons will come and Moses will be with them, he will know the proper sequence, and there is no point to raising the question.

⁸⁹ Rather, the question is: How did Moses dress them? The Gemara seeks to explain the verses on this topic, as they appear somewhat contradictory. The Gemara responds: The sons of Rabbi Ḥiyya and Rabbi Yoḥanan disagree with regard to this matter. One said: Moses dressed Aaron first and afterward Moses dressed his sons; and one said: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons simultaneously, i.e., consecutively from one to the next, without interruption, to avoid changing the order prescribed in the verses.

⁹⁰ Abaye said: With regard to the tunic and mitre everyone agrees that Moses dressed Aaron and afterward his sons, as both in the portion of the command concerning the inauguration and in the portion of the implementation, mention of Aaron precedes mention of his sons. When they disagree, it is with regard to the belt. The Gemara elaborates. The one who said: Moses dressed Aaron and afterward his sons derives it from that which is written: “And he girded him with the belt” (Leviticus 8:7), and then it is written: “And he girded them with belts” (Leviticus 8:13). Moses first dressed Aaron in all of the garments, including the belt, and then Moses dressed Aaron’s sons. And the one who said: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons, simultaneously derives it from that which is subsequently written: “And gird them with belts, Aaron and his sons” (Exodus 29:9), indicating that Moses girded them all with belts simultaneously. The Gemara asks: And according to the one who says: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons simultaneously, isn’t it written: He girded him with the belt,

and then it is written: He girded them with belts, clearly indicating that he dressed Aaron and then his sons?

⁹¹ The Gemara answers that he could have said to you: That verse comes to teach that the belt of the High Priest is not the belt of the common priest. It is explicit in the Torah that the belt of the High Priest is made of fine blue and purple linen. On the other hand, the Torah does not state the materials used in the belt of the common priest, which was in fact linen like the rest of the garments of the common priest. And still one can say that Aaron and his sons were dressed simultaneously.

⁹² The Gemara asks: And according to the one who said that Moses dressed Aaron first and then his sons, is it not written: “And you will gird them with belts,” indicating that they were girded simultaneously? The Gemara responds that he could have said to you: That verse teaches us that the belt of the High Priest is identical to the belt of the common priest. Both of them were from fine blue and purple linen. Therefore, although the Torah distinguishes between the girding of the belts, as Moses dressed Aaron before he dressed Aaron’s sons, there was a common command to make both belts, indicating that they were made of the same material.

⁹³ The Gemara asks: If they are identical, why do I need both the verse: “And he girded him with a belt,” and the verse: “And he girded them”? The Gemara explains: Learn from it that Moses dressed Aaron first and then dressed his sons. The Gemara asks: And can you find a situation where Moses could have girded Aaron and his sons simultaneously? The Gemara explains: It is necessary only to state that Moses girded Aaron first and then proceeded to gird his sons in order of their significance. After girding Aaron he did not dress Aaron in any other garments before girding his sons.

⁹⁴ § After a long digression in which many peripheral issues were addressed, the Gemara returns to interpreting the mishna. It was taught in the mishna: The Sages would remove the High Priest from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin. The Gemara asks: Why do the Sages remove him? The Gemara asks in astonishment: Why do the Sages remove him? It is as we stated above: Whether it is according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, as per his opinion: Sequestering of the High Priest is derived from the sequestering prior to the inauguration; or whether it is according to Reish Lakish, as per his opinion: Sequestering of the High Priest is derived from sequestering at Sinai, the answer is clear. What is the point of the Gemara’s question?

⁹⁵ The Gemara explains: This is what the Gemara is saying. Why did he withdraw from his house, i.e., his wife? The Gemara explained why he must be removed to a special location; but why doesn’t his wife join him? It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: It is due to the concern lest his wife be found to be in a situation of uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, and he will have relations with her and become impure.

⁹⁶ The Gemara asks in astonishment: Is that to say that we are dealing with wicked people? Will the High Priest, aware of the uncertain status of his wife, have relations with her? Rather, rephrase the statement: It is due to the concern lest he have relations with his wife and then she be found to be in a situation of uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman. In a case where blood is found on the sheets after the couple engaged in relations, and there is uncertainty as to whether or not the High Priest had relations with his wife while she had the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, the status of the High Priest is one of uncertain impurity.

⁹⁷ The Sages stated the following assumption before Rav Ḥisda: In accordance with whose opinion is that a reason for concern? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: A

menstruating woman who found blood on the sheets within twenty-fours after having relations, creating uncertainty with regard to her status when she engaged in relations, renders the man who had with relations with her retroactively impure. As, if it were in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, it is difficult: Didn't they say that a woman with regard to whom there is uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman does not render the man who had with relations with her retroactively impure. Therefore, the High Priest need not leave his wife during the week prior to Yom Kippur.

⁹⁸ Rav Ḥisda said to the Sages: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Akiva with regard to retroactive impurity only in a case where blood was discovered on the sheets long afterward, after there was time for the woman to leave the bed and bathe and only then discover the blood. Due to the time that elapsed, the Rabbis hold that there is no way to prove a connection between when the woman menstruated and when they engaged in relations. However, if the blood was found merely afterward, the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Akiva that she renders the man retroactively impure.

⁹⁹ Rabbi Zeira said: Learn from it that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is unlike a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion. Unlike the woman, who immerses after nightfall following the seventh day after her menstruation ceased, such a man may immerse on the seventh day and need not wait for nightfall. Therefore, if a High Priest has relations with his wife just before he is sequestered and there is uncertainty as to whether she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, the seventh day of his impurity occurs on Yom Kippur eve. He immerses himself that day and completes the purification process at nightfall. This allows him to enter the Temple to perform the Yom Kippur service.

¹⁰⁰ As, if you say that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is like a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion, when does he immerse? He may immerse only at night after seven complete days. Since that night is Yom Kippur, how can he perform the Yom Kippur service the next day? Isn't he required to wait for sunset following his immersion to complete the purification process? Until then his status is that of one who immersed that day, who may not serve in the Temple until the nightfall following his immersion. Rather, must one not conclude from it that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is unlike a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion? He immerses on the seventh day, Yom Kippur eve, and at nightfall he may serve in the Temple.

¹⁰¹ Rav Shimi from Neharde'a says: Even if you say that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is like a menstruating woman with regard to the time of immersion, the High Priest is not removed from his house at night. Rather, we sequester him one hour just before sunset on the eighth day prior to Yom Kippur, slightly before the start of the seven-day period, leaving seven full days to count prior to Yom Kippur. Although he is removed from his house more than seven days prior to Yom Kippur, that slight addition is not sufficient to have the period considered eight days.

¹⁰² The Gemara raises an objection to the opinion that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman immerses at night: With regard to all those obligated in immersions, their immersion is during the day. The exceptions are a menstruating woman and a woman after childbirth, whose immersion is at night. It can be learned by inference: With regard to a menstruating woman,

yes, she immerses at night; with regard to one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman, no, he does not immerse at night.

¹⁰³ The Gemara rejects that proof because the term menstruating woman in that baraita includes the woman and everyone whose inclusion in the impurity is derived from her status. The understanding is that a man who has relations with a menstruating woman assumes her impurity, and therefore his immersion would be identical to hers.

¹⁰⁴ The Gemara raises another objection: The halakhic status of one who is ritually impure due to a seminal emission is like that of one who came into contact with a creeping animal, whereas the legal status of one who is ritually impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is like that of one who became impure with ritual impurity imparted by a corpse. The Gemara asks: What, does the baraita not mean that one who had relations with a menstruating woman is like one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse in terms of immersion, which he may perform during the day? The Gemara rejects that conclusion. No, the baraita is merely comparing the duration of their impurity. One who experiences a seminal emission is impure for one day, like one who came into contact with a creeping animal; one who has relations with a menstruating woman is impure for seven days, like one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara wonders: For what purpose would the baraita come to teach the duration of their impurity? The Torah explicitly writes the durations of their impurity. This, one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, has impurity of seven days written in his regard; and similarly, that, one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman, has impurity of seven days written in his regard. There is no need for the baraita to derive a matter explicitly written in the Torah from another matter explicitly written in the Torah.

¹⁰⁶ Rather, must it not be that the baraita is equating them with regard to their immersion, in that both one who has relations with a menstruating woman and one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse immerse during the day?

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara rejects that conclusion. No; actually, the baraita is referring to the duration of their impurity. Although there is nothing novel in that equation, it was necessary for the tanna to teach the latter clause of the baraita: However, in one sense, the case of one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is more severe than one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse. One who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman transmits impurity through lying on a bed or sitting on a chair, even if he never came into direct contact with the chair or the bed. He renders the bed or chair impure with a mild form of impurity. He confers upon them first-degree ritual impurity status, sufficient only to render foods and liquids impure. One impure with impurity imparted by a corpse transmits impurity by means of direct contact.

¹⁰⁸ Come and hear an additional proof that Rabbi Hiyya taught: For the zav and the zava and the leper and the female leper, and one who had relations with a menstruating woman, and one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, their immersion is during the day. For a menstruating woman and a woman after childbirth, their immersion is at night. The Gemara concludes that this baraita is indeed a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Shimi from Neharde'a, who said that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman immerses at night.

¹⁰⁹ With regard to the sequestering of the High Priest, the Gemara asks: And before you remove him from the potential of impurity of his house, remove him from the potential of the more severe impurity imparted by a corpse. The Sages should have instituted an ordinance prohibiting visitors to the High Priest lest one die while in his chamber and render him impure. Rav Taḥlisa, father of Rav Huna bar Taḥlisa, said in the name of Rava: That is to say that impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public. In cases where the public is involved, impurity imparted by a corpse does not prevent the Temple service from being conducted. Since the service of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is a service involving communal offerings, impurity imparted by a corpse does not invalidate the service.

¹¹⁰ Ravina said: Even if you say that impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden in public and not completely permitted, the idea that the High Priest is not removed from the potential of impurity imparted by a corpse can be understood. Impurity imparted by a corpse is uncommon. The likelihood that one visiting the High Priest will suddenly die is minimal. In contrast, impurity of his house is common, as uncertainty with regard to his wife's status as a menstruating woman could arise at any moment.

¹¹¹ There is an amoraic dispute with regard to the effect of impurity imparted by a corpse on the conduct of the Temple service. It was stated with regard to impurity imparted by a corpse that Rav Naḥman said: It is permitted in cases involving the public; e.g., when a majority of the Jewish people is impure, the service of a ritually pure priest is not preferable to that of an impure priest. The Temple service proceeds as though there was no impurity at all. And Rav Sheshet said: Impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden in cases involving the public, and service performed by a ritually pure priest is preferable.

¹¹² The Gemara restricts the scope of the dispute. In a case where there are both ritually impure and pure priests in that patrilineal family tasked with serving in the Temple on that day, everyone, even Rav Naḥman, agrees that the pure priests serve and the impure priests do not serve. When they disagree, it is with regard to a case where the entire patrilineal family is impure. Is it necessary to seek out and bring pure priests from a different patrilineal family belonging to the same priestly watch, who are tasked with serving in the Temple on a different day that week?

¹¹³ Rav Naḥman said: The prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public, and we do not need to seek out other priests. Since the Torah permitted the performance of the Temple service by priests impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, it is completely permitted and it is as though the service is performed in purity. Rav Sheshet said: The prohibition of impurity imparted by a corpse is overridden in cases involving the public, and wherever possible we seek out ritually pure priests.

¹¹⁴ Some say that the dispute is slightly different: Even in a case where there are both ritually pure and ritually impure priests in that patrilineal family, Rav Naḥman disagreed with Rav Sheshet and said that the priests serve even when they are impure,

¹¹⁵ as in all situations of impurity imparted by corpses in cases involving the public, the Merciful One permits those who are impure to perform the Temple service.

¹¹⁶ The Gemara analyzes the rationale behind the two opinions. Rav Sheshet said: From where do I derive to say that impurity is overridden in cases involving the public? It is as it was taught in a baraita: If a priest was standing and sacrificing the omer meal-offering and it became impure in his

hand, the priest, who was aware of what transpired, says that it is impure and the priests bring another meal-offering in its stead. And if the meal-offering in his hand is the only meal-offering available there, the other priests say to him: Be shrewd and keep silent; do not tell anyone that it is impure.

¹¹⁷ In any case, it is teaching that he says that it is impure and the priests bring another meal-offering in its place. Apparently, when it is possible to perform the service in a state of purity, even in cases involving the public, it is preferable to do so, and the prohibition of ritual impurity is not permitted. Rav Naḥman rejected the proof and said: I concede that in a case where there are remnants of the offering designated for eating it must be performed in purity wherever possible. Although it is permitted to sacrifice an offering when impure, the mitzva to eat portions of the offering must be performed in a state of purity. Therefore, in cases where portions of the offering are eaten, the preference is to sacrifice the offering in a state of purity.

¹¹⁸ The Gemara raises an objection to the opinion of Rav Naḥman from the Tosefta: If a priest was sacrificing the meal-offering accompanying the sacrifice of bulls, rams, or sheep, and the meal-offering became impure in his hand, the priest says that it is impure and the priests bring another meal-offering in its stead. And if the meal-offering in his hand is the only meal-offering available there, the other priests say to him: Be shrewd and keep silent; do not tell anyone that it is impure.

¹¹⁹ What, is it not referring to the bulls, rams, and sheep of the festival of Sukkot, which are communal offerings that are not eaten? Apparently, even in cases of communal offerings, the priests seek to perform the service in a state of purity and the prohibition of impurity is not permitted but merely overridden.

¹²⁰ Rav Naḥman could have said to you: No, the bulls mentioned in the Tosefta are not standard communal offerings. Rather, the reference is to the bull sacrificed when the entire community engages in idolatry unwittingly. Although this offering is a communal offering, since it has no specific time fixed for its sacrifice, we seek out a pure meal-offering in its stead. Similarly, the rams mentioned in the Tosefta are not additional offerings of the Festival. Rather, the reference is to the ram of Aaron sacrificed on Yom Kippur. Although it has a specific time fixed for its sacrifice, since it is an offering brought by an individual, the High Priest, we seek out a pure meal-offering in its stead, as service in a state of impurity is permitted only for communal offerings. The sheep mentioned are not those for the daily offerings or the additional offerings of the Festival. Rather, the reference is to the sheep that accompanies the omer meal-offering, as in that case, there are remnants designated for eating. Therefore, the meal-offering must be offered in purity.

¹²¹ The Gemara raises an additional objection to the opinion of Rav Naḥman: With regard to blood that became impure and a priest sprinkled it on the altar, if he did so unwittingly, the offering is accepted. If he sprinkled the blood intentionally, the offering is not accepted. Apparently, even in cases involving the public, performing service in the Temple in a state of impurity is not permitted. This objection is rejected: When that baraita was taught, it was with regard to the offering of an individual, where the prohibition of impurity is certainly in effect.

¹²² The Gemara continues: Come and hear a different argument based on that which was taught in a baraita. For what does the frontplate worn by the High Priest effect acceptance? It effects acceptance for the blood, for the flesh, and for the fat of an offering that became impure in the Temple, whether it became impure unwittingly or whether it became impure intentionally, whether it was due to

circumstances beyond his control or whether it was done willfully, whether it was in the framework of an individual offering or whether it was in the framework of a communal offering. And if it enters your mind that impurity is permitted in cases involving the public, why do I need the frontplate to effect acceptance? If the prohibition of impurity is permitted, no pardon is necessary.

¹²³ The Gemara responds that Rav Nahman could have said to you: When the baraita teaches that the frontplate effects acceptance it is not referring to the entire list of items cited in the baraita; it is referring to an individual offering brought in impurity, not to a communal offering. The communal offering is mentioned only in the sense that in that case too, impurity is permitted, albeit for a different reason. Or if you wish, say instead: Even if you say that the frontplate effects acceptance for a communal offering, it is only for those offerings that lack a fixed time. Rav Nahman concedes that with regard to those communal offerings that have no specific time fixed for their sacrifice, the prohibition of performing the service in impurity remains in effect and requires the acceptance effected by the frontplate.

¹²⁴ The Gemara raises an objection. It is stated: “And Aaron will gain forgiveness for the sin committed in the sacred things that the children of Israel shall hallow in all their sacred gifts, and it shall be always upon his forehead that they may be accepted favorably before the Lord” (Exodus 28:38). And for which sin does the frontplate gain forgiveness? If it is for the sin of piggul, an offering disqualified by the intention to sacrifice or eat it after the permitted time, it has already been stated: “And if it is eaten at all on the third day, it is piggul; it shall not be accepted” (Leviticus 19:7). There is no acceptance of an offering that became piggul. And if it is for the sin of notar, meat of an offering left after the permitted time for eating it passed, it has already been stated: “And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings is eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be credited to he who offered it” (Leviticus 7:18).

¹²⁵ Apparently, the frontplate gains forgiveness only for the sin of impurity, which was exempted from its general prohibition in cases involving the public. This poses a difficulty to the opinion of Rav Sheshet, who said that the prohibition of impurity is overridden in cases involving the public, as the baraita clearly states that impurity is permitted. The Gemara responds: According to Rav Sheshet, the question of whether the prohibition of impurity is permitted or overridden in cases involving the public is the subject of a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: The frontplate effects acceptance whether it is on the High Priest's forehead or whether it is not on the High Priest's forehead when the offering becomes impure. This is the statement of Rabbi Shimon.

¹²⁶ Rabbi Yehuda says: As long as it is on his forehead it effects acceptance; if it is no longer on his forehead it does not effect acceptance. Rabbi Shimon said to Rabbi Yehuda: The case of the High Priest on Yom Kippur can prove that your statement is incorrect, as on Yom Kippur when the High priest wears only four linen garments the frontplate is no longer on his forehead, and it still effects acceptance.

¹²⁷ Rabbi Yehuda said to him: Leave the case of the High Priest on Yom Kippur, as the atonement of the frontplate is unnecessary because the prohibition of performing the Temple service in impurity is permitted in cases involving the public. Learn by inference that Rabbi Shimon holds that impurity is overridden in cases involving the public, and that is why the atonement of the frontplate is necessary. The dispute between Rav Sheshet and Rav Nahman is based on a tannaitic dispute, and the baraita cited above is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

¹²⁸ The Gemara proceeds to analyze the tannaitic dispute between Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Yehuda. Abaye said: In a case where the frontplate broke, everyone, including Rabbi Shimon, agrees that the frontplate no longer effects acceptance. When they disagree is in a case where the frontplate is not on his forehead but is hanging on a peg. Rabbi Yehuda holds that the verse: “And it shall be on the forehead of Aaron and Aaron shall gain forgiveness for the sin committed in the sacred things” (Exodus 28:38) means that the frontplate atones for sin as long as it is on his forehead.

¹²⁹ And Rabbi Shimon holds that emphasis should be placed on the end of that verse: “It shall be always upon his forehead that they may be accepted before the Lord.” From this, Rabbi Shimon derived that the frontplate always effects acceptance, even when it is not upon the High Priest’s forehead, as what is the meaning of the word always in the verse? If we say that it means that the frontplate must always be on the High Priest’s forehead, do you find that situation in reality? Doesn’t he need to enter the bathroom, when he must remove the frontplate bearing the name of God? Similarly, doesn’t he need to sleep, at which time he removes the priestly vestments? Rather, it means that the frontplate always effects acceptance, whether or not it is on his forehead.

¹³⁰ The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Yehuda as well, isn’t it written: “Always”? Clearly it does not mean that the frontplate must always be on his forehead. The Gemara answers: That term: “Always,” teaches that the High Priest must always be aware that the frontplate is on his head, and that he should not be distracted from it. This is in accordance with the statement of Rabba bar Rav Huna, as Rabba bar Rav Huna said: A person must touch the phylacteries on his head and on his arm each and every hour, to maintain awareness of their presence. This is derived by means of an a fortiori inference from the frontplate:

¹³¹ Just as with regard to the frontplate, which has only one mention of God’s name, the Torah said: “It shall be always upon his forehead,” teaching that that he should not be distracted from it, with regard to phylacteries, which have numerous mentions of God’s name in their four passages from the Torah, all the more so one may not be distracted from them.

¹³² The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Shimon, who says that the verse: “It shall be always upon his forehead,” teaches that the frontplate effects acceptance even when it is not on the High Priest’s forehead, isn’t it also written: “On his forehead...and shall gain forgiveness”? The Gemara answers: That verse comes to establish the place where the High Priest should position the frontplate, not to indicate that it effects acceptance only when it is on his forehead.

¹³³ The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Yehuda, from where does he derive the halakha to establish the frontplate’s place on the High Priest’s forehead? The Gemara answers: He derives it from that which is written: “On his forehead.” The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Shimon, too, let him derive the placement of the frontplate from: “On his forehead.” The Gemara responds: Yes, it is indeed so; that is Rabbi Shimon’s source.

¹³⁴ The Gemara asks: Rather, if so, with regard to the verse: “On his forehead...and shall gain forgiveness,” what does Rabbi Shimon do with that verse? The Gemara responds that Rabbi Shimon could have said to you: The frontplate that is intact and fit for placement on the High Priest’s forehead effects acceptance; that which is not fit for placement on the High Priest’s forehead does not effect acceptance. This comes to exclude a case where the frontplate broke, in which case it does not effect acceptance.

¹³⁵ The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Yehuda, from where does he derive the ruling that in a case where the frontplate broke it does not effect acceptance? The Gemara responds: He derives it from the fact that the Torah did not say forehead, and instead said his forehead, teaching that it must be fit for the forehead of the High Priest. And Rabbi Shimon does not learn anything from the difference between forehead and his forehead.

¹³⁶ § The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the dispute between these tanna'im, Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, who disagree with regard to a case of impurity involving the public, is like the dispute between those tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: Both in this case of a High Priest prior to Yom Kippur and in that case of a priest prior to burning the red heifer, on all seven days of his sequestering one sprinkles upon him purification water mixed with ashes from all the previous red heifer sin-offerings that were safeguarded there in the Temple. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Since these priests may have become impure with impurity imparted by a corpse at any point prior to their sequestering, one sprinkles the water upon them during all seven days, as there is no certainty which are the third and seventh days. Rabbi Yosei says: One sprinkles the water upon him only on the third and seventh days, not on all seven, as sprinkling upon him twice is sufficient to purify him. Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, says: With regard to the priest who burns the heifer, one sprinkles the water upon him all seven days. However, with regard to the High Priest on Yom Kippur, one sprinkles the water upon him only on the third and seventh days.

¹³⁷ The Gemara clarifies: What, is it not with regard to this point that they disagree? Rabbi Meir holds: The prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of impurity is overridden in cases involving the public. Therefore, one sprinkles the water upon the priest all seven days to ensure purification. And Rabbi Yosei holds: The prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of impurity is permitted in cases involving the public. Therefore, it may be sufficient to sprinkle the water on the third and the seventh days.

¹³⁸ This suggestion surprises the Gemara: And how can you understand the opinion of Rabbi Yosei in that manner? If Rabbi Yosei holds that impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public, why do I need sprinkling at all? Rather, it must be that everyone, i.e., both tanna'im, holds that impurity imparted by a corpse is overridden in cases involving the public, and that is why sprinkling is necessary.

¹³⁹ And here the tanna'im disagree with regard to this matter. Rabbi Meir holds: We say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva. Beginning with the moment that an impure person is eligible for immersion, whenever he immerses, even if he delays doing so, he is purified. Nevertheless, it is a mitzva to immerse as soon as one is eligible. It is similarly a mitzva to have the purification waters sprinkled as soon as the priest is eligible. Since there is concern that perhaps the High Priest became impure during the three days prior to his sequestering, there is an obligation to sprinkle him each day beginning with day one, since that might be the third day of his impurity. And Rabbi Yosei holds: We do not say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva, and the same is true with regard to sprinkling. Therefore, sprinkling on the third and seventh days of his sequestering is sufficient, despite their not necessarily being the third and seventh days of his impurity.

¹⁴⁰ And does Rabbi Yosei hold that we do not say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: With regard to one who had a sacred name of God written on his flesh, he may neither bathe, nor smear oil on his flesh, nor stand in a place of filth. If an immersion by

means of which he fulfills a mitzva happened to present itself to him, he wraps a reed over God's name and then descends and immerses, allowing the water to penetrate so that there will be no interposition between him and the water. Rabbi Yosei says: Actually, he descends and immerses in his usual manner, and he need not wrap a reed over the name, provided that he does not rub the spot and erase the name.

¹⁴¹ And we maintain that it is with regard to the issue of whether immersion at the appointed time is a mitzva that they disagree. The first tanna holds: We do not say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva. Therefore, one must wait to immerse until he procures a reed with which to cover God's name, even if it means delaying the immersion. And Rabbi Yosei holds: We say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva. Therefore, one must not delay the immersion until he procures a reed but must immerse immediately. The dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosei was not based on whether or not immersion on time is a mitzva. Rather, it must be that everyone agrees that according to these tanna'im we say that immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva.

¹⁴² And here they disagree with regard to this matter. Rabbi Meir holds: We equate sprinkling with immersion; just as immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva, so too, sprinkling at its appointed time is a mitzva. And Rabbi Yosei holds: We do not equate sprinkling with immersion; although immersion at its appointed time is a mitzva, sprinkling at its appointed time is not.

¹⁴³ The Gemara asks: And with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, why does he distinguish between sprinkling purification water on the High Priest before Yom Kippur and doing so to the priest before he burns the red heifer? If he equates sprinkling with immersion, then one should sprinkle purification water all seven days even on the High Priest prior to Yom Kippur. If he does not equate sprinkling with immersion, then even on the priest who burns the red heifer one would also not sprinkle purification waters all seven days.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara answers: Actually, Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, does not equate sprinkling with immersion, and fundamentally, one need not sprinkle purification water all seven days in either case. And with regard to the priest who burns the heifer, the Sages merely established a higher standard. This is one of the many stringencies that the Sages instituted with regard to the priest who burns the heifer in an attempt to underscore that the ritual must be performed in purity.

¹⁴⁵ The Gemara asks: With whose opinion, among the tanna'im cited above, does the following baraita that the Sages taught, correspond? The only difference between the priest who burns the heifer and the High Priest performing the service on Yom Kippur is

¹⁴⁶ that the sequestering of this High Priest prior to Yom Kippur is for the purpose of sanctity, i.e., to ensure that he appreciates the gravity of the occasion and to fill him with reverence in preparation for entering the Holy of Holies. His brethren, the priests, may touch him, as the objective of his sequestering is unrelated to any concern of impurity. In contrast, the sequestering of that priest who burns the heifer is for the purpose of purity, and his brethren, the priests, may not touch him. In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? It is in accordance with the opinion of either Rabbi Meir or Rabbi Yosei. As, if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, isn't there also this difference between the two priests: One sprinkles purification waters on the priest who burns the heifer all seven days that he is sequestered, whereas one sprinkles purification waters on the High Priest before Yom Kippur only on the third and seventh days?

¹⁴⁷ § Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, strongly objects to the opinion that one sprinkles purification waters on the priest who burns the heifer all seven days because those days may be the third or seventh day of his impurity. Granted, on the first day of the seven one sprinkles the water, as perhaps it is the third day of his impurity; and on the second day of the seven one sprinkles the water, as perhaps it is the third day of his impurity, if he became impure the day before he was sequestered. The same is true for the third day; one sprinkles the water, as perhaps that is the third day of his impurity. By the same token, on the fifth day one sprinkles the water, as perhaps that is the seventh day of his impurity if he became impure two days before he was sequestered. On the sixth day one sprinkles the water, as perhaps that is the seventh day of his impurity if he became impure the day before he was sequestered. On the seventh day one sprinkles the water, as perhaps that is the seventh day of his impurity.

¹⁴⁸ However, on the fourth day after he was sequestered, why do I require sprinkling at all? Neither with regard to the possibility that it may be the third day of his impurity is there uncertainty, since he has already been sequestered for three days, nor with regard to the possibility that it may be the seventh day of his impurity is there uncertainty, as even if it were, sprinkling would be useless because he did not have purification water sprinkled on him on the third day of his impurity. Nothing is accomplished by sprinkling the water on the priest on the fourth day.

¹⁴⁹ The Gemara asks: And according to your reasoning, is there ever sprinkling on the priest all seven days? Don't we maintain that sprinkling is prohibited by rabbinic decree issued to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest, and therefore, sprinkling does not override Shabbat. Rather, what have you to say? When it was instituted to sprinkle the water on the priest, it was for seven days except for Shabbat. Here too, say that sprinkling is performed for seven days except for the fourth day of sequestering.

¹⁵⁰ Rava said: Therefore, with regard to the High Priest on Yom Kippur, where the matter of the beginning of the seven-day period is not dependent on us; rather, the matter is dependent on the determination of the first day of the new month, for that reason it is required to remove the High Priest from his home on the third of Tishrei, and whenever the third of Tishrei occurs on a weekday, we remove him from his house. Therefore, both on the fourth day of his sequestering and on Shabbat, no sprinkling is performed. However, with regard to the priest who burns the heifer, where the matter of the beginning of the seven-day period is dependent on us, we remove him from his home on the fourth day of the week, Wednesday, so that the fourth day of his sequestering will occur on Shabbat. In that way, sprinkling will not be performed only one day of the seven, as the day on which sprinkling is prohibited will coincide with the day on which sprinkling is unnecessary.

¹⁵¹ § Having discussed the obligation to sequester the High Priest prior to Yom Kippur, the Gemara interprets the next matter in the mishna: The High Priest is removed from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: And was it called the Chamber of Parhedrin, the chamber for the annual royal appointees? Wasn't it called the Chamber of Balvatei, the chamber for ministers and council heads?

¹⁵² Rather, initially, during the era of Shimon HaTzaddik and his colleagues, who were rewarded with long lives due to their righteousness, they would call it the Chamber of Balvatei, a term connoting significance, since it was a place designated for the High Priest. However, because people were giving money in order to be appointed to the High Priesthood, the position was filled by

unworthy individuals. Due to their wickedness, they did not survive the year, and they were replaced every twelve months like the parhedrin who are replaced every twelve months. Therefore, the chamber was called disparagingly the Chamber of Parhedrin. Since the High Priest was replaced every year, the new appointee would renovate the chamber to reflect his own more elaborate tastes.

¹⁵³ Apropos the Parhedrin chamber, the Gemara discusses a related halakha. We learned in a mishna there in tractate Demai: With regard to doubtfully tithed produce, i.e., produce purchased from an am ha'aretz with regard to whom there is uncertainty whether or not he tithed the produce, the Sages required bakers to separate only teruma of the tithe, which is one one-hundredth of the produce that is given to the priests, and ḥalla, separated from the dough and given to priests.

¹⁵⁴ The Gemara asks: Granted, teruma gedola, which is equal to approximately one-fiftieth of the produce and is given to a priest, need not be separated from doubtfully-tithed produce, as it was taught in a baraita:

¹⁵⁵ This is because Yoḥanan the High Priest sent emissaries throughout all the areas located within the borders of Eretz Yisrael to assess the situation and saw that the people were separating only teruma gedola and were neglecting to separate tithes. Therefore, he issued a decree that anyone who purchases produce from an am ha'aretz must be concerned about the possibility that it was not tithed and is required to tithe it. Since even an am ha'aretz separates teruma gedola, the bakers who purchased grain from them were not required to do so.

¹⁵⁶ And granted, bakers need not separate first tithe and poor man's tithe due to the principle: The burden of proof rests upon the claimant. Neither first tithe, given to Levites, nor poor man's tithe, given to the poor, is sacred. It is merely the property of the Levite and the pauper, respectively. Since with regard to doubtfully tithed produce, by definition, there is no certainty that one is actually required to tithe it, if the Levite or the pauper should seek to take possession of the gifts, they must first prove that in fact the produce was not tithed. However, with regard to second tithe, why are the bakers exempt? Let them separate second-tithe from the produce, take it up to Jerusalem, and eat it in Jerusalem, which is the halakha with regard to anyone else who purchases doubtfully tithed produce.

¹⁵⁷ Ulla said: It is because these parhedrin, government appointees, beat the bakers throughout the entire twelve months of their tenure and tell them: Sell your baked goods cheaply, sell them cheaply. Since the officers insist that the bakers refrain from raising their prices, the Sages did not further burden them with the exertion of separating second tithe from a large quantity of grain and taking it to Jerusalem, as they would be unable to raise their prices to cover the cost of the lost grain and the trip to Jerusalem. Since the presumptive status of the grain is that it was tithed, and the obligation to tithe doubtfully tithed produce is a stringency, the Sages exempted the baker from the obligation to do so. What is the meaning of parhedrin? These are royal appointees [pursei] charged with performance of different tasks.

¹⁵⁸ § Apropos the Second Temple period, when High Priests were frequently replaced, the Gemara cites that Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "The fear of the Lord prolongs days, but the years of the wicked will be shortened" (Proverbs 10:27)? The fear of the Lord prolongs days; that is a reference to the First Temple, which stood for four hundred and ten years and in which only eighteen High Priests served, as is written in the lists of the genealogy of the priests in the Bible.

¹⁵⁹ But the years of the wicked will be shortened; that is a reference to the Second Temple, which stood for four hundred and twenty years and in which over three hundred High Priests served. In calculating the tenures of the High Priests, deduct from the figure of four hundred and twenty years forty years that Shimon HaTzaddik served, and eighty years that Yoḥanan the High Priest served, ten years that Yishmael ben Pavi served, and some say eleven years that Rabbi Elazar ben Ḥarsum served. These men were all righteous and were privileged to serve extended terms. After deducting those one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty-one years, go out and calculate from this point forward and conclude: Each and every one of the remaining High Priests did not complete his year in office, as the number of remaining High Priests is greater than the number of years remaining.

¹⁶⁰ § Apropos the sins of the High Priests in the Second Temple, the Gemara cites that Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Torta said: Due to what reason was the Tabernacle in Shiloh destroyed in the time of the prophet Samuel? It was destroyed due to the fact that there were two matters that existed in the Tabernacle: Forbidden sexual relations and degradation of consecrated items. There were forbidden sexual relations, as it is written: “Now Eli was very old and he heard what his sons were doing to all of Israel, how they lay with the women who did service at the opening of the Tent of Meeting” (I Samuel 2:22). And although Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who says that the sons of Eli sinned by engaging in forbidden sexual relations is nothing other than mistaken, even according to the alternative interpretation of the verse that it was due to the fact

¹⁶¹ that they deferred the sacrifice of their bird-offerings by women after childbirth; nevertheless, the verse ascribes to them as if they lay with them. These women came to the Tabernacle to sacrifice doves or pigeons as bird-offerings as part of their purification process, which would permit them to engage in sexual relations with their husbands. Eli’s sons delayed the sacrifice of these offerings and thereby delayed the return of these women to their husbands and their fulfillment of the mitzva of procreation. Even though, according to this opinion, Eli’s sons did not actually engage in sexual relations with these women, the verse attributes that degree of severity to their conduct.

¹⁶² Eli’s sons also sinned in the degradation of consecrated items, as it is written: “Before the fat was made burned, the priest’s servant came and said to the man who sacrificed: Hand over some flesh to roast for the priest, for he will not take cooked flesh from you, but raw. And if the man said to him: Let the fat be burnt first and then take as much as you want, then he would say: No, hand it over right now, or I will take it by force. The sin of the young men against the Lord was very great, for the men treated the Lord’s offerings with contempt” (I Samuel 2:15–17).

¹⁶³ § The Tosefta continues with a discussion of the sins of the Jewish people over the generations: Due to what reason was the First Temple destroyed? It was destroyed due to the fact that there were three matters that existed in the First Temple: Idol worship, forbidden sexual relations, and bloodshed. Idol worship, as it is written: “The bed is too short for stretching [mehistare’a], and the cover is too narrow for gathering” (Isaiah 28:20).

¹⁶⁴ What is the meaning of: “The bed is too short for stretching?” Rabbi Yonatan said: This bed is too short for two counterparts [re’im] to dominate [mehistarer]. Mehistare’a is a contraction of mehistarer re’im. It is inconceivable that there would be in one Temple both service of God and worship of the idol placed there by King Manasseh.

¹⁶⁵ What is the meaning of: And the cover [vehamasseikha] is too narrow [tzara] for gathering [kehitkannes]? Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that when Rabbi Yonatan reached this verse, he wept

and said: For He about Whom it is written: “He gathers [kones] waters of the sea together as a heap” (Psalms 33:7), the idol [masseikha] became a rival [tzara]? In the homiletic interpretation, masseikha is interpreted as idol and tzara is interpreted as rival, as in the term used to describe the relationship between two women married to the same husband, isha tzara.

¹⁶⁶ With regard to forbidden sexual relations, it is written: “The Lord says because the daughters of Zion are haughty and walk with outstretched necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go and making a tinkling with their feet” (Isaiah 3:16). Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, indicates a tall woman walking alongside a short one so that the tall woman would stand out. And walk with outstretched necks, indicates that they would walk with upright stature and carry themselves in an immodest way. And wanton eyes, indicates that they would fill their eyes with blue eye shadow in order to draw attention to their eyes. Walking and mincing as they go, indicates that they would walk in small steps, heel to toe, so onlookers would notice them. Making a tinkling [te’akasma] with their feet, Rabbi Yitzhak said: This teaches that they would bring myrrh and balsam and place them in their shoes and would walk in the marketplaces of Jerusalem. And once they approached a place where young Jewish men were congregated, they would stamp their feet on the ground and splash the perfume toward them and instill the evil inclination into them like venom of a viper [ke’eres bikhos].

¹⁶⁷ With regard to bloodshed it is written: “Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, until he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another” (II Kings 21:16).

¹⁶⁸ However, considering that the people during the Second Temple period were engaged in Torah study, observance of mitzvot, and acts of kindness, and that they did not perform the sinful acts that were performed in the First Temple, why was the Second Temple destroyed? It was destroyed due to the fact that there was wanton hatred during that period. This comes to teach you that the sin of wanton hatred is equivalent to the three severe transgressions: Idol worship, forbidden sexual relations and bloodshed.

¹⁶⁹ The Gemara continues: They were wicked; however, they put their faith in the Holy One, Blessed be He. With that statement we have come to the First Temple era, about which it is written: “Her chiefs judge for bribes, her priests give rulings for a fee, and her prophets divine for pay; yet they rely on the Lord, saying: The Lord is in our midst, no tragedy will overtake us” (Micah 3:11). At least the final portion of the verse was to their credit. Therefore, the Holy One, Blessed be He, brought upon them three decrees corresponding to their three wicked sins, as it is stated: “Therefore, due to you Zion will be plowed as a field, Jerusalem will become heaps of ruins, and the Temple Mount will be a like a shrine in the woods” (Micah 3:12).

¹⁷⁰ The Gemara asks: And in the First Temple era was there really no baseless hatred? Isn’t it written: “Cry and wail, son of man, for this will befall my people, this will befall all the princes of Israel: They will be cast before the sword together with my people, therefore strike the thigh” (Ezekiel 21:17)? Rabbi Eliezer interpreted this verse and said: These are people who eat and drink with each other, and stab each other with verbal barbs. Apparently, even those who were close were filled with hatred toward one another.

¹⁷¹ The Gemara answers: That behavior was found only among the princes of Israel, as it is written: “Cry and wail, son of man, for this will befall my people”; and it was taught in a baraita: “Cry and wail, son of man, for this will befall my people”; one might have thought that this unsavory trait was

common to all. Therefore, the verse states: “This will befall all the princes of Israel.” It was only the leaders of the nation who harbored baseless hatred for each other; the people of the nation as a whole did not hate one another.

¹⁷² § It was Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar who both said: In the case of the former, the people in the First Temple era, whose sin was exposed and no attempt was made to disguise their conduct, the end of their punishment was exposed, and the prophet informed them that they would return to their land in seventy years. In the case of the latter, the people in the Second Temple era, whose sin was not exposed; rather, they attempted to disguise their conduct, the end of their punishment was not exposed.

¹⁷³ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The fingernails of the former are preferable to the belly of the latter. Reish Lakish said to him: On the contrary, the latter were superior; even though there is subjugation by the kingdoms, they are engaged in Torah study. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Reish Lakish: The Temple will prove that the former were superior, as it was restored to the former. The Second Temple was constructed after the destruction of the first. However, after the destruction of the Second Temple, it was not restored to the latter. Apparently, the former were superior to the latter.

¹⁷⁴ Similarly, the Sages asked Rabbi Elazar: Are the former greater or are the latter greater? He said to them: Look to the Temple and see if it has been restored, as it was to our predecessors. Some say the exchange was slightly different: He said to them: The Temple is your witness. The restoration of the Temple after the destruction of the First Temple, attests to the fact that the former generation was greater.

¹⁷⁵ Reish Lakish was swimming in the Jordan River when Rabba bar bar Ḥana came and gave him a hand to help him out. Reish Lakish said to him: My God! I hate you Babylonians, as it is written: “If she be a wall we will build a silver turret upon her, if she be a door we will cover her with boards of cedar” (Song of Songs 8:9). This is the meaning of the verse as it applies to the Jewish people: Had you rendered yourselves a solid bloc like a wall and all ascended to Eretz Yisrael in the days of Ezra, you would have been likened to silver, which rot does not infest, in the sense that you would have merited experiencing the Divine Presence in all its glory. Now that you ascended like doors, and only some of you came to Eretz Yisrael, you are likened to cedar, which rot infests, and you merit experiencing only partial revelation of the Divine Presence.

¹⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: What rot infests cedar? Ulla said: It is sasmagor, a type of worm. The Gemara asks: What does sasmagor have to do with the Divine Presence during the Second Temple era? Rabbi Abba said: Just as little remains from a cedar tree infested by this worm, similarly, all that remained from the Divine Presence during the Second Temple period was a Divine Voice, as it was taught in a baraita: After the last prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died, the Divine Spirit of prophetic revelation departed from the Jewish people, and they were still utilizing a Divine Voice, which they heard as an echo of prophecy.

¹⁷⁷ The Gemara asks: And would Reish Lakish speak with Rabba bar bar Ḥana in public? Just as Rabbi Elazar, who was the master of Eretz Yisrael in wisdom and character, and nevertheless, Reish Lakish would not speak with him in public, as Reish Lakish was sparing in his speech and extended friendship to only a select few prominent, righteous people, to the extent that a person to whom Reish Lakish was seen speaking in the marketplace, one would give him a loan and do business with him without witnesses; would he have spoken with Rabba bar bar Ḥana?

¹⁷⁸ Rav Pappa said: Cast a man between them, and say that the incident did not involve Reish Lakish and Rabba bar bar Ḥana. It was either Reish Lakish bathing in the river and Ze'iri, the prominent Babylonian Sage, who extended him a hand, or it was Rabba bar bar Ḥana who was in the river and Rabbi Elazar extended a hand to him. In any event, when the Sage who heard what Reish Lakish said came before Rabbi Yoḥanan and related it, Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: That is not the reason; even had they all ascended in the days of Ezra, the Divine Presence would not have rested in the Second Temple, as it is written: "God will enlarge Japheth, and dwell in the tents of Shem" (Genesis 9:27).

¹⁷⁹ The Gemara explains: Although God will enlarge Japheth, referring to the Persians, who descended from Japheth and who assisted in constructing the Second Temple, the Divine Presence rests only in the tents of Shem, in the First Temple, which was built by King Solomon without the patronage of a foreign power.

¹⁸⁰ § The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the Persians descend from Japheth? The Gemara answers: As it is written: "The sons of Japheth were Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tuval and Meshech and Tiras" (Genesis 10:2). The Gemara explains: Gomer, that is Germamyā; Magog, that is Kandiya; Madai, that is Macedonia; Javan, in accordance with its plain meaning, Greece; Tuval, that is the nation called Beit Unaiki; Meshech, that is Musya. With regard to Tiras, Rabbi Simai and the Rabbis disagree, and some say the dispute is between Rabbi Simon and the Rabbis: One said: That is Beit Teraiki, and one said: That is Persia. According to that approach, Persia is listed among the descendants of Japheth. Rav Yosef taught: Tiras is Persia.

¹⁸¹ The list of nations continues: "And Sabtah and Raamah and Sabteca" (Genesis 10:7). Rav Yosef taught: These are the inner Sakistan and the outer Sakistan. Between one and the other there was a distance of one hundred parasangs, and the circumference of the land was one thousand parasangs.

¹⁸² The Gemara continues interpreting the verses. It is stated: "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar" (Genesis 10:10). Babel in accordance with its plain meaning, Babylonia; Erech, that is the city known then as Orikhut; and Accad, that is the place known then as Baskar; Calneh, that is Nofer Ninefi.

¹⁸³ The Torah continues: "Out of that land went forth Asshur" (Genesis 10:11). Rav Yosef taught: Asshur, that is Silek, meaning that is the region where the town Silkiya was built. "And built Nineveh and Rehoboth-ir and Calah" (Genesis 10:11). Nineveh, in accordance with its plain meaning; Rehovoth-ir, that is the town later known as Perat of Meishan; Calah, that is Perat of Bursif. "And Resen between Nineveh and Calah, it is the great city" (Genesis 10:12). Resen, that is the town later known as Akteisfon. It is the great city; I do not know whether this means that Nineveh is the great city, or whether it means that Resen is the great city. When it says: "And Nineveh was a great city of God, a three-day journey across" (Jonah 3:3), you must say that Nineveh is the great city.

¹⁸⁴ The Gemara continues to discuss the interpretation of names in the Bible. The Torah says: "And there were Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, the children of Anak" (Numbers 13:22). It was taught: Ahiman was so called because he was the greatest and most skillful [meyuman] of his brothers. Ahiman is a contraction of brother [ah] and right [yamin], which is the skilled hand. Sheshai was so called because he renders the ground like pits [shehitot] with his strides. Talmai was so called because he renders the ground filled with furrows [telamim] with his strides. Alternatively: Ahiman built the city of Anat; Sheshai built the town Alush; Talmai built the city of Talbush. The children of

Anak is referring to the fact that it appears that the sun is a necklace [shema'anikin] around their necks because of their height.

¹⁸⁵ § Apropos the opinion that Tiras is Persia, the Gemara addresses a related matter. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Rome is destined to fall into the hands of Persia, as it is stated: "Now hear the plan that the Lord has devised for Edom, and the thoughts He has considered for the residents of Teiman. Surely the youngest of the flock will drag them away, surely their habitation will be appalled due to them" (Jeremiah 49:20).

¹⁸⁶ Rabba bar Ulla strongly objected to this. From where may it be inferred that this phrase: Youngest of the flock, is Persia? It is as it is written: "The ram that you saw sporting two horns are the kings of Media and Persia" (Daniel 8:20), and the ram is a member of the flock mentioned in the verse. Still, how is that proof? And say that youngest of the flock refers to Greece, who will overthrow Rome, as it is written: "The goat is the king of Greece" (Daniel 8:21). The goat, too, could be characterized as a member of the flock.

¹⁸⁷ When Rav Ḥaviva bar Surmakei ascended from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael, he stated this difficulty before a certain one of the Sages. That Sage said to him: One who does not know how to interpret verses is so arrogant that he raises an objection to the opinion of the great Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? Indeed, Rabba bar Ulla misunderstood the basis of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's interpretation. What is the meaning of the phrase: The youngest of the flock? It means the youngest of the brothers, a reference to Persia, as Rav Yosef taught: Tiras, the youngest of Japheth's sons, that is Persia.

¹⁸⁸ Similarly, Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Elai: Rome is destined to fall into the hands of Persia. This is derived by means of an a fortiori inference: Just as the First Temple, that the descendants of Shem built it and the Chaldeans destroyed it, and in turn the Chaldeans, ruled by Belshazzar, fell to Persians, ruled by Darius the Mede and his son-in-law Cyrus the Persian; the Second Temple, that the Persians built it and the Romans destroyed it, is it not right that the Romans will fall into the hands of the Persians?

¹⁸⁹ In contrast, Rav said: Persia is destined to fall into the hands of Rome. Rav Kahana and Rav Asi, Rav's students, said to Rav: The builders will fall into the hands of the destroyers? Is that justice? He said to them: Although it seems unjust, yes, that is the King's decree. Some say that he said this to them: They, too, are destroyers of synagogues, and they are no better than the Romans.

¹⁹⁰ That was also taught in a baraita: Persia is destined to fall into the hands of Rome. One reason is that they destroyed synagogues. And furthermore, it is the King's decree that the builders will fall into the hands of the destroyers, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The son of David will come only when the wicked kingdom of Rome spreads its dominance throughout the world for nine months, as it is stated: "Therefore He will give them up until she who is to bear has borne; then the remnants of his brethren will return with the children of Israel" (Micah 5:2). The duration of Rome's rule over the world will be the duration of a pregnancy, nine months.

¹⁹¹ § The Gemara resumes the discussion of the High Priest's relocation to the Parhedrin chamber. The Rabbis taught: None of the chambers in the Temple had a mezuzah except for the Chamber of Parhedrin, in which there was a place of residence of the High Priest. Only residences in which one sleeps require a mezuzah, and the only chamber in the Temple that fits that description was the Parhedrin chamber.

¹⁹² Rabbi Yehuda said: That is not the reason; after all, weren't there several chambers in the Temple in which there was a place of residence designated for priests to sit and sleep, and yet they did not have a mezuzah? Rather, the mezuzah in the Chamber of Parhedrin was there because there was a rabbinic decree.

¹⁹³ The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that there was no fundamental obligation to affix a mezuzah in the Parhedrin chamber, and that one was affixed there due to a decree? Rava said that Rabbi Yehuda holds: The legal status of any house that is not designated for residence both for the summer and for the rainy season is not that of a house and therefore does not require a mezuzah. Abaye raised an objection to his opinion from a verse. How could you suggest that the legal status of a residence occupied for only part of the year is not that of a house? Isn't it written: "I will strike the winter-house with the summer-house" (Amos 3:15)? Apparently, even a residence occupied only half the year is a house. Rava said to him: A residence occupied only part of the year may be called the winter-house or the summer-house. It is not called a house unmodified. A house is a structure used year round.

¹⁹⁴ Abaye raised a different objection to the opinion of Rava, from a mishna: If one brought produce from the field into the sukkah that he constructed for the festival of Sukkot on the festival of Sukkot, Rabbi Yehuda obligates him to tithe the produce and the Rabbis exempt him from tithing the produce. And it was taught concerning the mishna: Rabbi Yehuda obligates the owner of that sukkah to include the sukkah in the joining of courtyards, like any of the houses in the courtyard; and in the mitzva of affixing a mezuzah in the sukkah; and in separating tithes from produce brought into the sukkah. One is obligated to tithe his produce only when its processing has been completed. When he brings the produce into the house, he is obligated to tithe it. Rabbi Yehuda holds that the legal status of a sukkah, in which one resides for a mere seven days, is that of a house in terms of the mitzva of mezuzah.

¹⁹⁵ And if you say that Rabbi Yehuda rules that by rabbinic law the status of the sukkah is like that of a house, but that by Torah law his opinion is consistent with Rava's opinion, granted, with regard to the joining of courtyards and mezuzah, it is possible to say that the obligation is by rabbinic law; however, with regard to tithes, is it possible to say that according to Rabbi Yehuda the obligation is by rabbinic law?

¹⁹⁶ In that case, there is the concern lest one come to separate tithes from the obligated produce to fulfill the obligation for the exempt produce, or from the exempt produce to fulfill the obligation for the obligated produce. Produce that one is obligated to tithe by rabbinic law has the status of exempt produce by Torah law. Since it is difficult to distinguish between produce that one is obligated to tithe by Torah law and produce that one is obligated to tithe by rabbinic law, one might seek to fulfill his obligation by separating tithes from one for the other. In both cases, both the produce designated as a tithe and the produce for which it was tithed would retain the status of untithed produce. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda could not have said that a sukkah is considered a house by rabbinic law.

¹⁹⁷ Rather, Abaye said: The dispute with regard to the mezuzah in the Parhedrin chamber must be explained differently. During the seven days that the High Priest lives in the Parhedrin chamber during his sequestering, everyone agrees that the chamber is obligated in the mitzva to affix a mezuzah there. When they disagree is with regard to the rest of the days of the year, when no one resides there. The Rabbis hold: We issue a decree and require that a mezuzah be affixed during the rest

of the year due to those seven days that the High Priest lives there; and Rabbi Yehuda holds: We do not issue that decree, and there is no obligation to affix a mezuzah to the chamber the rest of the year.

¹⁹⁸ Rava said to him: But isn't it taught in the mishna cited above: The sukkah that he constructed for the festival of Sukkot on the festival of Sukkot? Apparently, contrary to the opinion of Abaye, the dispute is whether or not there is an obligation to affix a mezuzah to the sukkah during the Festival itself. If, as Abaye said, the tanna'im agree that there is an obligation to affix a mezuzah during the festival of Sukkot even though it is used for only a brief period, on what basis do the Rabbis rule that there is no obligation even on the Festival itself?

¹⁹⁹ Rather, Rava said: During the rest of the days of the year, everyone agrees that the Parhedrin chamber is exempt from the obligation to affix a mezuzah there. When they disagree is with regard to the seven days that the High Priest lives there, and with regard to a sukkah during the Festival. And in order to resolve the contradiction between the opinions about the obligation of the chamber and of the sukkah, the Gemara asserts: With regard to the sukkah the reason is discrete, and with regard to the chamber the reason is discrete.

²⁰⁰ The Gemara explains: With regard to sukkah, the reason is discrete. Rabbi Yehuda conforms to his standard line of reasoning, as he said: In order to fulfill the mitzvah of sukkah, we require a well-built permanent residence. A permanent residence is obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah. The Rabbis conform to their standard line of reasoning, as they say: In order to fulfill the mitzvah of sukkah, we require a temporary residence, not a full-fledged house. A temporary residence is not obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah.

²⁰¹ And similarly, with regard to the chamber, the reason is discrete. The Rabbis hold: A residence in which one resides involuntarily is nevertheless considered a residence. Although the High Priest resides in the Parhedrin chamber due to a mitzvah and not of his own volition, its legal status is that of a residence and a mezuzah must be affixed. And Rabbi Yehuda holds: A residence in which one resides involuntarily is not considered a residence. Therefore, there should be no obligation to affix a mezuzah in the Parhedrin chamber, just as there is no obligation to do so in the other Temple chambers in which priests reside. However, the Sages instituted this obligation by rabbinic law so that people will not say: The High Priest is imprisoned in jail, as only in substandard residences that appear unfit for residence is there no obligation to affix a mezuzah.

²⁰² Who is the tanna who taught the following baraita? As the Sages taught:

²⁰³ All the gates that were there on the east side of the Temple courtyard did not have a mezuzah except for the Gate of Nicanor, as in the courtyard just inside the gate was the Chamber of Parhedrin, in which there is an obligation to affix a mezuzah. Therefore, a mezuzah was affixed to the gate as well.

²⁰⁴ Let us say that the baraita is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis and not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as, if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, a difficulty arises. The principle is that decrees are issued only to prevent violation of a Torah prohibition. The fact that a mezuzah was affixed to the Parhedrin chamber itself is due to a rabbinic decree, and will we then proceed to issue a decree to affix a mezuzah on the gate before the chamber in order to prevent violation of the existing decree? The Gemara rejects this reasoning: Even if you say that the baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, it is not difficult, as the entire obligation to affix the mezuzah on both the chamber and the gate is the result of a single decree.

²⁰⁵ § Apropos the mezuzah in the High Priest's chamber, the Gemara discusses other halakhot of mezuzah. The Sages taught with regard to the verse: "And you will write them upon the doorposts of your houses and upon your gates" (Deuteronomy 6:9): With regard to the gates of houses, and the gates of courtyards, and the gates of cities, and the gates of towns, all of them are obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah in that place, due to the fact that it is stated: "And you will write them upon the doorposts of your houses and upon your gates."

²⁰⁶ Abaye said to Rav Safra: If there is an obligation to affix a mezuzah on city gates, with regard to those city gates [abbulei] of Mehoza, a city with a Jewish majority, what is the reason that the Sages did not affix a mezuzah on them? Rav Safra said to him: Those gates are not the city gates. They are made as reinforcement to the fort [akra] of turrets above the gate, and therefore no mezuzah is required. Abaye said to him: And shouldn't the fort of turrets itself require a mezuzah, since there is a residence for the prison guard in the fort? As, wasn't a similar case taught in a baraita: A synagogue in which there is a residence for the synagogue attendant requires a mezuzah? Although no one lives in the synagogue itself, since the attendant lives in an adjacent room, the synagogue requires a mezuzah.

²⁰⁷ Rather, Abaye said: The reason that no mezuzah was affixed there was due to the danger involved. The gates of a city populated by Jews certainly require a mezuzah; however, since gentiles live there as well, the danger is that the gentiles would suspect the Jews of witchcraft or espionage, as it was taught in a baraita: The mezuzah belonging to an individual is examined twice every seven years to determine whether it was stolen or became disqualified. And in order to avoid excessive burden on the community, the mezuzah belonging to the public is examined twice in a fifty-year Jubilee period.

²⁰⁸ And Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident involving an examiner [artavin], who was examining mezuzot in the upper marketplace of Tzipori during a period when decrees were issued against the Jewish people, and a Roman official [kasdor] found him and collected a fine of one thousand zuz from him. The Gemara raises a difficulty: But didn't Rabbi Elazar say that those on the path to perform a mitzva are not susceptible to harm throughout the process of performing the mitzva? The Gemara responds: In a place where danger is permanent it is different, as one should not rely on a miracle, as it is written with regard to God's command to Samuel to anoint David as king in place of Saul: "And Samuel said: How will I go, and Saul will hear and kill me; and God said: Take in your hand a calf and say: I have come to offer a sacrifice to God" (I Samuel 16:2). Even when God Himself issues the command, there is concern with regard to a clear and present danger.

²⁰⁹ § Rav Kahana taught a baraita before Rav Yehuda: A storehouse for hay, and a cattle barn, and a woodshed, and a storehouse are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah, due to the fact that the women make use of them. And what is the meaning of the term: Make use? It means that the women bathe in them. Since women bathe there unclothed, it is inappropriate to affix a mezuzah there. Rabbi Yehuda said to him: The reason that there is no requirement to affix a mezuzah there is due to the fact that women bathe there; one can learn by inference that standard buildings of this kind, where women do not bathe, are obligated in the mitzva of affixing a mezuzah there. But wasn't it taught in a different baraita: A cattle barn is exempt from the obligation of mezuzah, unrelated to whether or not women bathe there?

²¹⁰ Rather, the term should be understood otherwise. What is the meaning of the term: Make use? It means that the women adorn themselves there, and this is what the baraita is teaching: Although

these structures are solid and clean to the extent that the women adorn themselves in them, they are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah since they are not residences. Rav Kahana said to him: Are you saying that structures where the women adorn themselves are exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah? But wasn't it taught in a different baraita: A cattle stable is exempt from the obligation of mezuzah, and a barn in which women adorn themselves is obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah?

²¹¹ Rather, what have you to say, that with regard to the requirement of mezuzah the status of places where women adorn themselves is subject to a dispute between tanna'im? Just as there are different opinions in that case, in my opinion, the status of standard cattle barns is also subject to a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita that it is written: Upon the doorposts of your house, meaning your house that is designated as a residence, to the exclusion of a storehouse for hay, and a cattle barn, and a woodshed, and a storehouse, which are exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah, and some obligate these structures in the mitzvah of mezuzah. Apparently, the Rabbis dispute the requirement of affixing a mezuzah in a standard stable.

²¹² Actually they said: There is a legal tradition that a building housing a bathroom, and a building housing a tannery [burseki], and a bathhouse, and a building housing a ritual bath for immersion, and any places of which women make use are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah. This baraita is inconsistent with the opinions of both Rav Kahana and Rav Yehuda. Therefore, Rav Kahana interprets the baraita according to his line of reasoning, and Rav Yehuda interprets it according to his line of reasoning.

²¹³ Rav Kahana interprets it according to his line of reasoning: Your house means your house that is designated for your residence, to the exclusion of a storehouse for hay, and a cattle barn, and a woodshed, and a storehouse, which are exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah in a case where their use is standard and they are not used for bathing or other immodest acts. And some obligate these structures in the mitzvah of mezuzah in a case where their use is standard. In truth they said the following with regard to a bathroom, and a tannery, and a bathhouse, and a ritual bath for immersion, and any places of which women make use; and what is the meaning of the term: Make use? It is that women bathe there. These places are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah.

²¹⁴ The Gemara challenges this interpretation: If so, that make use in this context means bathe, this is identical to the bathhouse. Why would the baraita need to list both a bathhouse and a place where women bathe? The Gemara answers: The baraita teaches us the halakha with regard to the bathhouse of the public, and it teaches us the halakha with regard to the bathhouse of an individual. As it could enter your mind to say: A bathhouse of the public, whose filth is extensive, is exempt from mezuzah; however, the bathhouse of an individual, whose filth is not extensive, as only women of that house bathe there, I would say it is obligated in the mitzvah of affixing a mezuzah. Therefore, the baraita teaches us that the bathhouse of an individual is also exempt.

²¹⁵ And Rav Yehuda interprets the baraita according to his line of reasoning, and this is what it is teaching: Your house means your house that is designated for your residence, to the exclusion of a storehouse for hay, and a cattle barn, and a woodshed, and a storehouse, which are exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah even in a case where women adorn themselves there. And some obligate these structures in the mitzvah of mezuzah in a case where women adorn themselves there. However, in a case where use of the building is standard, everyone agrees that these structures are exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah. In truth they said that a bathroom, and a tannery, and a bathhouse, and a ritual

bath for immersion, even though women adorn themselves there, are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah, because its filth is extensive.

²¹⁶ The Gemara asks: And according to Rav Yehuda, in cases where use of the building is standard, does everyone agree that a storehouse is exempt from the mitzva of mezuzah? But wasn't it taught in a baraita that it is written with regard to the mitzva to affix a mezuzah: And upon your gates, meaning that with regard to the gates of houses, and the gates of courtyards, and the gates of cities, and the gates of towns, and a barn, and chicken coops, and a hay storehouse, and wine storehouses, and oil storehouses, all of them are obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah? I might have thought that I include in the obligation of mezuzah even

²¹⁷ a gatehouse, used to guard the entrance to a courtyard, a portico [akhsadra], an open porch, and a balcony serving as a corridor to several residences. Therefore, the verse states: House; just as a house is a place that is designated for residence and is obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah, so too all similar structures are obligated. This is to the exclusion of those structures that are not designated for residence but for other purposes, which are exempt from the mitzva of mezuzah.

²¹⁸ I might have thought that I include in the obligation of mezuzah even a bathroom, and a tannery, and a bathhouse, and a ritual bath for immersion. Therefore, the verse states: House; just as a house is a place that is designed to honor people who enter it, so too, all places that are designed to honor those who enter are obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah, excluding those structures that are not designed to honor.

²¹⁹ I might have thought that I include in the obligation of mezuzah even the Temple Mount and its chambers and courtyards. Therefore, the verse states: House; just as a house is a place that is non-sacred, so too any place that is non-sacred is obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah, excluding those places that are sacred. For the purposes of this discussion, the baraita teaches that there are Sages who hold that barns and storehouses whose use is standard require a mezuzah, contrary to the opinion of Rav Yehuda that everyone agrees that these structures are exempt. Consequently, the baraita is a conclusive refutation of his opinion and support for the contention of Rav Kahana that this matter is the subject of a tannaitic debate.

²²⁰ § Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda taught a baraita before Rava: Six gates are exempt from the mitzva of mezuzah: The gate of a storehouse for hay, and of a cattle barn, and a woodshed, and a storehouse, and a Median gate, which is a dome, lacking two doorposts and a lintel, and an unroofed gate, and a gate that is not ten handbreadths high. Rava said to him: You began your statement with six gates that do not require a mezuzah, and you concluded with seven.

²²¹ Rava said to him: The obligation to affix a mezuzah to a Median gate is subject to a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: With regard to the gateway of a dome, i.e., an arched gateway, Rabbi Meir obligates it in the mitzva of mezuzah, and the Rabbis exempt it. And they agree that if, at the foot of the entrance, there are doorposts ten handbreadths high before the arch of the dome begins narrowing the width of the entrance, it is obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah since the sides form a usual doorway. Abaye said: However, everyone agrees that if the entire opening is only ten handbreadths high and at the foot of its entrance there are doorposts not even three handbreadths high, it is nothing. It is not considered an entrance and is exempt from the mitzva of mezuzah. Alternatively, if at the foot of its entrance there are doorposts three handbreadths high, but the entrance is not ten handbreadths high, it is nothing, as it is not considered a viable entrance.

²²² They disagree only with regard to a case where the entrance is ten handbreadths high, and at the foot of the entrance there are doorposts three handbreadths high, but at no point is the width of the opening four handbreadths. However, the space in the dome alongside the entrance is wide enough to theoretically carve out space to complete a width of four handbreadths. Rabbi Meir holds that in all cases where a certain minimum area is required for a specific halakha to take effect and the existing area is smaller, if circumstances would theoretically allow one to carve out and create an area of the requisite size, its legal status is as if one carves out the space to complete it. Therefore, the opening is considered wide enough to require a mezuzah. And the Rabbis hold: One does not carve out the space to complete it. Since the width of the opening is not actually four handbreadths, it is exempt from the mitzvah of mezuzah.

²²³ § The Sages taught in a baraita: A synagogue, a woman's house, and a house jointly owned by partners are all obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah. The Gemara asks: That is obvious; why would these structures be exempt? Lest you say that it is written: "Your house," in the masculine, and not her house; "Your house," in the singular, and not their house, excluding a jointly owned house. Therefore, the baraita teaches us that those houses are obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah like all others.

²²⁴ And say it is indeed so that a woman's house and a jointly owned house are exempt. The Gemara rejects this possibility: Immediately following the mitzvah of mezuzah is the reward for its fulfillment, as the verse states: "So that your days be numerous, as well as the days of your sons" (Deuteronomy 11:21). If these structures were exempt from the mitzvah, the question would arise: Do these men and individuals require long life, and these, meaning women and partners, do not require long life? The mitzvah of mezuzah clearly applies to all of them.

²²⁵ The Gemara then asks: Rather, why do I need the emphasis of the verse: Your house, if every house is obligated in the mitzvah of mezuzah? The Gemara answers: This could be understood in accordance with the opinion of Rava, as Rava said: Your house is interpreted to mean that the mezuzah is placed in the way that you enter the house. And when a person lifts his foot to begin walking, he lifts his right foot first. Therefore, the mezuzah is affixed on the right side of the doorway.

²²⁶ § Apropos the baraita just cited, the Gemara cites a related baraita that addresses a different topic. It was taught in another baraita: A synagogue, a house jointly owned by partners, and a woman's house become impure with the impurity of leprosy of the house, like all other houses. The Gemara asks: That is obvious; why wouldn't they become impure? The Gemara explains: Lest you say that it is written with regard to leprosy: "And the one whom the house is his will come" (Leviticus 14:35), which could be interpreted: His and not hers; his and not theirs, to the exclusion of a house owned by a woman or by partners. Therefore, it teaches us that these houses are also included in this halakha.

²²⁷ And say it is indeed so that a woman's house and a jointly owned house are excluded from the impurity of leprosy. The Gemara responds that the verse states: "In a house of the land of your possession" (Leviticus 14:34). The word your is written in the plural form to teach that all houses in Eretz Yisrael are subject to this impurity. The Gemara asks: Rather, why do I need the emphasis of the term: His, if every house is subject to the impurity of leprosy? The Gemara answers that the term does not teach a halakha but reveals why a house might be afflicted with leprosy. The house belonging to one who dedicates his house to himself alone, who refuses to lend his vessels to others and says that he does not have them, will be punished. The Holy One, Blessed be He, publicizes his

possessions for all to see when he is forced to empty them from his house due to leprosy. This excludes one who lends his vessels to others; his house is not afflicted with leprosy.

²²⁸ The Gemara raises another question: And with regard to a synagogue, does it become impure with the impurity of leprosy? But wasn't it taught in a baraita: One might have thought that synagogues and study halls become impure with the impurity of leprosy. Therefore, the verse states: And the one whom the house is his will come; this is referring to a house that is designated for him, excluding those houses that are not designated for him but are public property.

²²⁹ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as it is the subject of a tannaitic dispute. This baraita, which states that a synagogue can become impure with the impurity of leprosy, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir; that baraita, which states that a synagogue cannot become impure with the impurity of leprosy, is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, as it was taught in a baraita: A synagogue in which there is a residence for the synagogue attendant is obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah, as it is a dwelling. With regard to a synagogue in which there is no residence, Rabbi Meir obligates it in the mitzva of mezuzah, and the Rabbis exempt it. Rabbi Meir deems a synagogue like a residence with regard to both a mezuzah and its susceptibility to leprosy.

²³⁰ And if you wish, say instead a different resolution to the contradiction between the baraitot with regard to the synagogue. Both this baraita and that baraita are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and it is not difficult. This baraita, which states that it can become impure, is referring to a synagogue in which there is a place of residence; that baraita, which states that it cannot become impure, is referring to a synagogue in which there is not a place of residence.

²³¹ And if you wish, say instead yet a different resolution to the contradiction between the baraitot: Both this baraita and that baraita are referring to synagogues in which there is not a place of residence,

²³² and this baraita, which states that a synagogue does not become impure, is referring to synagogues in large cities. Since those synagogues attract people from different places, the building is not the property of the local residents but that of the public. And that baraita, which states that a synagogue becomes impure, is referring to synagogues in villages, which belong solely to the residents of the village, and its status is like that of a house owned by partners.

²³³ The Gemara asks: And do the synagogues in large cities not become ritually impure with the impurity of leprosy? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that it is written: "In a house of the land of your possession" (Leviticus 14:34); the land of your possession becomes ritually impure with the impurity of leprosy, and the city of Jerusalem does not become ritually impure with the impurity of leprosy, since it belongs to all the Jewish people rather than to a specific tribe? Rabbi Yehuda said: I heard that it is only the site of the Temple [mikdash] alone that does not become ritually impure with the impurity of leprosy. It can be inferred that in the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, even synagogues and study halls in Jerusalem become ritually impure with the impurity of leprosy, and that is the case even though they are synagogues in large cities. The Gemara rejects this; rather, one must emend the baraita and say that Rabbi Yehuda said: I heard that it is only a sacred [mekudash] site alone. That definition includes synagogues and study halls.

²³⁴ § The Gemara explains the dispute in the baraita that was cited: With regard to what principle do Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree? The first tanna holds: Jerusalem was not divided among the tribes but belonged to all of the Jewish people, and as such it does not become ritually impure with

the impurity of leprosy. Rabbi Yehuda holds: Jerusalem was divided between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. Therefore, the same halakhot of impurity apply there as apply in all other cities in Eretz Yisrael.

²³⁵ The Gemara states: And that dispute corresponds to the dispute between these tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: What part of the Temple was located in the portion of the tribe of Judah? It was the part including the entire Temple Mount, excluding those areas in the portion of Benjamin, the chambers, and the courtyards. And what part of the Temple was in the portion of the tribe of Benjamin? It was the part including the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary, and the Sanctuary, and the Holy of Holies. And a strip of land emerges from the portion of Judah and enters the portion of Benjamin on which the altar is built. And Benjamin the righteous would suffer longing to engulf it every day. The tribe of Benjamin was disappointed that the strip belonging to the tribe of Judah intersected its tribal land and wanted Judah to transfer ownership so that the land with the altar would belong to Benjamin.

²³⁶ An allusion to this is that which is stated in Moses' blessing to Benjamin: "Ever does he protect him and he rests between his shoulders" (Deuteronomy 33:12), like one who is unable to abide something stuck between his shoulders and constantly rubs it to remove it. Therefore, Benjamin the righteous was privileged to serve as host [ushpizekhan] to the Almighty, as it is stated: "And he rests between his shoulders," alluding to the fact that the Holy of Holies was located in the territory of Benjamin. According to this baraita, Jerusalem was divided among the tribes.

²³⁷ And this tanna holds: Jerusalem was not divided among the tribes at all, as it was taught in a baraita: Homeowners did not let their houses in Jerusalem because the houses were not actually theirs. Residents of Jerusalem did not own their residences, as the city belonged to the entire Jewish people. Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok says: Even beds were not rented. Therefore, with regard to hides of consecrated animals of the Festival peace-offerings, which the pilgrims to Jerusalem would give as gifts to their hosts, the hosts were not really entitled to them. This is why the hosts would take them by force. Abaye said: Learn from it that it is customary for a guest to leave his empty wine jug and hides from sacrificial animals and give them to his host.

²³⁸ After discussing the status of Jerusalem, the Gemara addresses the matter of synagogues in villages. The Gemara asks: And do the synagogues in villages become impure with the impurity of leprosy? Wasn't it taught in a baraita as follows? It is written: "When you enter the land of Canaan that I give you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession" (Leviticus 14:34). The term: "For a possession," means until you conquer it and it becomes entirely yours. However, in a case where they conquered it but did not divide it among the tribes, or where they divided it among the tribes but did not distribute it to the patrilineal families; or where they distributed it to the patrilineal families, but every one of them does not recognize his individual portion, from where is it derived that it does not become impure?

²³⁹ The verse states: "And the one whom the house is his will come" (Leviticus 14:35); one whom the house is designated for him and who is certain of his ownership, excluding those houses which are not designated for him. Apparently, the legal status of synagogues in villages is that of communal property, as the portion of each individual is not clearly identifiable, and therefore they cannot become impure. Rather, there is no distinction in this regard between synagogues in large cities and

those in villages. And with regard to the original question, it is clear as we responded initially with alternative resolutions to the contradiction between the baraitot.

²⁴⁰ § It was taught in the mishna: And they would designate another priest in the High Priest's stead, lest a disqualification due to impurity prevent his entering the Temple on Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks: It is obvious that if disqualification befell the incumbent High Priest prior to the sacrifice of the daily morning offering on Yom Kippur, that one initiates the replacement by dressing him in the eight garments of the High Priest with the daily morning offering, which renders him acting High Priest. However, if disqualification befell the incumbent High Priest after the daily morning offering, how does one initiate the replacement? After the daily morning offering, the High Priest begins the Yom Kippur service clothed in the four linen garments unique to the day, which are the same as the tunic, trousers, turban, and belt of the common priest. How is it evident that he is the acting High Priest?

²⁴¹ Rav Adda bar Ahava said: It is evident by means of his belt. The belt worn by the High Priest on Yom Kippur was made of linen, unlike that of the common priest, which was a mixture of the diverse kinds of linen and wool. The Gemara asks: This works out well according to the one who said: Throughout the rest of the year, the belt of the High Priest, which the Torah clearly states is made of a mixture of diverse kinds, is identical to the belt of the common priest, whereas on Yom Kippur, the belt is made of linen. When the replacement priest dons the linen belt he is initiated as the acting High Priest. However, according to the one who said: The belt of the High Priest is not identical to the belt of the common priest, what can be said? According to this approach, throughout the year the High Priest wears a belt of blue and purple wool and linen, while the belts of common priests are made of white linen like the rest of their clothes. Therefore, on Yom Kippur, when the High Priest dons a belt of white linen, his belt is identical to that of a common priest. If so, what initiates the replacement as acting High Priest?

²⁴² Abaye said: Before the replacement begins serving on Yom Kippur with the four linen garments, he is initiated and promoted to the High Priesthood by donning the eight garments of the High Priest and turning over one of the limbs on the altar with a fork, thereby accelerating the burning of the daily morning offering. By performing part of the service while wearing the garments of the High Priest, he is initiated as acting High Priest. And this is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, as Rav Huna said: A non-priest who turns over part of the offering on the altar with a fork is liable to receive the death penalty because he engaged in Temple service restricted to priests. And Rav Pappa said:

²⁴³ That action is unnecessary and therefore superfluous; his service initiates him. The replacement High Priest need not undergo any preliminary initiation. His very performance of the Yom Kippur service, which is valid only if performed by the High Priest, initiates him as acting High Priest. As proof, the Gemara states: Wasn't it taught in a baraita: With regard to all the sacred vessels that Moses made, their anointment with oil consecrates them. From that point forward, in the generations after Moses, new vessels did not require anointment to be consecrated; rather, their use in Temple service initiates them and renders them fit for use. Here, too, with regard to the High Priest, his service initiates him.

²⁴⁴ § Apropos the belt of the High Priest, the Gemara cites the aforementioned dispute in its entirety. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: With regard to the belt of the common priest, there is a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi

Shimon. One said: It was a mixture of diverse kinds of wool and linen, like the belt of the High Priest mentioned in the Torah. And one said: It was made of fine linen, like the rest of the garments of the common priest.

²⁴⁵ The Gemara suggests: Conclude that it is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi who said that the belt of the common priest was a mixture of diverse kinds, as it was taught in a baraita: The only difference between a High Priest and a common priest is the belt; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: Not even the belt represents a difference between them. The Gemara explains: With regard to the difference between the High Priest and the common priest, when is there a dispute between the tanna'im? If we say that the dispute is with regard to the rest of the days of the year, there are many other differences between them, since the High Priest serves wearing eight garments and the common priest wears four garments. Therefore, that could not be the point of the dispute.

²⁴⁶ Rather, is it not that the dispute is with regard to the differences between the High Priest and the common priest on Yom Kippur? They agree that the belt of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is made of linen, but disagree with regard to the common priest's belt. According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who says that there is a difference between the belts, the belt of the common priest must be made of a mixture of diverse kinds. According to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who says that there is no difference between their belts, the belt of the common priest must be made of linen, like that of the High Priest on Yom Kippur.

²⁴⁷ The Gemara rejects this proof. The Sages say: No, this is not a proof, as actually, the dispute is with regard to the differences during the rest of the days of the year. However, the dispute is not with regard to all the differences between the High Priest and the common priest, but rather only with regard to those four garments common to both priests: The tunic, trousers, turban, and belt. Based on this understanding that the dispute is with regard to the rest of the year, the analysis of the dispute is reversed: According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the belt of the High Priest is a mixture of diverse kinds and that of the common priest is made of linen, while according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, the belt of the common priest is a mixture of diverse kinds. Therefore, there is no definitive proof from the baraita.

²⁴⁸ When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he stated this tradition in a clearer fashion: With regard to the belt of the High Priest on Yom Kippur, everyone agrees that it is made of fine linen, as stated in the Torah. With regard to the belt of the High Priest during the rest of the days of the year, everyone agrees that it is a mixture of diverse kinds. They disagreed only with regard to the belt of the common priest both during the rest of the days of the year and on Yom Kippur, as Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It was a mixture of diverse kinds, and Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says it was made of linen.

²⁴⁹ Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: We, too, have learned in a baraita: The Torah says with regard to the removal of the ashes from the altar: "And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen trousers shall he put upon his flesh" (Leviticus 6:3). The baraita questions the formulation of the verse. Since at the beginning of the verse it is written: "And the priest shall put on," for what purpose does the verse state: "Shall he put upon," in the latter part of the verse? Rabbi Yehuda says: It comes to include donning the mitre and the belt for the removal of the ashes, even though it is not explicitly stated in the verse. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

²⁵⁰ Rabbi Dosa says that the term: Shall put on, comes to include the halakha that the garments of the High Priest on Yom Kippur are fit for a common priest. During the Yom Kippur service, the High Priest wears just four linen garments. Although he may not serve in those garments on Yom Kippur the following year, a common priest may serve in them during the rest of the year. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: There are two responses to reject this statement of Rabbi Dosa. One: The belt of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is not the same as the belt of the common priest during the rest of the year. Clearly, according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the belt of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is made of linen, and that of the common priest during the year is a mixture of the diverse kinds of wool and linen.

²⁵¹ And furthermore, there is another reason to reject the statement of Rabbi Dosa. Could it be that with regard to garments that were used by the High Priest to perform a service of extreme sanctity, the common priest will use them to perform a service of minor sanctity? Rather, according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, for what purpose does the verse state the phrase: Shall put on? It comes to include threadbare garments and to teach that as long as they are not completely tattered, they may be worn for that service.

²⁵² And Rabbi Dosa follows his line of reasoning, as it was taught in a baraita: That which is written: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the Sanctuary, and shall leave them there" (Leviticus 16:23), teaches that the garments worn by the High Priest on Yom Kippur require interment and may not be put to additional use. Rabbi Dosa says: It means only that the High Priest may not use them on Yom Kippur in a different year. According to Rabbi Dosa, they may be worn by a common priest during his service, as they do not require interment.

²⁵³ § The Gemara returns to the initiation of the acting High Priest. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: If a disqualification befalls the High Priest and they appointed another in his stead, and then the cause of the disqualification of the High Priest is resolved, e.g., he was purified from impurity, the original High Priest returns to his service. With regard to the second, acting High Priest, all the mitzvot of the High Priesthood are incumbent upon him. He serves wearing eight garments and it is prohibited for him to let his hair grow, to rend his garments in mourning the death of a relative, to subject himself to impurity imparted by the corpse of a relative, or to marry a widow. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

²⁵⁴ Rabbi Yosei says: The original priest returns to his service, while the second is fit to serve neither as High Priest with eight garments, because there is a different High Priest; nor as a common priest with four garments, as once he was elevated to a state of extreme sanctity he may not be reduced to a state of minor sanctity.

²⁵⁵ Rabbi Yosei said as proof for his opinion: There was an incident involving the priest Yosef ben Elem of Tzippori, who, when a reason for disqualification befell a High Priest, the priests appointed him in his stead. After the cause of the disqualification was resolved, the Sages said: The original High Priest returns to his service, while the second is fit to serve neither as High Priest nor as a common priest. The Gemara explains: Neither as a High Priest, due to hatred, jealousy and bitterness that would arise if there were two High Priests with equal standing in the Temple; nor as a common priest, because the principle is: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not

downgrade. Once he has served as a High Priest he cannot be restored to the position of a common priest.

²⁵⁶ Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said:

²⁵⁷ The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei that the original High Priest returns to his service, while the second is fit to serve neither as High Priest nor as a common priest. And Rabbi Yosei concedes that if the second priest violated this provision and served as High Priest wearing eight garments, his service is valid. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and Rabbi Yosei conceded that if the original High Priest dies, the second returns to his service as High Priest.

²⁵⁸ The Gemara asks: That is obvious. Clearly, the second priest may serve as High Priest after the first one dies without concern that their rivalry will generate hatred between them. The Gemara answers: Lest you say that the mere knowledge that another priest is in waiting to replace him is enough to generate hatred, and would be for him like a woman whose husband has taken a rival wife in her lifetime; therefore, Rav teaches us that this is not a concern.

²⁵⁹ § It was taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: The Sages would even designate another wife for the High Priest lest his wife die. The Rabbis say: There is no concern lest his wife die, and therefore the Sages did not designate another wife for him. The Gemara asks with regard to the Rabbis: Aren't they concerned lest he become impure, which is why the Sages designate a replacement High Priest? Why then, are they not concerned lest his wife die? The Gemara answers that the Rabbis could have said to you: Impurity is common, as it is not unusual for the High Priest to become impure either due to secretions from his body or from an external source. Death is not common, and therefore there is no concern lest his wife die.

²⁶⁰ It was taught in the mishna that the Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: If so, that you are concerned lest his wife die, there is no end to the matter. You should also be concerned lest the second wife die, requiring designation of a third and even a fourth wife. The Gemara comments: The Rabbis spoke well to Rabbi Yehuda, making a good point. What can Rabbi Yehuda respond? Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you: For the potential death of one wife, we are concerned; for the potential death of two wives, we are not concerned, as the likelihood of that happening is negligible. The Gemara asks: And what would the Rabbis respond to that contention? They would say: If there is reason to be concerned for a potential death, then even for the potential death of two wives, we are concerned.

²⁶¹ The Gemara suggests: If according to the Rabbis there is no distinction between concern that one wife might die and concern that two wives might die, let them say the same with regard to their own opinion. Just as they designate a replacement lest the High Priest become impure, they should designate a second replacement lest the first replacement also become impure. The Gemara answers that the Rabbis could have said to you: The High Priest is vigilant in avoiding impurity. No amount of vigilance can prevent death. The Gemara asks: If he is vigilant in avoiding impurity, then why do the Sages designate another priest in his stead? The reason for the designation of the replacement is that once we establish a replacement as a rival, all the more so will the High Priest be even more vigilant in avoiding impurity to maintain his position.

²⁶² § The Gemara asks with regard to Rabbi Yehuda's opinion: And is designation of a second wife sufficient for him? The Merciful One stated in the Torah: "And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house" (Leviticus 16:11). House means wife; and this designated woman is not his wife

as they are not yet married. What purpose does designation serve if his wife dies on Yom Kippur? The Gemara answers: He betroths her before Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks: But that does not solve the problem. As long as he has not married her, she is not yet his house, i.e., his wife. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda says that not only is a replacement wife designated, but he actually marries her. If so, another problem arises. The High Priest has two houses, and the Merciful One said: “And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house” (Leviticus 16:11). He atones for one house and not for two houses.

²⁶³ The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda says that after marrying the second wife, he then divorces her. The Gemara asks: If he divorces her, our difficulty is restored to its original place. There is no point in designating a second wife, as if the first wife dies, the second woman is not married to him. The Gemara responds: No, it is necessary in a case where he marries her and divorces her provisionally, as he says to her: This is your bill of divorce on condition that you die on Yom Kippur. If she dies on Yom Kippur, then she was divorced retroactively and he has only one wife; if she does not die but the original wife dies, her divorce does not take effect and the second wife is married to the High Priest. In either case, the High Priest has only one wife. The Gemara asks: And perhaps neither she nor the original wife will die, and the High Priest then has two houses on Yom Kippur.

²⁶⁴ Rather, it is a case where the High Priest said to her, the woman designated: This is your bill of divorce on condition that you will not die on Yom Kippur. If she does not die, then she is divorced and he remains married to the original wife; if she dies, isn't that original wife alive and he remains married to her alone? The Gemara asks: And perhaps the second one will not die and her bill of divorce will be a valid bill of divorce, meaning she is not his wife, but her counterpart might die, leaving the High Priest without a wife at all on Yom Kippur.

²⁶⁵ Rather, it is a case where the High Priest said to her: This is your bill of divorce on condition that one of you dies. If this one dies, that one is alive, and if that one dies, isn't this one alive? The Gemara asks: And perhaps neither one of them will die, and he will then have two houses.

²⁶⁶ And furthermore, the question arises: Is a document of that sort a valid bill of divorce? Does a condition of that sort take effect? But didn't Rava say: If a man says to his wife: This is your bill of divorce on condition that you will not drink wine for all the days of my life and your life, that is not severance. The bill of divorce in the Torah is called a bill of severance, meaning that for the document to be valid all connections between the husband and wife must be severed. If there is a provision in the document that maintains a permanent connection between the spouses, e.g., not to drink wine for all of her life, the document does not effect a valid divorce.

²⁶⁷ However, if one said to his wife: This is your bill of divorce on condition that you will not drink wine during all the days of the life of so-and-so; that is severance. Since the condition is not dependent on her and him but on the life of a third party, it is like any other condition in a divorce. Therefore, in the case of the High Priest, since the divorce takes effect only if neither of the women dies, that is a condition that maintains a relationship between the husband and wife for as long as she lives, which invalidates the divorce.

²⁶⁸ Rather, it is a case where the High Priest said to the second wife: This is your bill of divorce on condition that your counterpart, the other wife, will not die. If her counterpart, the first woman, does not die, the second woman is divorced; and if the first woman dies, isn't the second woman alive and

not divorced? The Gemara asks: And perhaps her counterpart will die in the middle of the Yom Kippur service, and it will become clear

²⁶⁹ retroactively that the bill of divorce of this second woman is not a valid bill of divorce, since the first wife died. In that case, it turns out retroactively that he performed part of the service with two houses, married to two wives. Rather, it is a case where the High Priest said to the second wife: This is your bill of divorce on condition that your counterpart dies. The Gemara asks: In this case, too, perhaps her counterpart will die and the bill of divorce of this second woman is a valid bill of divorce, and he will remain without a house at all.

²⁷⁰ Rather, this is a case where he divorces both of them provisionally, with a different stipulation to each woman. To one, he says: This is your bill of divorce on condition that your counterpart will not die. And to the other one, he says: This is your bill of divorce on condition that you will not enter the synagogue on Yom Kippur, cognizant of the fact that she can easily fulfill that condition and thereby effect her divorce. The Gemara asks: And perhaps her counterpart will not die, fulfilling the condition and effecting the divorce of one wife; and she will not enter the synagogue, fulfilling the condition and effecting the divorce of the other wife. In that case the bill of divorce of both women is a valid bill of divorce and he remains without a wife.

²⁷¹ Rather, it is a case where to one of the women, the High Priest says: This is your bill of divorce on condition that your counterpart does not die. And to the other one of the women he says: This is your bill of divorce on condition that I will enter the synagogue. If this wife dies, that other one is alive; and if that other one dies, this one is alive. What is there to say in refuting this possibility? Perhaps her counterpart will die in the middle of the service, and it will turn out retroactively that he performed part of the service with two houses, married to two wives. If he sees that she seeks, i.e., she is about to die, he will then preemptively enter the synagogue, rendering the bill of divorce of the dying wife a valid bill of divorce retroactively. He will then be married to only one woman. In that way, a second wife can be designated for the High Priest without him being married to two women on Yom Kippur.

²⁷² Rav Asi, and some say it was Rav Avira, strongly objects to that conclusion: However, if that is so, that from the term: His house, in the singular, one derives one wife and not two, then two widows of a brother who died without a child [yevamot] who come from one house, i.e., they were married to the same man, should not be obligated to marry his brother in levirate marriage. In addressing levirate marriage, the Torah says: “So shall it be done to the man that does not build his brother’s house” (Deuteronomy 25:9). One may derive from this: One house, i.e., wife, and not two. The Gemara responds that when the Torah says: “Then his yevama shall go up to the gate” (Deuteronomy 25:7), “and his yevama will draw nigh to him” (Deuteronomy 25:9), twice, it comes to include a situation where the deceased had two wives; in that case one of them is required to marry his brother in levirate marriage.

²⁷³ Ravina, and some say it was Rav Sherevya, strongly objects to this: It was stated above that a woman betrothed to the High Priest is not considered his house, i.e., his wife. However, if that is so, a betrothed woman whose betrothed passed away should not be obligated to marry his brother in levirate marriage, since the term: House, appears in that context as well. In practice, that is not the halakha. The Gemara answers that the Torah says: “The wife of the dead shall not be married outside to one not of his kin” (Deuteronomy 25:5). The superfluous term: Outside, comes to include the

betrothed woman. Although she is technically still outside the family, the brother of the deceased must either marry her in levirate marriage or perform ḥalitza.

²⁷⁴ § Apropos the death of the wife of the High Priest, the Gemara cites an additional baraita. The Sages taught: A High Priest sacrifices offerings when he is an acute mourner, on the day of a relative's death, but does not eat from those offerings. Rabbi Yehuda says: The entire day. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: The entire day? Rava said: This phrase is necessary only to bring him from his house. Not only is it permitted for the High Priest to serve in the Temple when he is an acute mourner, but it is a mitzva to bring him from his house to serve in the Temple for the entire day to help ease his pain.

²⁷⁵ Abaye said to him: Now, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, we remove the High Priest from the Temple when he is an acute mourner, as it was taught in a baraita: If a common priest was standing and sacrificing an offering on top of the altar and heard that a relative of his died, he leaves his service in the middle and exits the Temple; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: He completes the service and then leaves. Rabbi Yehuda rules stringently in the case of a priest who is an acute mourner sacrificing an offering. Even though the baraita is referring to a common priest, it is reasonable to say that the same is true with regard to a High Priest as well. Rabbi Yehuda says that a High Priest who becomes an acute mourner exits the Temple, and you say we bring the High Priest who is an acute mourner from his house to serve?

²⁷⁶ Rather, Rava said: The initial interpretation must be rejected. What is the meaning of the phrase: The entire day?

²⁷⁷ Rabbi Yehuda means to say that the High Priest does not serve for the entire day even though the Torah allows him to do so, due to a rabbinic decree lest he forget that he is an acute mourner and eat consecrated food forbidden to him. Rav Adda bar Ahava said to Rava: And did Rabbi Yehuda issue a decree lest he eat? But didn't we learn in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: The Sages would even designate another wife for him lest his wife die? And if his wife dies, he nevertheless performs the Temple service, and Rabbi Yehuda did not issue a decree lest he eat. That contradicts the other statement by Rabbi Yehuda that a High Priest may not serve for the entire day that he is an acute mourner. Rava said to him: How can these cases be compared? There, in the mishna, since it is Yom Kippur, when everyone does not eat, he too will not come to eat. However, here, during the rest of the year, when everyone eats, he too will come to eat. Therefore, a decree was issued.

²⁷⁸ The Gemara raises a question from a different perspective: And in a case like this, would the halakhic status of acute mourning take effect on him, considering that she is divorced? According to Rabbi Yehuda, the High Priest must give his wife a provisional divorce in which case she is no longer his wife and if she dies he is no longer obligated to mourn her. The Gemara answers: Although the status of acute mourning does not take effect on him, is he not troubled over the death of his wife? Therefore, according to Rabbi Yehuda, it is appropriate to prohibit his performance of the service on that day.

²⁷⁹ MISHNA: During all seven days of the High Priest's sequestering before Yom Kippur, he sprinkles the blood of the daily burnt-offering, and he burns the incense, and he removes the ashes of the lamps of the candelabrum, and he sacrifices the head and the hind leg of the daily offering. The High Priest performs these tasks in order to grow accustomed to the services that he will perform on Yom Kippur. On all the other days of the year, if the High Priest wishes to sacrifice any of the

offerings, he sacrifices them, as the High Priest sacrifices any portion that he chooses first and takes any portion that he chooses first.

²⁸⁰ GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who taught this mishna? Rav Ḥisda said: This mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, as if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, it is difficult. Didn't Rabbi Akiva say: With regard to a ritually pure person upon whom a sprinkling of purification water fell, it renders him impure? This is based on the enigmatic principle with regard to the water of the red heifer: It purifies the ritually impure and renders impure the ritually pure. If so, how can the High Priest perform the Temple service? The High Priest is sprinkled with purification water on each of the seven days of his sequestering due to the possibility that he was impure with impurity imparted by a corpse. However, it is possible that he is ritually pure. If he is ritually pure, the sprinkling will render him impure.

²⁸¹ As it was taught in a baraita that it is written: "And the pure person will sprinkle it upon the impure person" (Numbers 19:19); this emphasis that he sprinkles the water upon the impure person comes to teach that if he sprinkled on the ritually impure person, that person becomes pure; but if he sprinkled on the pure person, that person becomes ritually impure. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. And the Rabbis say: These matters are stated to teach that it is considered sprinkling only if it is performed on items susceptible to impurity, whereas if the water was sprinkled on items not susceptible to impurity, it is not considered sprinkling.

²⁸² What is the halakhic implication of that statement? It is as we learned in a mishna: With regard to one who mistakenly intended to sprinkle purification water on an animal, which does not become impure when alive, but happened to sprinkle it upon an impure person, if water remains on the hyssop that he used to sprinkle the water, he should repeat the action and sprinkle the purification water on the person to purify him. Since the first sprinkling was onto a person, who can become impure, the water remaining on the hyssop may be reused, and it is not disqualified by improper use. However, with regard to one who intended to sprinkle purification water on a person but happened to sprinkle it upon an animal, even if water remains on the hyssop, he should not repeat the action. Since the first sprinkling was onto an animal, which cannot become impure, the water is disqualified by improper use, and may not be used in a second sprinkling.

²⁸³ The Gemara analyzes the basis of the dispute: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Akiva? Instead of writing: And the pure person will sprinkle it upon the impure person, let the Merciful One write in the Torah: And the pure person will sprinkle it upon him, and it would be clear that it is upon the aforementioned impure person. What is taught by the phrase: Upon the impure person? Learn from it that if he sprinkled on the impure person, that person becomes pure; but if he sprinkled on the pure person, that person becomes impure. And the Rabbis say with regard to that phrase: It comes to teach that it is only considered sprinkling if it is performed on items susceptible to impurity. However, here, with regard to sprinkling purification water on a pure person, it is derived through an a fortiori inference that he remains ritually pure: If the water falls on the impure person, he is pure; if the water falls on the pure person, all the more so is it not clear that he remains pure?

²⁸⁴ And Rabbi Akiva would respond to that a fortiori inference: That is what King Solomon said: "I said I would become wise, but it eludes me" (Ecclesiastes 7:23). According to tradition, even Solomon in his great wisdom could not understand the contradictory nature of the sprinkling of purification water that purifies an impure person and impurifies a pure person. And the Rabbis

ascribe Solomon's bewilderment to a different aspect of the halakha: The one who sprinkles the water and the one upon whom one sprinkles the water are pure; but one who touches the water unrelated to sprinkling is impure.

²⁸⁵ The Gemara asks: Is the one who sprinkles the water actually pure? Isn't it written: "He who sprinkles the purification waters will wash his clothes, and he who touches the purification waters will be unclean until evening" (Numbers 19:21)? The Gemara responds: What is the meaning of the term: He who sprinkles? It means: He who touches. But isn't it written: He who sprinkles? And isn't it written in the same verse: And he who touches? And furthermore, in that verse, one who sprinkles requires washing of his clothes, indicating a more severe level of impurity, whereas one who touches does not require washing of his clothes. Apparently, when it is written: He who sprinkles, it is not referring to one who touches.

²⁸⁶ Rather, the Rabbis assert: What is the meaning of: He who sprinkles? It refers to one who carries the purification water. The Gemara asks: But if so, let the Merciful One write: One who carries; what is the reason that he who sprinkles is written if the reference is to carrying? The Gemara answers: This use of the term sprinkling to depict carrying teaches us that in order to become impure from carrying purification water, one must carry the measure required for sprinkling.

²⁸⁷ The Gemara asks: This works out well according to the one who said that sprinkling requires a minimum measure of water, as then the concept of a measure required for sprinkling has meaning. However, according to the one who said that sprinkling does not require a minimum measure of water, what can be said? There is no concept of a measure required for sprinkling. The Gemara answers: Even according to the one who said that sprinkling does not require a minimum measure of water, that applies only to the measure of purification water that must be sprinkled on the back of the impure man; any amount will suffice. However, in the vessel into which one dips the hyssop in order to sprinkle the water, a certain measure of water is required, as we learned in a mishna: How much water should be in the vessel so that it will be equivalent to the measure required for sprinkling? It must be equivalent to the measure required to dip

²⁸⁸ the tops of the stems of the hyssop branch into the water and sprinkle it. Apparently, even according to the one who said that there is no minimum measure of water for sprinkling there is a minimum measure of water that must be in the vessel. Abaye said: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said that the purification water impurifies the pure, the difficulty can be resolved: The High Priest performs the Temple service for the entire day on each of the seven days of sequestering, and toward the evening the priests sprinkle the purification water upon him. Even if he was pure and the sprinkling rendered him impure, he immerses immediately and observes the requirement to wait until sunset, at which point he is purified and prepared to serve the next day.

²⁸⁹ § The mishna teaches that on each of the seven days the High Priest burns the incense and removes the ashes from the lamps. Apparently, incense is burned first, and then the lamps are cleaned. And the Gemara raises a contradiction from a mishna in tractate Tamid that discusses the lottery in which the priests performing the various tasks that constitute the morning Temple service are selected. That mishna first mentions the one who was privileged to be selected to perform removal of the ashes from the inner altar, and then the one who was privileged to be selected to remove the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum, and only then does it deal with the one who is

privileged to be selected to burn the incense. According to that mishna, removing ashes from the candelabrum precedes the burning of the incense.

²⁹⁰ Rav Huna said: Who is the tanna who taught the mishnayot in tractate Tamid? It is Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, who disagrees with the tanna of the mishna here. The Gemara asks: But didn't we learn the opposite, as we learned in the mishna in tractate Tamid: The priest sprinkles the blood of the daily offering on the altar. He comes to the northeast corner of the altar and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. From there he proceeds to the southwest corner and sprinkles once on the southwest corner.

²⁹¹ And it was taught in the Tosefta concerning this mishna: Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa changes the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering relative to the sprinkling of blood of all other burnt-offerings. He agrees with the first tanna with regard to the first sprinkling of the blood; the priest comes to the northeast corner and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. However, when he proceeds to the southwest corner he does not sprinkle once as he would when offering a burnt-offering; rather, he sprinkles on the west side of the altar and then sprinkles on the south side. Since the disputing opinion is that of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, apparently the unattributed opinions in the mishnayot in tractate Tamid are not the opinions of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa.

²⁹² Rather, there must be a different resolution to the contradiction between the mishna here and the one in tractate Tamid. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Who is the tanna who taught the Yom Kippur service in tractate Yoma? It is Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, and tractate Tamid is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis who disagree with him.

²⁹³ The Gemara raises a contradiction from one mishna in tractate Yoma against another mishna in tractate Yoma, as we learned in a mishna: The second lottery conducted daily among the priests determined the following: Who slaughters the daily morning offering; who sprinkles its blood; who removes the ashes from the inner altar; and who removes the ashes and burnt wicks from the candelabrum; and who takes the limbs of the daily offering up to the ramp to be burned later. Following the second lottery the priests dispersed, and they later reconvened for the third lottery. Before the third lottery, the appointee declared: Let only those priests who are new to offering the incense come and participate in the lottery for the incense. Apparently, removing the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum preceded the burning of the incense, which contradicts the mishna here.

²⁹⁴ Abaye said: This is not difficult. Here, the mishna is discussing the removal of the ashes from two lamps, which is performed after the burning of the incense; there, the mishna of the lotteries is discussing the removal of the ashes from five lamps, which precedes the burning of the incense. As will be explained, the priest attends to five lamps first, and after a break, he attends to the final two lamps.

²⁹⁵ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that the burning of the incense interposes between attending to the first five lamps and attending the last two? But when Abaye related the order of the daily priestly functions in the name of tradition, didn't he state that it was the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering that interposed between the five lamps and the two, not the burning of the incense? The Sages say in response: This is not difficult. That sequence cited by Abaye is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, whereas this sequence cited in the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, as it was taught in a baraita: One should not remove the ashes from the lamps and then burn the incense; rather one should burn the incense and then remove the ashes from the lamps. Abba

Shaul says: One removes the ashes from the lamps and then burns the incense. The different sources reflect the dispute cited in the baraita.

²⁹⁶ The Gemara asks: What is the rationale for the opinion of Abba Shaul? It is as it is written: “Every morning when he removes the ashes from the lamps, he shall burn it” (Exodus 30:7), and then it is written: “He shall burn it” (Exodus 30:8). First the lamps are cleaned, and only then is the incense burned. And how do the Rabbis, who hold that the incense was burned first, interpret this verse? They say: What is the Merciful One saying?

²⁹⁷ It means: At the time of the removal of the ashes you shall burn the incense, and no later. As, if you do not say so but explain that the phrase: He shall burn the incense, at the end of the verse means after cleaning the lamps, then with regard to the burning of the afternoon incense, with regard to which it is written: “And when Aaron lights the lamps in the afternoon he shall burn it” (Exodus 30:8), in this case too, does it mean that initially the priest lights the lamps and only then burns the afternoon incense? And if you say indeed, that is so, wasn’t the following taught in a baraita with regard to the verse: “Aaron and his sons will set it in order to burn from evening until morning before the Lord; it shall be a statute forever throughout their generations on behalf of the children of Israel” (Exodus 27:21)?

²⁹⁸ And the baraita explains: Give the candelabrum its measure of oil so that it will continue to burn all night from evening until morning. Alternatively, the phrase: From evening to morning, teaches that you have only this service that is valid when performed from evening to morning. Apparently, lighting the candelabrum is the final daily Temple service and the incense is not burned after the lamps are lit. Rather, what is the Merciful One saying in the phrase: “And when Aaron lights the lamps in the afternoon he shall burn it.” This teaches that at the time of the lighting of the lamps you shall burn the incense, and no later. If so, here too, in the morning, at the time of the removal of the ashes you shall burn the incense, and no later. This is the rationale for the opinion of the Rabbis.

²⁹⁹ And Abba Shaul could have said to you in response: It is different there, with regard to the burning of the afternoon incense, as it is written: “Aaron and his sons will set it [oto] in order.” The term oto is exclusionary: Only in the afternoon is it critical that the lighting of the lamps be the last service performed and that it follow the burning of the incense. However, in the morning, where there is no exclusionary term, the sequence of the verse is observed: First attending to the candelabrum and then burning the incense.

³⁰⁰ Rav Pappa said a different resolution to the contradiction between the mishnayot. This is not difficult, because each mishna is in accordance with the opinion of a different tanna. This mishna, in which the burning of the incense is first, is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis; and that mishna, in which the lighting of the lamps is first, is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. The Gemara questions Rav Pappa’s resolution: In accordance with the opinion of which tanna is the mishna here established? It is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. The sequence in the mishna where the lottery is discussed is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul.

³⁰¹ Say the latter clause of that mishna as follows: They brought him the sheep for the daily morning offering that he slaughtered by cutting most of the way through the gullet and the windpipe. And a different priest completed the slaughter on his behalf. And then he entered the Sanctuary to burn the morning incense and to remove the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum. If so, we have again arrived at the opinion of the Rabbis that burning the incense precedes attending to the lamps, which

leads to the difficult conclusion: The first clause and the last clause of the mishna in tractate Yoma are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the middle clause is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. Rav Pappa could have said to you: Indeed, the first clause and the last clause are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the middle clause is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. Although this is not common, because these mishnayot are not directly juxtaposed, it is possible.

³⁰² The Gemara asks: Granted, Abaye does not say in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa, as he is not willing to establish the first clause and the last clause in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis and the middle clause in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. However, with regard to Rav Pappa, what is the reason that he did not say in accordance with the opinion of Abaye and instead prefers an uncommon and difficult resolution? Rav Pappa could have said to you that the resolution proposed by Abaye is difficult as well, as according to Abaye in the first clause of the mishna it was taught with regard to the removal of the ashes from two lamps, which is performed later, and only then taught the removal of the ashes from five lamps, which is performed before the ashes of the two lamps are cleared. Therefore, Rav Pappa prefers to establish that the mishnayot reflect a tannaitic dispute rather than to accept this reversal of the order.

³⁰³ And Abaye holds that this is not difficult and could have said to you that the first mishna, which describes the routine of the High Priest during his seven days of separation, teaches a general directive describing the services with which the High Priest must be familiarized prior to Yom Kippur, without concern for the sequence. And in terms of the sequence, the mishna then teaches it in the context of the actual performance of the services.

³⁰⁴ § The Gemara cites a dispute between the Rabbis and Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa. The Gemara proceeds to analyze the matter itself: The priest comes to the northeast corner of the altar and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. From there he proceeds to the southwest corner and sprinkles once on the southwest corner. And it was taught in the Tosefta concerning this mishna: Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa changes the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering vis-à-vis the sprinkling of blood of all other burnt-offerings. The priest comes to the northeast corner and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. However, when he proceeds to the southwest corner, he sprinkles on the west side of the altar and then sprinkles on the south side. The Gemara asks: What is the rationale for the opinion of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, who changes the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering vis-à-vis the sprinkling of blood of all other burnt-offerings?

³⁰⁵ Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of one of the Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai that the verse states: “And one goat as a sin-offering to the Lord; it shall be offered aside from the daily burnt-offering and its libation” (Numbers 28:15). From the phrase: Beside the daily burnt-offering, it is derived that the daily offering is a burnt-offering, and from the juxtaposition of the sacrifice of the sin-offering to the daily offering, the Merciful One said: Perform with it the procedure of a sin-offering.

³⁰⁶ And how can this be accomplished? It can be accomplished by performing half of the sprinklings according to the procedure of a burnt-offering, and half according to the procedure of a sin-offering. One sprinkles one sprinkling that is two, i.e., one sprinkles the blood on the corner of the altar so that the blood is divided between the two sides, in accordance with the procedure of a standard burnt-offering. Then he sprinkles two sprinklings that are two, in accordance with the procedure of a sin-

offering. The blood of a sin-offering is sprinkled in four separate actions, one on each of the four corners of the altar. The Gemara asks: And if the objective is to have the daily offering sacrificed like a sin-offering, let him sprinkle the blood in a manner that will accomplish both: First, two sprinklings that are four in accordance with the procedure of a standard burnt-offering, and then four sprinklings that are four in accordance with the procedure of a sin-offering.

³⁰⁷ The Gemara rejects that proposal: We did not find a case of blood that atones and then again atones. Once the blood was sprinkled and brought atonement by following the procedure of the burnt-offering, one cannot then begin the rite of atonement of a sin-offering. The Gemara asks: And did we find the blood of an offering, half of which is sprinkled as a sin-offering and half of which is sprinkled as a burnt-offering? Rather, perforce, say that the verse juxtaposes them and commands that the blood of the daily offering be offered half as a burnt-offering and half as a sin-offering. Here too, perforce, say that the verse juxtaposes them and commands two separate sprinklings: The sprinkling of a burnt-offering followed by the sprinkling of a sin-offering.

³⁰⁸ The Gemara responds: The two suggestions are different. There, in the statement of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, there is no radical divergence from the standard burnt-offering; it is merely dividing the sprinklings. Instead of sprinkling the blood on the corner so that it falls on two sides of the altar, one sprinkles the blood on each of the two sides separately. In contrast, performing two independent acts of sprinkling is a radical divergence. And the Gemara suggests an alternative manner in which the daily offering could be offered like a sin-offering. Let us sprinkle one sprinkling that is two below the red line painted halfway up the altar, in accordance with the procedure of a standard burnt-offering, and sprinkle another two sprinklings that are two above the red line on the upper half of the altar in accordance with the procedure of a sin-offering.

³⁰⁹ The Gemara rejects this: We did not find a case of blood half of which is sprinkled above the red line and half of which is sprinkled below the red line. One either sprinkles all the blood on the lower half of the altar, as in the case of most offerings, or entirely on the upper half of the altar, as in the case of sin-offerings. The Gemara asks: And is there really no case of that sort? Didn't we learn in a mishna: The High Priest took the blood of the bull into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled from the blood one time upward and then seven times downward? Apparently, the blood of an offering can be sprinkled part upward, toward the upper part of the thickness of the Ark cover, and part downward, toward the lower part of the thickness of the Ark cover.

³¹⁰ The Gemara rejects this: That is not a case of half the blood sprinkled upward and half sprinkled downward. Instead, that sprinkling was like a matzlif; the sprinklings were not performed one above the other, but rather one beneath the other, and all were sprinkled in a row on the Ark cover. The Gemara explains: What is the meaning of like a matzlif? Rav Yehuda demonstrated with his hand; it means like one who whips. One who whips another does not strike in one place but directs one lash beneath another.

³¹¹ The Gemara asks: And is there really no case of that sort? Didn't we learn in a mishna with regard to the sprinkling of blood on the incense altar: He sprinkled seven times from the blood on tohor of the altar. What, is it not referring to the middle of the side of the altar, as people say: Clear noon [tihara], that is the middle of the day? In other words, tohor refers to halfway up the altar. Now, since the blood was sprinkled on the altar seven times, inevitably some of the blood landed above the midpoint and some of it landed below the midpoint.

³¹² Rabba bar Sheila said: No, that is not the meaning of tohorō.

³¹³ Rather, tohorō means on top of the altar itself, as it is written: “Like the very sky for purity [latohar]” (Exodus 24:10). Tohorō refers to the top of the altar after the ashes of the incense are cleared and the pure gold is visible.

³¹⁴ The Gemara returns to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon IshHaMitzpa: What is different that he says to sprinkle in accordance with the procedure of the burnt-offering first and then sprinkle in accordance with the procedure that is used for the sin-offering? Let us first sprinkle in accordance with the procedure that is used for the sin-offering and then let us sprinkle in accordance with the procedure that is used for the burnt-offering. The Gemara answers: Since the daily offering is a burnt-offering, that procedure takes precedence, and it is followed by the sin-offering.

³¹⁵ The Gemara asks: What is different that he says to sprinkle first on the northeast corner of the altar and then on the southwest corner? Let him sprinkle first on the southeast corner and then on the northwest corner. The Sages say: That is because the blood of the burnt-offering requires sprinkling on the side of the altar with a base, as it is stated: “On the base of the altar of burnt-offering” (Leviticus 4:18) and the southeast corner did not have a base. Therefore, the sprinkling was performed on the northeast corner, where part of the base of the altar was located.

³¹⁶ The Gemara asks: What is different that he says to sprinkle first on the northeast corner of the altar and then on the southwest corner? Let him sprinkle first on the southwest corner and then on the northeast corner. The Gemara answers that it is since the Master said: All turns that you turn should be only to the right. With regard to certain offerings sacrificed when the priest is on the south side of the altar, he would turn to the east, which was to his right. Since the animal to be offered is slaughtered to the north of the altar, he first sprinkles blood at the corner that he encounters first.

³¹⁷ And from where is the conclusion drawn that the Merciful One says with regard to a burnt-offering to perform it in accordance with the procedure of a sin-offering? Perhaps it is with regard to a sin-offering of the New Moon that the Merciful One says to perform it in accordance with the procedure of a burnt-offering. The Gemara responds: This can not enter your mind, as it is written: “It shall be offered aside from the daily burnt-offering and its libation” (Numbers 28:15). What is the Merciful One saying? Cast a matter of the sin-offering upon the burnt-offering, i.e., apply the procedure of the sin-offering to the sacrifice of the burnt-offering.

³¹⁸ § Just as the contradiction above was resolved by attributing different sources to different tanna'im, the Gemara cites an additional contradiction with a similar resolution. We learned in a mishna there: The appointee, the deputy High Priest, said to the other priests: Go out and bring a lamb from the Chamber of the Lambs, where lambs awaiting sacrifice were kept after they underwent inspection and were found to be without blemish. That mishna continues: The Chamber of the Lambs was located in the northwest corner of the Hall of the Hearth in the Temple courtyard. And there were four chambers there in that hall. One was the Chamber of the Lambs, and one was the Chamber of the Seals. In the Temple, seals were dispensed as receipts to individuals who paid for sacrificial animals. The person then showed the seal to a Temple official, who supplied him with an animal. And one was the Chamber of the Hall of the Hearth, and one was the chamber where the shewbread was prepared.

³¹⁹ And the Gemara raises a contradiction from a mishna in tractate Middot: Four chambers were open into the Hall of the Hearth like small semi-open rooms [kitoniyyot] that open into a central hall

[teraklin]. Two of these chambers were located in the sacred area, in the Temple courtyard, and two of the chambers were located in the non-sacred area of the Temple Mount. And the tops of wooden stakes [pispasin] in the Hall of the Hearth divided between the sacred area and the non-sacred area to apprise the people in both areas where they were located and what conduct is required. And what purpose did these chambers serve? The southwest chamber was the Chamber of the Sacrificial Lambs;

³²⁰ the southeast chamber in the Hall of the Hearth was the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared. The northeast chamber was the chamber in which the Hasmoneans sequestered the altar stones that were desecrated by the gentile kings when they sacrificed idolatrous offerings. The northwest chamber was the chamber in which the priests descended through tunnels to the Hall of Immersion. There is a contradiction between the sources with regard to the location of the Chamber of the Lambs. Rav Huna said: Who is the tanna who taught the mishnayot in tractate Middot? It is Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, who has a different opinion with regard to this matter.

³²¹ As we learned in a mishna in tractate Middot: The dimensions of the women's courtyard were a length of 135 cubits by a width of 135 cubits, and there were four chambers in its four corners. And what purpose did these chambers serve? The southeast chamber was the Chamber of the Nazirites, as there the nazirites cook their peace-offerings and shave their hair and cast it in the fire to burn beneath the pot in which the peace-offering was cooked, as the Torah instructs (see Numbers 6:18). The northeast chamber was the Chamber of the Woodshed, where blemished priests, who are disqualified for any other service, stand and examine the logs to determine if they were infested by worms, as any log in which there are worms is disqualified for use on the altar.

³²² The northwest chamber was the Chamber of the Lepers, where lepers would immerse for purification. With regard to the southwest chamber, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov said: I forgot what purpose it would serve. Abba Shaul says: They would place wine and oil there for the meal-offerings and libations, and it was called the Chamber of the House of Oils. From this mishna it may be inferred that the tanna who taught the mishnayot in tractate Middot is Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, as that is why the mishna finds it necessary to mention that he forgot the purpose of one of the chambers.

³²³ So too, it is reasonable to conclude that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, as we learned in a mishna there: All the walls that were there surrounding the Temple Mount were high except for the Eastern Wall, as the priest who burns the red heifer stands on the Mount of Olives, where the red heifer was slaughtered and burned, and directs his attention and looks toward the entrance of the Sanctuary when he sprinkles the blood.

³²⁴ The Gemara seeks the opinion according to which this would be feasible. And we learned in a mishna: All the entrances that were there in the Temple were twenty cubits high and ten cubits wide. And we learned in a different mishna describing the layout of the Temple: Inside the eastern wall of the Temple Mount was a latticed gate. And we learned in a different mishna: Inside the latticed gate was the rampart, which was an elevated area ten cubits wide. In that area there were twelve stairs; each stair was half a cubit high and half a cubit deep, for a total ascent of six cubits.

³²⁵ In addition, fifteen stairs ascend from within the women's courtyard and descend from the Israelite courtyard to the women's courtyard. Each stair was half a cubit high and half a cubit deep, for an additional ascent of seven and a half cubits. The total height of both staircases together was

thirteen and a half cubits. And we learned in that mishna: The area between the Entrance Hall and the altar was twenty-two cubits wide, and there were twelve stairs in that area. Each stair was half a cubit high and half a cubit deep, for an additional ascent of six cubits and a total height of nineteen and a half cubits.

³²⁶ And we learned in that mishna that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: There was an additional stair there between the Israelite courtyard and the priests' courtyard. That stair was one cubit high, and the platform on which the Levites stood was placed upon it and on it were three stairs, each with a height and depth of half a cubit, for a total of twenty-two cubits.

³²⁷ Granted, if you say that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, that is how it can be understood that the entrance was concealed. The threshold of the entrance to the Sanctuary was more than twenty cubits higher than the threshold of the eastern gate of the Temple Mount. One looking through the Eastern Gate would be unable to see the entrance of the Sanctuary, because the gate was only twenty cubits high. In order to provide the priest performing the red heifer ritual on the Mount of Olives with a view of the entrance to the Sanctuary, the eastern wall had to be lowered.

³²⁸ However, if you say that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who do not add the two and a half cubits of the stair and the platform added by Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, isn't there half a cubit through which the entrance can be seen? Since the threshold of the Sanctuary is only nineteen and a half cubits higher than the threshold of the gate, the priest on the Mount of Olives could look through the eastern gate of the Temple Mount and see the bottom of the Temple entrance. There would be no need to lower the eastern wall.

³²⁹ Rather, must one not conclude from it that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are taught by Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov? Rav Adda bar Ahava said: This is not a definitive proof, and it is still possible to interpret halakhot of this tractate in a different manner. Rather, whose is that opinion that the Eastern Wall was lowered? It is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: The altar is centered and stands in the middle of the Temple courtyard, directly aligned with the entrances of the courtyards and the Sanctuary, and it was thirty-two cubits long and thirty-two cubits wide.

³³⁰ Ten of those cubits stood opposite the entrance to the Sanctuary. Eleven of those cubits were to the north of the entrance and eleven of those cubits were to the south of the entrance. It follows that the altar was aligned precisely opposite the Sanctuary and its walls. According to this opinion, since the altar was directly aligned with the entrance of the Sanctuary, it blocked the entrance. The floor of the Israelite courtyard was thirteen and a half cubits above the threshold of the Eastern Gate. Add nine cubits, which was the height of the altar, and the result is that the top of the altar was twenty-two and a half cubits higher than the threshold of the gate, rendering it impossible to see the entrance of the Sanctuary through the eastern gate of the Temple Mount. Therefore, it was necessary to lower the eastern wall to enable the priest standing on the Mount of Olives to see the entrance of the Sanctuary.

³³¹ And if it enters your mind to say that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, do you find that the altar stood in the middle of the courtyard in tractate Middot? But didn't we learn in a mishna there: The dimensions of the entire courtyard were a length of 187 cubits by a width of 135 cubits. That mishna elaborates: The length of the courtyard from east to west was 187 cubits, divided as follows: The area of access for the Israelites, known as the

Israelite courtyard, was eleven cubits long. The area of access for the priests to walk and serve was eleven cubits long, and the altar itself was thirty-two cubits long. There were twenty-two cubits between the Entrance Hall and the altar, and the Sanctuary was one hundred cubits long. And there was an additional eleven cubits of space behind the Hall of the Ark Cover, the Holy of Holies, which was at the western end of the Sanctuary.

³³² The Gemara provides the dimensions of the Temple's width from south to north, a total of 135 cubits. The ramp and the altar together were sixty-two cubits. The ramp and altar were each thirty-two cubits long, but two cubits of the upper part of the altar were subsumed in the base and ledge surrounding the altar. There were eight cubits from the altar to the rings to the north of the altar, through which the heads of the sacrificial animals were placed for slaughter. The area of the rings itself was twenty-four cubits, and from the rings to the tables on which the animals were rinsed there were an additional four cubits. From the tables to the pillars on which the animals were suspended for flaying there were an additional four cubits. From the pillars to the courtyard wall there were eight cubits. The total to this point is 110 cubits. And the balance of twenty-five cubits was between the ramp and the southern wall, along with the area filled by the pillars themselves, which was not included in the above tally. This yields a total of 135 cubits.

³³³ And if it enters your mind to say that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, do you find the altar in the middle of the courtyard? Most of the altar stands in the southern part of the courtyard.

³³⁴ Rather, must one not conclude from it that that the mishnayot in tractate Middot are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov? The Gemara concludes: Indeed, conclude from it that this is so.

³³⁵ § In an additional attempt to resolve the contradiction with regard to the Chamber of the Lambs, Rav Adda, son of Rav Yitzhak, said: This chamber was removed from the corner, as it was not actually in the corner of the Hall of the Hearth but was located along the middle of the western side of the hall. And therefore, for one who comes from the north, the chamber appears to him to be in the south of the hall; and for one who comes from the south, the chamber appears to him to be in the north of the hall.

³³⁶ The Gemara comments: In any event, it is reasonable to say that this chamber was closer to the southwest corner than it was to the northwest corner. From where does one arrive at that conclusion? From the fact that we raise a contradiction between the mishna in tractate Tamid, where we learned that the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared stood in the northeast corner, and the mishna in tractate Middot, where we learned that the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared stood in the southeast corner.

³³⁷ And we resolve the contradiction based on what Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: The Master in tractate Middot envisions the chambers as one coming via the right, from the south to the east, then to the north and then to the west. And the Master in tractate Tamid envisions the chambers as one coming via the left, from the south to the west, then to the north and then to the east. Both agree with regard to the location of the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared; they merely describe that location from different perspectives.

³³⁸ Granted, if you say that the Chamber of the Lambs was actually closer to the southwest corner, that is how Rav Huna resolves the contradiction between one mishna discussing the shewbread and

the other mishna discussing the shewbread. However, if you say that the Chamber of the Lambs was in the northwest corner, ultimately, what is the resolution with regard to the shewbread? Even if you envision the path from the other direction, the Chamber of the Seals interposes between the Chamber of the Lambs and the chamber where the shewbread is prepared. Rather, must one not conclude from it that the Chamber of the Lambs was indeed in the southwest? The Gemara concludes: Indeed, conclude from it that this is so.

³³⁹ The Gemara questions the assertion that one tanna envisions the chambers as one coming via the left. But didn't the Master say: All turns that you turn should be only to the right, which in certain cases is to the east? Here the turns are to the left. The Gemara answers: This restriction applies only in the course of performing the Temple service; however, here, it is a mere reckoning, and no priest actually proceeded that way from one chamber to the other.

³⁴⁰ § It was taught in the mishna: As the High Priest sacrifices any portion that he chooses first and takes any portion that he chooses first. The Sages taught in a baraita: How does the High Priest sacrifice any portion that he chooses first? If the High Priest so desires, he says: This burnt-offering, I am sacrificing, or: This meal-offering, I am sacrificing. That is sufficient, and the High Priest does not participate in a lottery.

³⁴¹ How does the High Priest take any portion that he chooses first? The High Priest says: This sin-offering, I am eating, or: This guilt-offering, I am eating. And he may even take one loaf of the two loaves offered on the festival of Shavuot. He may take four or five of the twelve shewbread loaves that are distributed to the priests every Shabbat. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The High Priest always takes five of the twelve shewbread loaves, as it is stated: "It shall be for Aaron and his sons and they shall eat it in a sacred place" (Leviticus 24:9). From the fact that Aaron and his sons are listed separately, it is derived that half of the loaves were given to Aaron, or the High Priests who succeeded him, and half were given to his sons. Since, as explained below, only ten of the loaves were actually distributed, the High Priest received five.

³⁴² This baraita is itself difficult, as it is self-contradictory. First you said: He takes one loaf of the two loaves offered on the festival of Shavuot. Whose opinion is this? It is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who said that the High Priest takes half. Say the middle clause of the baraita as follows: The High Priest takes four or five of the twelve shewbread loaves; we have come to the opinion of the Rabbis, who say that the High Priest does not take half but takes less than half. Say the last clause of the baraita as follows: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says that the High Priest always takes five. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that the first clause and the last clause of the baraita are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and the middle clause is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis? That conclusion is difficult.

³⁴³ Abaye said: The first clause and the middle clause of the baraita are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and in the case of the two loaves, the Rabbis concede with regard to a piece of a loaf that it is inappropriate to give it to the High Priest. According to the Rabbis, the High Priest should actually receive less than one loaf, as in their opinion he is entitled to less than half; however, since it is inappropriate to give him a piece of the loaf, he takes an entire loaf as his portion.

³⁴⁴ And what is the meaning of four or five; i.e., when does the High Priest take four loaves and when does he take five? According to the Rabbis, who say: The priestly watch that is incoming on Shabbat takes six of the loaves, and the outgoing watch takes six, and the incoming watch receives

no greater portion as payment for closing the doors, it is from twelve loaves that the High Priest must divide and take his share, but he receives half of the loaves less one, meaning that he takes five. According to the Rabbis, the High Priest receives less than half; however, since it is inappropriate to give him a piece of a loaf, less than half is five whole loaves.

³⁴⁵ According to Rabbi Yehuda, who said: The priestly watch that is incoming on Shabbat takes seven of the loaves, two of which are payment for closing the doors; and the outgoing watch takes five loaves, it is from ten that he must divide the loaves. Those two of the twelve loaves are a separate payment and are not factored into the tally of those designated for distribution. Subtract one from half of that total, as subtracting less than one loaf would lead to a situation where the High Priest receives a piece of a loaf, which is inappropriate. And therefore, the High Priest takes four.

³⁴⁶ Rava said that the baraita should be explained differently. The entire baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that only ten loaves are divided. Rather, what then is the meaning of the statement that the High Priest takes four loaves? According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, doesn't he need to take five?

³⁴⁷ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This halakha that the High Priest takes four loaves is in a case where there is a watch that is detained. When the start of a Festival occurs on a Sunday night and one of the priestly watches was forced to arrive before Shabbat to ensure that they would arrive in time for the Festival; or, alternatively, if the Festival ended on a Thursday and one of the priestly watches was detained until the conclusion of Shabbat and only then departed, that priestly watch takes two loaves. That halakha that the High Priest takes five loaves is in a case where there is not a watch that is detained, and the shewbread is divided only between the watch that concludes its service that Shabbat and the watch that begins its service that Shabbat.

³⁴⁸ If there is a watch that is detained, that detained watch takes two loaves, and the outgoing watch takes two loaves as payment for closing the doors. Therefore, it is from eight that the High Priest must divide the loaves, and he takes four. If there is not a watch that is detained, it is from ten that he must divide the loaves and the High Priest takes five.

³⁴⁹ The Gemara asks: If so, that even the middle statement of the baraita is attributed to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and it is referring to a watch that is detained, what is the meaning of the last clause in the baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The High Priest always takes five loaves? That statement indicates that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi disagrees with the middle clause, while according to Rava's interpretation Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi concedes that in certain circumstances the High Priest takes only four loaves. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is difficult to reconcile Rava's interpretation with the language of the baraita.

³⁵⁰ MISHNA: The Sages provided the High Priest with Elders selected from the Elders of the court, and they would read before him the order of the service of the day of Yom Kippur. And they would say to him: My Master, High Priest. Read the order of the service with your own mouth, as perhaps you forgot this reading or perhaps you did not learn to read. On Yom Kippur eve in the morning, the Elders stand him at the eastern gate of the courtyard and pass before him bulls and rams and sheep so that he will be familiar with the animals and grow accustomed to the service, as these were the animals sacrificed on Yom Kippur. Throughout all the seven days that the High Priest was in the Parhedrin chamber, they would not withhold from him any food or drink that he desired. However,

on Yom Kippur eve at nightfall, they would not allow him to eat a great deal because food induces sleep and they did not allow him to sleep, as will be explained.

³⁵¹ GEMARA: The Gemara wonders about the depiction in the mishna of the Elders questioning the High Priest as to whether he forgot this reading or perhaps did not learn to read. Granted, perhaps he forgot, that is fine, as it is conceivable that he is not accustomed to reading the Torah and might have forgotten this portion. However, is it conceivable that perhaps the High Priest did not learn to read? Do we appoint a High Priest of that sort who never learned the Bible?

³⁵² But wasn't it taught in a baraita that it is stated: "And the priest who is greater than his brethren" (Leviticus 21:10); this teaches that he must be greater than his priestly brethren in strength, in beauty, in wisdom, and in wealth. Aḥerim say: Wealth is not a prerequisite for selecting a High Priest, but from where is it derived that if he does not have property of his own that his brethren the priests elevate him and render him wealthy from their own property? The verse states: "And the priest who is greater [haggadol] than his brethren"; elevate him [gaddelehu] from the property of his brethren. In any event, there is a consensus that wisdom is a prerequisite for his selection.

³⁵³ Rav Yosef said: This is not difficult. There, the baraita that lists wisdom among the attributes of the High Priest is referring to the First Temple, where this halakha was observed and the High Priests possessed those attributes listed. Here, the mishna is referring to the Second Temple, where this halakha was not observed, so a situation where the High Priest was not well-versed in the Bible was conceivable. As Rav Asi said: The wealthy Marta, daughter of Baitos, brought a half-se'a of dinars in to King Yannai for the fact that he appointed Yehoshua ben Gamla as High Priest. This is an example of the appointment of High Priests by means of bribery and gifts. Since that was the practice, a totally ignorant High Priest could have been appointed.

³⁵⁴ § It was taught in the mishna: On Yom Kippur eve in the morning, the elders pass different animals before the High Priest. A tanna taught in the Tosefta: Even goats were brought before him. The Gemara asks: And the tanna of our mishna, what is the reason that he did not teach that goats were among the animals that passed before the High Priest? The Gemara answers: Since goats come as atonement for sins, passing them before the High Priest will evoke transgressions and he will become distraught.

³⁵⁵ The Gemara asks: If so, a bull should not be passed before him, as it too comes to atone for sin. The Gemara answers that there is a difference in the case of a bull, since it is to atone for his sins and for the sins of his brethren the priests that it comes; among his brethren the priests, if there is a person who has a sinful matter, the High Priest would know about it and lead him back to the path of righteousness through repentance. Therefore, passing a bull before the High Priest will not render him distraught, as it will merely remind him of his responsibility toward his priestly brethren. On the other hand, with regard to the entire Jewish people, he does not know of their sinful matters and is unable to facilitate their repentance. Passing goats before the High Priest will evoke their sins as well as his inability to correct the situation, leaving him distraught.

³⁵⁶ Apropos the High Priest being privy to the sinful behavior of his fellow priests, Ravina said that this explains the folk saying that people say: If the beloved son of your beloved sister becomes a policeman [dayyala], see to it that in the marketplace you do not pass before him. Be wary of him because he knows your sins.

³⁵⁷ § We learned in the mishna: Throughout all the seven days that the High Priest was in the Parhedrin chamber, they would not withhold from him any food or drink that he desired. It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda ben Nekosa says: On Yom Kippur eve they feed him fine flour and eggs in order to loosen his bowels, so that he will not need to relieve himself on Yom Kippur. They said to Rabbi Yehuda ben Nekosa: In feeding him those foods, all the more so that you bring him to a state of arousal. Feeding him those foods is antithetical to the efforts to prevent the High Priest from becoming impure, as they are liable to cause him to experience a seminal emission.

³⁵⁸ It was taught in a baraita that Sumakhos said in the name of Rabbi Meir: One does not feed him foods represented by the acrostic: Ales, beit, yod; and some say that one does not feed him foods represented by the acrostic: Ales, beit, beit, yod; and some say neither does one feed him white wine. The Gemara elaborates: Not ales, beit, yod means neither etrog, nor eggs [beitzim], nor old wine [yayin]. And some say: Not ales, beit, beit, yod means neither etrog, nor eggs [beitzim], nor fatty meat [basar], nor old wine [yayin]. And some say neither does one feed him white wine because white wine brings a man to the impurity of a seminal emission.

³⁵⁹ Similarly, the Sages taught: If a man experienced an emission that could render him a zav, one attributes the emission not to his being a zav but perhaps to a different cause, e.g., to food, or to all kinds of food, i.e., he may have eaten too much food, which could have caused the emission. Elazar ben Pineḥas says in the name of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira: During the days that a zav is examining himself to determine whether or not he is impure, one feeds him neither foods represented by the acrostic: Ḥet, gimmel, beit, yod, nor foods represented by the acrostic: Gimmel, beit, mem, nor any food items that might bring him to impurity caused by an emission. The Gemara explains: Not ḥet, gimmel, beit, yod means neither milk [ḥalav], nor cheese [gevina], nor egg [beitza], nor wine [yayin]. And not gimmel, beit, mem means neither soup of pounded beans [mei gerisin], nor fatty meat [basar], nor small fish pickled in brine [muryas].

³⁶⁰ The Gemara asks about the phrase: Nor any food items that might bring him to impurity; what does it come to include? It comes to include that which the Sages taught: Five food items bring a man to a state of impurity due to emission. And these are: Garlic,

³⁶¹ cress, purslane, eggs, and arugula. Apropos the arugula plant, the Gemara cites a verse: “And one of them went out into the fields to collect orot” (II Kings 4:39). It was taught in the name of Rabbi Meir with regard to orot in this verse: This is the plant called arugula. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Why are these arugula plants called orot? It is because they enlighten [me’irot] the eyes. Rav Huna said: With regard to one who finds arugula, if he can eat it, he eats it, and if not, he passes it over his eyes, as that too is beneficial. Rav Pappa said: Arugula is most effective when it grows on the border of the field, where it is unadulterated by other plants.

³⁶² Rav Giddel said that Rav said: A guest should neither eat eggs, because they lead to a seminal emission, nor sleep in a garment belonging to the homeowner, his host, because if he experiences a seminal emission and it gets on the garment, he will be diminished in the estimation of his host. Apropos conduct of a guest, the Gemara relates: When Rav would happen to come to Darshish he would declare: Who will be married to me for the day that I am here so that I will not be unwed in this place, after which I will divorce her? Similarly, when Rav Naḥman would come to Shekhantziv he would declare: Who will be married to me for the day that I am here?

³⁶³ But wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: A man should not marry a woman in one state and go and marry another woman in a different state, lest a match be arranged between the child of this wife with the child of that wife who are unaware of their relationship. This would lead to a brother marrying his sister or a father marrying his daughter, filling the whole world in its entirety with mamzerim. And concerning this it is stated: "And the land became filled with lewdness" (Leviticus 19:29). The Sages say in response: The Sages generate publicity. Since they were well-known, the identity of their children was also undoubtedly known. Therefore, there was no concern that errors of this kind would befall their children.

³⁶⁴ The Gemara raises a different problem with the practice of Rav and Rav Nahman. But didn't Rava say: With regard to one who proposed marriage to a woman and she agreed, she is required to sit seven clean days, as perhaps due to the anticipatory desire she might not notice that she experienced menstrual bleeding and she is therefore impure. How, then, could these amora'im marry a woman on the day that they proposed? The Gemara answers: The Sages would inform them by sending messengers before their arrival. The messenger would announce that the amora sought to marry a local woman. The woman who agreed would in fact wait seven clean days before marrying him.

³⁶⁵ And if you wish, say instead that these Sages were not actually proposing marriage; rather, they proposed so that they could be in seclusion with the women, without consummating the relationship. Since the women knew that the marriage would not be consummated, they did not experience anticipatory desire. There is no similarity between one who has bread in his basket and one who does not have bread in his basket. One who does not have access to bread experiences hunger more acutely than one for whom bread is available and can eat whenever he chooses. Similarly, an unmarried man experiences a more acute desire. In order to mitigate that desire, these Sages made certain that women would be designated for them.

³⁶⁶ MISHNA: The Elders of the court who read the order of the service of the day before the High Priest passed him to the Elders of the priesthood, and they took him up to the House of Avtinas. And they administered him an oath and took leave of him and went on their way. When they administered this oath they said to him: My Master, High Priest. We are agents of the court, and you are our agent and the agent of the court. We administer an oath to you in the name of Him who housed His name in this House, that you will not change even one matter from all that we have said to you with regard to the burning of the incense or any other service that you will perform when alone. After this oath, he would leave them and cry, and they would leave him and cry in sorrow that the oath was necessary.

³⁶⁷ They kept him occupied throughout the night to prevent him from sleeping. If he was a scholar, he would teach Torah. If he was not a scholar, Torah scholars would teach Torah before him. And if he was accustomed to read the Bible, he would read; and if he was not, they would read the Bible before him. And what books would they read before him to pique his interest so that he would not fall asleep? They would read from Job, and from Ezra, and from Chronicles. Zekharya, son of Kevutal, says: Many times I read before him from the book of Daniel.

³⁶⁸ GEMARA: A tanna taught: The Sages took the High Priest to the House of Avtinas, where the incense was prepared, to teach him the method of taking handfuls of incense, which is a difficult and complex skill. Rav Pappa said: The High Priest had two chambers. One was the Parhedrin chamber and one was the Chamber of the House of Avtinas. One of them was in the north of the courtyard,

and one was in the south. The Gemara explains: One was in the north, as we learned in the mishna: There were six chambers in the Israelite courtyard, three in the north and three in the south.

³⁶⁹ The chambers in the south were the Chamber of the Salt, the Chamber of the Parva, and the Chamber of the Rinsers. The Gemara explains the function performed in each chamber. The Chamber of the Salt was where the priests would place the salt for the offering in storage. The Chamber of the Parva, the hides, was where they salted the consecrated hides that belonged to the priests, to prevent them from spoiling. And on the roof of that chamber was the Hall of Immersion for the High Priest for Yom Kippur. The Chamber of the Rinsers was where they would rinse the innards of consecrated animals, which were not taken up to the altar while dirty or with undigested food remaining in them. From there a circular staircase ascended to the roof of the Chamber of the Parva.

³⁷⁰ The three chambers in the north of the courtyard were the Chamber of the Wood, the Chamber of the Exile, and the Chamber of Hewn Stone. With regard to the Chamber of the Wood, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, who is the tanna of the mishnayot in tractate Middot in which this mishna appears, said: I forgot what purpose that chamber would serve. Abba Shaul says: The High Priest's chamber was behind the two chambers, the Chamber of the Exile and the Chamber of Hewn Stone, and the roofs of all three of them were level. As the three were attached, they shared a roof.

³⁷¹ In the Chamber of the Exile there was the well excavated by those returning from exile, for which the chamber was named, and the wheel with which water was drawn was positioned over it. And from there, they would supply water for use in the entire Temple courtyard for washing and rinsing. In the Chamber of Hewn Stone, there the great Sanhedrin of Israel convened and judged whether the priests were fit for service. A priest in whom a disqualification was detected due to a blemish or lineage would wear black and would wrap himself in black in a display of sorrow and mourning and would emerge from the Temple and go on his way, because he was not fit for service as a priest. And any priest in whom a disqualification was not found would wear white and wrap himself in white in a display of joy and would enter and serve with his fellow priests.

³⁷² In any event, it was taught that there was a chamber of the High Priest in the north of the courtyard, and there is proof that he also had one chamber in the south of the courtyard, as we learned in a mishna: Seven gates were in the Temple courtyard, three in the north and three in the south and one in the east. The gates in the south were the Gate of Fire; second to it was the Gate of the Offering; third to it was the Gate of the Water. The gate that was in the east was called the Gate of Nicanor, and two chambers were there next to the Gate of Nicanor, one to its right and one to its left. One was the Chamber of Pinehas the Dresser, where the priestly vestments were stored, and one was the Chamber of the Preparers of the Griddle-Cake Offering, where the daily griddle-cake offering was prepared on behalf of the High Priest.

³⁷³ The gates that were in the north: The first was the Gate of the Spark, which was a portico building, meaning it had a roof but was not completely closed on every side. And there was a second story built atop it, and there the honor guard of the Temple stood, with the priests guarding from above and the Levites from below. Inside of this gate was the rampart, and an opening led from the gate to the rampart. Second to this gate was the Gate of the Offering; third to it was the Gate of the Hall of the Hearth.

³⁷⁴ And it was taught in a baraita: The High Priest would perform five immersions and ten sanctifications of his hands and feet on that day, Yom Kippur. And each of these was performed in the sacred area of the courtyard, on the roof of the Hall of the Parva, except for this first immersion, which was performed in the non-sacred area outside the courtyard. The first immersion was not unique to Yom Kippur but was performed every day by any priest entering the Temple. That immersion was performed on the roof of the Gate of the Water, and that gate was alongside his chamber. Apparently, the High Priest had a chamber next to the Gate of the Water, which was in the south of the courtyard.

³⁷⁵ The High Priest had use of two chambers, but we do not know whether the Parhedrin chamber was in the north and the Chamber of the House of Avtinas was in the south, or the Chamber of the House of Avtinas was in the north and the Parhedrin chamber was in the south. And, however, it is reasonable to say that the Parhedrin chamber was in the south and the High Priest slept there.

³⁷⁶ What is the reason for that assumption? Because if that is the case, the High Priest arises early every morning of the seven days of sequestering and he covers his legs, a euphemism for defecating, and immerses alongside his chamber, which was in the south. And then he walks to the north of the courtyard to the second chamber, which is the Chamber of the House of Avtinas, and learns there the method of taking handfuls. And then he comes to the Temple and performs the service for the entire day. Toward the evening they sprinkle purification water upon him, and he then walks back to the south and immerses again alongside his chamber and rests in his chamber.

³⁷⁷ As, if you say that the Chamber of Parhedrin was in the north, this would mean that the High Priest would be forced to exert himself and walk significant distances. According to this understanding, he arises early, and he covers his legs. However, since it was taught in the baraita that the place of his immersion was in the south, he then walks to the south and immerses. And then he learns the method of taking handfuls. And then he comes to the Temple and performs the service for the entire day. Toward the evening they sprinkle purification water upon him, and he then walks back to the south and immerses, and then he needs to walk back to the north and rest. Do we impose upon him to that extent? Rather, it is reasonable to say that the Parhedrin chamber, the High Priest's private chamber, was in the south, which would limit the distance that he needed to walk.

³⁷⁸ The Gemara rejects this reasoning: Why not impose upon him? On the contrary, we impose upon him even more, so that if he is a Sadducee, he will retire. As he is not a God-fearing person, he would prefer to walk away rather than subject himself to that added exertion. That is a desirable result, ridding the High Priesthood of a Sadducee.

³⁷⁹ Or, alternatively, there is even value in imposing on a God-fearing Pharisee High Priest, in order that he will not become haughty in his lofty position. Since he is occupied in performing his task, he does not have leisure to be impressed with his elevated status. As, if you do not say that it is an intentional attempt to impose upon him, let us establish both of the chambers of the High Priest next to one another; or, alternatively, one chamber would be sufficient for him. From the fact that neither of these alternatives is adopted, it is apparently an intentional attempt to impose upon him, and there is no proof as to the location of either of the chambers of the High Priest.

³⁸⁰ § It was taught in the mishna that the Elders said to him: My Master, High Priest. We are agents of the court, and you are our agent and the agent of the court. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, as Rav Huna, son of

Rav Yehoshua, said: These priests who sacrifice the offerings are the agents of the Merciful One. They are not agents representing the Jewish people but are agents representing God, as He commanded them to perform the service. Proof is cited for this opinion: As, if you say they are our agents,

³⁸¹ is there any matter that we are unable to perform and our agents are able to perform? The role of the agent is to perform a task on behalf of the one who commissioned him. The agent cannot perform a task that the one who commissioned him is unable to perform. Since it is prohibited for Israelites to enter the priests' courtyard and to perform the sacrificial rites, clearly the priests are not agents representing the Israelites. The language of the mishna in which the court Elders address the High Priest as their agent apparently contradicts that understanding. The Gemara answers: This is what they say to him: We administer an oath to you according to our understanding and the understanding of the court, cautioning him that he cannot rationalize violating the oath by claiming that he took the oath based on his own interpretation. He is bound by the understanding of the court. The mishna does not address the nature of the High Priest's agency.

³⁸² § The mishna continues: After this oath, he would leave them and cry and they would leave him and cry. The Gemara explains: He turned aside and cried due to the indignity that they suspected him of being a Sadducee; and they turned aside and cried, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who suspects the innocent of indiscretion is afflicted in his body. The High Priest might in fact be beyond reproach and they may have suspected him falsely.

³⁸³ The Gemara asks: And why were the Elders so insistent that the High Priest take an oath? The Gemara explains: So that he would not prepare the incense and light it outside in the Sanctuary, before entering the Holy of Holies, and bring the coal pan with the incense already burning on it into the Holy of Holies in the manner that the Sadducees did. Since the High Priest is alone inside the Sanctuary and there is no way to ascertain whether he is in fact performing the service in the proper manner, the Elders insisted that he take an oath to perform it according to their instructions.

³⁸⁴ The Sages taught in the Tosefta: There was an incident involving a certain Sadducee who was appointed as High Priest, who prepared the incense outside and then brought it into the Holy of Holies. Upon his emergence he was overjoyed that he had succeeded. The father of that Sadducee met him and said to him: My son, although we are Sadducees and you performed the service in accordance with our opinion, we fear the Pharisees and do not actually implement that procedure in practice. The son said to his father: All my days I have been troubled over this verse: "For I will appear in the cloud above the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:2). The Sadducees interpreted this verse to mean that God will appear above the Ark cover, i.e., will enter the Holy of Holies, only after the incense cloud is already there. I said: When will the opportunity become available to me, and I will fulfill it according to the Sadducee interpretation? Now that the opportunity has become available to me, will I not fulfill it?

³⁸⁵ The Sages said: Not even a few days passed until he died and was laid out in the garbage dump, and worms were coming out of his nose in punishment for his actions. And some say that he was struck as soon as he emerged from the Holy of Holies, as Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: A type of sound was heard in the Temple courtyard, as an angel came and struck him in the face. And his fellow priests came in to remove him from there and they found the likeness of a footprint of a calf between his

shoulders. That is the mark left by an angel striking, as it is stated with regard to angels: “And their feet were straight feet, and the sole of their feet was like the sole of a calf’s foot” (Ezekiel 1:7).

³⁸⁶ § It was taught in the mishna that Rabbi Zekharya ben Kevutal says: Many times I read before the High Priest from the book of Daniel. Rav Ḥanan bar Rava taught this to Ḥiyya bar Rav before Rav in the following manner: Rabbi Zekharya bar Kefutal said, and Rav demonstrated with his hand that the name should be pronounced Kevutal. The Gemara asks: Why did Rav demonstrate his point with a gesture? Let him simply say it. The Gemara answers: Rav was reciting Shema at that moment and could not interrupt Shema by speaking.

³⁸⁷ The Gemara asks: And is interrupting in a manner of that sort, by gesturing, permitted during Shema? Didn’t Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Shmuel bar Marta say: One who is reciting Shema should neither make allusions with his eyes, nor open and close his mouth with his lips to convey a message, nor gesture with his fingers? And it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Elazar Ḥisma says: Concerning one who recites Shema and makes allusions with his eyes, or opens and closes his mouth with his lips, or gestures with his fingers, the verse says: “And you did not call out to Me, O Jacob” (Isaiah 43:22). By signaling while reciting Shema he behaves contemptuously toward God, and it is tantamount to not having recited Shema before Him. How, then, could Rav gesture while reading Shema?

³⁸⁸ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This prohibition to interrupt one’s recitation of Shema with a gesture applies in the course of reciting the first paragraph of Shema, which is more fundamental; that case where Rav gestured was in the course of reciting the second paragraph of Shema, where gesturing to convey a significant message is permitted.

³⁸⁹ Apropos interruptions in the course of reciting Shema, the Gemara cites a baraita in which the Sages taught: “And these words, which I command you this day, shall be upon your heart; and you shall teach them diligently unto your children, and you shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you arise” (Deuteronomy 6:6–7). This means that in the course of reciting them, the study of Torah and the recitation of Shema, it is permitted to interrupt to state a significant matter, but not in the course of reciting the Amida prayer, which may not be interrupted for any kind of speech. Another interpretation of the verse is: And you shall talk of them is to emphasize that it is permitted to interrupt Shema to speak these matters of Torah, but not to speak other matters that may lead to levity.

³⁹⁰ Rabbi Aḥa says: Talk of them means one must render them, the words of Torah, a permanent fixture, and not render them a temporary exercise. Rava said: One who engages in idle chatter without Torah or any particular purpose violates a positive commandment, as it is stated: And you shall talk of them; talk of them and not of other matters. Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov said: Furthermore, one even violates a negative commandment, as it is stated: “All these matters are wearisome; no man can ever state them” (Ecclesiastes 1:8). The phrase: No man can ever state them, is understood as a prohibition against engaging in idle chatter.

³⁹¹ MISHNA: If the High Priest sought to sleep at night, the young priests would snap the middle [tzerada] finger against the thumb before him, and they would say to him every so often: My Master, High Priest. Stand from your bed and chill yourself once on the floor and overcome your drowsiness. And they would engage him in various ways until the time would arrive to slaughter the daily offering.

³⁹² GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What is the tzerada finger mentioned in the mishna? Rav Yehuda said: It is the rival [tzara] of that [da] one. Which finger is it? Tzerada is the rival of the thumb; it is the middle finger. The middle finger would be strongly positioned against the thumb, and when one separates them, the finger hits the palm, creating a sound. Rav Huna demonstrated the loud noise that could be achieved by snapping with the middle finger, and the sound traveled throughout Rav's study hall. The sound created was loud enough to keep the High Priest awake.

³⁹³ It was taught in the mishna that they said to him: My Master, High Priest. Stand from your bed and chill yourself once on the floor and overcome your drowsiness. Rav Yitzḥak said that they said to the High Priest: Introduce something new. The Gemara asks: What is it that they asked him to introduce? They say to him: Demonstrate how to perform the ceremonial bowing [kidda]. This was a form of bowing that was difficult to perform, in which the High Priest was expert. The thought was that the exercise would keep him awake.

³⁹⁴ The mishna continues: And they would engage him in different ways until the time to slaughter the daily offering would arrive. It was taught: They would not occupy him with a harp or a lyre, which may not be played on a Festival, but would sing with their mouths. And what would they say? They would say this verse: "Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders labor in vain on it; unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchman keeps vigil in vain" (Psalms 127:1). The message to the High Priest was that his service must be performed for the sake of Heaven for it to be accepted by God; otherwise his efforts would be in vain.

³⁹⁵ The Gemara relates that the prominent men of Jerusalem would not sleep the entire night but instead engaged in Torah study, so that the High Priest would hear the sound of noise in the city and sleep would not overcome him in the silence of the sleeping city. It was taught in a baraita that Abba Shaul said: They would do so even in the outlying areas and stay awake all night in acknowledgment of the Temple; however, the result was that they would sin, as the men and women would participate in games together to pass the time, leading to transgression.

³⁹⁶ Abaye said, and some say it was Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak who said: Interpret that statement as referring to Neharde'a, as Elijah the Prophet said to Rav Yehuda, brother of Rav Salla Ḥasida: You have said and wondered: Why has the Messiah not come? Why is that surprising? Isn't today Yom Kippur, and relations were had with several virgins in Neharde'a, as the men and women stayed awake all night and that led to promiscuity? Rav Yehuda said to him: What did the Holy One, Blessed be He, say about those sins committed by the Jewish people? He said: This is what God said:

³⁹⁷ "Sin lies in waiting at the door" (Genesis 4:7), and it is no wonder that men sin. He asked him: And what did Satan the prosecutor say about their sinning? Elijah said to him: Satan, on Yom Kippur, has no license to prosecute. From where is that idea derived? Rami bar Ḥama said: The numerological value of the letters that constitute the word HaSatan is three hundred and sixty four: Heh has a value of five, sin has a value of three hundred, tet has a value of nine, and nun has a value of fifty. Three hundred and sixty-four days of the solar year, which is three hundred and sixty-five days long, Satan has license to prosecute. On the remaining day, Yom Kippur, he has no license to prosecute. Since that day is exalted above all others, there is no room for the accusations of Satan.

³⁹⁸ MISHNA: Every day the priests would remove the ashes from the altar and place them on the east side of the ramp at the crow of the rooster or adjacent to it, whether before it or after it, as there was no insistence on a precise time. And on Yom Kippur they would remove the ashes earlier, from

midnight onward. And on the Festivals, the ashes were removed even earlier, at the end of the first watch. And the call of the rooster would not arrive on Festivals until the Temple courtyard was full with the Jewish people who vowed to bring offerings and would fulfill their obligations on the Festivals. Those offerings were sacrificed immediately following the daily offering.

³⁹⁹ GEMARA: We learned in a mishna there, in tractate Zevaḥim: With regard to limbs from offerings that were forced off the altar by the heat of the fire, if they fell before midnight, these limbs remain sacred; the priest should return them to the fire, and one is liable for misuse of consecrated property for deriving benefit from them. If they fell after midnight, the priest should not return them to the fire, and one is not liable for misuse of consecrated property for deriving benefit from them; they are considered like ashes.

⁴⁰⁰ The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived that midnight determines the end of the burning period for limbs, after which they assume the legal status of ashes? Rav said: One verse says: “It is the burnt-offering that goes up on its firewood upon the altar all night until morning” (Leviticus 6:2) and he shall burn it, indicating that the sacrificial limbs may be burned throughout the night. And one verse says: “All night...and he shall remove the ashes” (Leviticus 6:2–3), meaning that the ashes may be removed throughout the night. How can these texts be reconciled? Rather, divide the night into two sections: Half of it for burning the limbs, and half of it for removal of the ashes.

⁴⁰¹ Rav Kahana raised an objection. It was taught in the mishna: Every day the priests would remove the ashes from the altar at the crow of the rooster or adjacent to it, whether before it or after it, and on Yom Kippur from midnight, and on the Festivals from the end of the first watch.

⁴⁰² And if it enters your mind to say that the time for removal of the ashes is from midnight by Torah law, how do we perform it earlier and how do we perform it later than the time established by Torah law?

⁴⁰³ Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The fact that midnight is the deadline after which the limbs may not be burned is derived from a different source. From the fact that it is stated with regard to the burning of the limbs: All night, don’t I know that it means until morning? And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: Until morning? It means: Add another morning to the morning of the night. Arise before dawn, and that is the time for removal of the ashes. Nevertheless, there is no specific hour fixed for performing this removal, and how much earlier than dawn it is performed depends on the need.

⁴⁰⁴ Therefore, every day the priests remove the ashes from the altar at the crow of the rooster or adjacent to it, whether before it or after it, as on a typical day removing the ashes just before dawn is sufficient. On Yom Kippur, when, due to the fact that he performs the entire day’s service, there is an issue of the weakness of the High Priest, the ashes are removed earlier and we do so from midnight. And on the Festivals, when the Jewish people in Jerusalem are numerous and the offerings that they bring to sacrifice during the Festival are numerous, the ashes are removed even earlier, and we do so from the first watch, in accordance with the reason that is taught in the mishna: And the call of the rooster would not arrive on Festivals until the Temple courtyard was full with the Jewish people.

⁴⁰⁵ § The term *keriat hagever*, translated above as the call of the rooster, is mentioned in the mishna as an indication of a certain time. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase *keriat hagever*? Rav said: It is the call of the man; the priest appointed for this task proclaimed that it was

time for the priests to report for service. Rabbi Sheila said: It is the call of the rooster, which is also called *gever*.

⁴⁰⁶ Rav happened to come to the place where Rabbi Sheila was the most prominent local Torah scholar and Rav was not yet known. There was no disseminator to stand before Rabbi Sheila to disseminate his lecture to the public. Rav stood before him to disseminate the lecture, in the course of which Rabbi Sheila mentioned *keriat hagever*. Rav interpreted the concept for the audience and said: What is the meaning of *keriat hagever*? It means the call of the man. Rabbi Sheila said to him: And let the Master say it is the call of the rooster. Rav said to him, quoting a folk saying: A flute played for noblemen is music, but when played for weavers, they receive no pleasure from it, due to their lack of sophistication. Similarly, the interpretation that I disseminated was accepted by Torah scholars greater than you. You, who lack their sophistication, cannot appreciate it.

⁴⁰⁷ When I stood before Rabbi Ḥiyya and interpreted: What is the meaning of *keriat hagever*? It means the call of the man, he did not say anything to me in response, and you, Rabbi Sheila, say to me: Say it is the call of the rooster. As soon as Rabbi Sheila heard that, he knew at once who had been disseminating his lecture. He said to him: Is the Master Rav? Let the Master rest and cease disseminating my lecture, as it is beneath your dignity to serve as my assistant. Rav said to him: People say this aphorism: If you hired yourself to him, comb his wool. Once one agrees to perform a task, he should bear its less pleasing aspects and complete the job. Some say, this is what Rav said to him: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade. Since the task of interpreting was undertaken by a man of my stature, it is not fitting that a lesser man will replace me. That would be a display of contempt for the Torah.

⁴⁰⁸ The Gemara comments: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and a baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Sheila. The Gemara elaborates: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav: What did Gevini the Crier, who was an appointee in the Temple, say in his proclamation? Arise, priests, to your service, and Levites to your platform, and Israelites to your non-priestly watch. And the Gemara relates: His voice was so strong that it could be heard at a distance of three parasangs, slightly more than eight miles.

⁴⁰⁹ There was an incident involving King Agrippa, who was coming down the road and heard Gevini the Crier's voice at a distance of three parasangs. And when the king came to his house he sent gifts to him, since he was so impressed with the man's voice. The Gemara notes: And even so, the voice of the High Priest was stronger and superior to his, as the Master said: And there already was an incident where the High Priest recited, in his confession that accompanied the placing of hands on his bull on Yom Kippur: Please God, and his voice was heard in Jericho. And Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The distance from Jerusalem to Jericho is ten parasangs.

⁴¹⁰ And not only was the distance greater in the case of the High Priest than in the case of Gevini the Crier, here, there is the issue of the weakness of the High Priest due to the fast and his obligation to perform the entire service, while there, there is no issue of the weakness of Gevini. And in addition, here it was during the day, when sound does not travel as well, that the High Priest recited his confession; and there it was during the night when Gevini called the priests, Levites, and Israelites.

⁴¹¹ As Rabbi Levi said: Why is a person's voice not heard during the day in the manner that it is during the night? It is due to the fact that the sound of the sphere of the sun traversing the sky generates noise like the noise generated by a carpenter sawing cedars, and that noise drowns out

other sounds. And that sawdust that is visible during the day in the rays of the sun, la is its name. This is what Nebuchadnezzar said: “And all the inhabitants of the world are considered like la” (Daniel 4:32), i.e., all inhabitants of the earth are equivalent to specks of dust.

⁴¹² Apropos sounds, the Gemara cites that the Sages taught: Were it not for the sound of the sphere of the sun, the sound of the bustle of the crowds of Rome would be heard throughout the world; and were it not for the sound of the bustle of the crowds of Rome, the sound of the sun’s sphere would be heard throughout the world. And the Sages taught: Three sounds travel from the end of the world to its other end, and these are: The sound of the sphere of the sun, and the sound of the bustle of the crowds of Rome, and the sound of the soul at the moment that it leaves the body, which should be audible throughout the world. And some say: Even the sound of a woman giving birth.

⁴¹³ And some say: The sound of Ridya as well. Ridya is the angel tasked with irrigating the earth, who calls to the heavens and to the aquifers to provide their water. The Gemara comments: And the Sages asked for mercy so that the sound of the soul at the moment that it leaves the body would no longer be heard to that extent, and God eliminated it. In any event, clearly this baraita understands keriat hagever as the proclamation of the Temple crier, in support of the opinion of Rav.

⁴¹⁴ A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Sheila: With regard to one who sets out on the path at night before keriat hagever and is killed by demons, his blood is on his own head, i.e., he is at fault. Rabbi Yoshiya says: The prohibition of traveling at night is in effect until the rooster crows twice. And some say: Until he crows three times. And with regard to what rooster did these Sages state this advisory? It is with regard to a rooster of medium size. Clearly, this baraita understands keriat hagever as the crow of the rooster.

⁴¹⁵ § Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: When the Jewish people ascend to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage Festivals they stand crowded, but when they bow during confession they are spaced so that no one hears the confession of another. And due to the large crowd they extend eleven cubits behind the Hall of the Ark Cover, the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: What is he saying in the reference to eleven cubits behind the Holy of Holies? The Gemara explains that this is what he is saying: Even though the crowd is so large that the people extend eleven cubits behind the Hall of the Ark Cover and people stand crowded, still, when they bow, they bow spaced. And that is one of the ten miracles that were performed in the Temple.

⁴¹⁶ As we learned in a mishna: Ten miracles were performed in the Temple. No woman miscarried from the aroma of the sacrificial meat, as a pregnant woman craves various foods and occasionally that craving leads to miscarriage. And the sacrificial meat never putrefied. And no fly was seen in the slaughterhouse, although flies are generally attracted to a place where there is flesh and blood. And a seminal emission did not befall the High Priest on Yom Kippur. And no disqualification was found in the omer or the two loaves, which are communal offerings, or in the shewbread. And the Jewish people stand crowded but bow spaced. And neither a snake nor a scorpion ever harmed anyone in Jerusalem. And a person never said to another: There is no room for me to stay overnight in Jerusalem.

⁴¹⁷ The Gemara notes: This list opened with miracles that occurred in the Temple, and closed with miracles that occurred in Jerusalem. Apparently there were not actually ten miracles performed in the Temple. The Gemara answers: There are two other miracles in the Temple, as it was taught in a baraita: Rain never extinguished the fire of the arrangement of wood on the altar, despite the fact that

the altar stood in the courtyard, exposed to the elements. And with regard to the smoke of the arrangement, even if all the winds in the world come and blow it, they do not move it from its place and it rises directly heavenward.

⁴¹⁸ The Gemara asks: And are there no more miracles in the Temple? But didn't Rav Shemaya teach in a baraita in the city of Kalnevo: Shards of earthenware vessels were swallowed in the earth in their places, and there was no need to dispose of them. The vessels used for cooking the meat of the offerings of the most sacred order absorbed some of the meat. The meat that was absorbed became notar when the period during which the offering may be eaten concludes. One was required to break those vessels in which the meat was absorbed. The shards of those vessels were miraculously swallowed in the earth where they were smashed. And similarly, Abaye said: The crop and feathers of sacrificial birds, and the ashes of the inner altar, and the ashes of the candelabrum, which were not removed to the place of ashes outside the Temple like the ashes of the outer altar, were also swallowed in the earth in their places. Apparently, there were more than ten miracles in the Temple.

⁴¹⁹ The Gemara answers: The disqualifications mentioned that never occurred in the Temple, in the omer, the two loaves, or the shewbread, were three; consider them as one miracle. Eliminate two from the total and introduce these two to complete the list of ten miracles. The Gemara asks: If similar miracles are combined and considered as one, the swallowing of the earthenware, crops, feathers, and ashes are also two similar miracles that should be considered as one, the result being that they are lacking one miracle to complete the total of ten. The Gemara responds: There is also another miracle, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: A great miracle was performed with regard to the shewbread in the Temple, that the bread was as hot at its removal on Shabbat, after a week on the table, as it was at its arrangement, as it is stated: "To put out hot bread on the day it was taken away" (I Samuel 21:7).

⁴²⁰ The Gemara asks: And were there no more miracles in the Temple? But didn't Rabbi Levi say that this matter is a tradition that we received from our ancestors: The place of the Ark of the Covenant is not included in the measurement of the Holy of Holies. Based on that measurement, the Ark should not have fit inside the hall. The Holy of Holies measured twenty cubits by twenty cubits (see I Kings 6), and a baraita states that there were ten cubits of space on either side of the Ark. Therefore, it was only through a miracle that the Ark fit in the Holy of Holies. And Rabbenai said that Shmuel said: It was through a miracle that the cherubs that Solomon placed in the Holy of Holies would stand. Their wingspan was twenty cubits, and since the length of the chamber was the same, there was no room for the bodies of the cherubs. There were additional miracles performed in the Temple.

⁴²¹ The Gemara responds: The tanna counts miracles that were performed outside the Sanctuary and were visible to all, but he does not count miracles that were performed inside the Sanctuary and were not visible to all. The Gemara asks: If so, the shewbread is also a miracle performed on the table inside the Sanctuary and is not visible to all, yet the miracle that the bread's heat did not dissipate was listed among the miracles. The Gemara answers: The shewbread was a miracle performed outside, as Reish Lakish said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "Place them on the pure table before the Lord in two rows, six to a row" (Leviticus 24:6)? From the emphasis that the Torah places on the fact that the table was ritually pure, it can be learned by inference that it indicates that it could become impure as well.

⁴²² The Gemara asks: How is that possible? It is a wooden vessel designated to rest in a fixed place and not to be moved. And it was taught: Any wooden vessel designated to rest in a fixed place is not susceptible to ritual impurity, and it serves as a barrier before impurity, preventing its transmission. Rather, the fact that the table is described as pure teaches that the priests lift it in order to display the shewbread to the Festival pilgrims, and they say to them: See how beloved you are before the Omnipresent, as the bread is as hot at its removal on Shabbat, after a week on the table, as it was at its arrangement, as it is stated: “To put out hot bread on the day it was taken away” (I Samuel 21:7). Since the table was moved on occasion, it was not considered a wooden vessel designated to rest and was therefore susceptible to impurity. At the same time, it is clear that the miracle of the shewbread was a miracle performed outside the Sanctuary, as it was visible to all.

⁴²³ The Gemara asks: And are there no more miracles performed in the Temple? But didn’t Rav Oshaya say: When Solomon built the Temple he planted all sorts of precious golden fruits there, and these brought forth their fruit in their appointed season like other trees, and when the wind blew them the fruit would fall, as it is stated: “May his fruits rustle like Lebanon” (Psalms 72:16). This indicates that fruits grew in Lebanon, which the Sages interpreted as a reference to the Temple, which was built with cedar trees from Lebanon. And when the gentiles entered the Sanctuary the golden tree withered, as it stated: “And the blossoms of Lebanon wither” (Nahum 1:4). And the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore the miraculous trees to Israel in the future, as it is stated: “It shall blossom abundantly, it shall also rejoice and shout, the glory of Lebanon will be given to it” (Isaiah 35:2). Apparently, there were additional miracles in the Temple.

⁴²⁴ The Gemara responds: The tanna does not count perpetual miracles on the list. The Gemara comments: Now that you have arrived at this solution, it can resolve an earlier difficulty as well: The Ark and the cherubs are also not counted, since they too were perpetual miracles.

⁴²⁵ § The Master said in listing the miracles that even strong winds were unable to displace the smoke of the arrangement of wood. The Gemara asks: And did smoke rise from the arrangement of wood on the altar? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: There were five matters stated with regard to the fire of the arrangement of wood: It crouched above the wood like a lion; and it was as clear as the light of the sun; and it had substance to the extent that it could be felt; it was powerful enough to consume wet wood like dry wood; and it did not raise smoke.

⁴²⁶ The Gemara answers: When we said that the smoke was not displaced, indicating that the wood produced smoke, that was in reference to the fire brought by a person, as it was taught in a baraita: “And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar” (Leviticus 1:7), indicating that even though fire descends from the heavens, still there is a special mitzva to bring fire by a person. The fire that the priests brought produced smoke, and the miracle related to that smoke.

⁴²⁷ The Gemara asks: And was the altar’s fire crouched like a lion? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, said: I saw the fire in the Temple and it was crouched like a dog and not a lion? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. Here, where the baraita stated that the fire resembled a lion, it refers to the fire in the First Temple; there, where Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, said that the fire resembled a dog, it refers to the fire in the Second Temple.

⁴²⁸ The Gemara asks: And was there fire that descended from the heavens in the Second Temple? Didn’t Rav Shmuel bar Inya say: What is the meaning of that which is written with regard to the Second Temple: “Go up to the hills and get wood and build the house; and I will look on it favorably

and I will be glorified [ve'ekkaved], said the Lord" (Haggai 1:8)? Even though it is written ve'ekkaved, we read it ve'ikkavda, with an added letter heh. The Gemara explains: What is different that the word is missing the letter heh? This represents five, the numerological value of heh, phenomena that constituted the difference between the First Temple and the Second Temple, in that they were not in the Second Temple. And these are: The Ark of the Covenant, and the Ark cover upon it, and the cherubs that were on the Ark cover; fire; and the Divine Presence; and the Divine Spirit; and the Urim VeTummim. Apparently, there was no fire from heaven in the Second Temple. The Sages say in response: Yes, there was fire from heaven in the Second Temple; however, it did not assist in burning the offerings but was merely visible above the wood.

⁴²⁹ Apropos the fire on the altar, the Gemara cites a related baraita. The Sages taught that there are six kinds of fire: There is fire that consumes solids and does not consume liquids; and there is fire that consumes liquids and does not consume solids; and there is fire that consumes solids and consumes liquids; and there is fire that consumes wet objects like dry objects; and there is fire that repels other fire; and there is fire that consumes other fire.

⁴³⁰ The Gemara elaborates: There is fire that consumes solids and does not consume liquids; that is our standard fire that consumes dry items but does not dry liquids. Fire that consumes liquids and does not consume solids is the fever of the sick that dehydrates the body but does not consume the flesh. Fire that consumes solids and consumes liquids is the fire of Elijah the Prophet, as it is written: "And fire fell from the sky and consumed the offering and the wood and the stones and the earth, and it licked up the water that was in the trench" (I Kings 18:38). Fire that consumes wet objects like dry objects is the fire of the arrangement of wood. There is fire that repels other fire; that is the fire of the angel Gabriel. The book of Daniel relates that Gabriel was an angel of fire who descended to the fiery furnace, repelled the fire, and rescued Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, who had been cast inside. And there is fire that consumes other fire; that is the fire of the Divine Presence, as the Master said in another context: The Holy One, Blessed be He, extended His finger between the angels, who are also made of fire, and burned them. The fire of the Divine Presence consumed the fire of the angels.

⁴³¹ § The Gemara asks: And with regard to the smoke of the arrangement, is it so that even if all the winds in the world come and blow it, they do not move it from its place and it rises directly heavenward? Didn't Rabbi Yitzhak bar Avdimi say: At the conclusion of the final day of the festival of Sukkot, everyone looks to the smoke of the arrangement of wood; if the wind blew from the south and the smoke tends toward the north, the poor were glad and the homeowners were sad. This is because it was a sign that the year's rains would be plentiful, producing an abundant crop on the one hand, but on the other hand, the fruit would rot due to the humidity, rendering it impossible to store the abundant harvest. This forced the landowners to sell quickly at a lower price. And if a northern wind caused the smoke to tend toward the south, the poor were sad and the homeowners were glad, because it was an indication that the year's rains would be sparse. The yield would be low, and it would be easy to store the fruit and sell it at a higher price.

⁴³² If a western wind caused the smoke to tend to the east, that was an indication that there would be sufficient rainfall to ensure a substantial crop, and at the same time, it would be possible to store the fruit, and everyone was glad. If an eastern wind caused the smoke to tend to the west that was an indication that there would be a drought because eastern winds do not bring rain, and everyone was

sad. Apparently, wind causes the smoke rising from the arrangement of wood to move. The Gemara responds: The smoke comes and goes like a palm tree, swaying in the wind, but it did not disperse.

⁴³³ The Master said: If a western wind caused the pillar of smoke to tend to the east everyone is glad; if an eastern wind caused the smoke to tend to the west everyone was sad. And the Gemara raised a contradiction, as the Sages said: An eastern wind is always good; a western wind is always bad; a northern wind is good for wheat when it has reached one-third of its potential growth, and bad for olives when they are ripening; a southern wind is bad for wheat when it has reached one-third of its potential growth, and good for olives when they are ripening.

⁴³⁴ And Rav Yosef said, and some say it was Mar Zutra who said it: And your mnemonic for which is good for wheat and which for olives is that in the Temple the table was in the north and the candelabrum was in the south of the Sanctuary. Bread made out of wheat was placed on the table, and oil made out of olives was burned in the candelabrum. The wind coming from this side, the north, increased its own component, wheat; and the wind coming from this side, the south, increased its own component, olives. In any event, there are contradictory opinions with regard to the effect of western and eastern winds.

⁴³⁵ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult: This opinion that a wind from the east is good is for us, in Babylonia. Babylonia is a land whose water is plentiful, and a dry east wind will not harm the crop at all. This opinion that a wind from the east is harmful is for them, in Eretz Yisrael. That is a land where water is sparse, and the dry east wind will dry the land and ruin the crops.

Chapter 2

¹ MISHNA: Initially, the practice among the priests was that whoever wishes to remove the ashes from the altar removes them. And when there are many priests who wish to perform that task, the privilege to do so is determined by a race: The priests run and ascend on the ramp leading to the top of the altar. Any priest who precedes another and reaches within four cubits of the top of the altar first is privileged to remove the ashes. And if both of them were equal and neither preceded the other, the appointed priest says to all the priests: Extend your fingers, and a lottery was performed, as will be explained.

² And what fingers do they extend for the lottery? They may extend one or two fingers, and the priests do not extend a thumb in the Temple. The reason is that the lottery was conducted by the appointee choosing a number and counting the extended fingers of the priests standing in a circle. As the count progressed, a priest could calculate and manipulate the result in his favor by surreptitiously extending his thumb and an additional finger. Since there is separation between the thumb and the forefinger it could appear as though they belonged to two different priests, skewing the results of the lottery.

³ Initially, that was the procedure; however, an incident occurred where both of them were equal as they were running and ascending on the ramp, and one of them shoved another and he fell and his leg was broken. And once the court saw that people were coming to potential danger, they instituted that priests would remove ashes from the altar only by means of a lottery. There were four lotteries there,

in the Temple, on a daily basis to determine the priests privileged to perform the various services, and this, determining which priest would remove the ashes, was the first lottery.

⁴ GEMARA: The Gemara questions the original practice of holding a race to determine which priest would remove the ashes: And what is the reason that the Sages did not initially institute a lottery for the removal of the ashes as they did for other parts of the service? The Gemara answers: Initially they thought: Since it is a service performed at night it would not be important to the priests, and not many of them would come to perform it, so a lottery would be unnecessary. Then, when they saw that many priests did indeed come and that they were coming to danger by racing up the altar's ramp, they instituted a lottery.

⁵ The Gemara poses a question against the assertion that nighttime Temple services did not normally require a lottery: But there is the burning of the limbs of burnt-offerings and the fats of other offerings, which is a service that is performed at night, and nevertheless the Sages instituted a lottery for that from the outset. The Gemara answers: The burning of those parts is not considered a nighttime service but the end of a daytime service, as the main part of the sacrificial service, the slaughtering and the sprinkling of blood, took place during the day.

⁶ The Gemara asks: If so, it could be argued that this service of removing the ashes is also not a nighttime service but the start of a daytime service, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If a priest has sanctified his hands at night by washing them for the removal of the ashes, the next day, i.e., after daybreak, if he remained in the confines of the Temple, he need not sanctify his hands again, because he already sanctified them at the start of the service. Apparently, the removal of the ashes, though performed at night, is considered the start of the next day's service.

⁷ The Gemara responds by emending Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement: Say the following version of the end of Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement: Because he had already sanctified them at the outset for service. According to this formulation, Rabbi Yoḥanan did not say that the removal of the ashes is considered the start of the following day's service. Rather, he said that although the removal of the ashes is a nighttime service, since the priest sanctified his hands before performing that service, the sanctification remains in effect for the services performed after daybreak as well, since there is no interruption between the two activities.

⁸ Some say that the original practice should be explained as follows: Initially, the Sages thought that since there is a likelihood of being overcome by sleep at that time of night, not many priests would come. When they saw that they did indeed come and that they were also coming to danger, the Sages instituted a lottery for this task. The Gemara asks: But there is the burning of the limbs of burnt-offerings and the fats of other offerings, a service for which there is the same likelihood of being overcome by sleep, and nevertheless the Sages instituted a lottery for that from the outset. The Gemara answers: Lying down to go to sleep late is different from rising in the middle of the night. It is not as difficult to stay up late in order to burn limbs on the altar as it is to rise before dawn to remove the ashes from the altar.

⁹ The Gemara addresses the substance of the mishna's claim: But was the ordinance to assign the removal of ashes by means of a lottery due to that reason cited in the mishna, the matter of the dangerous incident? The ordinance was instituted due to this reason: There were other important tasks associated with the removal of the ashes that required a lottery in their own right, as it was taught in a baraita: The priest who was privileged to perform the removal of the ashes was also

privileged with laying out the arrangement of wood on the altar and with placing the two logs that were placed on the altar each morning. Since these were inherently important tasks, the only way to assign them was through a lottery, which would also determine who removed the ashes.

¹⁰ The Gemara answers: Rav Ashi said: There were two separate ordinances instituted. Initially, the Sages thought that priests would not come forward to perform the task of removing the ashes. Once they saw that many priests did come and that they were also coming to danger, the Sages instituted a lottery for this task. Once they established a lottery for removing the ashes, the priests did not come anymore. They said: Who says the lottery will fall in our favor? Therefore, they did not bother to come. Then the Sages instituted for the priests that whoever was privileged with performing the removal of the ashes would also be privileged with laying out the arrangement of wood on the altar and with placing the two logs, so that the importance of all these tasks combined would ensure that the priests would come and participate in the lottery.

¹¹ § It was taught in the mishna that before the lottery was instituted, when there were many priests who sought to perform the removal of the ashes, the first priest to reach within four cubits of the top of the altar was privileged with performing the removal of the ashes. Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that the four cubits the mishna is referring to are not the four cubits adjacent to the ramp on the ground, because we learned in the mishna that the priests run and ascend on the ramp, and not adjacent to the ramp. It is also not referring to the first four cubits from the foot of the ramp, because we learned that the priests run and ascend on the ramp, and only afterward it says: Any priest who precedes another and reaches within four cubits of the altar first, indicating that the competition begins only once they have ascended the ramp to some extent.

¹² It is also not referring to four cubits somewhere in the middle, between the four on the bottom and the top of the altar, because the matter is not defined and there is no clear indication which four cubits on the ramp are the determining cubits. In light of all this, it is obvious to me that the four cubits we learned in the mishna are referring to the four cubits that are adjacent to the altar itself. The priest who reaches those four cubits first is the one privileged to remove the ashes.

¹³ Rav Pappa raised a dilemma based on the above clarification: Are the four cubits that they stated, which are the four cubits adjacent to the altar, calculated including the cubit of the base of the altar and the cubit of its ledge, as the ramp continues and overlaps these two cubits at the top of the altar,

¹⁴ or are they perhaps calculated excluding the cubit of the base of the altar and the cubit of its ledge? The altar's edge can be considered to be at the end of the ramp, the point at which it meets the altar, or it can be considered the point on the ramp that is directly over the external base of the altar, which is two cubits away from the point where the ramp meets the altar. Which of these two calculations is the correct one? Rav Pappa's question remains unanswered, and the Gemara concludes: The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

¹⁵ § It was taught in the mishna that if both of them were equal and neither preceded the other, the appointed priest says to all the priests: Extend your fingers [hatzbiu], and a lottery was performed. A tanna taught the meaning of the unusual term hatzbiu: Put out your fingers for a count. The Gemara asks: Let him count the priests themselves directly, rather than counting their fingers. The Gemara answers: This is a support for a teaching of Rabbi Yitzḥak, as Rabbi Yitzḥak said: It is prohibited to count Jews directly, even for the purposes of a mitzva, as it is written concerning King Saul and his

count of his soldiers: “And he numbered them with bezek” (I Samuel 11:8), meaning that he counted them through shards, one shard representing each man, rather than counting them directly.

¹⁶ Rav Ashi strongly objects to this interpretation of the verse: From where do you derive that this word bezek is a term related to the verb meaning to break apart, so that it means shards? Perhaps it is the name of a town, and it means that Saul counted them in Bezek, as it is written: “And they found Adoni-bezek in Bezek” (Judges 1:5), which shows that Bezek is the name of a place. The Gemara answers: Indeed, the proof is not from that verse but from here, where it says: “And Saul summoned the people and numbered them by sheep” (I Samuel 15:4), meaning that Saul tallied his soldiers by having each one take a sheep and put it aside to represent him in the count.

¹⁷ Rabbi Elazar said: Whoever counts a group of Jews violates a negative mitzva, as it is stated: “And the number of the children of Israel will be like the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured” (Hosea 2:1). Rabbi Elazar interprets the verse to be saying: Which may not be measured. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: One who counts a group of Jews in fact violates two negative mitzvot, as it is stated in that verse: “Which cannot be measured and cannot be counted” (Hosea 2:1).

¹⁸ Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan raised a contradiction: It is written in this verse: “And the number of the children of Israel will be like the sand of the sea,” suggesting that they will have a specific number, though it will be very large. On the other hand, it continues and says: “Which cannot be measured and cannot be counted,” which means they will not be countable at all. How can these two statements be reconciled?

¹⁹ It is not difficult: Here, in the second statement, it is referring to a time when the Jewish people fulfill the will of God; then they will be innumerable. There, in the first statement, it is referring to a time when the Jewish people do not fulfill the will of God; then they will be like the sand of the sea, having a specific number. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said a different resolution in the name of Abba Yosei ben Dostai: It is not difficult: Here, in the second statement, it is referring to counting by the hand of man; the Jewish people will be too numerous to count by man. There, in the first statement, it is referring to counting by the hand of God, and He will find that they are like the number of the grains of the sand of the sea.

²⁰ Rav Nehilai bar Idi said that Shmuel said: Once a man is appointed as a leader of the community, he becomes wealthy. This is derived from the verses cited above. Initially, it is written with regard to Saul: “And he numbered them with bezek,” meaning pottery shards, and in the end it is written: “And he numbered them with sheep,” indicating that he was able to provide enough of his own sheep to use them in counting the people. The Gemara asks: But perhaps the people provided these sheep from their own flocks. The Gemara rejects this: If so, what is the novelty in the matter? Why would the text tell us that the people were counted with sheep if not to illustrate incidentally the great wealth of Saul?

²¹ § Having mentioned the verse about Saul, the Gemara proceeds to interpret more of that passage: “And Saul came to the city of Amalek and he strove in the valley” (I Samuel 15:5). Rabbi Mani said: This means that Saul strove with God, as it were, concerning the matter of the valley. At the time when the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Saul: “Now go and attack Amalek and proscribe all that belongs to him; do not pity him, but kill men and women alike, infants and sucklings alike, oxen and sheep alike, camel and donkey alike” (I Samuel 15:3), Saul countered and said: Now, if on account of one life that is taken, in a case where a slain person’s body is found and the murderer is unknown, the

Torah said to bring a heifer whose neck is broken to a barren valley, in the atonement ritual described in Deuteronomy 21:1–9, all the more so must I have pity and not take all these Amalekite lives.

²² And he further reasoned: If the men have sinned, in what way have the animals sinned? Why, then, should the Amalekites' livestock be destroyed? And if the adults have sinned, in what way have the children sinned? A Divine Voice then came forth and said to him: "Do not be overly righteous" (Ecclesiastes 7:16). That is to say: Do not be more merciful than the Creator Himself, Who has commanded you to do this, for to do so would not be an indication of righteousness but of weakness. At a later time, when Saul said to Doeg: "Turn around and strike down the priests, and Doeg the Edomite turned around and struck down the priests, and he killed on that day eighty-five men who wore the linen ephod, and he struck Nob the city of priests by the sword, man and woman alike, infants and sucklings alike, oxen and donkeys and sheep, by the sword" (I Samuel 22:18–19), a Divine Voice came forth and said to him: "Do not be overly wicked" (Ecclesiastes 7:17).

²³ Apropos Saul's contravention of God's command to obliterate Amalek, the Gemara observes that Rav Huna said: How little does a person who has the support of his Lord have to worry or be concerned. The proof for this assertion is a comparison between Saul and David. Saul failed with one single sin and it was counted against him, costing him the throne. David, however, failed with two sins and they were not counted against him, as he retained his position. The Gemara asks: What was Saul's one sin? The incident with Agag, king of Amalek, whom Saul spared in defiance of God's command (see I Samuel 15:9). But was this his sole sin? There is also the incident of Nob, the city of priests, in which Saul later slew many innocent people, as cited above. The Gemara answers: It was after the incident with Agag, and even before the incident at Nob, that God said: "I regret that I have crowned Saul to be king" (I Samuel 15:11).

²⁴ Rav Huna stated above that David failed with two sins. What were they? One was the incident in which he had Uriah killed. The other was the matter of the incitement of David to conduct a census of the Jewish people (see II Samuel 24:1), which led to many deaths in a plague.

²⁵ The Gemara asks: But were these his only two sins? There is also the incident of Bathsheba, in which he took another man's wife as his own. The Gemara answers: There, in that case, punishment was exacted from him separately, so the matter is no longer listed among his sins, as it is written with regard to this incident: "And he shall restore the lamb fourfold" (II Samuel 12:6). The lamb was a metaphor for Bathsheba, and ultimately David was indeed given a fourfold punishment for taking Bathsheba: The first child born to Bathsheba and David died (see II Samuel 12:13–23); David's son Amnon was killed; Tamar, his daughter, was raped by Amnon (see II Samuel 13); and his son Avshalom rebelled against him and was ultimately killed (see II Samuel 15–18).

²⁶ The Gemara asks: If sins for which David was punished separately are not counted, one could ask: There, too, with regard to the sin of the census, he was punished separately, as it is written: "And the Lord sent a plague against Israel from the morning until the appointed time" (II Samuel 24:15). The Gemara responds: There, David was not punished personally, in his own body; rather, the punishment was inflicted on the Jewish people.

²⁷ The Gemara challenges this: There, too, in the incident with Bathsheba, David was not punished personally, in his own body; rather, it was his children who suffered punishment. The Gemara answers: That is not so; he was punished personally, in his own body, for that sin, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: David was stricken with leprosy for six months after that incident, and the Sanhedrin

withdrew from him in protest over his behavior, and the Divine Presence also left him. As it is written that David prayed: “May those who fear You return to me, and they who know Your testimonies” (Psalms 119:79). Since he prayed for the return of those who fear God and who know His testimonies, referring to the Sages of the Sanhedrin, it can be inferred that they had withdrawn from him. And it is written as well: “Restore to me the joy of Your salvation, let a vigorous spirit support me” (Psalms 51:14), where David asks for the return of the Divine Spirit, which had left him.

²⁸ The Gemara asks: And didn’t David commit other sins? Didn’t Rav say: David accepted a slanderous report from Ziba about Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan, stating that the latter was pleased with David’s downfall? There was, in that case, this additional sin. The Gemara responds: Consequently, it is necessary to follow the approach of Shmuel, who said: David did not accept a slanderous report, because Ziba’s claim was true.

²⁹ The Gemara continues: And even according to Rav, who said that David accepted a slanderous report, one could answer that that sin is not counted, as was he not punished for it? As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: At the time when David said to Mephibosheth: “I say that you and Ziba should divide the field” (II Samuel 19:30), a Divine Voice came forth and said to him: Rehoboam and Jeroboam will divide the kingship. Because David believed Ziba’s slanderous report and awarded him half of Mephibosheth’s field, David was punished by having his kingdom divided into two. Following King Solomon’s death the Jewish people split into two kingdoms, Israel to the north and Judea to the south (see I Kings 12). Therefore, David was punished for that sin too.

³⁰ § The Gemara continues its discussion of Saul and David. It is written: “Saul was one year old when he began to reign” (I Samuel 13:1), which cannot be understood literally, as Saul was appointed king when he was a young man. Rav Huna said: The verse means that when he began to reign he was like a one-year-old, in that he had never tasted the taste of sin but was wholly innocent and upright.

³¹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak strongly objects to this interpretation of the verse, saying: You could just as well say that he was like a one-year-old in that he was always filthy with mud and excrement. Rav Naḥman was shown a frightful dream that night, and he understood it as a punishment for having disparaged Saul. He said: I humbly submit myself to you, O bones of Saul, son of Kish, and beg your forgiveness. But once again he was shown a frightful dream, and he understood that he had not shown enough deference in his first apology. He therefore said this time: I humbly submit myself to you, O bones of Saul, son of Kish, king of Israel, and beg your forgiveness. Subsequently, the nightmares ceased.

³² Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Why did the kingship of the house of Saul not continue on to succeeding generations? It is because there was no flaw in his ancestry; he was of impeccable lineage. As Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak: One appoints a leader over the community only if he has a box full of creeping animals hanging behind him, i.e., he has something inappropriate in his ancestry that preceded him. Why is that? It is so that if he exhibits a haughty attitude toward the community, one can say to him: Turn and look behind you and be reminded of your humble roots. This is why David’s kingdom lasted while Saul’s did not, as David descended from a family with problematic ancestry, namely Tamar (see Genesis, chapter 38) and Ruth the Moabite (see Ruth 4:18–22).

³³ Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Why was Saul punished in that he was ultimately led to commit the sins described above? Because at the very outset of his reign he inappropriately forwent his royal honor, as it is stated with regard to Saul's inauguration: "And some base fellows said: How can this man save us? So they disparaged him and brought him no present. But he made himself as if he did not hear" (I Samuel 10:27). And it is stated immediately afterward: "And Nahash the Ammonite marched up and encamped against Jabesh-gilead" (I Samuel 11:1). The implication is that if Saul had forcefully assumed his throne, Nahash would not have dared to attack the people of Jabesh-gilead. In this way, his humility led to the crisis.

³⁴ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak: Any Torah scholar

³⁵ who does not avenge himself and bear a grudge like a snake when insulted is not considered a Torah scholar at all, as it is important to uphold the honor of Torah and its students by reacting harshly to insults. The Gemara asks: But isn't it written explicitly in the Torah: "You shall not take vengeance nor bear any grudge against the children of your people" (Leviticus 19:18)? The Gemara responds: That prohibition is written with regard to monetary matters and not personal insults, as it was taught in a baraita: What is revenge and what is bearing a grudge? Revenge is illustrated by the following example: One said to his fellow: Lend me your sickle, and he said: No. The next day he, the one who had refused to lend the sickle, said to the other person: Lend me your ax. If he said to him: I will not lend to you, just as you did not lend to me, that is revenge.

³⁶ And what is bearing a grudge? If one said to his fellow: Lend me your ax, and he said: No, and the next day he, the one who had refused to lend the ax, said to the other man: Lend me your robe; if the first one said to him: Here it is, as I am not like you, who would not lend to me, that is bearing a grudge. Although he does not respond to his friend's inconsiderate behavior in kind, he still makes it known to his friend that he resents his inconsiderate behavior. This baraita shows that the prohibition relates only to monetary matters, such as borrowing and lending.

³⁷ The Gemara asks: But does the prohibition against vengeance really not relate also to matters of personal anguish suffered by someone? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Those who are insulted but do not insult others, who hear themselves being shamed but do not respond, who act out of love for God, and who remain happy in their suffering, about them the verse states: "They that love Him be as the sun when it goes forth in its might" (Judges 5:31). This baraita shows that one should forgive personal insults as well as wrongs in monetary matters.

³⁸ The Gemara responds that the prohibition against taking vengeance and bearing a grudge indeed applies to cases of personal anguish; however, actually, the scholar may keep resentment in his heart, though he should not act on it or remind the other person of his insulting behavior. The Gemara asks: But didn't Rava say: With regard to whoever forgoes his reckonings with others for injustices done to him, the heavenly court in turn forgoes punishment for all his sins? The Gemara answers: Indeed, even a scholar who is insulted must forgive insults, but that is only in cases where his antagonist has sought to appease him, in which case he should allow himself to be appeased toward him. However, if no apology has been offered, the scholar should not forgive him, in order to uphold the honor of the Torah.

³⁹ § The mishna describes that the lottery between competing priests is conducted by the priests extending their fingers for a count. And the mishna elaborated: And what fingers do they extend for the lottery? They may extend one or two fingers, and the priests do not extend a thumb in the

Temple. The Gemara asks: Now that the mishna states that the priest may extend two fingers, is it necessary to state that they may also extend one finger?

⁴⁰ Rav Ḥisda said: This is not difficult. Here, when the mishna speaks of extending one finger, it is referring to a healthy person, who has no difficulty extending just one finger without extending a second one. There, when the mishna mentions two fingers, it is referring to a sick person, for whom it is difficult to extend a single finger at a time. And so it was taught in a baraita: They may extend one finger, but they may not extend two. In what case is this statement said? It is said in reference to a healthy person; however, a sick person may extend even two fingers. And the sick priests who sit or lie alone, separately from the other priests, extend two fingers, but their two fingers are counted only as one.

⁴¹ The Gemara asks: And are the sick priest's two fingers really counted as only one? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: The priests may not extend the third finger, i.e., the middle finger, or the thumb, together with the index finger, due to concern for cheaters. One who sees that the count is approaching him might intentionally extend or withdraw an extra finger so that the lottery will fall on him. But if he does extend the third finger it is counted for him. This is because the third finger cannot be stretched very far from the index finger, so that it is easily recognizable that both fingers are from the same person, and this is not taken as an attempt to cheat. If he extends his thumb, however, it is not counted for him, and moreover he is punished with lashes administered by the person in charge of the pakia. The implication of the baraita is that when the third finger is extended along with the index finger, both fingers are counted.

⁴² The Gemara answers: What does the baraita mean when it says that if the priest extended his middle finger along with his index finger, it is counted for him? It also means, as stated earlier, that the two fingers are counted as one.

⁴³ The baraita mentions lashes administered by the person in charge of the pakia. What is a pakia? Rav said: It is a madra. However, the meaning of that term also became unclear over time, so the Gemara asks: What is a madra? Rav Pappa said: It is a whip [matraka] used by the Arabs, the end of which is split into several strands. That is the pakia mentioned above, which was used for punishing the priests.

⁴⁴ Apropos this discussion, Abaye said: At first I would say as follows: When we learned in a mishna that ben Beivai was in charge of the pakia, I would say that it means that he was in charge of producing wicks, as we learned in another mishna: They would tear [mafkia] strips from the priests' worn-out trousers and belts and make wicks out of them, with which they lit the lamps for the Celebration of Drawing Water. But once I heard that which is taught in the previously cited baraita: And moreover, he is punished with lashes administered by the person in charge of the pakia, I now say: What is a pakia? It is lashes. Ben Beivai was in charge of corporal punishment in the Temple.

⁴⁵ § It was taught in the mishna: An incident occurred where both of the priests were equal as they were running and ascending on the ramp, and one of them shoved the other and he fell and his leg was broken. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: An incident occurred where there were two priests who were equal as they were running and ascending the ramp. One of them reached the four cubits before his colleague, who then, out of anger, took a knife and stabbed him in the heart.

⁴⁶ The Tosefta continues: Rabbi Tzadok then stood up on the steps of the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary and said: Hear this, my brothers of the house of Israel. The verse states: "If one be found

slain in the land... and it be not known who had smitten him; then your Elders and your judges shall come forth and they shall measure...and it shall be that the city which is nearest to the slain man... shall take a heifer” (Deuteronomy 21:1–3). And the Elders of that city took that heifer and broke its neck in a ritual of atonement. But what of us, in our situation? Upon whom is the obligation to bring the heifer whose neck is broken? Does the obligation fall on the city, Jerusalem, so that its Sages must bring the calf, or does the obligation fall upon the Temple courtyards, so that the priests must bring it? At that point the entire assembly of people burst into tears.

⁴⁷ The father of the boy, i.e., the young priest who was stabbed, came and found that he was still convulsing. He said: May my son’s death be an atonement for you. But my son is still convulsing and has not yet died, and as such, the knife, which is in his body, has not become ritually impure through contact with a corpse. If you remove it promptly, it will still be pure for future use. The Tosefta comments: This incident comes to teach you that the ritual purity of utensils was of more concern to them than the shedding of blood. Even the boy’s father voiced more concern over the purity of the knife than over the death of his child. And similarly, it says: “Furthermore, Manasseh spilled innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another” (II Kings 21:16), which shows that in his day as well people paid little attention to bloodshed.

⁴⁸ The Gemara asks: Which incident came first, the one about the broken leg reported in the mishna or the one about the slain priest in the Tosefta? If we say that the incident of bloodshed came first, this raises a problem: Now, if in response to a case of bloodshed they did not establish a lottery but continued with the running competition, can it be that in response to an incident of a priest’s leg being broken they did establish a lottery? Rather, we must say that the case in which the priest’s leg was broken in the course of the race came first, and as the mishna states, the establishment of the lottery was in response to that incident.

⁴⁹ The Gemara asks: If the running competition was abolished immediately after the incident of the broken leg and a lottery was instituted to replace it, once they established the lottery, what were they doing still running to within the four cubits in the incident that led to the priest’s murder? Rather, actually, it is necessary to return to the approach suggested earlier, that the case involving bloodshed came first. Initially, the Sages thought that it was merely a random, i.e., isolated, event, and because it was extremely unlikely for a murder to happen again they did not abolish the competition due to that incident. Then, once they saw that in any event the priests were coming to danger, as one of them was pushed and broke his leg, the Sages established a lottery.

⁵⁰ The Gemara returns to the incident of the slain priest and discusses several details of it. It was related that Rabbi Tzadok stood up on the steps of the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary and said: Hear this, my brothers of the house of Israel. The verse states: “If one be found slain in the land, etc.” But what of us, in our situation? Upon whom is the obligation to bring the heifer whose neck is broken? Does the obligation fall upon the city, Jerusalem, or does the obligation fall upon the Temple courtyards? The Gemara asks: Is Jerusalem subject to bringing a heifer whose neck is broken? Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: Ten things were said about Jerusalem to distinguish it from all other cities in Eretz Yisrael, and this is one of them:

⁵¹ Jerusalem does not bring a heifer whose neck is broken. The reason for this is that the halakha of the heifer whose neck is broken applies only to land that was apportioned to a specific tribe of the Jewish people. Jerusalem alone was not divided among the tribes, but was shared equally by the

entire nation. And furthermore, it is written that the heifer whose neck is broken is brought when “it be not known who had smitten him,” and here, in the case of the slain priest, it was well known who had smitten him. Rather, one must conclude that Rabbi Tzadok invoked the halakha of the heifer whose neck is broken not because it actually applied in this case but only in order to arouse the people’s grief and to increase weeping.

⁵² In relating the above incident the Tosefta said: The father of the boy came and found that he was still convulsing. He said: May my son’s death be an atonement for you. But my son is still alive, etc. This incident comes to teach you that the ritual purity of utensils was of more concern to them than the shedding of blood. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Should one conclude from this comment that bloodshed had become trivialized in their eyes but their concern for purity of utensils remained where it was originally, meaning that while they cared less than they should have about murder, they did not exaggerate the importance of purity of utensils; or perhaps their concern for bloodshed remained where it was originally, but their concern for purity of vessels had become too strict, to the extent that its importance was exaggerated beyond concern for human life?

⁵³ The Gemara answers: Come and hear an answer to the dilemma: Since the Tosefta adduces a biblical teaching from the verse, “Furthermore, Manasseh spilled innocent blood,” conclude from this that it was bloodshed that had become trivialized, and the importance of purity of utensils remained where it had been.

⁵⁴ § The Gemara returns to the mitzva of removing the ashes from the altar and associated issues. The Sages taught in a baraita: The Torah states, after describing the removal of the ashes: “And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry the ashes out of the camp to a clean place” (Leviticus 6:4). I might understand from here that this change of garments is a mitzva to change into a different kind of garment, similar to the change of garments performed on Yom Kippur, when the High Priest changes back and forth from gold clothes to white clothes. Here, too, the Torah requires that he remove his sacred garments and put on non-sacred garments.

⁵⁵ The baraita continues: To teach us otherwise, the verse states: “And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments,” thereby juxtaposing the garments he puts on to the garments he takes off. This indicates that just as there, the garments he removes, i.e., those in which he had performed the mitzva of removal of the ashes, are sacred garments, so too here, the clothes he puts on to take the ashes out of the camp are sacred garments.

⁵⁶ If so, what is the meaning when the verse states: Other garments, which implies that the second set of garments is different from the first? It means they are of lower quality than the first set of garments. Rabbi Eliezer says a different interpretation of the words: Other garments. The verse states: “And put on other garments, and carry the ashes out of the camp,” in which the Hebrew juxtaposes the words “other” and “carry out.” This teaches that priests with physical blemishes, who are considered others in that they are not eligible to perform sacred tasks, are eligible to carry out the ashes.

⁵⁷ The Gemara now explains the baraita in detail. The Master said in the baraita: The words: Other garments, teach that they are to be of lower quality than the garments worn during the removal of the ashes. This is in accordance with what was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael, as it was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: Clothes worn by a servant as he was cooking food for his master that became soiled in the process should not be worn by him when he pours a cup for his master,

which is a task that calls for the servant to present a dignified appearance. Similarly, one who performs the dirtying task of carrying out the ashes should not wear the same fine clothes worn to perform other services.

⁵⁸ The baraita taught that Rabbi Eliezer derived from the word *other* that blemished priests are eligible for the task of carrying out the ashes, while the first tanna derived a different teaching from those words. The Gemara clarifies the scope of the dispute between the first tanna and Rabbi Eliezer. Reish Lakish said: Just as there is a dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the first tanna with regard to carrying the ashes out of the camp, so too, there is a dispute with regard to the removal of the ashes from the altar. Rabbi Eliezer maintains that the removal of the ashes may also be performed by blemished priests, while the first tanna disagrees. But Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The dispute is only with regard to carrying the ashes out of the camp, but all agree that the removal of the ashes is a bona side Temple service that cannot be performed by blemished priests.

⁵⁹ The Gemara explains: What is the reason behind the opinion of Reish Lakish? Reish Lakish could have said to you: If it enters your mind that the removal of the ashes is a bona side Temple service, you are faced with the following difficulty: Do you have any Temple service that may be performed with only two garments rather than the full set of four vestments worn by the priests? In the Torah's description of the garments worn to remove the ashes it says: "And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen trousers shall he put on his flesh" (Leviticus 6:3).

⁶⁰ And what is the explanation for Rabbi Yoḥanan's opinion? In fact, the priest is required to wear all four priestly garments. The Merciful One reveals in the Torah that the priest must wear the tunic and the trousers like any other service so that one would not think that taking out the ashes may be performed in regular, non-sacred clothes. Once the Torah has made this point and mentioned these two specific garments, the same is true for the other two garments as well, i.e., the mitre and the belt.

⁶¹ The Gemara asks: If the Torah requires all four garments and mentions the tunic and trousers only as examples, what is different about these two that the Torah mentioned them in particular? The Gemara answers that these two particular garments were mentioned in order to teach certain halakhot. The Torah refers to the tunic as "his linen garment," with the words "his garment" [middo], indicating that the tunic must conform to his exact size [middato] and should fit the priest perfectly. As for the words "linen trousers," they come to teach that which was taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that as the priest gets dressed no garment should precede the trousers? As it is stated: "And his linen trousers shall he put on his flesh," which implies that the trousers should be donned when the priest has nothing but his flesh, i.e., when he has no other garments on him yet.

⁶² The Gemara asks: And with regard to Reish Lakish, who maintains that these two garments are mentioned because they are the only two that the priest wears when removing the ashes, from where does he derive these two halakhot? The Gemara answers: The halakha that his linen garment, i.e., the tunic, must be according to his size is derived the fact that the Merciful One uses the expression "his garment," i.e., his fitted garment, in the Torah, rather than calling it by its usual name, tunic. And the halakha that no garment should precede the trousers when the priest dresses is derived from the fact that the Torah added the phrase "on his flesh."

⁶³ Let us say that the dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish is parallel to a dispute between tanna'im. As it was taught in a baraita that the Torah states: "And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen trousers shall he put on his flesh" (Leviticus 6:3). The words "shall he

put on” seem superfluous, since these same words were already stated earlier in the verse. Therefore, the Torah could have sufficed with saying: “And linen trousers on his flesh.” What is the meaning when the verse states: “Shall he put on”? This extra expression comes to include the donning of the mitre and the belt, which are not mentioned here explicitly, for the removal of the ash; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

⁶⁴ Rabbi Dosa says: The extra expression comes to include the permissibility of the High Priest’s clothes that he wears on Yom Kippur, which are linen garments identical to those of the common priest, to teach that they are acceptable to be used afterward by common priests in their service. In other words, the expression teaches that the High Priest’s garments need not be permanently retired from service after Yom Kippur, unlike the opinion of another Sage, as will be explained below.

⁶⁵ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: There are two refutations against Rabbi Dosa’s interpretation: One is that the belt of the High Priest that he wears on Yom Kippur is made only of linen and is not identical to the belt of the common priest, which, in Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s opinion, is made of wool and linen. Therefore, it is impossible for the High Priest’s Yom Kippur garments to be used by a common priest. And furthermore, with regard to garments that you used to perform the services of the most severe sanctity, i.e., the services performed by the High Priest on Yom Kippur, can it be that you will then use them to perform services of lesser sanctity by a common priest? Instead of this, a different interpretation must be said. What, then, is the meaning when the verse states the superfluous words “shall he put on”?

⁶⁶ The phrase comes to include worn out garments, teaching that as long as they have not become tattered they may be used for Temple services.

⁶⁷ The Gemara continues with another baraita connected to this debate. With regard to the garments of the High Priest, the Torah states: “And Aaron shall go into the tent of meeting, and he shall take off the linen garments that he had put on when he went into the Sanctuary, and shall leave them there” (Leviticus 16:23). This verse teaches that the linen garments worn by the High Priest during the Yom Kippur service require storing away, i.e., they may not be used again. Rabbi Dosa says: They do not have to be stored away, because although they may not be used again by the High Priest on a subsequent Yom Kippur, they are acceptable for use for a common priest. And what, then, is the meaning when the verse states: “And shall leave them there,” which implies that they are not to be used again? It means that the High Priest himself may not use them on a subsequent Yom Kippur for service in the Holy of Holies; it does not mean that they may not be used at all.

⁶⁸ The Gemara returns to the question of whether or not the removal of the ashes is considered a bona side Temple service, requiring all four priestly garments, and whether or not this is the subject of debate between tanna’im. What, is it not with regard to this that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Dosa disagree: One Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, who derives from the phrase “he shall wear” that all four garments are required, holds that the removal of the ashes is a bona side service; and one Sage, Rabbi Dosa, who derives a different teaching from “he shall wear,” holds that it is not a bona side service, and consequently only two of the four garments are required? Their dispute would therefore be identical to the dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish.

⁶⁹ The Gemara rejects this suggestion: It is possible to say that this is not the subject of debate between these two tanna’im. Rather, everyone agrees that the removal of ashes is a bona side Temple service requiring all four garments, and here they disagree about a different point, which is this: One

Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, holds that a derivation from the verse is necessary to include the mitre and belt, which are not mentioned explicitly in the verse. And one Sage, Rabbi Dosa, holds that since the removal of the ash is a bona side Temple service it is obvious that all four garments are required, so a derivation from a verse to include the other two garments is not necessary. Accordingly, both tanna'im are in agreement that the removal of ash is a bona side service and requires all four priestly garments.

⁷⁰ § Rabbi Avin raised a dilemma: How much ash must be removed in order to fulfill the mitzva of removal of the ashes? Do we derive it from the teruma of the tithe, the portion that the Levite sets aside for the priest, in which case one hundredth of the total is separated, or do we derive it from the donations that were set aside from the spoils of the war with Midian, where one five-hundredth was taken from the spoils of war (see Numbers 31:28)? Come and hear a teaching with regard to this dilemma. As Rabbi Ḥiyya taught in a baraita that it is stated here: “And he shall take up the ashes” (Leviticus 6:3), and it is said elsewhere, with regard to a meal-offering: “And he shall take up a handful of the choice flour of the meal-offering” (Leviticus 6:8). Just as there, the amount he removes is a handful of flour, so too, here, he removes a handful of ash. The amount of ashes removed from the altar is therefore not a fixed percentage of the total ash.

⁷¹ § Rav said: Although a non-priest may not perform any Temple service, there are only four Temple services for which a non-priest is liable to receive the punishment of death by God's hand for doing so. They are: Sprinkling sacrificial blood on the altar, and burning incense or parts of sacrificial animals on the altar, and pouring out the water libation on the altar on the festival of Sukkot, and pouring out the wine libation on the altar. And Levi said: This is true also for the removal of the ashes. And similarly, Levi taught in his collection of baraitot: The removal of ashes is also included among those services for which a non-priest incurs the death penalty if he performs them.

⁷² The Gemara explains: What is the reason for Rav's opinion? As it is written: “And you and your sons with you shall keep your priesthood in everything pertaining to the altar and to that within the veil; and you shall serve; I give you the priesthood as a service of gift; and the common man that draws near shall be put to death” (Numbers 18:7). Rav interprets this verse as follows: “A service of gift” indicates a service that involves giving, i.e., placing something on the altar, and not a service that involves removal from the altar, to the exclusion of removing the ashes. “And you shall serve [va'avadtem]” is interpreted as referring to a service that is complete [avoda tamma] on its own, such as sprinkling the blood, and not a service that is not complete, i.e., a service that is only a preparatory step and has another service after it that completes its purpose, such as slaughtering the animal or collecting its blood, which are only preparatory steps leading up to the sprinkling of the blood on the altar.

⁷³ And what is the reason for the opinion of Levi? Why does he include the removal of ashes? According to him, the Merciful One includes this service by adding “in everything pertaining to the altar,” which teaches that all actions performed on the altar, including the removal of ashes, are significant and are prohibited to a non-priest on pain of death. The Gemara asks: And what does Rav learn from the phrase “in everything pertaining to the altar”? The Gemara answers: According to him, the word “everything” in that phrase comes to include the seven sprinklings that are performed inside the Sanctuary, when the blood of certain offerings is sprinkled on the veil of the Holy of

Holies, and the seven sprinklings of oil of the leper, which are also performed inside the Sanctuary. Rav learns from the word “everything” that if a non-priest were to perform any of these actions he would be liable to receive the death penalty, despite the fact that they are not performed on the altar.

⁷⁴ The Gemara asks: And from where does Levi derive these cases? The Gemara answers: He derives them from the superfluous wording of the text. As the entire phrase “pertaining to the altar” is superfluous, he derives from this the inclusion of the removal of the ashes. Additionally, the expression “everything pertaining” implies a further inclusion, from which he derives the internal sprinklings mentioned above. And what does Rav learn from this superfluous wording? Rav does not derive anything particular from the distinction between the expressions “pertaining to the altar” and “everything pertaining to the altar.”

⁷⁵ The Gemara asks about Levi’s position: But say that the verse should be interpreted as follows: “In everything pertaining” is a generalization, and “a service of gift” is a specification, indicating a case of a generalization followed by a specification. One of the principles of hermeneutics states that in such cases, the generalization includes only what is mentioned explicitly in the specification. Following that rule, one would conclude: A service of giving, i.e., placing on the altar, yes, this is included, but a service of removal is not included. This presents a difficulty for Levi. The Gemara responds that the verse states:

⁷⁶ “To that within the veil; and you shall serve; I give you the priesthood as a service of gift” (Numbers 18:7), indicating that it is only with regard to services that are performed within the veil, i.e., in the Holy of Holies, that there is a distinction between services, and a non-priest who performs services of giving there, such as sprinkling the blood inside the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur, is subject to the death penalty, but not one who performs services of removing there, such as the removal of the censer from the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur. This leads to the conclusion that when it comes to services performed outside of the Holy of Holies, a non-priest would be liable if he performed any service, even a service of removal, such as the removal of ashes from the altar.

⁷⁷ The Gemara asks: If it is so that the limitations of the verse apply only to those services performed in the Holy of Holies, one should say that the phrase: “And you shall serve [va’avadtem],” from which it is derived that one is liable only for a service that is complete [avoda tamma] on its own and not incomplete, should also be similarly limited to services performed to what is within the veil. In that case, the liability of the non-priest, which is limited to cases where he performs a complete service and does not apply if he performs a service that is only preparatory and has another service after it that completes its purpose, should apply only to services performed in the Holy of Holies. But for services performed outside the Holy of Holies, a non-priest should be liable even if it is a service that is incomplete and has a service after it.

⁷⁸ The Gemara answers: The phrase: “And you shall serve [va’avadtem],” which begins with the conjunction vav, meaning: And, indicates that the verse goes back and combines the service performed within the veil to services performed outside of it. This teaches that with regard to this halakha there is no difference between a service performed outside and a service performed inside.

⁷⁹ According to Levi, if a non-priest performs a service involving removal within the veil, i.e., in the Holy of Holies, he does not incur the death penalty, but if he performs a service involving removal outside, such as the removal of the ashes from the external altar, he is liable to the death penalty. Rava raised a dilemma relating to Levi’s approach: What would be the halakha with regard to a

service of removal performed in the Sanctuary chamber that is before the Holy of Holies, such as removing the burnt incense from the inner altar, or removing burnt wicks and leftover oil from the candelabrum? Do we compare such an act to a service performed inside the Holy of Holies, so that he would be exempt from the death penalty, or do we compare it to the outer service?

⁸⁰ Rava himself went back and resolved the dilemma: Had the Torah said only: Within the veil, it would have been understood that it is referring only to actions performed in the Holy of Holies. But since the Torah says: And to what is within the veil, the added conjunction: And, teaches that it is referring to something else besides the Holy of Holies, i.e., the Sanctuary.

⁸¹ The Gemara asks: However, if it is so that a non-priest is liable for performing a service that is complete on its own that takes place in the Sanctuary, one should say that a non-priest who arranges the loaves on the shewbread table should be liable. The Gemara answers: After arranging the bread there is still the arranging of the vessels of frankincense on the table that remains to be done, so the arrangement of the bread is not a service that is complete on its own. The Gemara asks: If so, a non-priest who arranges the vessels of frankincense on the table should be liable. The Gemara rejects this: After arranging the vessels, there is still the removal of these vessels and the burning of their frankincense on the altar that remain to be done; therefore, arranging the vessels is not considered a service that is complete on its own.

⁸² The Gemara asks further with regard to the notion that a non-priest is liable for performing a service that is complete on its own that takes place in the Sanctuary: If so, a non-priest who arranges the lamps of the candelabrum should be liable. The Gemara rejects this: There is still the placing of the wicks in the lamps that remains to be done, so arranging the lamps is not considered a service that is complete on its own. The Gemara asks: If so, a non-priest who placed a wick in the candelabrum's lamps should be liable. The Gemara answers: That too is not a service that is complete on its own, as there is still the necessity of placing the oil.

⁸³ The Gemara asks: If so, a non-priest who placed the oil should be liable. The Gemara answers: That too is not a service that is complete on its own, as there is still the service of lighting that needs to be done. The Gemara asks: If so, if a non-priest who lit the lamps should be liable. The Gemara answers: Lighting the lamps is not considered a bona side Temple service, since in doing so nothing is done to the candelabrum itself.

⁸⁴ The Gemara asks: And is kindling a fire really not considered a Temple service? But wasn't it taught in a baraita that it is written: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar and lay out wood in order upon the fire" (Leviticus 1:7), which teaches that the kindling of chips [alita] added to keep the altar's fire going must be performed only by a proper priest and that he must be wearing the priestly garments? This shows that kindling is considered a service. The Gemara answers: Kindling the chips is a bona side service, but lighting the candelabrum is not a bona side service.

⁸⁵ The Gemara further asks: However, if it is so that a non-priest is liable for performing any service involving placing, as established above, a non-priest who set up the arrangement of wood on the altar should be liable, since that is a service involving placing. The Gemara answers: There is still the mitzva of the arrangement of two logs on the altar that remains to be done, so that setting up the arrangement of wood is not a service that is complete on its own. The Gemara asks: If so, a non-priest who arranged the two logs should be liable. The Gemara answers: There is still the

arrangement of limbs of offerings on the fire that remains to be done, so placing the two logs is also not considered a service that is complete on its own.

⁸⁶ The Gemara asks: But didn't Rav Asi say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest who arranged the two pieces of wood is liable? This shows that placing the two logs is a complete service and contradicts Rav's statement that a non-priest is liable only if he performs the four services that he mentioned above. The Gemara answers: Indeed, Rav and Rabbi Yoḥanan disagree on this point. One Sage, Rabbi Yoḥanan, holds that the placement of the two logs is a service that is complete on its own, as the arrangement of limbs that follows is not considered a continuation of the setting up of the wood; and one Sage, Rav, holds that the placement of the two logs is not considered a service that is complete on its own, since it is followed by the arrangement of the limbs on the wood.

⁸⁷ The Gemara returns to the disagreement between Rav and Levi and notes: It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and it was taught in a second baraita in accordance with the opinion of Levi. It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav: These are the services for which a non-priest who performs them is liable to receive the penalty of death by God's hand: One who performs the sprinkling of blood, whether inside the Sanctuary; on the golden altar or at the veil; or inside the innermost chamber, the Holy of Holies, on Yom Kippur; or outside on the main altar; and one who sprinkles blood in the case of a bird sin-offering; and one who squeezes the blood of a bird burnt-offering on the wall of the altar or burns the bird on the altar; and one who pours out three log of water on the altar for the Sukkot water libation or three log of wine on the altar for an ordinary libation. The removal of ashes from the altar is not listed here.

⁸⁸ It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Levi: These are the services for which a non-priest who performs them is liable to receive the penalty of death by God's hand: One who removes the ashes from the altar; one who performs the seven sprinklings that are performed inside the Sanctuary or the sprinklings of the leper; and one who raises up an offering onto the altar, whether it is a proper offering or a disqualified one. In this baraita, the removal of ashes is listed.

⁸⁹ § The Gemara returns to its interpretation of the mishna. The mishna states that there were four lotteries held in the Temple every day. One of the Sages asked: Why did the Temple authorities hold lotteries? Before answering the question, the Gemara expresses astonishment at the question itself: Why did they hold lotteries? The reason is as we said clearly in the mishna: To prevent quarrels among the priests. The Gemara explains: Rather, this is the meaning of the question: Why did they assemble all the priests together and hold a lottery, and once again gather them together to hold another lottery, four times, when the priests could be gathered one time and all the necessary lotteries held at that time?

⁹⁰ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It was done this way in order to create a commotion throughout the Temple courtyard, as the priests would converge from all over to assemble there, as it is stated: "We took sweet counsel together, in the House of God we walked with the throng" (Psalms 55:15). This verse teaches that it is proper to stir up a commotion and to cause public excitement in the course of the Temple services and the preliminary steps leading up to them, such as the assignment of tasks to the priests.

⁹¹ The Gemara asks: With what garments were the priests clothed when they held the lottery? Rav Naḥman said: The priests were clothed in their own non-sacred garments. And Rav Sheshet said: The priests were dressed in the priestly sacred garments.

⁹² The Gemara explains the two approaches. Rav Naḥman said: The priests were dressed in non-sacred garments, because if you say the lottery was to be held when they were dressed in their sacred garments, there are strong-armed men who might act with force and perform the service even if they did not win the lottery. Since they were already wearing the sacred garments, they would simply force their way into performing the service. Rav Sheshet said: They were wearing the sacred garments, as, if you say they wore their non-sacred garments, due to the fact that the service was so beloved to them, in their excitement over having been granted the privilege to perform the service, it may happen that they would perform the service immediately, forgetting to don their sacred garments, thereby disqualifying the service.

⁹³ Rav Naḥman said: From where do I state my opinion? As we learned in a mishna: After the lottery they gave the priests over to the attendants, and they would take their clothes off them and they would leave only their trousers on them.

⁹⁴ What, is this not talking about those priests who won the lottery, describing how their non-sacred garments were removed from them before they were dressed in the priestly garments? Rav Huna bar Yehuda said that Rav Sheshet said, rejecting that interpretation: No, it is possible to explain that all the priests at the lottery were wearing sacred garments and that, on the contrary, the mishna speaks about those priests who did not win the lottery. The text describes how the sacred garments they wore during the lottery were removed from them.

⁹⁵ The Gemara supports this latter interpretation: So too, it is reasonable to follow Rav Sheshet's interpretation of the mishna. As, if it were to enter your mind to say that the mishna is dealing with those who won the lottery and describes how their non-sacred garments were removed and sacred garments put on, how would one understand the statement: They would leave only their trousers on them? One would have to explain that the priests subsequently donned the sacred clothes on top of the non-sacred trousers; then they would remove the non-sacred trousers and replace them with the sacred trousers. But wasn't it taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that nothing should precede the trousers when the priest dresses? The verse states: "And he shall have linen trousers upon his flesh" (Leviticus 16:4)? However, according to the proposed interpretation of the mishna, the priests donned the other sacred garments and put on the trousers after them.

⁹⁶ The Gemara asks: And how would the other one, Rav Naḥman, resolve this difficulty? He would respond that this is not difficult, as this is what the mishna is teaching: While the non-sacred garments are still on them they put the sacred trousers on them, and then they remove from them the non-sacred clothes, and they left them wearing only the sacred trousers. Therefore, it is possible to interpret the mishna either way.

⁹⁷ Rav Sheshet said: From where do I say that the priests wore sacred garments when the lottery was held? As it was taught in a baraita: The Chamber of Hewn Stone was built in the style of a large basilica [basileki]; the lottery is held in the east of the chamber, and an Elder of the court sits in its west to provide instruction and adjudicate any doubtful cases. And the priests stand in a circle in the shape of a bracelet [bekholyar], and the appointed priest comes and removes the mitre from the head of one of them, and everyone thereby knew that the count began from him. And if it were to enter your mind to say that the priests wore non-sacred garments during the lottery, is there such a thing as a mitre among one's non-sacred garments? This shows that the priests were wearing their sacred garments when the lottery took place.

⁹⁸ The Gemara rejects this reasoning: Yes, indeed, there is such a thing as a mitre that one wears as non-sacred apparel, as Rav Yehuda, and some say it was Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda, taught: A priest whose mother made a tunic for him, to show her love for her son and her love for mitzvot, may perform an individual service with it on, but not communal services. Therefore, it is possible that the priests had non-sacred mitres in the style of the sacred mitres, just as they sometimes had non-sacred tunics.

⁹⁹ Apropos the baraita that was just cited, Abaye said: Conclude from this baraita that the Chamber of Hewn Stone was built half in the sacred area, within the consecrated Temple grounds, and half in the non-sacred part of the Temple grounds. And conclude from it as well that the chamber had two doorways, one that opened to the sacred area of the Temple and one that opened to the non-sacred area. Abaye explains these inferences: As, were it to enter your mind that the Chamber of Hewn Stone stood entirely in the sacred area, how could one say that an Elder sat in its west? Didn't the Master say: There is no sitting allowed in the Temple courtyard except for kings of the house of David alone? The Elder must therefore have been sitting in an area external to the Temple courtyard area.

¹⁰⁰ And if it were to enter your mind to say the opposite, that the chamber stood entirely in the non-sacred area, how could the lottery be held in the east? Aren't we required to fulfill the verse: "In the House of God we walked with the throng" (Psalms 55:15), from where it was derived earlier that it is desirable that the lotteries cause a commotion in the House of God, i.e., in the sacred area of the Temple? If the lottery were held in a non-sacred area, there would not be a fulfillment of this verse. Rather, one must conclude from this baraita that the chamber was situated half in the sacred area of the Temple and half in the non-sacred area.

¹⁰¹ Abaye continues: And were it to enter your mind that the chamber had just one doorway, which opened to the sacred area, how could the Elder sit in its west? Didn't we learn in a mishna: Chambers that are built in the non-sacred area of the Temple Mount, but that open up into the sacred area, their interior is considered entirely sacred, despite the fact that they also occupy land outside the sacred area? And if, on the other hand, it were to enter your mind that the chamber had just one doorway, which opened to the non-sacred area, how could the lottery be held in its east? Didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to chambers that are built in the sacred area but which open up into the non-sacred area, the space within them is considered entirely non-sacred, despite the chambers' location on sacred territory. Rather, isn't it correct to conclude from this that the Chamber of Hewn Stone had two doorways, one that opened up into the sacred area and one that opened into the non-sacred area?

¹⁰² MISHNA: The second lottery conducted daily among the priests determines the following: Who slaughters the daily morning offering, who sprinkles its blood, who removes the ashes from the inner altar, and who removes the ashes and burnt wicks from the candelabrum, and who takes the limbs of the daily offering up to the ramp to be burned later.

¹⁰³ This is how the limbs were divided before taking them up to the altar: The head and the right leg were carried by one priest, and the two forelegs were carried by a second priest. The tail, including the lower vertebrae of the spinal column and the fat tail, and the left leg were carried by a third priest. And the breast and the throat and some of the inner organs attached to it were carried by a fourth priest. And the two flanks were taken by a fifth priest, and the intestines by a sixth priest. And the fine flour of the meal-offering accompanying the daily offering was carried by a seventh priest.

And the High Priest's daily griddle-cake offering was carried by an eighth priest, and the wine for libation was carried by a ninth priest. Altogether thirteen priests prevailed in this lottery: Nine priests who carried the daily offering and its accompanying elements, and four who performed the slaughter, sprinkling, and removal of ashes from the inner altar and the candelabrum.

¹⁰⁴ Ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: That was not the sequence of taking the limbs up to the ramp; rather, the order in which it was sacrificed was according to the way it walks when alive, as will be explained in the Gemara.

¹⁰⁵ GEMARA: A dilemma was raised before the Sages: When the priests performed the lottery, did they perform a lottery for just one service, such as the slaughtering, and the other twelve tasks were divided among the priests adjacent to the chosen one; or perhaps they performed a separate lottery for each and every service of the thirteen acts listed? The Gemara answers: Come and hear a proof from that which was taught in the mishna: There were four lotteries there. And if it were to enter your mind that they performed a lottery for each and every service separately, there would be many more than four lotteries. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: That is not a conclusive proof, because one could argue that this is what the mishna is saying: The priests gathered four times for a lottery, but each gathering involved many lotteries for many individual services.

¹⁰⁶ Come and hear a proof from a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda says: When the third lottery was held to determine who would perform the burning of the incense, there was no separate lottery held for carrying the coal pan, although a second priest was required to rake up coals from the outer altar, carry them in a coal pan, and put them on the inner altar, where the priest assigned the task of burning the incense would then place the incense onto the coals. Rather, the priest who won the privilege of the incense said to the one who was next to him: Be privileged along with me with the task of carrying the coal pan. This shows that each individual service did not have its own lottery; rather, the other priests adjacent to the winner of the lottery were automatically chosen for the ancillary tasks.

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara rejects this proof: The tasks of carrying the coal pan and burning the incense are different, because together they are considered as a single service, so that a single lottery determined the participants for the two tasks.

¹⁰⁸ There are those who say that this baraita was brought to derive the opposite conclusion: It was specifically concerning the case of carrying the coal pan and burning the incense, which are considered as two parts of one and the same service, that Rabbi Yehuda said one lottery can be used to assign the two tasks. However, the implication is that other services, which are not interrelated in this manner, require a lottery for each and every separate task. If Rabbi Yehuda had meant this to be a general principle, why did he mention the specific example of the coal pan and the incense?

¹⁰⁹ This argument is rejected: That is not a proof that other services require their own lotteries. The reason Rabbi Yehuda mentioned this specific example is that it was necessary for him to teach explicitly that the coal pan and the burning of the incense do not have separate lotteries but a single, combined lottery. It might have entered your mind to say that since the burning of incense is infrequent, being performed only twice a day, unlike other offerings, which may be donated by private individuals and brought many times a day, and also since it brings about wealth for whoever performs it, as the Gemara teaches later, we should institute a separate lottery for bringing in the coal pan itself, as many priests wished to perform this task. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda teaches us that

despite this, the bringing in of the coal pan does not have its own lottery. Consequently, there is no proof either way from this baraita.

¹¹⁰ Come and hear a proof from what Rabbi Ḥiyya taught explicitly in a baraita: A lottery is not held for each individual service; rather, beginning with the priest who won the lottery of the daily offering, twelve of his fellow priests, those standing next to him, are drawn in along with him to perform the other acts of the daily offering. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that it is so.

¹¹¹ § It was taught in the mishna: The second lottery determines who slaughters, who sprinkles the blood, etc. The task of collecting the blood in a vessel, which is between slaughtering and sprinkling, is not mentioned. Therefore, it must be assumed that either the priest who slaughtered or the priest who sprinkled the blood was assigned this task as well. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Who collects the blood? Is it the one who slaughters the offering who also collects the blood? The reason to support this conclusion is that if you say that the one who sprinkles the blood is the one who collects it, a situation might arise in which, due to his enthusiasm and his love for the mitzva of sprinkling, a service that is considered more important than collecting because it directly involves the altar, the priest might not collect all the blood as the halakha requires but would hurry to go on and sprinkle it after he has collected only some of the blood.

¹¹² Or perhaps one should draw the opposite conclusion, that it is the one who sprinkles that collects the blood, as, if you say that the one who slaughters is the one who collects, this principle could not be universally applied, as sometimes a non-priest slaughters the offering. Slaughtering offerings is not a sacred service and may be performed by anyone, unlike the collection of the blood, which is performed by a priest. In those cases when a non-priest slaughtered the daily offering, he would not be able to collect the blood.

¹¹³ The Gemara cites a source as evidence for one side of the argument: Come and hear from that which was taught in a mishna: Ben Katin made twelve spigots for the large laver to replace the original two spouts that were there, so that his twelve fellow priests who were engaged in the sacrifice of the daily offering could all sanctify their hands and feet at one time. Although there are thirteen participants listed in the mishna, the slaughterer of the offering was not required to sanctify his hands and feet because, as mentioned above, slaughtering is not a sacred service. Therefore, only twelve spigots were needed.

¹¹⁴ And if it should enter your mind to say that the one who slaughters is the one who collects the blood, then there are sometimes thirteen participants, so thirteen spigots should be needed. On those occasions when a non-priest slaughtered the daily offering, an extra priest would be required to come and collect its blood. Since the collection of blood is a sacred service, it too requires sanctification of the hands and feet. Rather, since there were only twelve spigots, isn't it correct to conclude from this that it is the one who sprinkles, and not the one who slaughters, who collects the blood? The Gemara concludes: Conclude from this that it is so.

¹¹⁵ Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, said to Rav Ashi: We too have learned a support for this conclusion in a mishna that gives the sequence of the services for the daily offering: The slaughterer of the offering slaughtered, the collector of its blood collected, and he then comes to sprinkle the blood. The wording indicates that the one who collects the blood is also the one who subsequently sprinkles it. The Gemara concludes: Conclude from this that it is so.

¹¹⁶ § The mishna states that ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua that the sequence for carrying up the animal's limbs was based on the way it walks when alive, meaning that its front parts are taken up first. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: In what manner is the animal brought up according to the way it walks? It is in this manner: The head and the right hind leg are brought up first. The other parts follow this sequence: The breast and the neck, and then the two forelegs, and then the two flanks, then the tail and the left hind leg. Rabbi Yosei says: It was sacrificed according to the way it was skinned. In what manner is the animal brought up according to the way it was skinned? It is in this manner: The head and the right leg are brought first, then the tail and the left leg together, then the two flanks, and then the two forelegs, then the breast and the neck.

¹¹⁷ Rabbi Akiva says: It was sacrificed according to the way it was cut up into limbs after the skinning. In what manner is the animal brought up according to the way it was cut up? It is in this manner: The head and the right leg first, and then the two forelegs, then the breast and the neck, and then the two flanks, and then the tail and the left leg. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: It was sacrificed according to the quality of its various sections, so that the best pieces were taken up first. In what manner is the animal brought up according to the quality of the pieces? It is in this manner: The head and the right leg, then the breast and the neck, and then the two flanks, then the tail and the left leg, and then the two forelegs.

¹¹⁸ The Gemara poses a question with regard to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili's position: But isn't it written: "Every good piece, the thigh and the shoulder" (Ezekiel 24:4), indicating that these are the best cuts of the animal? Why doesn't Rabbi Yosei HaGelili say that these are offered first (Rabbeinu Ḥananel)? The Gemara answers: That verse is speaking of a lean sheep, whose thigh and shoulder are indeed the best pieces. However, in the sheep brought for the daily offering, which were of the finest quality, there were other parts that were of higher quality.

¹¹⁹ The Gemara explains the reason behind the order of the pieces in the mishna. Rava said: Both the tanna of our mishna and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili agree that we follow the relative quality of the meat in the various pieces. The difference in opinion between them is that one Sage, the tanna of this mishna, follows the limb, i.e., the amount, of the meat; the other Sage, Rabbi Yosei, follows the fattiness of the meat.

¹²⁰ The Gemara asks: According to all opinions, what is the reason that the right leg goes up to the altar together with the head? What is the connection between these two pieces? The Gemara explains: Because the head has much bone in it, the leg is offered with it.

¹²¹ The Gemara asks further: Although the Sages disagree as to the order of bringing up the various pieces, at any rate everyone agrees that the head is sacrificed first. From where do we derive this? As it was taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that when sacrificing an animal the head and the fat precede all the other limbs? The verse states: "And he shall cut it up into its pieces and its head and its fat, and the priest shall arrange them on the wood that is on the fire upon the altar" (Leviticus 1:12). The Gemara asks: And the other mention of fat before this, where the verse states: "The pieces, the head and the fat" (Leviticus 1:8),

¹²² what does that come to teach us? The Gemara explains: As it was taught in a baraita: In what manner would the priest placing the pieces on the altar do so? He would place the fat right over the place of slaughter, that is, on the cut neck, and bring it up that way, and that is the most respectful way toward the Most High, that the bloody point of slaughter not be exposed.

¹²³ MISHNA: Before the third lottery, the appointee declared: Let only those priests who are new to offering the incense come and participate in the lottery for the incense. The fourth lottery was open to those new to the service along with those old hands who had already performed it, to determine who would take the limbs up from the ramp, where they had been placed earlier, to the altar.

¹²⁴ GEMARA: A Sage taught in the Tosefta: No person ever performed the service of the incense twice, as a new priest was always found for this service. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that they were insistent that no priest should be assigned this task more than once in his life? Rabbi Ḥanina said: It is because it brings wealth to the one who performs it. Since bringing the incense was a blessing for wealth, it was decided that as many different priests as possible should have an opportunity to do this service.

¹²⁵ Rav Pappa said to Abaye: What is the reason for this assertion that the one who burns the incense becomes wealthy? If we say it is because it is written: “They shall put incense before You and whole burnt-offerings on Your altar” (Deuteronomy 33:10), and it is written immediately after that: “Bless, O Lord, his substance” (Deuteronomy 33:11), if so, we should also make the same assertion concerning those who perform the sacrifice of a burnt-offering, since it is written in that same verse: “And whole burnt-offerings on Your altar.”

¹²⁶ Abaye said to him: There is a difference between the two: This, the sacrifice of a burnt-offering, is frequent, and that, the burning of incense, is infrequent. There were many burnt-offerings, both obligatory and voluntary, brought during the course of a day, whereas the incense was burned only twice a day. It is logical to assume that the blessing of riches was not extended to the many priests who participated in the burnt-offerings, but to the few priests who performed the burning of the incense.

¹²⁷ Apropos this passage in Deuteronomy, Rava said: You do not find a young Torah scholar who gives halakhic instruction unless he comes from the tribe of Levi or from the tribe of Issachar. The assertion with regard to the tribe of Levi is as it is written: “They shall teach Jacob Your ordinances and Israel Your law” (Deuteronomy 33:10). And the assertion with regard to the tribe of Issachar is as it is written: “And of the children of Issachar, men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel should do” (I Chronicles 12:33). The Gemara asks: And say that scholars come from the tribe of Judah also, as it is written: “Judah is my lawgiver” (Psalms 60:9). Rava answers: While it is true that the tribe of Judah also taught Torah, in my statement I was speaking only of those who can draw conclusions according to the halakha. Although Judah produces great scholars, men capable of translating abstract analysis of the Torah into legal principles come from the two tribes mentioned.

¹²⁸ § Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They did not hold a separate lottery for the slaughtering and sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering. Rather, the same priest who won a particular privilege for the morning offering wins the privilege for the corresponding task in the evening, i.e., for the afternoon service. In this way, the morning lottery covered both services. The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: Just as they hold a lottery in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery in the afternoon. This shows that there was a separate lottery for the daily afternoon offering. The Gemara answers: When that baraita was taught, it referred only to the incense, which, as stated above, was given to a different priest each time it was offered.

¹²⁹ The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: Just as they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the afternoon. The masculine pronoun lo indicates

that it is not referring to the incense, which is a feminine noun in Hebrew, but to the daily afternoon offering, which is described by a masculine noun. The Gemara answers: Change the wording of the baraita and say: Lah, using the feminine pronoun instead of the masculine lo, so that it is indeed referring to the incense.

¹³⁰ The Gemara asks further: But wasn't it taught in another baraita: Just as they hold a lottery for it [lo] the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lo] in the afternoon; and just as they hold a lottery for it [lah] in the morning, so too, they hold a lottery for it [lah] in the afternoon. This baraita makes the statement twice, once using the masculine pronoun and once using the feminine pronoun, which shows that there was a separate lottery in the afternoon not only for the incense but also for the daily offering.

¹³¹ Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzhak said: There is no contradiction. Here, in this last baraita, we are dealing with Shabbat, when a second lottery in the afternoon was necessary, since the priestly rotations are renewed each Shabbat. On Shabbat the outgoing watch of priests performs the morning service, and the incoming watch performs the afternoon service. Therefore, the same priest could not perform the service of both the morning and afternoon offerings, necessitating a second lottery on that day to designate priests for the various afternoon tasks.

¹³² The Gemara asks: And according to what we thought initially, that there was a separate lottery each day for the daily afternoon offering, there would be too many lotteries, as the mishna states that there were just four lotteries daily. How was it conceivable even to consider such a possibility? The Gemara answers: The thought was that all the priests would come and assemble just once, in the morning, for both lotteries, and the priest who would win the lottery for sacrificing the daily morning offering would win that privilege for the morning only, and the priest who would win the lottery for sacrificing the daily afternoon offering would win the privilege for the afternoon.

¹³³ § The mishna states: The fourth lottery was open to those new to the service along with those old hands who had already performed it, to determine who would take the limbs up from the ramp to the altar. The Gemara states: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. As we learned in a mishna in tractate Tamid that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: The priest who takes the limbs up to the ramp is the one who takes them up from the ramp to the altar. In contrast, according to the mishna discussed here, it is implied that a different priest won the privilege for the latter service in the lottery.

¹³⁴ The Gemara asks: With regard to what do they disagree? One Sage, the tanna of the mishna discussed here, holds that it is proper to follow the verse: "In the multitude of people is the king's glory" (Proverbs 14:28). It is a glorification of God for many priests to participate in the service, so different priests were assigned the task of taking the limbs to the ramp, and others were tasked with carrying them up the ramp to the altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, holds that it is not proper conduct in the place of the Divine Presence to have two sets of priests for these tasks, as it gives the appearance that the first set does not want to be bothered to take the limbs up to the altar.

¹³⁵ Rava said: Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, who holds that the same priest who brought the limbs to the ramp also brought them up to the altar, is not of the same opinion as Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that there is no separate lottery for the privilege of carrying the coal pan for the incense. And conversely, Rabbi Yehuda is not of the same opinion as Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. As, if it would be so that these two Sages agreed with each other, there would be too few lotteries; there would be only

three lotteries rather than four. Rather, one must say that according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, who maintains that there was no lottery held for taking the limbs up to the altar, there was a fourth lottery to determine who would carry the coal pan; and according to Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that there was no lottery for carrying the coal pan, there must have been a lottery for carrying the limbs up to the ramp.

¹³⁶ And if you find a tanna in a baraita who teaches that there were five lotteries for the Temple service,

¹³⁷ the opinion of that tanna would be in accordance with neither the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov nor the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as these five lotteries would include one for carrying the coal pan and another one for taking the limbs up to the altar.

¹³⁸ MISHNA: The daily offering is sacrificed and its limbs are carried by nine priests, as mentioned in a previous mishna. These nine carry the limbs and the accompanying libations and meal-offerings. Occasionally, the service is performed by ten priests, occasionally by eleven, and sometimes by twelve priests; no fewer than nine and no more than twelve. How so? The daily offering itself is sacrificed by nine priests, as explained earlier. On the festival of Sukkot a priest in whose hand is a jug of water for the water libation is added, and there are ten priests. On Sukkot, a water libation is poured on the altar in addition to the standard wine libation.

¹³⁹ In the daily afternoon offering, eleven priests participate in the service. How so? The daily offering itself is sacrificed by nine, and there are an additional two priests in whose hands are two logs that are placed on the altar. The mitzva of placing the two logs in the morning was assigned in the first lottery, as the Gemara explained earlier. On Shabbat, eleven priests participate. How so? The daily morning offering itself is performed by nine, and there are an additional two priests in whose hands are two vessels of frankincense that accompany the shewbread. This frankincense is burned on Shabbat. And on Shabbat that occurs within the festival of Sukkot there is an additional priest in whose hand is a jug of water for the water libation, for a total of twelve priests.

¹⁴⁰ GEMARA: Rabbi Abba, and some say it was Rami bar Hama, and some say it was Rabbi Yoḥanan, said: On the festival of Sukkot they pour the water libation only during the sacrifice of the daily morning offering and not in the afternoon. From where is this derived? It is derived from the fact that it is taught in the mishna: And on Shabbat that occurs within the festival of Sukkot there is a priest in whose hand is a jug of water, bringing the number of participating priests to twelve. And if it should enter your mind to say that they pour water during the daily afternoon offering also, if so, you find that there were twelve priests on a weekday as well, that is, during the intermediate days of the Festival: Nine priests for the daily offering, two to carry the logs, and one to pour the water.

¹⁴¹ Rav Ashi said: We too have learned this in a different mishna, that the water libation was offered only in the morning, as it was taught: And they would say to the pourer: Raise your hand so everyone will see as you pour the water into the aperture on the altar, in accordance with the proper procedure. This was done because one time a Sadducee priest, who did not accept that there is a mitzva of water libation, poured the water onto his feet, whereupon all the people pelted him with their etrogim in anger. Since the episode involved etrogim, it is apparent that it took place in the morning, when people have their etrogim with them. Since the mishna mentions the fact that it was etrogim that were used to pelt the priest, it is apparently coming to teach that the water libation takes place only in the morning. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is so.

¹⁴² It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai says: From where is it derived that the daily afternoon offering requires that two logs be brought along with it, and that they must be brought by two priests? As it is stated with regard to the burnt-offering: “The sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar and lay out wood [etzim] in order upon the fire” (Leviticus 1:7). The word etzim is plural, which teaches that two logs are called for. If this is not applicable to the daily morning offering, as it is already written about the morning offering explicitly: “And the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and arrange the burnt-offering on it” (Leviticus 6:5), apply it to the daily afternoon offering. The verse therefore teaches us that two logs should be added before that offering.

¹⁴³ But say that this and this, i.e., both verses cited above, are dealing with the daily morning offering, and that the Merciful One states in the Torah: Perform the arrangement of wood and then return and perform it again. In other words, perhaps the Torah’s intention is that two logs be arranged on the altar twice in the morning, and that accounts for the two verses. The Gemara rejects this possibility: If it were so, the text should use the same expression both times and say: “And he shall burn wood on it,” and again: “And he shall burn wood on it.” Since the text does not do so, but instead employs two different verbs, saying: “They shall lay out wood” once and: “He shall burn wood” the second time, this indicates that the Torah is describing two different times.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara rejects this inference: If the Merciful One had written in the Torah: “And he shall burn wood on it” twice, I would have said it means that one priest should arrange the wood, not two. The change of terminology to a plural verb is therefore necessary because it teaches us that one priest should perform it the first time and two priests should perform it the second time, but they are both performed in the morning.

¹⁴⁵ The Gemara rejects this: If so, if this were what the Torah wished to indicate, the verse should say: “And he shall burn wood” in the singular, and then, in the second verse, say: And they shall burn wood, in the plural, using the same verb both times, changing only the number of the verb. Or, alternatively, the verse should say: And he shall lay out wood, in the singular, and then, in the second verse, say: “And they shall lay out wood,” in the plural. What is the reason the Torah uses two different verbs in the two verses, stating: “And he shall burn wood” and then: “And they shall lay out wood”? Learn from this as we have said, that the Torah in these two verses is referring to two separate times of day, and the verse: “They shall lay out wood [etzim]” is referring to the daily afternoon offering, mandating that at that time “they,” i.e., two priests, shall lay out etzim, the plural term for wood, referring to two logs.

¹⁴⁶ Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Sometimes thirteen priests were involved in sacrificing the daily offering, all these tasks being assigned in the second lottery, as the mishna taught earlier. But sometimes fourteen priests are chosen in this manner to participate, since on Sukkot an additional priest is chosen to pour the water libation. And sometimes fifteen priests are chosen, on Shabbat, when two priests are tasked with burning the frankincense in the vessels. And sometimes sixteen priests are chosen, on Shabbat that occurs during Sukkot, when three extra priests are added: One to pour the water and two to burn the frankincense.

¹⁴⁷ The Gemara asks with regard to Rabbi Ḥiyya’s statement: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita that sometimes there are seventeen priests involved in the daily offering?

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara responds: That baraita is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov but is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The seventeenth task of the daily morning offering referred to in the baraita is taking up the pieces of the offering from the ramp to the altar. According to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, this task was not assigned to a new priest but was performed by the same priests who had brought the pieces to the ramp. The baraita, which does assign this task to a seventeenth priest, is therefore not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. As the Gemara explained earlier, the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov are mutually exclusive; consequently, since the baraita contradicts the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, it must be in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Ḥiyya, however, adopted the view of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, and for this reason he taught that the maximum number of tasks assigned through the second lottery is only sixteen.

¹⁴⁹ MISHNA: A ram that is brought for a communal burnt-offering is sacrificed by eleven priests. The flesh on the various limbs is taken by five priests, as in the case of the sheep of the daily offering. The intestines, and the fine flour of the meal-offering, and the wine of the libation are carried by two priests each, because the meal-offering and wine libation that accompany a ram are larger than those that accompany a sheep. A bull is sacrificed by twenty-four priests. How so? The head and the right leg are sacrificed first, but due to its size the head is carried by one priest and the leg by two. The tail and the left leg are carried as follows: The tail is sacrificed by two and the leg by two. The breast and the neck are carried as follows: The breast is offered by one and the neck by three priests. The two forelegs are carried by two priests, and the two flanks are carried by two. The intestines and the fine flour and the wine are carried by three each, because the meal-offering and wine libation that accompany a bull are larger than those that accompany a ram.

¹⁵⁰ In what case is this statement said, that this is the sequence followed? It is in the case of communal offerings. However, in the case of an individual offering brought to fulfill a vow or an obligation, if a single priest wishes to sacrifice it alone he may sacrifice it alone, or if he chooses he may include other priests in the service. With regard to the flaying and the cutting of both these, individual offerings, and those, communal offerings, they are equal, as will be explained in the Gemara.

¹⁵¹ GEMARA: A Sage taught in the Tosefta: The individual offerings and communal offerings are equal with regard to their flaying and cutting, in that these may be performed by a non-priest. They are not considered services that require priests.

¹⁵² Ḥizkiya said: From where is it derived that they are equal with regard to their flaying and cutting? From where is it derived that flaying and cutting of offerings, whether individual or communal, may be performed by a non-priest? At first it is stated with regard to the burnt-offering: "And he shall flay the burnt-offering and cut it into its pieces" (Leviticus 1:6), and following that it is stated: "The sons of Aaron the priest shall place fire on the altar" (Leviticus 1:7). The fact that the sons of Aaron are mentioned in the verse about putting fire on the altar but not in the verse about flaying and cutting teaches that placing fire on the altar requires priesthood, i.e., it must be performed by priests, but flaying and cutting do not require priesthood.

¹⁵³ The Gemara asks: But that verse about putting fire on the altar is needed for its own sake, to teach that the wood must be brought by a priest; it should not be interpreted as an inference that other services, such as flaying and cutting, may be performed by non-priests. Rav Shimi bar Ashi said: I

found Abaye explaining Hizkiya's derivation to his son based on the following baraita. It is written: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord" (Leviticus 1:5), with no mention of a priest, which teaches that slaughter by a non-priest is acceptable. The baraita continues: Now, from where would you come to think otherwise? Why would one even suspect that a priest should be required to slaughter the offering, so that a specific verse is required to tell us otherwise? From the fact that it is stated: "And you and your sons with you shall keep your priesthood" (Numbers 18:7), I would derive that no part of the sacrificial service may be performed by a non-priest, not even slaughtering.

¹⁵⁴ The baraita continues: Therefore, the verse states: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord, and the sons of Aaron...shall sacrifice the blood" (Leviticus 1:5), from which it is inferred that from the sacrificing of blood, which begins with the collection of the blood, and onward is a mitzva exclusively of priesthood. Just prior to this the Torah states: "And he shall place his hands upon the head of the burnt-offering...and he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord" (Leviticus 1:4–5). In this verse the Torah is referring to the donor of the offering when it says: He shall place his hands, and therefore when it continues: And he shall slaughter, it is also referring to the donor. The Torah thereby taught that the slaughter of the offering is acceptable if performed by a non-priest.

¹⁵⁵ Abaye asked: Since, as this baraita establishes, from the collection of the blood and onward is a mitzva exclusively of priesthood, why do I need the Torah to say afterward: "The sons of Aaron shall put fire on the altar" (Leviticus 1:7)? Since the verse about putting the fire on the altar follows the verse about collection of blood, it is clear that it must be done by priests, and the verse's stipulation of this fact appears superfluous. This is why Hizkiya concluded that the verse is not required for its own sake but is needed to teach the following inference: It is only the placing of fire on the altar that requires priests, to the exclusion of flaying and cutting up the animal, which may be performed by a non-priest.

¹⁵⁶ The Gemara asks: But still, the verse about the placement of wood by priests is necessary for its own sake. As it might have entered your mind to say that since placing the wood is not a service that is indispensable for obtaining atonement, as atonement is achieved solely through the blood of the offering, it should not be required to be performed by priests. And one might have thought that the principle that all tasks from the collection of the blood and onward require a priest applies only to services relating to the blood. Therefore, the verse teaches us that nevertheless, priesthood is required. Consequently, it cannot be asserted that the verse is written for the purpose of excluding other services.

¹⁵⁷ Rather, Hizkiya's derivation must be rejected, and the acceptability of non-priests for flaying and cutting the animal must be learned from here: It is written: "And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall lay out the pieces, the head and the fat" (Leviticus 1:8). Since, as the baraita above establishes, from the collection of the blood and onward is a mitzva exclusively of priesthood, why do I need the verse to specify: "And Aaron's sons shall lay out the pieces"? Since the specification of priesthood here appears superfluous, one must conclude that it is written not for its own sake but to exclude flaying and cutting up the animal, to teach that those acts need not be performed by a priest.

¹⁵⁸ The Gemara asks: Granted, the verse comes to convey the inference that another act does not require priesthood, but say that it comes to exclude the arrangement of the two logs, to teach that this activity may be done by a non-priest. The Gemara rejects this: It is more reasonable that the verse, which deals with laying out the pieces of the offering on the altar, would exclude a service that is

similar to itself, i.e., something related to the body of the sacrificial animal, such as flaying it and cutting it up, rather than the arrangement of the wood, which is not related to the animal itself.

¹⁵⁹ The Gemara responds: On the contrary, one should say that it excludes something relevant to arrangement, i.e., the placement of the logs, which is similar to the laying of the pieces of the offering in that both pertain to the placement of an item on the altar. Perhaps, then, the verse is coming to convey the inference that the arrangement of the logs, unlike the arrangement of the pieces of the offering, may be performed by a non-priest.

¹⁶⁰ The Gemara rejects this argument: It cannot enter your mind to say this, as the Master said: After mentioning the mitzva to collect the blood, the Torah states: “And the priest shall bring all of it near and burn it on the altar” (Leviticus 1:13), where bringing near is referring to carrying the limbs to the ramp. The specification of priesthood in this verse is not required for its own sake, since all services following the collection of blood require priesthood. Therefore, it must be that it comes to convey the inference that it is only carrying the limbs to the ramp that requires priesthood, but carrying wood to the altar does not require priesthood. This, in turn, implies that the actual arrangement of the two logs, which was not excluded, does require priesthood.

¹⁶¹ The Gemara returns to the derivation presented above, where the question was raised: Why do I need the words “and Aaron’s sons shall lay out the pieces”? The conclusion was that the specification of priesthood here comes to exclude flaying and cutting up the animal, to teach that these acts may be performed by a non-priest. The Gemara now rejects this derivation: But say that this verse too is necessary for its own sake, to teach the lesson that the Gemara will shortly derive from these words (Maharsha), and one can no longer assert that the verse comes solely for the purpose of conveying the inference that other, similar acts, i.e., flaying and cutting up the animal, do not require priesthood.

¹⁶² Rather, this derivation must be rejected as well, and another verse must be found from which to prove that non-priests may flay and cut up the animal. The Torah states: “And the priest shall burn all of it on the altar” (Leviticus 1:9). Since this is an act following the collection of the blood, the specification of priesthood is not needed for its own sake. Therefore, for what purpose does that verse come? It comes to exclude flaying and cutting up the animal, which may be performed by a non-priest.

¹⁶³ The Gemara reviews the lessons taught by the other verses cited above. When the Torah writes: “The priest shall bring all of it near...the altar” (Leviticus 1:13), this is referring to carrying the limbs to the ramp, and the verse comes to exclude other, similar actions, teaching that although carrying the limbs to the ramp requires priesthood, carrying wood to the altar does not require priesthood. Therefore, it is derived from here as well that the arrangement of the two logs does require priesthood, as explained above. And when the Torah writes: “The sons of Aaron shall put fire on the altar” (Leviticus 1:7), this is necessary for its own sake, to teach that this service must be done by priests.

¹⁶⁴ When the Torah states: “And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall lay out the pieces, the head and the fat” (Leviticus 1:8), it comes to teach the following: “And they shall lay out,” through the use of the plural, teaches that it must be done by two priests, as the minimum number implied by a plural word is two. “The sons of Aaron,” also in plural, indicates an additional two; “the priests,” also in plural, indicates two more. We therefore learn from this verse that the sacrificial lamb requires six

priests to carry its limbs to the altar. The flesh is taken by five priests, and the innards by one, as described in an earlier mishna.

¹⁶⁵ Rav Hamnuna said that Rabbi Elazar posed a difficulty: This verse is written about a young bull, not a lamb; and a bull requires twenty-four priests. How, then, can this verse be used as the source that six priests are required to carry the limbs of a lamb? And he resolved the difficulty himself as follows: The same verse states: “On the wood that is on the fire upon the altar” (Leviticus 1:8), all of which apparently teaches nothing new about the sacrifice. Therefore, it is seen as an allusion to the daily offering, which was a lamb, as what is an item about which it is stated that specially prepared wood and fire on an altar must be provided, and that pre-existing wood and fire do not suffice?

¹⁶⁶ You must say that this is the lamb of the morning daily offering, concerning which the Torah commands that a new woodpile be prepared every day and that the altar must be lit anew each morning. Therefore, although the verse is ostensibly speaking of a bull, it also alludes to the lamb of the daily offering and to the fact that it should be brought by six priests.

¹⁶⁷ § Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest who set up the arrangement of wood on the altar is liable to receive the death penalty by God’s hand for having performed an act that is restricted to priests, and the woodpile that he placed is invalid. What should he do to repair the woodpile? He should dismantle it and then rearrange it. The Gemara is surprised at this: What good would this do for the woodpile? How would it help for the non-priest himself to rearrange the wood? It would be just as invalid as it was the first time. Rather, one must say that the non-priest should dismantle it, as there is nothing wrong with a non-priest dismantling the woodpile, and a priest then rearranges it.

¹⁶⁸ Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to Rabbi Yoḥanan’s teaching: And do you have any service that is valid if performed at night and yet is invalid if performed by a non-priest? A bona side Temple service must be performed during the day. That the wood on the altar may be arranged while it is still nighttime shows that it is not a bona side service, and therefore it should be permitted for non-priests to perform it.

¹⁶⁹ The Gemara expresses wonder at Rabbi Zeira’s equation of the two issues: And is there really no such thing as a service that may be performed at night but which is prohibited for a non-priest to perform? Isn’t there the burning of the limbs and the fats of offerings on the altar, which continues throughout the night, and yet it was taught earlier in this chapter that a non-priest who participates in that service incurs the death penalty? The Gemara rejects this objection: The burning of sacrificial limbs and fats, though it may be done at night, is not considered a nighttime service but the end of the daytime service, as it is merely the culmination of the sacrificial service that began during the day.

¹⁷⁰ The Gemara asks further: But isn’t there the removal of the ashes from the altar, which may be performed at night, and yet may not be done by a non-priest? The Gemara rejects this too: The removal of ashes is also not considered a nighttime service but the start of the daytime service. And the proof for this is that Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If a priest has sanctified his hands at night by washing them for the removal of the ashes, the next day, i.e., after daybreak, he need not sanctify his hands again, as he already sanctified them at the start of the service. Rabbi Zeira’s equation between services performed at night and services that may be performed by non-priests

therefore remains intact. If so, the objection that he raised to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan remains difficult.

¹⁷¹ Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement must be revised, and one must posit that when it was stated, this is how it was stated. Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest who arranges the two logs on the altar is liable to receive the death penalty by God's hand, since it is a daytime service. Rava strongly objects to this: But if that is so, if arranging the two logs is a bona side daytime service and is prohibited to non-priests on pain of death, it should require a lottery; and yet in practice this service is not assigned by a lottery. The Gemara comments that it must have escaped Rava's mind that which is taught explicitly in a baraita: The priest who was privileged to perform the removal of the ashes was also privileged with setting up the arrangement of wood on the altar and with placing the two logs.

¹⁷² Another difficulty is raised with regard to Rava's statement: Is that to say that a daytime service requires a lottery and, conversely, a nighttime service does not require a lottery? Isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats on the altar, which is done at night and yet is assigned through a lottery? The Gemara responds: That is not difficult, since the burning of the limbs and the fats is the end of the daytime service, as explained above. The Gemara asks: But isn't there the removal of the ashes from the altar, which is a nighttime service and yet requires a lottery? The Gemara answers: Indeed, a lottery should not have been required for that service, but one was instituted due to the incident that occurred, when the priests came to danger, as related in the mishna.

¹⁷³ The Gemara asks further: Is that to say that any service that is a daytime service and for which a non-priest would be liable to receive the death penalty requires a lottery, and conversely, a daytime service for which a non-priest would not be liable to receive the death penalty does not require a lottery? But isn't there the slaughtering of the daily offering, which may be performed by a non-priest and yet requires a lottery? The Gemara rejects this point: Slaughtering is different, because it is the beginning of the service of the daily offering and is therefore considered important enough to warrant a lottery.

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara asks with regard to the revised version of Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement: Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said: But didn't we learn that it is not so that arranging the logs must be done during the day, as it was taught in a mishna: The appointed priest said to them: Go out and see if the time for slaughtering has arrived. The mishna does not teach that the appointee said: Go and see if the time for arranging the two logs has arrived. This shows that the logs need not be placed after daybreak but may be arranged while it is still night.

¹⁷⁵ The Gemara rejects this argument: The reason the mishna mentions slaughtering is that it prefers to teach this statement with regard to that which has no rectification if it is done at night, such as slaughtering the offering, which is rendered irreparably invalid if done before daybreak. It does not want to teach something that has rectification if done at night, such as arranging the two logs, which can always be removed and replaced properly. However, the proper time for arranging the logs is indeed daytime.

¹⁷⁶ And some say a different version of Rabbi Zeira's objection: Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement that a non-priest who arranged the woodpile incurs the death penalty: And do you have any service that is not complete on its own but is followed by a different service, such as the arrangement of the two logs, and yet is invalid and is punishable by death if performed by

a non-priest? It was taught earlier in the chapter that a non-priest incurs the death penalty only for performing a service that is complete, i.e., a service that is not followed by other services that complete the task being performed.

¹⁷⁷ The Gemara expresses wonder at Rabbi Zeira's equation of these two issues: But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats? The Gemara answers: That is not difficult, because the burning of the limbs and the fats is the end of the daytime service. The Gemara asks further: But isn't there the removal of the ashes? The Gemara rejects that argument: Removing the ashes is the start of the daytime service, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If a priest sanctified his hands at night by washing them for the removal of the ashes, the next day, i.e., after daybreak, he need not sanctify his hands again, as he already sanctified them at the start of the service. Rabbi Zeira's equation between services that are incomplete by themselves and services for which a non-priest does not incur the death penalty therefore remains intact. If so, the question that he asked concerning Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement remains difficult.

¹⁷⁸ Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement must be revised, and one must posit that when it was stated, this is how it was stated: Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest who arranges the two logs is liable to receive the death penalty, since it is a service that is complete, i.e., it is not followed and completed by a subsequent service. Although the burning of the limbs upon the altar follows the placement of the logs, that is considered to be an independent act, not the completion of the service of placing the logs. This is because the placing of the logs is done while still night, while the burning of the limbs cannot be done until daybreak.

¹⁷⁹ Rava strongly objects to this: However, if that is so, the service of placing the two logs should require a lottery. The Gemara expresses surprise at Rava's comment: And doesn't it require a lottery? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Whoever was privileged to perform the removal of the ashes is also privileged to perform the arrangement of the two logs? There was in fact a lottery for arranging the two logs.

¹⁸⁰ Rather, this is what Rava actually said: If placing the logs is considered a complete service and is therefore a task important enough to warrant the death penalty for a non-priest who performs it, they should hold a separate lottery for it by itself. The Gemara answers: It is as we said at the beginning of the chapter, that the task of placing the logs was added to the lottery for the removal of ashes as an incentive for the priests to rise before dawn (Rabbeinu Ḥananel).

¹⁸¹ Based on Rava's comments, the Gemara asks: Is that to say that any service that is a complete service and for which a non-priest would be liable to receive the death penalty requires a lottery, but if a non-priest would not be liable to receive the death penalty it would not require a lottery? But isn't there slaughtering, which may be performed by non-priest and yet requires a lottery? The Gemara rejects this point: Slaughtering is different, because it is the beginning of the daytime service, which gives it added importance.

¹⁸² The Gemara asks further on Rava's statement: Is that to say that a service that is complete requires a lottery, whereas a service which is followed by a subsequent service that completes it does not require a lottery? But isn't there the burning of the limbs and the fats? The Gemara answers: That is not difficult because the burning of the limbs and the fats is the end of the daytime service. The Gemara asks: Isn't there the removal of the ashes? The Gemara answers: A lottery was established for that service only due to the incident that occurred when the priests came to danger.

¹⁸³ As explained above, the reason Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that the arrangement of the logs is a complete service, and is not considered a prelude to the burning of limbs, is because the former is a nighttime service and the latter is a daytime service. Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said: We too have learned in a mishna that the arrangement of the two logs is a nighttime service. As we learned: The appointed priest said to them: Go out and see if the time for slaughtering has arrived, whereas the mishna did not teach: See whether the time for arranging the two logs has arrived. This shows that arranging the logs may be done while it is still night; it is therefore not considered to be connected to, and complemented by, the placing of the limbs the following day.

¹⁸⁴ The Gemara rejects this proof: The reason the mishna mentions slaughtering is that it prefers to teach this statement with regard to that which has no rectification if it is done at night, such as slaughtering the offering, which is rendered irreparably invalid if performed before daybreak. It does not want to teach it with regard to something that has rectification if done at night, such as arranging the two logs, which can always be removed and replaced properly. However, it is possible that the proper time for arranging the logs is daytime, and therefore it may be regarded as a service that is completed by the subsequent burning of limbs on the altar.

Chapter 3

¹ MISHNA: The appointed priest said to the other priests: Go out and observe if it is day and the time for slaughter has arrived. If the time has arrived, the observer says: There is light [barkai]. Matya ben Shmuel says that the appointed priest phrased his question differently: Is the entire eastern sky illuminated even to Hebron? And the observer says: Yes. And why did they need to ascertain whether or not it is day, which is typically evident to all? It was necessary, as once, the light of the moon rose, and they imagined that the eastern sky was illuminated with sunlight, and they slaughtered the daily offering before its appropriate time. The animal was later taken out to the place designated for burning and burned because it was slaughtered too early. In order to prevent similar errors in the future, the Sages instituted that they would carefully assess the situation until they were certain that it was day.

² After the priests announced the start of the day, they led the High Priest down to the Hall of Immersion. The Gemara comments: This was the principle in the Temple: Anyone who covers his legs, a euphemism for defecating, requires immersion afterward; and anyone who urinates requires sanctification of the hands and feet with water from the basin afterward.

³ GEMARA: It was taught in a baraita that the Sages disputed the precise expression that was employed in the Temple. Rabbi Yishmael says that the formula is: The light flashed; Rabbi Akiva says: The light has risen, which is brighter than a mere flash. Naḥuma ben Apakshiyon says: There is even light in Hebron. Matya ben Shmuel says that the appointed priest in charge of the lotteries says: The entire eastern sky is illuminated all the way to Hebron. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says that this is what the appointed priest said: The entire eastern sky is illuminated all the way to Hebron and the entire nation has gone out, each and every person to engage in his labor.

⁴ The Gemara questions Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira's version of the formula: If it is so that the people have gone to work, it has grown considerably lighter. People go to work after it is light. Apparently,

Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira is referring to a time after sunrise, not a time adjacent to dawn. The Gemara answers: It is that people have gone out to hire workers that we are saying. Owners of fields rose early, adjacent to dawn, to hire workers so that they could begin working when it is light.

⁵ § Rav Safra said: The time for the afternoon prayer of Abraham begins from when the walls begin to blacken from shade. When the sun begins to descend from the middle of the sky, producing shadows on the walls, that marks the beginning of the setting of the sun and then the afternoon prayer may be recited.

⁶ Rav Yosef said: And will we arise and derive a halakha from Abraham? Didn't Abraham live before the Torah was given to the Jewish people, and therefore halakhot cannot be derived from his conduct? Rava said: The tanna derived a halakha from Abraham's conduct, and we do not derive a halakha from his conduct? As it was taught in a baraita with regard to the verse: "And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised" (Leviticus 12:3), this verse teaches that the entire day is suitable for performance of the mitzva of circumcision. However, the vigilant are early in their performance of mitzvot and circumcise in the morning, as it is stated with regard to the binding of Isaac: "And Abraham arose early in the morning and saddled his donkey" (Genesis 22:3). He awakened early to fulfill the mitzva without delay. Apparently, halakha is derived from the conduct of Abraham.

⁷ Rather, Rava said: With regard to Rav Yosef, it was not the matter of deriving halakha from the conduct of Abraham that is difficult. Rather, this is difficult for him, as we learned in a mishna: When Passover eves occur on Shabbat eves, the daily afternoon offering is slaughtered at six and a half hours of the day and sacrificed on the altar at seven and a half hours. The afternoon offering was slaughtered as early as possible to enable all the Paschal lambs, which were slaughtered after the daily afternoon offering was sacrificed, to be slaughtered and roasted before sunset, so that no labor would be performed on Shabbat. Now, if indeed this halakha is derived from the conduct of Abraham, let us slaughter the offering even earlier, from when the walls begin to blacken, just after the end of the sixth hour of the day. Apparently, halakha is not derived from the conduct of Abraham.

⁸ The Gemara rejects this: What is the difficulty? Perhaps the walls of the Temple begin to blacken only at six and a half hours of the day because they are not perfectly aligned. The Temple walls were broad at the bottom and gradually narrowed as they reached the top; therefore, the upper part of the wall did not cast a shadow on the wall opposite it until six and a half hours of the day. Or, alternatively, it is different with regard to Abraham because there was great knowledge of astronomy [itztagninut] in his heart. He was able to precisely calculate the movements of the heavenly bodies and was therefore able to discern immediately after noon that the sun had begun its descent. Others require a half hour to be certain that the descent of the sun has begun. Or, alternatively Abraham was different because he was an Elder and sat and studied Torah in a yeshiva, where the Divine Presence rests. There he developed the expertise to determine the precise hour. As Rabbi Hama, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: From the days of our ancestors, yeshiva never left them. Our ancestors were leaders of their generations, who taught Torah to students who came to them.

⁹ When they were in Egypt there was a yeshiva with them, as it is stated: "Go and gather the Elders of Israel" (Exodus 3:16), indicating that there were Sages among them who studied Torah. And similarly, when they were in the desert, there was a yeshiva with them, as it is stated: "Gather for me seventy men from the Elders of Israel" (Numbers 11:16). Abraham our Patriarch was himself an

Elder and would sit in yeshiva, as it is stated: “And Abraham was old, advanced in years” (Genesis 24:1). From the apparent redundancy of the terms old and advanced in years, it is derived that old means that he was a wise Elder and prominent in Torah, and advanced in years means that he was elderly. Similarly, Isaac our Patriarch was an Elder and sat in yeshiva, as it is stated: “And it came to pass when Isaac was old and his eyes were dim” (Genesis 27:1). Similarly, Jacob our Patriarch was an Elder and sat in yeshiva, as it is stated: “And Israel’s eyes were heavy with age” (Genesis 48:10).

¹⁰ Eliezer, servant of Abraham, was an Elder and sat in yeshiva, as it is stated: “And Abraham said to his servant, the elder of his household, who ruled over all he had” (Genesis 24:2). Rabbi Elazar said: The verse means that he had mastery over the Torah of his master, having gained proficiency in all of the Torah of Abraham. That is the meaning of the verse: “He is Damascus [Dammeseq] Eliezer” (Genesis 15:2). Rabbi Elazar said: The word Dammeseq is a contraction of he who draws [doleh] and gives drink [mashke] to others from his master’s Torah.

¹¹ Apropos the previous statement, the Gemara cites that Rav said: Abraham our Patriarch fulfilled the entire Torah before it was given, as it is stated: “Because [ekev] Abraham hearkened to My voice and kept My charge, My mitzvot, My statutes and My Torahs” (Genesis 26:5). Rav Shimi bar Ḥiyya said to Rav: And say that the verse means that he fulfilled only the seven Noahide mitzvot and not the entire Torah. The Gemara asks: But isn’t there also circumcision that Abraham clearly observed, which is not one of the Noahide laws? Apparently, Abraham fulfilled more than just those seven. The Gemara asks: And say that he fulfilled only the seven mitzvot and circumcision. Rav said to him: If so, why do I need the continuation of the verse, that Abraham kept: My mitzvot and My Torah? That is a clear indication that he fulfilled mitzvot beyond the seven Noahide mitzvot, and apparently fulfilled the entire Torah.

¹² Rav said, and some say Rav Ashi said: Abraham our Patriarch fulfilled the entire Torah, even the mitzva of the joining of cooked foods, a rabbinic ordinance instituted later, as it is stated: My Torahs. Since the term is in the plural, it indicates that Abraham kept two Torahs; one, the Written Torah, and one, the Oral Torah. In the course of fulfilling the Oral Torah, he fulfilled all the details and parameters included therein.

¹³ § It was taught in the mishna that Matya ben Shmuel says that the appointed priest asks: Is the entire eastern sky illuminated even to Hebron? And he says: Yes. The Gemara asks: Who said yes? If we say it is that person who is standing on the roof, does he dream and also interpret his dream? Is it reasonable that the one asking the question answers it? Rather, say that it was that person who is standing on the ground who said yes. From where does he know that the sky is illuminated such that he is able to answer yes?

¹⁴ The Gemara suggests two possible solutions: If you wish, say it was that person who is standing on the ground who answered yes, and if you wish, say it was that person who is standing on the roof who answered. If you wish, say that the person who is standing on the roof said: The entire eastern sky is illuminated. And that person who is standing on the ground said to him: Has it illuminated even to Hebron? And he who is standing on the roof said to him: Yes.

¹⁵ And if you wish, say instead that the person who is standing on the ground said: Is the entire eastern sky illuminated? And he who is standing on the roof said to him: Do you mean that it is illuminated even to Hebron? And he who is standing on the ground said to him: Yes, that is what I mean.

¹⁶ § The mishna asks: And why did they need to ascertain this? The mishna answered that there was an incident where they confused the light of the moon with the light of the rising sun and slaughtered the daily morning offering too early. The Gemara asks: And are sunlight and moonlight mistaken for one another? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: A column of the light of the moon is not similar to a column of the light of the sun; a column of the light of the moon rises like a staff in one column while a column of the light of the sun diffuses to here and to there? The Gemara answers that the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: It was a cloudy day, and then even the moonlight diffuses to here and to there, which caused them to err and believe that it was the rising sun. Rav Pappa said: Learn from this statement of Rabbi Yishmael that a cloudy day is similar to a completely sunny day because the sunlight is further diffused by the clouds.

¹⁷ The Gemara asks: What are the practical ramifications of the statement that a cloudy day is similar to a completely sunny day? The Gemara explains: The ramifications are with regard to spreading hides to dry them. On a cloudy day, wherever the hides are placed they will be exposed to sunlight. Alternatively, the ramifications are according to that which Rava taught with regard to matza: A woman may neither knead dough for matza for Passover in the light of the sun nor may she prepare the dough with hot water heated in the sun. On a cloudy day, one may not knead the dough anywhere outside since the light of the sun is diffused everywhere.

¹⁸ Apropos a cloudy day, the Gemara cites that Rav Nahman said: The hazy light of the sun through the clouds is more damaging than the light of the sun itself. And your mnemonic is the cover of a jar of vinegar: As long as the jar is tightly closed, the odor of the vinegar does not spread and it intensifies. Even the slightest opening in the lid releases an odor more powerful than the odor generated by vinegar that was not sealed in a jar. The same is true with regard to the rays of the sun. With regard to sunlight that is obscured behind clouds, when it escapes through breaks in the clouds it is more powerful than direct sunlight. Dazzling sunlight, which shines through cracks in the clouds, is more harmful to the eyes than direct sunlight. And your mnemonic is a drip; water that drips on a person is more bothersome than water in which one completely immerses his body.

¹⁹ Thoughts of transgression are worse than transgression itself, and your mnemonic is the odor of meat. The smell of roasting meat is more appetizing than actually eating the meat. The heat of the end of summer is more oppressive than the heat of the summer itself, and your mnemonic is a heated oven. After an oven has been heated several times in the course of a day, lighting it again, even slightly, will produce powerful heat. So too, at the end of the summer, since everything is hot, the heat is more oppressive.

²⁰ A fever in the winter is more powerful than a fever in the summer, and your mnemonic is a cold oven. Heating a cold oven requires greater heat than heating a hot oven. A fever that succeeds in raising the body temperature in the winter must be more powerful than a fever that raises the body temperature in the summer. Relearning old material that was known and forgotten is more difficult than learning from new material. And your mnemonic is mixing mortar from mortar. It is harder to take hardened mortar, crush it, and mix new mortar than it is to simply mix new mortar.

²¹ Apropos moonlight and sunlight discussed previously, Rabbi Abbahu said: What is the rationale for the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi that sunlight diffuses and in that sense is dissimilar to moonlight? It is as it is written: "For the leader, about the morning hind" (Psalms 22:1); just as the

antlers of a hind branch out to here and to there, so too, the light of dawn diffuses to here and to there.

²² In tractate Megilla, the Gemara states that Queen Esther prophetically recited this Psalm in reference to her situation as she was about to come before King Ahasuerus without being summoned. Rabbi Zeira said: Why is Esther likened to a hind? It is to tell you: Just as in the case of a hind its womb is narrow and it is desirable to its mate at each and every hour like it is at the first hour, so too, Esther was desirable to Ahasuerus at each and every hour like she was at the first hour. Rabbi Asi said: Why was Esther likened to the dawn? It is to tell you: Just as the dawn is the conclusion of the entire night, so too, Esther was the conclusion of all miracles performed for the entire Jewish people.

²³ The Gemara asks: But isn't there the miracle of Hanukkah, which was performed many years later? The Gemara answers: It is true that additional miracles were performed after the miracle of Purim; however, it is with regard to miracles for which permission was granted to write them in the Bible that we are saying that the miracle of Purim was the last one. The Gemara asks: That works out well according to the one who said: Permission was granted to write the Scroll of Esther in the Bible as a book whose sanctity equals that of the other books of the Bible. However, according to the one who said: Permission was not granted to write the Scroll of Esther in the Bible, and its sanctity does not reach the level of the other books of the Bible, what can be said?

²⁴ The Gemara answers: Actually, Purim was not the conclusion of all miracles performed for the entire Jewish people, and the one who holds that permission was not granted for the Scroll of Esther to be written establishes the analogy between Esther and the hind in accordance with the statement that Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Elazar said; as Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Elazar said: Why are the prayers of the righteous likened to a hind? It is to tell you: Just as with regard to a hind, as long as it grows its antlers they continue to branch out; so too, with regard to the righteous, as long as they engage more in prayer their prayer is heard.

²⁵ § The mishna relates that as a result of the confusion, they slaughtered the daily offering before dawn. The Gemara asks: When did this incident occur? If we say it occurred during the rest of the days of the year, is there no alternative to having the service performed by the High Priest? The mishna states that after slaughtering the daily offering, they led the High Priest down to the Hall of Immersion. On all the other days of the year, the High Priest need not perform the service and it may be performed by a common priest. Rather, it must be that this incident occurred on Yom Kippur, when the service is performed exclusively by the High Priest. However, in that case, is there moonlight? According to the lunar cycle, the moon never rises in the east adjacent to dawn on Yom Kippur.

²⁶ The Gemara answers that this is what the mishna is saying: The incident occurred during the rest of the year, at which point they instituted that the appointed priest announce the arrival of dawn in the Temple. And on Yom Kippur, when the appointed priest said: The light flashed, they immediately led the High Priest down to the Hall of Immersion.

²⁷ Apropos this fundamental halakha, the father of Rabbi Avin taught a baraita: Not only this, that a daily offering slaughtered before dawn is disqualified and burned, did they say; rather, even in the case of the pinching of the neck of a bird and the taking of the handful of a meal-offering that are performed at night, these items must be burned. The Gemara analyzes the baraita: Granted, a bird sacrificed as a burnt-offering is disqualified if pinched before dawn; what was, was. The situation can

no longer be remedied, and the bird must be burned. However, why should the handful of a meal-offering be burned?

²⁸ Let us restore the handful that was removed from the meal-offering at night, and let us again take a handful during the day. Why must the meal-offering be burned? The Gemara explains: He taught the baraita that he received through tradition, and he said its explanation. Service vessels, which are sacred, consecrate their contents even when those contents are not placed in the vessel at the appointed time for that service. Once the handful is placed in the sacred vessel, the sanctity of the handful immediately takes effect and the situation can no longer be remedied.

²⁹ The Gemara raises an objection from that which was taught in a baraita. This is the principle: Any offering that is sacrificed during the day is consecrated by being sacrificed during the day; and any offering that is sacrificed at night is consecrated only at night; and any offering that is sacrificed both during the day and at night is consecrated both during the day and at night. In any case, it is teaching that any offering that is sacrificed during the day is consecrated during the day. One learns by inference: During the day, yes, it is consecrated; at night, no, it is not consecrated. Apparently, the handful of the meal-offering is not consecrated before dawn, which poses a difficulty to the explanation of Rabbi Avin's father. The Gemara answers: Perhaps the inference from the baraita means that when it is not sacrificed at its appointed time it is not sufficiently consecrated to be sacrificed on the altar; however, it is sufficiently consecrated to be disqualified.

³⁰ Rabbi Zeira raised an objection to the principle of the father of Rabbi Avin based on what was taught in a mishna: If a priest arranged the bread and the vessels of frankincense that accompany the shewbread on the golden table after Shabbat, on Sunday instead of on Shabbat, then even though he burned the frankincense that was in the vessels on Shabbat, they are disqualified. That is because the bread was not arranged at its appointed time and therefore will not be arranged on the table for the requisite seven days.

³¹ How shall he proceed to prevent its disqualification? He should not remove it, but rather he should leave the shewbread on the table to be removed the following Shabbat, as even if the bread remained on the table for many days, that does not matter. Then, on the following Shabbat, he arranges and places the shewbread in the appropriate manner. And according to the opinion of the father of Rabbi Avin, why is this remedy effective? If service vessels consecrate their contents even when those contents are not placed there at the appointed time, once the bread was placed on the table after Shabbat it is consecrated and disqualified.

³² Rava said: Rabbi Zeira, who raises the objection, raises the objection well. And the father of Rabbi Avin is also stating a baraita. Therefore, his opinion cannot be dismissed. At the same time, the contradiction between the baraita and the mishna must be resolved. And the tanna of the baraita maintains: A service performed at night is not considered premature. If there is a requirement to perform a certain action during the day but one performed it the night before, it is not considered as though he did not perform it at its appointed time, because the day and the night before it are considered a single unit. Therefore, placing the shewbread on the table before dawn disqualifies it. However, a service performed a day earlier is considered premature. Therefore, the table does not consecrate shewbread placed on it a day before Shabbat, and all the more so a week before Shabbat.

³³ If a service performed at night is not considered premature, when Shabbat evening arrives, the arrangement of bread remaining on the table should be consecrated and disqualified when morning

comes, because it was arranged at night. Ravina said: It is referring to a case where one removed the shewbread from the table before nightfall on Friday night to prevent consecration and disqualification. Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said: Even if you say that one did not remove the shewbread before nightfall, since he arranged the shewbread not in accordance with the procedure dictated by its mitzva as it was not at its appointed time, its legal status becomes as if a monkey arranged the shewbread. At dawn, the priest will remove it from the table and replace it in accordance with the procedure dictated by its mitzva. However, with regard to a meal-offering whose handful was placed into a sacred vessel and shewbread that was placed on the table before dawn, they are not considered premature. They are therefore consecrated and disqualified.

³⁴ The mishna continues: This was the principle in the Temple: Anyone who covers his legs, a euphemism for defecating, must immerse afterward; and anyone who urinates requires sanctification of the hands and feet with water from the basin afterward. The Gemara asks: Granted, one who urinates is required to sanctify his feet, due to drops of urine that drip on his feet. However, with regard to his hands, what is the reason that he is required to sanctify them? His hands did not come into contact with anything filthy. Rabbi Abba said: That is to say that one learns appropriate conduct from this, namely that

³⁵ it is a mitzva to brush the drops of urine from one's legs so that they cannot be seen. Since one rubs it with his hands, his hands require sanctification as well. The Gemara comments: This supports the opinion of Rabbi Ami, as Rabbi Ami said: It is prohibited for a man to go out with the drops of urine that are on his legs, because he appears as one whose penis has been severed. A man with that condition is incapable of fathering children. People who see urine on his legs might suspect that he is suffering from that condition and spread rumors about his children that they are mamzerim. Therefore, one must be certain to brush the drops of urine from his legs.

³⁶ Apropos the above discussion the Gemara cites that Rav Pappa said: For one with excrement in its place, in the anus, it is prohibited to recite Shema until he removes it. What are the circumstances? If it is excrement that is visible, it is obvious that he cannot recite Shema, as there is excrement on his skin. If it is excrement that is not visible, and it is inside his body, how can Rav Pappa rule that he may not recite Shema? The Torah was not given to the ministering angels, and one's body cannot be totally free of excrement. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary to prohibit the recitation of Shema only in a situation where when he is sitting it is visible, and when he is standing it is not visible.

³⁷ The Gemara asks: If so, in what way is that different from excrement on his flesh? As it was stated in a case where one has excrement on his flesh or that his hands were placed into a bathroom that Rav Huna said: It is nevertheless permitted to recite Shema. And Rav Ḥisda said: It is prohibited to recite Shema in those cases. The Gemara rejects this: The situations are not comparable. There is no dispute that excrement in its place is more severe, as in the anus the filth is great because it is new and malodorous. And if it is not in its place, its filth is not great, as it is dried and less malodorous. It is with regard to that situation that there is an amoraic dispute.

³⁸ The Gemara proceeds to discuss a related topic. The Sages taught a halakha with regard to a meal in a baraita: A person who exits a meal to urinate washes one of his hands, the one that he used to brush off drops of urine, and enters to resume the meal. If one left, spoke with another, and lingered outside, he washes both of his hands and enters to resume the meal. Presumably, during the lengthy conversation he was distracted from maintaining the cleanliness of his hands, requiring him to wash

his hands again. And when one washes his hands for the meal he should not wash them outside and then enter, due to the concern that doing so will arouse suspicion that he did not wash his hands. Rather, he enters and sits in his place and washes both his hands, and returns the jug of water to pass among the guests and ask if anyone requires water, to make certain that everyone is aware that he washed his hands.

³⁹ Rav Ḥisda said: We said this principle with regard to making certain that one washes his hands in public only when he enters to drink; however, if he enters and intends to eat he may even wash his hands outside and enter. Why is this so? It is because it is well known that he is fastidious and would not handle food without cleaning urine and the like off his hands. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: And I can even wash my hands outside when I intend only to drink, because they know that I am fastidious and that I certainly washed my hands before I entered to eat.

⁴⁰ MISHNA: A person does not enter the Temple courtyard for the Temple service, even if he is pure, until he immerses. Five immersions and ten sanctifications the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur. And all of these immersions and sanctifications take place in the sacred area, the Temple courtyard, on the roof of the Hall of Parva, except for this first immersion alone. As that immersion is not unique to Yom Kippur, it may be performed outside the courtyard. They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people in the interest of modesty, and then the High Priest immersed and sanctified his hands and feet.

⁴¹ GEMARA: They asked ben Zoma with regard to this immersion: Why is it a requirement for anyone who enters to perform the Temple service? He said to them: Just as one who moves from service in one sacred area to service in another sacred area, i.e., the High Priest on Yom Kippur, who moves from one service to another in the Temple courtyard and the Sanctuary; and likewise one who moves from service in an area that one who enters while impure is punished by karet, the courtyard, to service in another area that one who enters impure is punished by karet, the Sanctuary or the Holy of Holies, requires immersion; so too, with regard to one who moves from a non-sacred area to a sacred area, and from a place that one who enters while impure is not punished by karet to a place that one who enters while impure is punished by karet, is it not right that he require immersion? This first immersion was instituted for purposes of sanctity rather than purity.

⁴² Rabbi Yehuda says: It is an ancillary immersion, which is not a mitzva, instituted so that one will remember any old impurity that he contracted and withdraw. In the course of immersion, he will remember if he was exposed to a source of seven-day impurity and will refrain from serving in the Temple.

⁴³ The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do ben Zoma and Rabbi Yehuda, who provided two different rationales for the immersion, disagree?

⁴⁴ It is with regard to whether the Temple service is desecrated and disqualified if the priest failed to immerse before its performance that they disagree. According to the opinion of ben Zoma, this immersion is for the purpose of sanctification and is an integral part of the service; consequently, if the priest failed to immerse he desecrates the service. According to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda he does not desecrate the service, because the immersion is merely a precautionary measure.

⁴⁵ The Gemara wonders: And according to ben Zoma, is the service desecrated? But wasn't it taught in a baraita: With regard to a High Priest who did not immerse and did not sanctify his hands and feet between donning the golden garments and the white linen garments, and similarly, with regard to a

High Priest who did not immerse between performance of one service and another service, his service is valid. However, both a High Priest and a common priest who did not sanctify his hands and feet at all in the morning and performed the service, his service is disqualified. If the High Priest's failure to immerse between services does not desecrate the service, all the more so that failure to perform the first immersion would not desecrate the service, as ben Zoma derives the first immersion from the immersion of the High Priest. Apparently, that is not the basis of their dispute.

⁴⁶ Rather, it is with regard to whether one who fails to immerse before service stands in violation of a positive mitzva that they disagree. According to ben Zoma, he stands in violation of a positive mitzva because there is a special requirement to perform this immersion for the purpose of sanctification. According to Rabbi Yehuda, he does not stand in violation of a positive mitzva.

⁴⁷ The Gemara wonders: And does Rabbi Yehuda hold in accordance with this line of reasoning? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: A leper on the eighth day of his purification, after he has already immersed at the end of the seventh day, immerses again and stands at the Gate of Nicanor in the Temple to bring his purification offerings and to have the priest sprinkle the blood of the guilt-offering and the oil that accompanies his purification offerings on his thumbs and big toes to complete the purification process. Rabbi Yehuda says: He does not require an additional immersion, as he already immersed the previous evening. Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda does not require a special immersion in the morning to remind the leper of old impurity.

⁴⁸ The Gemara answers: In that case of the leper, the reason that no immersion is required in the morning is as the reason was taught in the baraita: As he already immersed the previous evening. That immersion purified him and reminded him of any old impurity that he might have. This is in no way connected to the matter of ancillary immersion.

⁴⁹ The Gemara asks: And the one who grasps this baraita as a contradiction to Rabbi Yehuda's opinion, in what manner does he grasp it? The rationale for the halakha is explicit. The Gemara answers: Because the Gemara wants to raise a contradiction between another baraita and this baraita, and the question will be clarified through combination of the sources. As it was taught: Why was the chamber called the Chamber of the Lepers? It is because the lepers immerse there. Rabbi Yehuda says: It was not only lepers that they said immerse there; rather, all people immersed there. Rabbi Yehuda states that lepers and others immersed in this chamber in the Temple, contradicting his statement in the first baraita that a leper does not require immersion in the Temple, as he immersed the evening before.

⁵⁰ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult; this baraita is referring to a case where the leper immersed the evening before and need not immerse again; that baraita is referring to a case where the leper did not immerse. In that case, there was a special chamber where lepers could immerse. The Gemara asks: If it is a case where the leper did not immerse at all the previous evening, he requires the sun to set after his immersion to be sufficiently purified to enter the Temple. Rather, both this baraita and that baraita refer to a case where the leper immersed, but this baraita that requires a second immersion is in a case where he was distracted from his efforts to avoid impurity imparted by a corpse; that baraita that does not require a second immersion is in a case where he was not distracted.

⁵¹ The Gemara asks: If he was distracted from his efforts to avoid impurity imparted by a corpse, it is sprinkling of purification waters on the third and the seventh days that he requires, not merely

immersion. As Rabbi Dostai bar Matun said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Distraction from efforts to avoid impurity requires sprinkling of purification waters on the third and the seventh days.

⁵² Rather, both this baraita and that baraita refer to a case where the leper was not distracted, and this is not difficult; this baraita is referring to a case where the leper immersed the evening before with the intention of entering the Temple; that baraita is referring to a case where the leper did not immerse in the evening with the intention of entering the Temple. In that case, he requires a second immersion for purification even to enter the sacred area. And if you wish, say instead: Teach the baraita with a slight emendation: It was not lepers that they said immerse there; rather, all people immersed there. Rabbi Yehuda does not qualify the statement of the Rabbis but disputes it. In his opinion, lepers do not require immersion in the morning at all.

⁵³ In an alternative resolution of the contradiction between the statements of Rabbi Yehuda, Ravina said: In the second baraita, Rabbi Yehuda is stating his opinion to them according to the statement of the Rabbis. His statement does not reflect his opinion. Rather, it is a contention that he raised in the framework of his dispute with the Rabbis. According to my opinion, a leper does not require a second immersion to enter the Temple. However, according to your opinion, concede to me then [izi] that it was not only lepers that they said immerse there; rather, all people immersed there. The Gemara asks: And how do the Rabbis explain their opinion? It answers that there is no comparison: A leper is accustomed to impurity; therefore, he could overlook other impurities that he may have contracted. The immersion reminds him to purify himself for those as well. However, all other people, who are not accustomed to impurity, will certainly be sensitive to and conscious of any impurity that they may have encountered and do not require a special immersion.

⁵⁴ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Let us say that the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Yehuda with regard to immersions, hold in accordance with the opinion of ben Zoma, who maintains that this immersion is an obligation by Torah law for anyone entering the courtyard. And the fact that the dispute in the baraita is taught with regard to a leper, contrary to the opinion of ben Zoma, comes to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that even a leper does not require immersion. Or perhaps fundamentally the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Yehuda; however, the halakha of a leper is different because he is accustomed to impurity, and that is why a second immersion was instituted for him. Rav Yosef said to him: A leper is different because he is accustomed to impurity.

⁵⁵ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: According to Rabbi Yehuda, who said the immersion is not an actual obligation but it is an ancillary immersion to remind the individual of old impurity,

⁵⁶ do items that are generally considered interpositions that invalidate an immersion interpose in this immersion, or do they not interpose, since the immersion is only ancillary and serves as a reminder? Rav Yosef said to him: All ordinances that the Sages instituted, they instituted parallel to Torah law. Therefore, this immersion by rabbinic law has the same basic parameters as immersion by Torah law. There may be no interposition.

⁵⁷ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Is partial entry, when one enters a certain place with only part of his body, considered entry or not? Rav Yosef said to him: The thumbs of the leper will prove this point, as the leper reaching his thumbs into the Temple constitutes partial entry, and it was taught in a baraita: A leper immerses and stands at the Gate of Nicanor, indicating that immersion is required before even partial entry. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is the halakha; may an impure person craft a very long knife and slaughter an animal in the Temple courtyard while

remaining outside the courtyard? Is it the essence of the service that requires immersion, or is it entry into the courtyard that requires immersion?

⁵⁸ The Gemara comments: Raise the dilemma according to ben Zoma, who rules stringently with regard to immersion; and raise the dilemma according to the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Yehuda and do not obligate all people in this immersion. The Gemara elaborates: Raise the dilemma according to ben Zoma: Does ben Zoma require immersion only for entry inside the courtyard; however, for standing outside the courtyard, no, he does not require immersion? Or perhaps even for one standing outside the courtyard ben Zoma requires immersion, lest he inadvertently come to be drawn inside in the course of his service.

⁵⁹ Similarly, raise the dilemma according to the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Yehuda: How so? Do the Rabbis say that there is no requirement of immersion only there, where he is not performing any Temple service; however, here, where he is performing service, no, they would require immersion? Or perhaps there is no difference, and they would not require immersion under any circumstances. The Gemara concludes: The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

⁶⁰ § It was taught in the mishna: Five immersions and ten sanctifications the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively. The Sages taught in a baraita: Five immersions and ten sanctifications the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur. And all of these immersions and sanctifications take place in the sacred area, the Temple courtyard, in the Hall of Parva, except for this first immersion, which was in the non-sacred area on the roof of Gate of the Water, and that gate was alongside his chamber. Abaye said: Conclude from that which was taught in this baraita that Ein Eitam, the spring from which water was supplied to the Temple, was twenty-three cubits higher than the ground of the Temple courtyard.

⁶¹ As we learned in a mishna: All the entrances that were there in the Temple, their height is twenty cubits and their width is ten cubits, except for the entrance to the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary, which was twice that, i.e., forty cubits high and twenty cubits wide. And it was taught in a baraita that it is stated: “And he shall wash his flesh in water” (Leviticus 15:13), and it is stated in another verse: “And he shall wash all of his flesh in water” (Leviticus 15:16). This refers to water known as the waters of a ritual bath. The verse adds the emphasis: All of his flesh, to say that immersion must be in water that one’s entire body enters at the same time. And how much water is it? It is one cubit length by one cubit width by a height of three cubits. That is sufficient water to cover a person’s height. And the Sages calculated that the volume of the waters of a ritual bath that fit into that space is forty se’a.

⁶² As the gate is twenty cubits high, and the immersion chamber above it is at least three additional cubits high, the water was twenty-three cubits above the ground of the courtyard. The Gemara asks: How could it be only twenty-three cubits higher? Isn’t there the cubit of the thickness of the ceiling over the gate and the cubit of the thickness of the plaster sealing of the ritual bath floor for a total of at least twenty-five cubits? The Gemara answers: With regard to the Temple gates, since they were constructed of marble, they constructed them with minimal thickness. Neither the thickness of the ceiling nor the thickness of the plaster was a cubit. The Gemara asks: But isn’t there that minimal thickness of the ceiling and the plaster that would nevertheless total more than twenty-three cubits? The Gemara answers: Indeed; however, since the ceiling was not a whole cubit he does not consider it in his calculation.

⁶³ § We learned in the mishna: They spread a sheet of fine linen between the High Priest and the people in the interest of modesty. The Gemara asks: What is different that they specifically used a sheet of fine linen? The Gemara answers: It is as Rav Kahana said with regard to a related issue: So that he will be aware that the service of the day of Yom Kippur is performed in fine linen garments. Here, too, a linen sheet was used so that he will be aware that the service of the day of Yom Kippur is performed in fine linen garments.

⁶⁴ MISHNA: The High Priest removed the white garments that he was wearing, descended to the ritual bath, and immersed. He ascended and dried himself with a towel. Then they brought him the golden garments of the High Priest, and he dressed in the garments, and he sanctified his hands and his feet. They brought him the sheep for the daily morning offering, which he slaughtered by cutting most of the way through the gullet and the windpipe. And a different priest completed the slaughter on his behalf so that the High Priest could receive the blood in a vessel and proceed with the order of the Yom Kippur service. As soon as the slaughter was completed, the High Priest received the blood in a vessel and sprinkled it on the altar.

⁶⁵ He entered the Sanctuary to burn the morning incense and to remove the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum; and he left the Sanctuary and returned to the courtyard to sacrifice the head and the limbs of the sheep sacrificed for the daily offering and the High Priest's daily griddle-cake offering, and the wine libation of the daily offering. The Mishna comments: The morning incense was burned between the receiving and sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the limbs; and the afternoon incense was burned between the taking of the limbs up to the altar and the pouring of the libations that accompanied the offering.

⁶⁶ With regard to the immersion, if the High Priest was old and found it difficult to immerse in cold water, or if he was delicate [istenis], they would heat hot water for him on Yom Kippur eve and place it into the cold water of the ritual bath in order to temper its chill so the High Priest could immerse without discomfort.

⁶⁷ GEMARA: The Sages said this matter before Rav Pappa: This mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as, if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, since he said: The High Priest performs two sanctifications of his hands and his feet upon each change of garments, once before donning the garments and once after donning them, here too, in the mishna, let him perform two sanctifications upon the change of garments. However, the description in the mishna indicates that he removes his garments and does not sanctify his hands and feet.

⁶⁸ Rav Pappa said to them: Both according to the opinion of the Rabbis and according to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, there is one sanctification upon removal of sacred garments, and one sanctification upon donning other sacred garments. And here, it is with regard to this issue that they disagree. It is written: "And he shall remove the linen garments that he put on when he entered the Sanctuary and leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh in water in a sacred place and he shall put on his garments" (Leviticus 16:23–24). Rabbi Meir holds: The Torah juxtaposes removal of garments to donning of garments for the following reason: Just as when donning the garments, he dons the garments and afterward sanctifies his hands and feet, so too, with regard to removal of the garments, he removes the garments and afterward sanctifies his hands and feet.

⁶⁹ And the Rabbis hold that the Torah juxtaposes removal of garments to donning of garments for the following reason: Just as when donning the garments, when he is dressed, he sanctifies his hands and

feet; so too, for removal of the garments, he sanctifies his hands and feet when he is dressed. Therefore, when he completes the service he sanctifies his hands and feet and only then removes the garments. However, the first time that the High Priest dons the priestly vestments on Yom Kippur he certainly does not require two sanctifications, since at that point he does not remove any other garments.

⁷⁰ The Sages said to Rav Pappa: And how can you say that according to Rabbi Meir the first time that the High Priest dons the garments he does not require two sanctifications? Wasn't it taught in a baraita as follows? They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people, and he removed his garments and descended and immersed, and he ascended and dried himself. They brought him golden garments, and he donned them, and he sanctified his hands and his feet. Rabbi Meir says: He removed his garments and sanctified his hands and his feet and descended and immersed. He ascended and dried himself. They brought him golden garments and he donned them and sanctified his hands and his feet. Apparently, Rabbi Meir maintains that there is a special sanctification prior to donning the garments. He said to them: If it was taught, it was taught. I will retract my opinion, which was based on logical analysis, in favor of an explicit baraita that contradicts that opinion.

⁷¹ The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the approach of Rabbi Meir, that is how you find that possibility of

⁷² ten sanctifications, as according to his opinion each of the five immersions is accompanied by two sanctifications. However, according to the opinion of the Rabbis who do not require sanctification before donning the garments for the first time, only nine sanctifications are performed. The Gemara answers that The Rabbis could have said to you: With regard to the final sanctification, when he removes the sacred garments and dons non-sacred garments, he performs it there. According to the Rabbis' opinion, he sanctifies his hands and his feet when he removes the sacred garments. Rabbi Meir holds that sanctification of his hands and feet is performed only before donning sacred garments.

⁷³ § The Sages taught the following with regard to the verse: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting" (Leviticus 16:23). Why does he come there? He already completed the service in the Sanctuary. He comes only to remove the spoon and the coal pan that he left in the Holy of Holies, as the entire Torah portion in which the Yom Kippur service is discussed was stated in the order in which it is performed in the Temple except for this verse, which should have been written after the sacrifice of the burnt-offering in the following verse. The High Priest does not remove the spoon immediately after he places it in the Holy of Holies. Rather, after placing it there, he emerges and performs certain services outside the Sanctuary and changes his garments again. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that the High Priest interrupts the inner rite of the incense to offer his ram and the people's ram before removing the spoon and the coal pan?

⁷⁴ Rav Ḥisda said: We learned as a tradition that five immersions and ten sanctifications the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur; and if the service is performed in the order that appears in the Torah, you find only three immersions and six sanctifications. The first immersion is before sacrifice of the daily morning offering; the second is between the daily offering and the rest of the service of the day, including the removal of the spoon and the coal pan from the Holy of Holies. The High Priest immerses a third time between removal of the ladle and the coal pan from the Holy of Holies and the sacrifice of his ram and the people's ram,

which were part of the additional offering and the daily afternoon offering that follow. According to the revised sequence, the High Priest performs a service outside the Sanctuary after placing the spoon and the coal pan in the Holy of Holies, and then he reenters the Holy of Holies to remove those vessels. The High Priest immersed and changed his garments both before entering and after exiting the Holy of Holies, for a total of five immersions.

⁷⁵ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: From where are derived the five immersions and ten sanctifications that the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur? They are derived from the verse that states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments that he put on when he entered the Sanctuary and leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh in water in a sacred place and put on his garments, and he shall go out and perform his own burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people” (Leviticus 16:23–24). From this you learned: Anyone who moves from an inner service, in the Holy of Holies, to an outer service, and vice versa, requires immersion. According to the order of the services there are a total of five immersions.

⁷⁶ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: From where are derived the five immersions and ten sanctifications that the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur? They are derived from that which is stated: “He shall be dressed in a sacred linen tunic, and with linen trousers next to his flesh, and he shall be girded with a linen belt, and he shall wear a linen mitre; they are sacred garments, and he shall wash his flesh in water and then put them on” (Leviticus 16:4). From this you learned: Anyone who moves from an inner service, in the Holy of Holies, to an outer service requires immersion. And the verse says: “They are sacred garments”; all of the garments are equated to one another. Just as the High Priest immerses when donning the linen garments, so he immerses when donning the golden garments.

⁷⁷ And they are five services: The sacrifice of the daily morning offering, performed in golden garments; the service of the day, the sacrifice of the bull and the goat, which is performed in white garments; the sacrifice of his ram guilt-offering and the ram of the people in golden garments. After that he removes the spoon and the coal pan from the Holy of Holies in white garments. He emerges from the Holy of Holies and sacrifices the daily afternoon offering in golden garments.

⁷⁸ And from where is it derived that each and every immersion requires two sanctifications of the hands and the feet? It is derived from the verse that states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments that he put on when he entered the Sanctuary and leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh in water” (Leviticus 16:23–24). And it says: “And he shall wash his flesh in water in a sacred place and put on his garments” (Leviticus 16:24). This indicates that one sanctifies his hands and feet when he removes garments, and one likewise sanctifies his hands and feet when he dons garments.

⁷⁹ Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says that it is derived by means of an a fortiori inference: Just as in a place where the Torah does not require immersion, i.e., for a priest before he enters the Temple to perform service, it nevertheless requires sanctification of the hands and feet; in a place where the Torah requires immersion for all changes of garments, i.e., on Yom Kippur, is it not right that it requires sanctification of the hands and feet?

⁸⁰ If based on that inference the suggestion arises: Just as there, in the case of a priest entering to perform the Temple service, only one sanctification is required, so too here, on Yom Kippur, only one

sanctification should be required for the changes of garments throughout all the services of the day. Therefore, the verse states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments that he put on” (Leviticus 16:23). What is the meaning when the verse states: “That he put on”? Does a person remove any garments other than those that he put on? Rather, this phrase comes to equate removal of garments to donning of garments: Just as donning garments requires sanctification, so too, removal of garments requires sanctification.

⁸¹ The Gemara explains the position of Rabbi Yehuda that was mentioned earlier. Rabbi Yehuda said: From where are derived the five immersions and ten sanctifications that the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur? They are derived from the verse that states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments that he put on when he entered the Sanctuary and leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh in water in a sacred place” (Leviticus 16:23–24). From this you learned: Anyone who moves from an inner service, in the Holy of Holies, to an outer service, and vice versa, requires immersion. The Gemara asks: We found proof that the High Priest requires immersion when he changes from white garments to golden garments; however, from where is it derived that he requires immersion when he changes from golden garments to white garments?

⁸² The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught that it is derived by means of an a fortiori inference: Just as before donning golden garments, with which the High Priest does not enter the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies, the High Priest requires immersion, before donning white garments, with which the High Priest enters the innermost sanctum, is it not right that the High Priest require immersion? The Gemara asks: The a fortiori inference can be refuted: What is the comparison to golden garments, as the atonement that they effect is extensive? The High Priest serves in the golden garments throughout the year atoning for the sins of the Jewish people; he wears the white garments on just one Yom Kippur. Therefore, it is reasonable that before donning them, the High Priest would require immersion. Rather, it is derived from the verse cited by Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

⁸³ The Gemara analyzes an additional clause from the baraita cited above. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: From where are derived the five immersions and ten sanctifications that the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur? They are derived from the verse that states: “He shall be dressed in a sacred linen tunic, and with linen trousers next to his flesh, and he shall be girded with a linen belt, and he shall wear a linen mitre; they are sacred garments, and he shall wash his flesh in water and then put them on” (Leviticus 16:4). From this you learned: Anyone who moves from an inner service, in the Holy of Holies, to an outer service, and vice versa, requires immersion. The Gemara asks: We found proof that the High Priest requires immersion when he changes from golden garments to white garments; however, from where is it derived that he requires immersion when he changes from white garments to golden garments?

⁸⁴ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught that it is derived by means of an a fortiori inference: Just as before donning white garments, with regard to which the atonement that they effect is minimal as the priest wears them only on one Yom Kippur, immersion is required, before donning golden garments, with regard to which the atonement that they effect is extensive throughout the year, is it not right that immersion should be required?

⁸⁵ The Gemara asks: The a fortiori inference can be refuted: What is the comparison to white garments, as he enters with them to the innermost sanctum? As the High Priest does not enter the

Holy of Holies with the golden garments, apparently the sanctity of the white garments is greater. The Gemara comments: The source for the requirement to immerse when changing from white garments to golden garments is that which is taught later in the baraita: The verse states: “They are sacred garments, and he shall wash his flesh in water and then put them on” (Leviticus 16:4), meaning immersion is required before donning all sacred garments.

⁸⁶ And they are five services: The sacrifice of the daily morning offering, performed in golden garments; the service of the day, the bull and the goat, which is performed in white garments; the sacrifice of his ram guilt-offering and the ram of the people, performed in golden garments. After that the High Priest places the spoon and the coal pan into the Holy of Holies in white garments. He emerges from the Holy of Holies and sacrifices the daily afternoon offering in golden garments and then removes the spoon and the coal pan in white garments.

⁸⁷ And from where is it derived that each and every immersion requires two sanctifications of the hands and the feet? It is derived from the verse that states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments that he put on when he entered the Sanctuary and leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh in water” (Leviticus 16:23–24). And it says: “And he shall wash his flesh in water in a sacred place and put on his garments” (Leviticus 16:24). The Gemara asks: That is written with regard to immersion. The washing mentioned in this verse is not sanctification of the hands and feet but rather immersion. The Gemara answers: If it is not a matter relating to immersion, which is derived from the phrase: “They are sacred garments” (Leviticus 16:4), indicating that every change of clothes requires immersion, then render it a matter relating to sanctification.

⁸⁸ The Gemara asks: And let the Merciful One write the obligation in the language of sanctification of the hands and feet rather than the language of immersion. The Gemara answers: This language comes to teach us that in this case, the legal status of immersion is like that of sanctification. Just as sanctification of the hands and feet is performed in a sacred area, as the basin used for sanctification is situated in the courtyard, so too, the immersion before donning garments must be performed in a sacred area, not outside the Temple.

⁸⁹ The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Yehuda, who derives immersion before donning the golden garments from this verse and does not derive anything from the phrase: They are sacred garments, from where does he derive the obligation to perform sanctification of the hands and feet? The Gemara answers: He derives it as an a fortiori inference from the inference of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon: In a place that the Torah does not require immersion it nevertheless requires sanctification of the hands and feet; therefore, in a place that the Torah requires immersion for all changes of garments, is it not right that it requires sanctification of the hands and feet?

⁹⁰ Rav Ḥisda said: That statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi with regard to immersion and sanctification is an original opinion to the exclusion of the opinion of Rabbi Meir with regard to sanctification, and to the exclusion of the opinion of the Rabbis. It is to the exclusion of the opinion of the Rabbis, as the Rabbis said that he sanctifies his hands and feet when he is dressed, and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: He sanctifies them when he undresses. And it is to the exclusion of the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as Rabbi Meir said: With regard to this last sanctification that he performs after each immersion, he sanctifies his hands and feet when he is dressed. And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: He sanctifies them when he undresses.

⁹¹ Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Everyone agrees with regard to the second sanctification that one dresses, and afterward sanctifies his hands and feet. What is the reason for this? It is as the verse states: "Or when they approach the altar to serve, to burn an offering by fire to God, they shall wash their hands and feet so that they do not die" (Exodus 30:20–21). This teaches that the priest who is obligated to sanctify his hands and feet is one who is lacking only the element of approach to the altar to begin performing the service, to the exclusion of that priest who has not yet donned the priestly vestments, who is lacking both the element of donning priestly vestments and the element of approach to the altar. Sanctification of the hands and feet prior to the service is performed when he is already dressed.

⁹² Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, said to Rav Ashi: Neither does Rav Ḥisda, who said that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the priest performs the two sanctifications before donning the garments, agree with Rav Aḥa, who said that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the sanctification is done after donning the garments; nor does Rav Aḥa, who said that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the sanctification must be performed directly prior to the service, agree with Rav Ḥisda, who said that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the two sanctifications are performed before donning the garments. As, if they do agree, according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi there are fifteen sanctifications. For each change of garments he would require three sanctifications: One when he undresses, one prior to dressing, and one after he is dressed.

⁹³ § It was taught in the mishna: They brought him the sheep for the daily morning offering, which he slaughtered [keratzo]. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of keratzo? Ulla said: It is a term meaning killing. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: What is the verse that indicates this meaning? It is stated: "Egypt is a very fair heifer, but the keretz out of north is come, it is come" (Jeremiah 46:20). The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that keretz means killing? The Gemara explains: It is as translated by Rav Yosef: Egypt is a fair kingdom, but murderous nations will come upon it from the north. The Gemara asks: When he slaughtered the sheep, to what extent did he do so? Ulla said: He slaughtered the animal with a cut through the majority of each of the two organs, the windpipe and the gullet, which is sufficient to render the animal ritually slaughtered.

⁹⁴ And similarly, Rav Yoḥanan said: With the majority of each of the two organs. And Reish Lakish also held: With the majority of each of the two organs. This is indeed Reish Lakish's opinion, as Reish Lakish said: Once we learned in the halakhot of ritual slaughter that the majority of one organ is like the whole, why was it necessary that we also learn there that in order for the slaughter to be valid it requires the majority of one organ in a bird and the majority of each of two organs in an animal? That is clear based on the principle that one organ is required in a bird and two in an animal. Rather, since we learned: They brought him the sheep for the daily morning offering, which he slaughtered by cutting most of the way through the gullet and the windpipe, and a different priest completed the slaughter on his behalf so that the High Priest could receive the blood in a vessel, and the High Priest received the blood in a vessel and sprinkled it on the altar; one might have thought that if the other priest did not complete cutting through the two organs, the slaughter would be invalid.

⁹⁵ The Gemara asks: How is it possible that one might have thought that if the other priest did not complete cutting through the two organs, the slaughter would be invalid? If that is so, the completion of the slaughter is a Temple service performed by another on Yom Kippur. And it was taught in a

baraita: All Yom Kippur services are valid only if performed by the High Priest. The Gemara answers that this is what Reish Lakish is saying: Clearly, there is no requirement by Torah law to complete the slaughter of the two organs. One might have thought that it would be invalid by rabbinic law;

⁹⁶ therefore, we learned again: The majority of one organ in a bird and the majority of each of two organs in an animal, to teach that slaughtering the majority of each of the signs is sufficient. The Gemara asks: And since there is not even an invalidation by rabbinic law, why do I need another priest to finish cutting the organs? Why not suffice with the High Priest's slaughter of the majority of each of the two organs? The Gemara answers: It is nevertheless a mitzva to complete the slaughter ab initio to cause the blood to flow more freely.

⁹⁷ § Abaye arranged the sequence of the daily services in the Temple based on tradition and in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul: Setting up the large arrangement of wood on the altar on which the offerings were burned precedes the second arrangement of wood. This second arrangement was arranged separately near the southwest corner of the altar, and twice every day priests raked coals from it and placed them on the inner altar in order to burn the incense. The second arrangement for the incense precedes setting up the two logs of wood above the large arrangement to fulfill the mitzva of bringing wood. And the setting up of the two logs of wood precedes the removal of ashes from the inner altar. And the removal of ashes from the inner altar precedes the removal of ashes from five of the seven lamps of the candelabrum.

⁹⁸ And removal of ashes from five lamps precedes the slaughter and the receiving and sprinkling of the blood of the daily morning offering. The sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering precedes the removal of ashes from the two remaining lamps of the candelabrum. And the removal of ashes from two lamps precedes the burning of the incense. The burning of the incense on the inner altar precedes the burning of the limbs of the daily offering on the outer altar. The burning of the limbs precedes the sacrifice of the meal-offering which accompanies the daily offering. The sacrifice of the meal-offering precedes the sacrifice of the High Priest's daily griddle-cake offering, half of which he sacrificed in the morning and half in the afternoon. And the griddle-cake offering precedes the pouring of the libations of the daily offering.

⁹⁹ And the libations precede the sacrifice of the additional offerings on days when the additional offerings are sacrificed. And the additional offerings precede the vessels of frankincense that are offered on Shabbat. And the vessels precede the sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering, as it is stated: "And he shall lay out the burnt-offering on it, and burn on it the fat parts of the peace-offerings" (Leviticus 6:5). The term on it, means complete sacrifice of all other offerings, i.e., after the daily morning offering rather than after the daily afternoon offering. In all cases, the daily afternoon offering is the final offering sacrificed.

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara proceeds to analyze the items listed by Abaye and seeks biblical or logical sources for each. The Master said: Setting up the large arrangement of wood on the altar on which the offerings were burned precedes the second arrangement of wood for incense. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita: The verse states: "The burnt-offering itself shall go up on its bonfire upon the altar all night" (Leviticus 6:2); this is referring to the large arrangement of wood. "And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning on it" (Leviticus 6:2); this is referring to the second arrangement of wood near the corner of the altar, from which coals are taken for the incense.

¹⁰¹ The Gemara asks: And perhaps I should reverse them and say that the first verse refers to the arrangement of wood for the incense, and the second verse refers to the large arrangement of wood. The Gemara answers: It is reasonable that the large arrangement of wood takes precedence, as the atonement that it effects is extensive. All of the offerings are sacrificed on the large pile, not just the incense.

¹⁰² The Gemara rejects this: On the contrary, the second arrangement takes precedence, as unlike the large arrangement in which offerings are burned exclusively on the outer altar, coals from it are taken inside the Sanctuary. The Gemara answers: Even so, the contention that the atonement that it effects is extensive takes precedence. And if you wish, say instead: If one does not find wood for the second arrangement, wouldn't he take coals from the large arrangement into the Sanctuary to burn the incense? There is no fundamental obligation to bring coals from a special arrangement, and the second arrangement is only an addition to the large arrangement on which all the offerings are burned.

¹⁰³ Abaye continued and said that the second arrangement for incense precedes the setting up of the two logs. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this? As it is written: "And the priest shall burn wood upon it in the morning, in the morning" (Leviticus 6:5); there is an obligation to place new logs upon the large arrangement. The term upon it underscores that the wood is placed only on the large arrangement, and not on the other arrangement from which coals are taken for the incense. From the fact that this exclusionary term is necessary, it can be derived by inference that there is another pile on the altar, meaning that when the new logs are placed on the altar, the two arrangements are already there.

¹⁰⁴ The Gemara asks: But this term: Upon it, is needed for its own sake, to teach the obligation to place the logs on the altar; therefore, how can the timing of their placement be derived from that term? The Gemara answers: The term: Upon it, is written twice in that verse: "And the priest shall burn wood upon it in the morning, in the morning, and he shall place the burnt-offering upon it." From one instance of this term the fundamental obligation to place the logs is derived, and from the other instance the order of their placement is derived.

¹⁰⁵ Abaye continued: The setting up of the two logs precedes the removal of ashes from the inner altar. Although here, with regard to the two logs, it is written: In the morning, in the morning, meaning that the priest must arise early in the morning to perform this act, and here, with regard to removal of the ashes from the inner altar, it is also written: "In the morning, in the morning" (Exodus 30:7), even so, an action that facilitates another service takes precedence. Therefore, setting up the logs, from which coals are taken, facilitating the burning of the incense, precedes removal of ashes from the inner altar. The Gemara asks: What is the act that facilitates? It is the placement of the two logs. But didn't you say that the two logs go to the large arrangement of wood and not to the arrangement of wood from which the coals are taken for the incense? These logs in no way facilitate the burning of the incense.

¹⁰⁶ Rabbi Yirmeya said: The reference is to the category of wood. Although these logs do not facilitate the burning of the incense, wood facilitates its burning, and the two logs are wood. Therefore, they take precedence. Ravina said a different reason: Since he began with the service of setting up the arrangement, he completes it by placing two logs. Only then he moves on to perform a different service. Rav Ashi said: If one does not find wood for the second arrangement, won't he take

coals from the large arrangement into the Sanctuary to burn the incense? This demonstrates that there are circumstances in which placing the logs facilitates the burning of the incense. Therefore, it takes precedence.

¹⁰⁷ Abaye continued: And removal of ashes from the inner altar precedes the removal of ashes from five of the seven lamps of the candelabrum. What is the reason for this? Abaye said: I learned this through tradition; however, I do not know the rationale behind it. And Rava said: The reason is in accordance with the statement of Reish Lakish, as Reish Lakish said: One may not forego performance of any of the mitzvot in order to perform another mitzva.

¹⁰⁸ And when he enters the Sanctuary it is the altar that he encounters first, before reaching the candelabrum; therefore, he performs the service of the altar before removing the ashes from the lamps, as it was taught in a baraita: The table stood in the north of the Sanctuary, removed two and a half cubits from the wall. And the candelabrum stood in the south of the Sanctuary, removed two and a half cubits from the wall. The altar was centered and standing in the middle of the Sanctuary, removed a bit outward. Therefore, one encounters the altar first. The Gemara questions the essence of the matter: And let us stand the altar alongside the table and the candelabrum; why was it removed outward? The Gemara answers: It is because it is written: “And the candelabrum opposite the table” (Exodus 26:35); we require that they are visible to each other. Were the altar aligned with the table and the candelabrum, it would interpose between them.

¹⁰⁹ Rava said: Conclude from the statement of Reish Lakish that one may not forego performance of any of the mitzvot, that it is prohibited to forego donning the phylacteries of the arm in order to don the phylacteries of the head, as when donning phylacteries, one encounters the arm first. How does he conduct himself? He proceeds from the phylacteries of the arm to the phylacteries of the head.

¹¹⁰ § Abaye continued: And removal of ashes from five lamps precedes the slaughter and the receiving and sprinkling of the blood of the daily morning offering. The sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering precedes the removal of ashes from the two remaining lamps of the candelabrum. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? Abaye said: Take that phrase: In the morning, in the morning, written with regard to the two logs, which is unnecessary to establish the time for performance of that service, as its precedence was explained due to its association with the arrangement of wood. And cast that extraneous phrase to here, and apply it to other elements of the morning service. If the phrase is superfluous in its context, apply it elsewhere where a halakha can be derived. Cast one term: In the morning, and apply it to removal of ashes from five lamps so that it will precede the blood of the daily offering. And cast one term: In the morning, and apply it to the blood of the daily offering, so that it will precede the removal of ashes from the two additional lamps.

¹¹¹ The Gemara elaborates: Cast one term: In the morning, and apply it to removal of ashes from five lamps so that it will precede the blood of the daily offering, as here, there are three instances of: In the morning; two instances are written explicitly with regard to removal of ashes from the lamps (see Exodus 30:7) and one is written with regard to the two logs. And here, with regard to the blood of the daily offering, there are two instances of the phrase; one explicit mention in the text (see Exodus 29:39) and one written with regard to the two logs.

¹¹² And cast one term: In the morning, to the blood of the daily offering so that it will precede the removal of ashes from the two additional lamps. Although here, with regard to removal of ashes from

the lamps, there are two instances of the phrase: In the morning, and here, with regard to the blood of the daily offering, there are two instances of the phrase: In the morning, one written and one cast from the portion of two logs, the blood of the daily offering takes precedence because an act that effects atonement, the sprinkling of blood, takes precedence.

¹¹³ Rav Pappa said to Abaye: And say instead, cast one of the extraneous phrases: In the morning, and apply it to the removal of ashes from the inner altar, so that it will precede the blood of the daily offering, as here there are three instances of the phrase and there there are two. And cast one of the extraneous phrases: In the morning, and apply it to the blood of the daily offering so that it will precede the removal of ashes from five lamps, and say that although here there are two instances of the phrase: In the morning, and here there are two instances of the phrase: In the morning, still an act that effects atonement, the sprinkling of blood, takes precedence. Abaye dismisses this question by saying: If the blood of the daily offering precedes the removal of ashes from five lamps, with what will you demarcate between the removal of ashes from five lamps and the removal of ashes from two lamps?

¹¹⁴ That works out well according to the opinion of Reish Lakish, who said: Why does the priest remove the ashes from five lamps of the candelabrum and then return and remove the ashes from two lamps of the candelabrum rather than arrange all seven lamps at once? It is in order to enliven those present in the entire Temple courtyard, since people are coming and going to fulfill this mitzva with great ceremony. It works out well according to the opinion of Reish Lakish, because he says there is no need for any other service to demarcate between removal of ashes from five lamps and removal of ashes from two.

¹¹⁵ However, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said the following based on the verse: “And Aaron shall burn upon it incense of sweet spices; in the morning, in the morning, when he removes the ashes from the lamps” (Exodus 30:7); take the term in the morning, in the morning, and divide the service of removal of ashes from the lamps into two mornings, i.e., into two parts, by performing a service in between, what can be said? According to Rabbi Yoḥanan, since the result would be that there is no service demarcating between the five lamps and the two lamps, there is no alternative to interpreting the matter in accordance with the explanation of Abaye.

¹¹⁶ Ravina said to Rav Ashi with regard to the basis for Abaye’s argument: Is this term: In the morning, in the morning, written with regard to the two logs actually superfluous and therefore available to have other matters derived from it? Isn’t it necessary to teach its own basic halakha, as the Merciful One states in the Torah: Have it precede the second arrangement of wood, from which coals are taken for the incense? Rav Ashi said to him: And did we not establish that it is written: Upon it, underscoring the fact that wood is placed only on the large arrangement and not on the other arrangement from which coals are taken for the incense? From the fact that this exclusionary term is necessary, it can be derived by inference that there is another pile on the altar, meaning that when the new logs are placed on the altar, the two arrangements are already there.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara asks with regard to the sequence in which the priest removes the ashes from the lamps: What is different that he performs the removal of ashes from five lamps first? Let us perform the removal of ashes from two lamps first. The Gemara answers: Since he begins the service with them, he performs the service on a majority of the lamps. The Gemara asks: If so, let him perform the service on six lamps. The Gemara responds that the verse states: “When he removes the ashes from

the lamps, he shall burn it” (Exodus 30:7), and lamps is plural, meaning no fewer than two. Apparently, removal of ashes from lamps must be performed on a minimum of two lamps.

¹¹⁸ Abaye continued: And the removal of ashes from two lamps precedes the burning of the incense, as the verse first states: “When he removes the ashes from the lamps,” and then states: “He shall burn it.” The removal of the ashes precedes the burning of the incense.

¹¹⁹ Abaye continued: And the burning of the incense on the inner altar precedes the burning of the limbs of the daily offering on the outer altar, as it was taught in a baraita: Let the matter with regard to which it is stated: In the morning, in the morning, i.e., the burning of the incense, precede the matter with regard to which only one: In the morning, is stated, i.e., the daily morning offering, in the verse: “You shall offer one lamb in the morning” (Exodus 29:39).

¹²⁰ Abaye continued: The burning of the limbs precedes the sacrifice of the meal-offering that accompanies the daily offering, as it was taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that there may be no item placed on the arrangement of wood prior to the daily morning offering?

¹²¹ The verse states: “And the priest shall burn wood upon it in the morning, in the morning, and he shall place the burnt-offering upon it” (Leviticus 6:5), and Rava said: The verse could have simply said: And he shall place upon it, indicating that everything sacrificed on the altar is placed upon it; but instead, the verse states: “And he shall place the burnt-offering upon it,” to teach that it ascends the altar first.

¹²² Abaye continued: The sacrifice of the meal-offering precedes the sacrifice of the High Priest’s daily griddle-cake offering, half of which he sacrifices in the morning and half in the afternoon, as the verse states: “To bring offerings by fire to the Lord, burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, sacrifices, and libations, on each day what is proper to it” (Leviticus 23:37). Since the Torah states burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, apparently the daily burnt-offering precedes the meal-offering. And since the meal-offering is part of the burnt-offering sacrifice, it precedes the griddle-cake offering, which is a meal-offering unrelated to the burnt-offering.

¹²³ Abaye continued: And the griddle-cake offering precedes the pouring of the libations of the daily offering. This is because it is in the category of meal-offering. Since it has been established that the meal-offering that accompanies the daily offering is sacrificed after the daily offering, all meal-offerings are sacrificed after the daily-offering prior to any other service.

¹²⁴ Abaye continued: And the libations precede the sacrifice of the additional offerings, as it is written: Offerings and libations, from which it is derived that the libations are brought immediately after the daily offering, before any other offering is sacrificed. And the additional offerings precede the vessels of frankincense that are brought on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: The vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings? The Gemara answers: This is the subject of a dispute between the tanna’im Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva (Pesahim 58a).

¹²⁵ Abaye said: It is reasonable that the sequence should be in accordance with the opinion of the one who said the additional offerings precede the vessels of frankincense, as didn’t you say that the repetition of the term: In the morning, in the morning, comes to prioritize the daily offering? Here too, repetition within the clause: “He shall arrange them on Shabbat day, on Shabbat day” (Leviticus 24:8), with regard to the vessels of frankincense, comes to postpone that service until the peak of the day.

¹²⁶ The Gemara asks: What is the rationale for the opinion of the one who said: The vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings? The Gemara explains: By means of a verbal analogy he derives: Statute, written with regard to the vessels of frankincense: “A statute for all time” (Leviticus 24:9), from: Statute, written with regard to the griddle-cake offering: “A statute for all time” (Leviticus 6:15). Just as the griddle-cake offering precedes the additional offerings, so too, the vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings.

¹²⁷ The Gemara asks: If he derived it from there, let him derive the entire matter from there, and let the vessels of frankincense be burned immediately after the griddle-cake offering; why are the libations offered between them? The Gemara answers: It is to that end that the verse: “He shall arrange them on Shabbat day, on Shabbat day,” with regard to the vessels of frankincense, is effective, to postpone their offering until later.

¹²⁸ § After analyzing Abaye’s tradition with regard to the sequence of the daily service, the Gemara returns to analyzing the passage in the mishna: The morning incense was burned between the receiving and sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the limbs. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the mishna? If it is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis elsewhere (15a), the mishna should say that the incense was burned between the sprinkling of the blood and the removal of the ashes from the lamps. If it is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, the mishna should say that the incense was burned between the removal of the ashes from the lamps and the burning of the limbs.

¹²⁹ The Gemara responds: Actually, the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, but the mishna is not speaking of the sequence of the entire service. The mishna states that the incense was burned between the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the limbs of the daily offering, although other services were performed then as well, including the removal of ashes from the lamps.

¹³⁰ The mishna continues: The afternoon incense was burned between the taking of the limbs up to the altar and the pouring of its libations. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Yoḥanan said that the verse states: “And the other lamb you shall present in the afternoon, as the meal-offering in the morning and its libation, you shall present it, an offering made by fire, of a sweet fragrance unto the Lord” (Numbers 28:8). Just as with regard to the morning meal-offering incense precedes libations, so too here, in the afternoon, incense precedes the libations.

¹³¹ The Gemara asks: If so, just as there, in the morning, incense even precedes limbs, so too here, in the afternoon, incense should precede limbs. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: As the limbs in the morning? As the meal-offering in the morning, is written, indicating with regard to the daily afternoon offering that it is like the meal-offering in the morning, and not like the burning of the limbs of the morning.

¹³² The Sages taught in a baraita that it is written: “And its libation shall be a quarter-hin for the one lamb, in the sacred area it shall be poured as an offering of strong drink unto the Lord” (Numbers 28:7). The Sages understand this verse as referring to the daily afternoon offering; therefore, one will derive the manner and order of the daily morning offering from the manner and order of the daily afternoon offering. Just as libations are required for the daily afternoon offering, so too, they are required for the daily morning offering.

¹³³ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The daily afternoon offering is derived from that of the morning. The phrase: “The one lamb,” refers to the lamb of the daily morning offering, and the daily afternoon offering is derived from it.

¹³⁴ The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the opinion of the Rabbis who hold that this verse is written with regard to the daily afternoon offering based on the preceding verses, they can explain that the daily morning offering is derived from the daily afternoon offering. However, what is the rationale for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who holds that the afternoon offering is derived from the morning offering? Rabba bar Ulla said that the verse states: “For the one lamb.” Which is the lamb with regard to which it is previously stated: One? You must say: That is the lamb of the daily morning offering (see Exodus 29:39).

¹³⁵ And according to the Rabbis, what is the meaning of the term: One? It means the special lamb that is one in his flock. The lamb for the daily offering should be of the highest quality. And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive that principle? The Gemara answers that in his opinion, the principle is derived from that which is written: “And all the choicest of your vow-offerings” (Deuteronomy 12:11). One is required to fulfill his vow by offering the animal of the highest quality. And how do the Rabbis interpret this verse? They interpret that one verse refers to the requirement to bring the animal of the highest quality for obligatory offerings and one verse refers to the requirement to bring the animal of the highest quality for gift-offerings. And both verses are necessary, as otherwise it would not have been clear that this requirement applies to both. On the one hand, one might think it is only with regard to obligatory offerings that the animal of the highest quality must be sacrificed. On the other hand, one might think it is only with regard to a gift-offering that the animal of the highest quality must be sacrificed, as if it is not of the highest quality, it is better not to sacrifice it at all.

¹³⁶ § The mishna continues: If the High Priest was old or delicate, they would heat hot water for him on Yom Kippur eve and place it into the cold water of the ritual bath in order to temper its chill. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: They would heat blocks of iron on Yom Kippur eve and cast them into the cold water of the ritual bath to temper its chill. The Gemara asks: But by doing so, doesn’t he harden the iron, which is a labor prohibited on Yom Kippur? Rav Beivai said: The temperature of the blocks of iron did not reach the hardening point. Abaye said: Even if you say that the temperature of the iron reached the hardening point, the fact that the iron hardened when he placed it in the water is an unintentional act, which is permitted. His intention was to temper the chill of the water, not to harden the iron.

¹³⁷ And did Abaye actually say that an unintentional act is permitted? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita that it is written: “And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Leviticus 12:3), from which it is derived that one may cut the foreskin and circumcise the baby even if there is a white spot of leprosy there? He may do so even though the Torah prohibits excising a white spot of leprosy. This is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya. And we discussed this matter: Why do I need a verse to permit it? His intention is not to excise the leprosy but to fulfill the mitzva of circumcision. And Abaye said: The statement of Rabbi Yoshiya is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that performing an unintentional act is prohibited. Therefore, a special verse is necessary to permit circumcision in that case. Apparently, Abaye holds that Rabbi Yehuda prohibits

even unintentional acts. Why, then, does he explain that Rabbi Yehuda permits placing blocks of iron into the water if his intention is not to harden the iron?

¹³⁸ The Gemara answers: When Abaye said that Rabbi Yehuda prohibits unintentional acts, that applies only to actions prohibited by Torah law that appear in the whole Torah in its entirety. However, here, hardening the blocks of iron is not a labor prohibited by Torah law but is prohibited by rabbinic law, as a decree intended to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest. Rabbi Yehuda concedes that unintentional performance of prohibitions by rabbinic law is permitted.

¹³⁹ MISHNA: They brought the High Priest to immerse a second time in the Hall of Parva, which was in the sacred area, the Temple courtyard. They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people in the interest of modesty. And he sanctified his hands and his feet and removed his garments. Rabbi Meir says that this was the sequence: He first removed his garments and then he sanctified his hands and his feet. He descended and immersed a second time. He ascended and dried himself. And they immediately brought him the white garments, in which he dressed, and he sanctified his hands and his feet.

¹⁴⁰ In the morning he would wear linen garments from the Egyptian city of Pelusium worth twelve maneh, 1,200 dinars or zuz. These garments were very expensive due to their high quality. And in the afternoon he wore linen garments from India, which were slightly less expensive, worth eight hundred zuz. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: In the morning he would wear garments worth eighteen maneh, and in the afternoon he would wear garments worth twelve maneh. In total, the clothes were worth thirty maneh. These sums for the garments came from the community, and if the High Priest wished to add money to purchase even finer garments, he would add funding of his own.

¹⁴¹ GEMARA: What is the meaning of the name Parva? Rav Yosef said: Parva is the name of a Persian sorcerer, whose name is associated with the chamber due to a particular incident.

¹⁴² § It was stated in the mishna: They spread there a sheet of fine linen. The Gemara asks: What is different that the sheet that they spread was made of fine linen? Rav Kahana said: It was so that the High Priest will be aware and remember that the service of the day is performed in fine linen.

¹⁴³ § The mishna continues: In the morning, he would wear garments worth eighteen maneh, and in the afternoon he would wear garments worth twelve maneh. In total, the clothes were worth thirty maneh. The Gemara expresses surprise at the total in the mishna: Does the tanna come to tell us the tally that eighteen and twelve equal thirty? The Gemara answers: This comes to teach us that one may not fashion garments worth less than the total of these morning and afternoon garments. The Gemara elaborates: If one decreases the value of these morning garments, and raises the value of those afternoon garments, we have no problem with it. One can distribute the total of thirty maneh between the two sets of garments in any manner that he chooses.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara comments: However, everyone, both Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis, agrees that the clothes of the morning are superior and must be more valuable than those of the afternoon. From where do we derive this? Rav Huna, son of Rav Ilai, said that with regard to the linen garments donned by the High Priest in the morning, the verse states: “He shall be dressed in a sacred linen tunic, and with linen trousers next to his flesh, and he shall be girded with a linen belt, and he shall wear a linen mitre” (Leviticus 16:4). From the fact that the verse repeats the term linen four times it is derived that the choicest linen should be used for this purpose.

¹⁴⁵ The Gemara raises an objection. It is stated: “And it shall be that when they enter in at the gates of the inner court, they shall be clothed with linen garments; and no wool shall come upon them, while they minister in the gates of the inner court, and within” (Ezekiel 44:17). This verse is referring to the Yom Kippur service, as during the year the High Priest performed the service in eight priestly vestments made partially of wool. Two verses later the prophet says: “And when they go forth into the outer court, into the outer court to the people, they shall remove their garments in which they serve, and lay them in the sacred chambers, and they shall put on other garments, so that they do not sanctify the people with their garments” (Ezekiel 44:19).

¹⁴⁶ The Gemara infers: What, doesn’t “other” mean more important than the first set of linen garments? The Gemara rejects this: No, although “other” means different garments, it means garments inferior to them, the first set of linen garments. The High Priest does not don a second set of garments to effect atonement; rather, he dons them in deference to God to remove the spoon and the coal pan from the Holy of Holies.

¹⁴⁷ Rav Huna bar Yehuda, and some say Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda, taught: After the public service concluded, a priest whose mother had made him a priestly tunic may wear it and perform an individual service while wearing it, such as removal of the spoon and the coal pan, which is not a service in and of itself, provided he transfers it to the possession of the public. All services performed by the priest must be performed while he is wearing sacred garments owned by the public, as all the Temple vessels are. The Gemara asks: This is obvious; once he transfers it to the possession of the public, it is Temple property like any other vessel that an individual donates to the Temple. What is novel in this statement?

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara answers: Lest you say that the concern is that since he is the one wearing it perhaps he will intend to retain ownership and will not transfer it wholeheartedly; therefore, it teaches us that if he transfers possession to the public, that is not a concern. Apropos this halakha, the Gemara relates: They said about the High Priest Rabbi Yishmael ben Pabi that his mother made him a tunic worth one hundred maneh. He donned it and performed an individual service and transferred possession of it to the public.

¹⁴⁹ And similarly, they said about the High Priest Rabbi Elazar ben Harsum that his mother made him a tunic worth twenty thousand dinars, but his fellow priests did not allow him to wear it because it was transparent and he appeared as one who is naked. The Gemara asks: And could he be seen through a garment made to the specifications of the priestly vestments? Didn’t the Master say: The threads of the priestly vestments were six-fold? Since the clothes were woven from threads that thick, his body could not have been seen through them. Abaye said: It is like wine in a thick glass cup. His flesh could not actually be seen, but since it was very fine linen, it was somewhat translucent and his skin color was discernible.

¹⁵⁰ § Apropos the great wealth of Rabbi Elazar ben Harsum, the Gemara cites that which the Sages taught: A poor person, and a wealthy person, and a wicked person come to face judgment before the Heavenly court for their conduct in this world. To the poor person, the members of the court say: Why did you not engage in Torah? If he rationalizes his conduct and says: I was poor and preoccupied with earning enough to pay for my sustenance and that is why I did not engage in Torah study, they say to him: Were you any poorer than Hillel, who was wretchedly poor and nevertheless attempted to study Torah?

¹⁵¹ They said about Hillel the Elder that each and every day he would work and earn a half-dinar, half of which he would give to the guard of the study hall and half of which he spent for his sustenance and the sustenance of the members of his family. One time he did not find employment to earn a wage, and the guard of the study hall did not allow him to enter. He ascended to the roof, suspended himself, and sat at the edge of the skylight in order to hear the words of the Torah of the living God from the mouths of Shemaya and Avtalyon, the spiritual leaders of that generation.

¹⁵² The Sages continued and said: That day was Shabbat eve and it was the winter season of Tevet, and snow fell upon him from the sky. When it was dawn, Shemaya said to Avtalyon: Avtalyon, my brother, every day at this hour the study hall is already bright from the sunlight streaming through the skylight, and today it is dark; is it perhaps a cloudy day? They focused their eyes and saw the image of a man in the skylight. They ascended and found him covered with snow three cubits high. They extricated him from the snow, and they washed him and smeared oil on him, and they sat him opposite the bonfire to warm him. They said: This man is worthy for us to desecrate Shabbat for him. Saving a life overrides Shabbat in any case; however, this great man is especially deserving. Clearly, poverty is no excuse for the failure to attempt to study Torah.

¹⁵³ And if a wealthy man comes before the heavenly court, the members of the court say to him: Why did you not engage in Torah? If he says: I was wealthy and preoccupied with managing my possessions, they say to him: Were you any wealthier than Rabbi Elazar, who was exceedingly wealthy and nevertheless studied Torah? They said about Rabbi Elazar ben Ḥarsum that his father left him an inheritance of one thousand villages on land, and corresponding to them, one thousand ships at sea. And each and every day he takes a leather jug of flour on his shoulder and walks from city to city and from state to state to study Torah from the Torah scholars in each of those places.

¹⁵⁴ One time as he passed through the villages in his estate and his servants found him, did not recognize him, and, thinking he was a resident of the town, they pressed him into service [angarya] for the master of the estate. He said to them: I beseech you; let me be and I will go study Torah. They said: We swear by the life of Rabbi Elazar ben Ḥarsum that we will not let you be. The Gemara comments: And in all his days, he never went and saw all his possessions and his property; rather, he would sit and engage in the study of Torah all day and all night.

¹⁵⁵ And if a wicked man comes to judgment, the members of the court say to him: Why did you not engage in Torah? If he said: I was handsome and preoccupied with my evil inclination, as I had many temptations, they say to him: Were you any more handsome than Joseph, who did not neglect Torah despite his beauty? They said about Joseph the righteous: Each and every day, the wife of Potiphar seduced him with words. In addition, the clothes that she wore to entice him in the morning, she did not wear to entice him in the evening. The clothes that she wore to entice him in the evening, she did not wear to entice him in the morning of the next day.

¹⁵⁶ One day she said to him: Submit to me and have relations with me. He said to her: No. She said to him: I will incarcerate you in the prison. He said to her: I do not fear you, as it is stated: "God releases prisoners" (Psalms 146:7). She said to him: I will cause you to be bent over with suffering. He said: "God straightens those who are bent over" (Psalms 146:8). She said I will blind your eyes. He said to her "God opens the eyes of the blind" (Psalms 146:8). She gave him a thousand talents of silver to submit to her, "to lie with her and be with her" (Genesis 39:10), and he refused.

¹⁵⁷ The Gemara elaborates: Had he submitted to her to lie with her in this world, it would have been decreed in Heaven that he would be with her in the World-to-Come. Therefore, he refused. Consequently, Hillel obligates the poor to study Torah, Rabbi Elazar ben Ḥarsum obligates the wealthy, and Joseph obligates the wicked. For each category of people, there is a role model who overcame his preoccupations and temptations to study Torah.

¹⁵⁸ MISHNA: The High Priest comes and stands next to his bull, and his bull was standing between the Entrance Hall and the altar with its head facing to the south and its face to the west. And the priest stands to the east of the bull, and his face points to the west. And the priest places his two hands on the bull and confesses.

¹⁵⁹ And this is what he would say in his confession: Please, God, I have sinned, I have done wrong, and I have rebelled before You, I and my family. Please, God, grant atonement, please, for the sins, and for the wrongs, and for the rebellions that I have sinned, and done wrong, and rebelled before You, I and my family, as it is written in the Torah of Moses your servant: “For on this day atonement shall be made for you to cleanse you of all your sins; you shall be clean before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:30). And the priests and the people who were in the courtyard respond after he recites the name of God: Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and all time.

¹⁶⁰ GEMARA: The mishna states that when the High Priest recites his confession, the bull stands between the Entrance Hall to the Sanctuary and the altar, and elsewhere (41b) it is stated that the bull is slaughtered at the place where the confession is recited. Apparently, the place where the confession is recited must be considered north. The Gemara clarifies: About whom did you learn that he said that the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar is considered north and is therefore a valid location for slaughtering offerings of the most sacred order, based on the verse written with regard to the burnt-offering: “On the side of the altar northward” (Leviticus 1:11)?

¹⁶¹ It is Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, as it was taught in a baraita: What is the north? It is the area from the northern wall of the altar until the wall of the Temple courtyard. And opposite the entire altar is also considered north; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda. And Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, adds even the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar to the area that is considered north. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi adds that even the areas to the north in the place where the priests walk, and even areas to the north in the place where the Israelites walk, are considered north in terms of the halakha of slaughtering offerings. However, everyone agrees that the area from the chamber of the knives and inward, which is an area off to the side, is unfit for slaughtering offerings of the most sacred order, as it is not visible from the altar.

¹⁶² The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, and not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. The Gemara rejects this: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, now, does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi add only to the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, but does not add to the statement of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon? After all, the area deemed north according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, is included in the area deemed north by Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Therefore, the mishna could be in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi as well.

¹⁶³ The Gemara reformulates its suggestion: This is what we are saying: If the mishna were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who holds that the entire courtyard is

considered north, let us stand the bull anywhere in the entire courtyard and not necessarily between the Entrance Hall and the altar. The Gemara rejects this: Rather, what do you suggest? The mishna is only in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon? According to his opinion one could suggest: And let us stand the bull between the altar and the wall, as everyone agrees that this area is considered north.

¹⁶⁴ Rather, what have you to say to explain why the bull is positioned specifically between the Entrance Hall and the altar? It is due to the weakness of the High Priest, so that he need not exert himself and walk long distances on Yom Kippur. According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi as well, it is due to the weakness of the High Priest that the bull is positioned specifically there, although it is permitted to position the bull anywhere in the courtyard.

¹⁶⁵ § The mishna continues: The head of the bull was facing to the south and its face was facing to the west. The Gemara asks: Under what circumstances can a case be found where its head is toward one direction and its face is toward another? Rav said: It is a case where the animal is standing north-south and it turns its head and faces west. The Gemara asks: And let us stand it straight east-west with its back to the altar and its head facing the Sanctuary. Abaye said: It is prohibited due to a decree lest the bull defecate opposite the altar, which is a display of contempt for the altar.

¹⁶⁶ The Sages taught: How does the priest place his hands on the offering? In the offerings of the most sacred order, the animal stands in the north of the courtyard and its face is to the west, and the one who is placing his hands stands to the east of the offering and his face is to the west, and he places his two hands between the two horns of the offering, provided that nothing interposes between his hands and the offering. And he confesses his sins. If the confession is over a sin-offering, he confesses the transgression for which he is bringing the sin-offering, i.e., unwitting violation of a prohibition punishable by karet. And over a guilt-offering he confesses the transgression for which he is bringing the guilt-offering, e.g., theft or misuse of consecrated property. And over a burnt-offering, with regard to which the Torah does not specify for which transgressions it is brought, he confesses the sin of not leaving gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and produce of the corners [pe'a], as well as not separating poor man's tithe. This is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili.

¹⁶⁷ Rabbi Akiva says: A burnt-offering is brought only over the failure to fulfill a positive mitzva and over violation of a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva. This refers to all prohibitions followed by positive mitzvot intended to rectify them; e.g., the prohibition against robbery is followed in the Torah by a positive mitzva for the robber to return the object that he stole. These transgressions are not punishable by lashes nor does a human court administer any other form of penalty. However, a burnt-offering is required in order to gain divine atonement for the sinner.

¹⁶⁸ The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do they disagree? Rabbi Yirmeya said:

¹⁶⁹ It is with regard to the prohibition against eating an unslaughtered animal carcass, and similar prohibitions, that they disagree. The Torah says: "You shall not eat any unslaughtered animal carcass; give it to the stranger in your community to eat" (Deuteronomy 14:21). The dispute is whether this is a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva or whether it is a standard prohibition punishable by lashes.

¹⁷⁰ Rabbi Akiva holds: It is a full-fledged prohibition, violators of which are flogged, as is the case with regard to violators of standard Torah prohibitions. In his opinion, this is not a case of a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva, as the positive mitzva: "Give it

to the stranger in your community to eat,” in no way rectifies the prohibition that was violated. If the carcass was eaten, obviously it cannot then be given to the stranger. Apparently, the verse means that due to the prohibition against eating it, one should give it to the stranger. And Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds: It is not a full-fledged prohibition; rather, it is a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva. Because the positive command appears after the prohibition, it is tantamount to a prohibition that can be rectified.

¹⁷¹ Abaye said that everyone agrees that the prohibition of eating an unslaughtered animal carcass is a full-fledged prohibition, and it is not a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva, and here, it is with regard to the positive mitzva written after the prohibitions with regard to gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and pe’a that they disagree. The verse states: “And when you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not wholly reap the corner of your field, neither shall you gather the gleanings of your harvest. And you shall not glean your vineyard, neither shall you gather the fallen fruit of your vineyard; you shall leave them for the poor and for the stranger, I am the Lord your God (Leviticus 19:9–10). After listing the prohibitions: You shall not wholly reap, you shall not glean, and you shall not gather, the Torah commands: You shall leave them.

¹⁷² Rabbi Akiva holds that the positive mitzva: You shall leave, indicates that one leaves gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and pe’a in the field from the outset, and is not in effect after he violates the prohibition of: You shall not wholly reap. If one fails to fulfill that mitzva, he violates full-fledged prohibitions punishable by lashes. However, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds that the positive mitzva: You shall leave, indicates now, after one violated the prohibition. Even if the individual violated the prohibitions and harvested those crops, there is an obligation to rectify his actions by leaving the produce he harvested for the poor. This is not a full-fledged prohibition; rather, it is a prohibition that after violation is transformed into a positive mitzva that rectifies the transgression.

¹⁷³ § The Sages taught in the Tosefta: How does he confess? What is the formula of the confession? It is: I have done wrong, I have rebelled, and I have sinned. And likewise, with regard to the scapegoat, it says that the confession is in that order: “And he shall confess over it all of the children of Israel’s wrongdoings and all their rebellions and all their sins” (Leviticus 16:21). And likewise, when God revealed Himself to Moses it says: “Forgiving wrongdoing and rebellion and sin” (Exodus 34:7). This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say that the meaning of these terms is: Wrongdoings are intentional transgressions, and likewise it says: “That soul shall be cut off, it bears its guilt” (Numbers 15:31). This refers to sins committed intentionally.

¹⁷⁴ Rebellions are rebellious transgressions, when one not only intends to violate a prohibition but does so as an act of defiance against God. And likewise, it says: “The king of Moab rebelled [pasha] against me” (II Kings 3:7). And it is said: “Then Livna rebelled at that time” (II Kings 8:22). With regard to the phrase: All of their sins, these are unwitting sins. And it says: “If a soul should sin unwittingly” (Leviticus 4:2). In light of these definitions the sequence suggested by Rabbi Meir is unlikely, as once he confessed the wrongdoings and rebellions, does he then confess the unwitting sins?

¹⁷⁵ Rather, this is the manner in which he confesses: I have sinned, I have done wrong, and I have rebelled before You, I and my household. And likewise, with regard to David it says in this sequence: “We have sinned along with our forefathers, we have done wrong, we have performed evil” (Psalms 106:6). And likewise, with regard to Solomon it says: “We have sinned, and we have done wrong, we

have done evil” (I Kings 8:47). And likewise, with regard to Daniel it says: “We have sinned, and we have done wrong, and we have done evil, and we have rebelled” (Daniel 9:5). However, according to this interpretation, what is the rationale for the sequence of that which Moses said: Forgiving wrongdoing and rebellion and sin, where sin appears last? Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, when the Jewish people sin before you and repent, render their intentional sins like unwitting ones, forgive wrongdoing and rebellion as if they were sin.

¹⁷⁶ Rabba bar Shmuel said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the Rabbis. The confession begins with the unwitting sins and concludes with the severe rebellions. The Gemara expresses surprise concerning the need for this ruling: It is obvious that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, based on the principle: In a dispute between an individual and the many, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the many. The Gemara answers: Lest you say in this case that the rationale for the opinion of Rabbi Meir is reasonable, as the verse with regard to Moses is written in the order stated by Rabbi Meir and supports his opinion, therefore Rabba bar Shmuel teaches us that the halakha is nevertheless in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis.

¹⁷⁷ The Gemara relates that there was a certain person who descended to lead the prayers before Rabba, and he performed the confession sequence in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir. Rabba said to him: Have you forsaken the opinion of the Rabbis, who are the many, and performed the confession sequence in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir? That person said to Rabba: I hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as it is written explicitly in the Torah of Moses.

¹⁷⁸ § The Sages taught in a halakhic midrash that it is written: “And Aaron is to offer his own bull as a sin-offering and atone for himself and for his household” (Leviticus 16:6). Apparently, the verse is speaking of atonement achieved through words of confession. Do you say it is atonement achieved through words, or perhaps it is only atonement achieved through sprinkling blood, as each mention of atonement associated with an offering involves the sprinkling of blood on the altar?

¹⁷⁹ I will infer via a verbal analogy: Atonement is stated here, with regard to the bull of the sin-offering, and atonement is stated there, with regard to the scapegoat: “And the goat designated by the lottery for Azazel shall be left standing alive before God, to atone with it” (Leviticus 16:10). Just as the atonement that is stated with regard to the goat is atonement achieved through words, as neither is the goat slaughtered nor is its blood sprinkled on the altar, so too, the atonement stated with regard to the bull refers to atonement achieved through words.

¹⁸⁰ And if it is your wish to state a claim rejecting that proof, there is a different proof. It says: “And Aaron shall then offer his bull of sin-offering and atone for himself and his household. And he shall slaughter his bull of sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:11). Here, the term atonement is used despite the fact that the bull has not yet been slaughtered. Apparently, the atonement of the bull is achieved through confession and not through sprinkling the blood.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara seeks to clarify the midrash: What is the meaning of: And if it is your wish to say, which indicates that there is room to undermine the first source? Why is a second source required? The Gemara answers: And if you say that instead of deriving the atonement of the bull from the atonement of the scapegoat, let us derive it from the goat that is offered within, whose atonement is achieved through sprinkling its blood in the innermost sanctum; therefore, it was taught in the baraita that it says: And atone, and the bull has not yet been slaughtered.

¹⁸² And from where is it derived that the confession must begin with the word please? It is stated here: Atonement, and it is stated there, just before Moses's plea following the sin of the Golden Calf at Horeb: "Perhaps I may secure atonement for your sin" (Exodus 32:30). Just as there, the prayer includes: "Please, this people is guilty of a great sin" (Exodus 32:31), so too here, the term please should be used. And from where is it derived that the Yom Kippur confession includes the name of God? It is stated here: Atonement, and it is stated with regard to the heifer whose neck is broken: "Atone, O God, for Your nation of Israel whom You redeemed, and do not let guilt for the blood of the innocent remain among Your people Israel, and they will be atoned of bloodguilt" (Deuteronomy 21:8). Just as there, with regard to the heifer, the name of God is mentioned, so too here, the name of God is mentioned.

¹⁸³ Abaye said: Granted, the obligation to include the name of God in the confession at Horeb cannot be derived from the heifer whose neck is broken, since what was, was. The sin of the Golden Calf predated the mitzva of the heifer. However, you should derive that the confession in the ritual of the heifer whose neck is broken requires use of the term: Please, from Horeb, where Moses employed that term. And if you say that is so, and the term: Please, should be employed, didn't we learn in a mishna that the priests say: "Atone, O God, for Your nation, Israel" (Deuteronomy 21:8), while the mishna does not state the term please. Apparently, the formula of confession during the ritual of the heifer is not derived from Horeb. The Gemara says: It is indeed difficult why that is not derived.

¹⁸⁴ § The mishna continues: And the priests and the people who were in the courtyard respond after he recites the name of God: Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and all time. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says the following with regard to the verse: "When I call out the name of the Lord, give glory to our God" (Deuteronomy 32:3). Moses said to the Jewish people: When I mention the name of the Holy One, Blessed be He, you give Him glory and recite praises in his honor. Hananya, son of the brother of Rabbi Yehoshua, says that proof for the practice is from a different source: "The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing" (Proverbs 10:7). The prophet, Solomon, said to the Jewish people: When I mention the Righteous One of all worlds, you accord Him a blessing.

¹⁸⁵ MISHNA: The priest then came to the eastern side of the Temple courtyard, farthest from the Holy of Holies, to the north of the altar. The deputy was to his right, and the head of the patrilineal family belonging to the priestly watch that was assigned to serve in the Temple that week was to his left. And they arranged two goats there, and there was a lottery receptacle there, and in it were two lots. These were originally made of boxwood, and the High Priest Yehoshua ben Gamla fashioned them of gold, and the people would mention him favorably for what he did.

¹⁸⁶ Since the mishna mentions an item designed to enhance the Temple service, it also lists other such items: The High Priest ben Katin made twelve spigots for the basin so that several priests could sanctify their hands and feet at once, as previously the basin had only two. He also made a machine [mukheni] for sinking the basin into flowing water during the night so that its water would not be disqualified by remaining overnight. Had the water remained in the basin overnight, it would have been necessary to pour it out the following morning. By immersing the basin in flowing water, the water inside remained fit for use the next morning.

¹⁸⁷ King Munbaz would contribute the funds required to make the handles of all the Yom Kippur vessels of gold. Queen Helene, his mother, fashioned a decorative gold chandelier above the entrance

of the Sanctuary. She also fashioned a golden tablet [tavla] on which the Torah portion relating to sota was written. The tablet could be utilized to copy this Torah portion, so that a Torah scroll need not be taken out for that purpose. With regard to Nicanor, miracles were performed to his doors, the doors in the gate of the Temple named for him, the Gate of Nicanor. And the people would mention all of those whose contributions were listed favorably.

¹⁸⁸ GEMARA: From the fact that it says in the mishna that the priest comes to the north of the altar, it can be learned by inference that the altar itself does not stand in the north but in the south of the courtyard. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the mishna? The Gemara answers: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, as it was taught in a baraita that from the verse: "And he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward before God" (Leviticus 1:11), it is derived that the entire north side should be vacant. The altar is in the south, and the north is vacant. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov.

¹⁸⁹ The Gemara asks: But isn't the first clause, the previous mishna, as explained above, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who holds that the altar was partially in the north? The Gemara rejects this assertion: The entire mishna, including the first clause, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. Emend the previous mishna and teach it as referring to the space adjacent to the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar and not actually the space between them, north of the altar, where everyone agrees that it is the north.

¹⁹⁰ § The mishna states that the deputy High Priest stands to the right of the High Priest, and the head of the patrilineal family is to his left. Rav Yehuda said with regard to the laws of etiquette: One who walks to the right of his teacher is a boor, in that he hasn't the slightest notion of good manners. The Gemara asks: Didn't we learn in the mishna that the deputy, who is like a student to the High Priest, is to the right of the High Priest, and the head of the patrilineal priestly family responsible for the Temple service that day is to his left?

¹⁹¹ And furthermore, it was taught in a baraita: Three people who were walking on the road should not walk in single file but should walk with the teacher in the middle, the greater of the students on his right, and the lesser of them to his left. And so too do we find with the three ministering angels who came to Abraham: Michael, the greatest of the three, was in the middle, Gabriel was to his right, and Raphael was to his left. Apparently, a student walks to the right of his teacher.

¹⁹² Rav Shmuel bar Pappa interpreted it before Rav Adda: He does not walk next to his teacher as an equal, but walks slightly behind him so that he is slightly obscured by his teacher. The Gemara asks: But wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who walks next to his teacher is a boor; one who walks behind his teacher, allowing his teacher to walk before him, is among the arrogant. The Gemara answers: He does not walk directly beside him but slightly to his side and slightly behind his teacher.

¹⁹³ § The mishna continues: And there was a lottery receptacle in the east of the courtyard there, and in it were two lots. The Sages taught the following in a baraita with regard to the verse: "And Aaron shall place lots on the two goats, one lot for God and one lot for Azazel" (Leviticus 16:8). Lots is a general term; they may be fashioned from any material, as the Torah does not specify the material of which they are made.

¹⁹⁴ One might have thought that he should place two lots on this goat and two lots on that goat; therefore, the verse states: "One lot for God and one lot for Azazel" (Leviticus 16:8), meaning there is only one lot here for God, and there is only one lot here for Azazel. Likewise, one might have

thought he should place the lot of God and the lot of Azazel on this goat, and the lot of God and the lot of Azazel on that goat; therefore, the verse states: One lot for God, i.e., there is only one lot here for God, and there is only one lot here for Azazel. If so, what is the meaning when the verse states lots, in the plural, since each of the two goats has one lot not two? It is to teach that the two lots should be identical; that he should not make one of gold and one of silver, or one big and one small.

¹⁹⁵ It was taught in the baraita that the lots may be fashioned from any material. The Gemara asks: This is obvious, considering that the Torah does not designate a particular material. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary only due to that which was taught in a baraita: Because we find with regard to the High Priest's frontplate that the name of God was written upon it and it was made of gold, one might have thought that this lot, too, should be made of gold since it has God's name on it. Therefore, the verse states: Lot, lot, twice to include other materials and not exclusively gold. It includes lots made of olive wood, and includes lots made of walnut wood, and includes lots made of boxwood.

¹⁹⁶ § The mishna continues: The High Priest ben Katin made twelve spigots for the basin. It was taught: Ben Katin did this so that twelve of his fellow priests, who are occupied with sacrificing the daily offering as explained above, could sanctify their hands and their feet simultaneously. It was taught: In the morning, when the basin is full, one sanctifies his hands and his feet from the spigots fixed at the top of the basin because the water level is high. And in the afternoon, when the water level is low, he sanctifies his hands and his feet from the spigots fixed at the bottom.

¹⁹⁷ The mishna continues with regard to ben Katin: He also made a machine for sinking the basin. The Gemara asks: What is this machine? Abaye said: It is a wheel with which he lowered the basin into the pit.

¹⁹⁸ The mishna continues: King Munbaz would contribute the funds required to make the handles of all the Yom Kippur vessels of gold. The Gemara asks: If he wanted to donate money to beautify the Temple, he should have made the vessels themselves of gold, not just the handles.

¹⁹⁹ Abaye said: Although gold is not suitable for knife blades, as it is too soft for use in slaughter, the mishna is referring to knife handles. The Gemara raises an objection from a different baraita: King Munbaz also made the bases of vessels, the grips of vessels, the handles of vessels, and the handles of knives of Yom Kippur of gold. Apparently, knives are not categorized as vessels; therefore, the handles of the Yom Kippur vessels that Munbaz donated were not knife handles. The Gemara answers: Abaye interpreted that Munbaz donated gold for the handles of axes and hatchets. The blades of these implements cannot be made of gold; rather, like knives, they require stronger material.

²⁰⁰ § The mishna continues: Queen Helene, his mother, fashioned a decorative gold chandelier above the entrance of the Sanctuary. It was taught in a mishna: When the sun rose, sparks of light would emanate from the chandelier, which was polished, and everyone knew that the time to recite Shema had arrived. The ideal time to recite Shema is at the moment of sunrise.

²⁰¹ The Gemara raises an objection: One who recites Shema in the morning with the men of the priestly watch, who served in the Temple during a given week, or with the men of the non-priestly watch, designated groups of Israelites who accompanied the priestly watch to Jerusalem that week, did not fulfill his obligation. That is because the men of the priestly watch recite Shema too early so that they will have sufficient time to perform the Temple service, and the men of the non-priestly

watch, who recite lengthy prayers and stand over the daily morning offering when it is sacrificed, postpone reciting Shema. For whom, then, did the emanating sparks signal the time to recite Shema? Abaye said: It was an indicator for the rest of the people in Jerusalem, who recited Shema at the appropriate time to recite Shema.

²⁰² § The mishna relates: Queen Helene also fashioned a golden tablet on which the sota Torah portion was written. The Gemara comments: You learn from this that one may write a scroll that contains only several portions of the Torah, from which a child may be taught. The Sages disputed whether it is permitted to do so even for the purpose of education. Reish Lakish said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: There is no proof from this mishna, as the tablet prepared by Queen Helene consisted of the letters of the ales-beit, i.e., only the first letter of each word was written on the tablet, representing the word.

²⁰³ The Gemara raises an objection from the halakhot of sota: When the scribe writes the sota scroll, he looks and writes that which is written on the tablet. Apparently, the full text of the passage was written on the tablet. The Gemara rejects this: Emend the baraita and say: He looks and writes like that which is written on the tablet. The tablet aids the scribe in remembering the text that must be written.

²⁰⁴ The Gemara raises an objection from a different baraita: When he writes, he looks and writes that which is written on the tablet. And what is written on the tablet? If a man lay with you...and if he did not lay with you; if you strayed...if you did not stray (see Numbers 5:19–20). Apparently, the full text of the passage was written on the tablet. The Gemara answers: There, it was written

²⁰⁵ with alternating complete words and initials. The first words of each verse were written there, but the rest of the words in the verse were represented by initials. Therefore, this contribution of Queen Helene does not resolve the question of whether writing a scroll for a child is permitted.

²⁰⁶ § The mishna related: For Nicanor, miracles were performed to his doors. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: What miracles occurred for his doors? They said: When Nicanor went to bring copper doors for the eastern gate of the Temple from Alexandria in Egypt, famous for its craftsmanship, on his return voyage by ship, a storm arose in the sea and threatened to drown him. The ship's passengers took one of the doors, which were exceedingly heavy, and cast it into the sea, fearing that the weight of the doors would sink the ship. And still the sea did not rest from its rage.

²⁰⁷ They sought to cast the other door into the sea, at which point Nicanor stood and embraced it and said to them: Cast me into the sea with it. Immediately, the sea rested from its rage, and it was necessary to cast neither the door nor Nicanor into the sea. The ship continued its journey with one door and for the entire voyage, he regretted the fate of the other door that he allowed them to cast into the sea. When they arrived at the port of Akko and prepared to disembark, despite the fact that it was made of copper, the door that was thrown into the sea was poking out under the sides of the ship. And some say a sea creature swallowed it and spewed it onto the land.

²⁰⁸ And with regard to this, Solomon said: "The beams of our houses are cedars, and our doors are cypresses [berotim]" (Song of Songs 1:17), and the Sages interpreted it homiletically: Do not read it as berotim but as berit yam, covenant of the sea, meaning that the door forged a covenant with the sea for the sea to deliver it to its place. Therefore, when the nation prospered and the people replaced the doors made of various metals, the doors in all the gates in the Temple were altered to become doors of gold except the doors in the Gates of Nicanor because miracles were performed to them.

And some say it was because their copper was brightly-colored and high quality. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says it was refined [kelonita] copper, and it illuminated its surroundings like gold.

²⁰⁹ MISHNA: Apropos the mention in the mishna of people who took action in the Temple and were mentioned favorably, the mishna lists those who took action in the Temple and were mentioned unfavorably. The craftsmen of the House of Garmu did not want to teach the secret of the preparation of the shewbread and sought to keep the secret within their family. The craftsmen of the House of Avtinas did not want to teach the secret of the preparation of the incense.

²¹⁰ Also, Hugas ben Levi knew a chapter in the art of music, as will be explained, and he did not want to teach it to others. And the scribe ben Kamtzar did not want to teach a special act of writing. He was expert at writing all four letters of a four-letter name simultaneously. About the first ones, who were mentioned favorably, it is stated: "The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing" (Proverbs 10:7); and about these who were concerned only for themselves it is stated: "But the name of the wicked shall rot" (Proverbs 10:7).

²¹¹ GEMARA: The Sages taught in a baraita: The craftsmen of the House of Garmu were expert in the preparation of the shewbread, and they did not want to teach others the secret of its production. The Sages dismissed them and sent for and brought craftsmen from Alexandria in Egypt, a large city with many experts. And those craftsmen knew how to bake like the members of the House of Garmu did, but they did not know how to remove the bread from the oven like they did. The shewbread was baked in a complex shape, and it was difficult to place it in the oven and remove it without breaking it. The difference was that these Alexandrians light the fire outside the oven and bake it outside the oven; and these members of the House of Garmu light the fire inside the oven and bake it inside. In the case of these Alexandrians, their bread becomes moldy over the course of the week, and in the case of these members of the House of Garmu, their bread does not become moldy.

²¹² When the Sages heard of the matter that the bread of the imported craftsmen was of lower quality than before, they said: Whatever the Holy One, Blessed be He, created, He created in His honor, as it is stated: "Everyone who is called by My name, I have created for My glory" (Isaiah 43:7). In deference to God, the Sages should diminish their honor for the greater glory of God and let the House of Garmu return to their original station. The Sages sent for them to reassume their previous position, and they did not come. They doubled their wages and they came. Each day until then they would take wages of twelve maneh, and today they take wages of twenty-four maneh. Rabbi Yehuda says: Each day they took twenty-four maneh, and today they take forty-eight.

²¹³ The Sages said to them: What did you see that led you not to teach others this craft? They said: The members of our father's house knew that this house, the Temple, is destined to be destroyed, and they were concerned lest an unworthy man learn our skill of baking and go and engage in idol worship with that skill. Therefore, they attempted to prevent this skill from spreading beyond their family. The Gemara comments: And for this matter they are mentioned favorably: Never was refined bread of fine flour found in the hands of their descendants, so that people would not say that they are sustained from that technique of preparing the shewbread. They ate only bread made of coarse flour mixed with bran, to fulfill that which is stated: "And you shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel" (Numbers 32:22). Not only must one's behavior be beyond reproach, he should also make certain to be beyond suspicion.

²¹⁴ § Similarly, the mishna related: The craftsmen of the House of Avtinas did not want to teach about the secret of the preparation of the incense, at which they were particularly adept. The Sages taught in a baraita: The members of the House of Avtinas were expert in the technique of preparing the incense, and they did not want to teach others. The Sages dismissed them and sent for and brought craftsmen from Alexandria in Egypt. And the Alexandrian craftsmen knew how to blend the spices like they did, but they did not know how to cause the smoke to rise like the House of Avtinas did. The smoke of the incense blended by these members of the House of Avtinas rises in a column like a stick; the smoke of the incense blended by these Alexandrians branched out to here and to there and did not rise in a straight line.

²¹⁵ When the Sages heard of the matter, they said: Whatever the Holy One, Blessed be He, created, He created in His honor, as it is stated: “God made everything for His sake” (Proverbs 16:4), and they let the House of Avtinas return to their original station. The Sages sent for the members of the House of Avtinas to reassume their previous position, and they did not come. They doubled their wages and they came. Each day until then they would take wages of twelve maneh, and today they take wages of twenty-four maneh. Rabbi Yehuda says: Each day they took twenty-four maneh, and today they take forty-eight.

²¹⁶ The Sages said to them: What did you see that led you not to teach others this craft? They said: The members of our father’s house knew that this house, the Temple, is destined to be destroyed, and they were concerned lest an unworthy man learn our skill of preparing incense and go and engage in idol worship with that skill. Therefore, they attempted to prevent this skill from spreading beyond their family. The Gemara comments: And for this matter they are mentioned favorably: Never did a perfumed bride emerge from their homes. And when they marry a woman from a different place, they stipulate with her that she will not perfume herself, so that cynics would not say that it is with the work of the incense that they perfume themselves, to fulfill that which is stated: “And you shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel” (Numbers 32:22).

²¹⁷ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yishmael said: One time I was walking along the road and I found one of the descendants of the House of Avtinas. I said to him: Your fathers sought to enhance their honor and sought to diminish God’s honor by not revealing their secret to others. Now, although the Temple was destroyed, the honor of God remains as it was, and He diminished their honor, as their significance stemmed from their Temple service.

²¹⁸ Rabbi Akiva said: One time Rabbi Yishmael ben Loga related to me: One time I and one of the descendants of the House of Avtinas went out to the field to collect herbs, and I saw that he laughed and he cried. I said to him: Why did you cry? He said to me: I was reminded of the honor of my forefathers, how important they were in the Temple. I said to him: And why did you laugh? He said to me: The Holy One, Blessed be He, is going to restore it to us in the future and we will be honored again. I said to him: And why are you reminded of this now? He said to me: The smoke-raising herb is before me, here in the field, reminding me of the past. I said to him: Show it to me; which one is it? He said to me: We are bound by oath not to show it to any person other than the members of our family.

²¹⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri said: One time I found an old man who had in his hand a scroll with the location and formula for blending of spices. I said to him: Where are you from? What is your ancestry? He said to me: I am from the House of Avtinas. I asked him: And what is in your hand? He

said to me: A scroll of spices. I said to him: Show it to me. He said to me: As long as the House of Avtinas, my forefathers, was extant, they would not pass it on to anyone. And now, here it is; and be careful with it not to give it to anyone. And when I came and related my statement before Rabbi Akiva, he said to me: And now that they have surrendered the scroll to worthy recipients since they are unable to maintain its sanctity, it is prohibited to mention them unfavorably, as even their earlier reticence was apparently for the glory of God.

²²⁰ From here, with regard to the cases of the Temple's craftsmen whom the Sages restored to their posts, ben Azzai said: One should not be concerned that others might usurp his livelihood and success, since at the appropriate moment, by your name they shall call you to return to your previous position, and in your place, they shall seat you,

²²¹ and from your own they shall give you. Everyone has a portion designated for him by God, and the individual is privileged to receive what is coming to him, as was the case with the House of Avtinas. The principle is: No person may touch that which is prepared for another by God; everyone receives what is designated for him. And one reign does not overlap with another and deduct from the time allotted it even a hairbreadth. When the time comes for one kingdom to fall, its successor takes over immediately, as no king rules during the time designated for another.

²²² § The mishna related that Hugas ben Levi knew a lesson in the art of music and he did not want to teach it to others. It was taught in a baraita: When Hugas ben Levi projects his voice in a sweet melody, he places his thumb into his mouth and places his finger between the strings of a lyre and sings. This produced a sound so sweet that his brethren the priests were abruptly taken aback.

²²³ The Sages taught: Ben Kamtzar did not want to teach others a special technique of writing. What was that technique? They said about him that he would take four quills between his fingers, and if there was a word consisting of four letters that he wanted to write, he could write it simultaneously. They said to him: What did you see that led you not to teach that technique? All the others with unique skills came up with a response to questions about the matter of their conduct, claiming that they sought to prevent their technique from being used in idol worship. However, ben Kamtzar did not come up with a response to questions about the matter of his conduct, and it was clear that his only motivation in preventing his skill from being disseminated was his own personal honor. With regard to the first people listed, it is stated: "The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing" (Proverbs 10:7); and about ben Kamtzar and his counterparts it is stated: "But the name of the wicked shall rot" (Proverbs 10:7).

²²⁴ § Apropos the verse cited, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: But the name of the wicked shall rot? How does a name rot? Rabbi Elazar said: It means that decay will spread on their names, meaning that we do not call others by their names, and the name will sink into oblivion. Ravina raised an objection from an incident that transpired during the Second Temple era. There was an incident involving Doeg ben Yosef, whose father died and left him as a young child to his mother, who loved him. Each day his mother measured his height in handbreadths and donated a measure of gold equivalent to the weight that he gained to the Temple. Later, when the enemy prevailed and there was a terrible famine in the city, she slaughtered and ate him.

²²⁵ And with regard to her and others like her Jeremiah lamented: "Shall the women eat their fruit, their children in their care [tipuḥim]?" (Lamentations 2:20). The Gemara interprets the term tipuḥim homiletically as referring to this baby, who was measured in handbreadths [tefaḥim]. Even he was

eaten by his mother. And the Divine Spirit responds and says: Why did this happen? “Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the Temple of the Lord?” (Lamentations 2:20). It is punishment for the murder of the priest Zechariah ben Jehoiada. This incident involves a boy named Doeg; even though the person with that name was wicked (see I Samuel, chapter 22), the boy was named for him. The Gemara responds: See what befell him. Clearly, his name was a bad omen.

²²⁶ Rabbi Elazar said: A righteous person is praised for his own actions, and a wicked person is cursed not only for his own actions but also for the actions of his wicked counterpart. A righteous person is praised for his actions, as it is written: “The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing”; righteous is written in the singular. A wicked person is also cursed for the actions of his wicked counterpart, as it is written: “But the name of the wicked shall rot”; wicked is written in the plural. Once one wicked person is mentioned, his wicked counterparts are cursed as well.

²²⁷ Ravina said to one of the Sages who would organize aggadic statements before him: From where is this matter that the Sages stated: The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing, derived? He said to him: As it is written explicitly in the book of Proverbs: “The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing.” He then asked him: From where in the Torah do we derive this? He said to him: As it is written: “And God said: Shall I hide from Abraham that which I am doing?” (Genesis 18:17). And as soon as Abraham’s name is mentioned, it is written: “And Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation” (Genesis 18:18), although there is no clear connection to the previous verse. Apparently, once the name of a righteous person is mentioned, it is followed directly by praise of the individual. That is the Torah source for the statement that the mention of the righteous is for blessing.

²²⁸ Then he asked: From where is this matter that the Sages said: But the name of the wicked shall rot, derived? He said to him: As it is written explicitly in the book of Proverbs: “But the name of the wicked shall rot.” He then asked him: From where in the Torah do we derive this? He said to him: As it is written with regard to Lot: “And he moved his tent as far as Sodom” (Genesis 13:12). And as soon as Sodom is mentioned, it is written: “And the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful to God” (Genesis 13:13).

²²⁹ Apropos these statements, the Gemara cites another statement that Rabbi Elazar said: There was a righteous person who lived between two wicked people and did not learn from their actions; there was a wicked person who lived between two righteous people and did not learn from their actions. How so? A righteous person lived between two wicked people and did not learn from their actions is Obadiah, who was a minister for Ahab and Jezebel and nevertheless remained God-fearing (see I Kings, chapter 18). A wicked person who lived between two righteous people and did not learn from their actions is Esau, who was born and raised in the house of Isaac and Rebecca and nevertheless remained wicked.

²³⁰ § Rabbi Elazar said: From the blessing of the righteous you infer a curse for the wicked; and conversely, from the curse of the wicked you infer a blessing for the righteous. How so? From the blessing of the righteous you infer a curse for the wicked, as it is written with regard to Abraham: “For I have known him to the end that he will command his children and his household after him” (Genesis 18:19), and it is written thereafter: “The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is very great” (Genesis 18:20). The righteousness of Abraham underscores the relative wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah, exacerbating their punishment.

²³¹ Conversely, from the curse of the wicked you infer a blessing for the righteous, as it is written: “And the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful to God” (Genesis 13:13), after which it is written: “And God said to Abram, after that Lot had separated from him” (Genesis 13:14); God proceeds to bless him. And Rabbi Elazar said: Even for one righteous person an entire world is created, as it is stated: “And God saw the light, that it was good” (Genesis 1:4), and good means nothing other than righteous, as it is stated: “Say of the righteous that he is good” (Isaiah 3:10).

²³² Rabbi Elazar further said: One who causes himself to forget a matter of his studies ultimately causes exile for his children, as it is stated: “Because you have forgotten the Torah of your God, I will also forget your children” (Hosea 4:6). Rabbi Abbahu said: With regard to he who causes his studies to be forgotten, one reduces him from his prominence, as it is stated: “Because you have rejected knowledge, I will also reject you; you shall not serve Me” (Hosea 4:6).

²³³ Apropos the righteous, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: No righteous person departs from this world until another comparable righteous person is created, as it is stated: “And the sun rises and the sun sets” (Ecclesiastes 1:5); before the sun sets the new sun has already risen. Before the sun of Eli was extinguished, the sun of Samuel of Ramah had already shone (see I Samuel, chapter 3), and so on throughout the generations. And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, saw that righteous people were few, so He arose and planted some of them in each and every generation to ensure the presence of at least one righteous person in each generation. As it is stated: “For the pillars of the earth are the Lord’s, and He has set the world upon them” (I Samuel 2:8). Since the world rests upon the righteous, each generation requires the presence of a righteous person to provide that support.

²³⁴ Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even for one righteous person the world exists, as it is stated: “But the righteous is the foundation of the world” (Proverbs 10:25). Rabbi Ḥiyya himself said: The proof is from here, as it is stated: “He will keep the feet of His pious ones” (I Samuel 2:9), meaning that God maintains the world due to the pious people. The Gemara questions this proof; “pious ones” indicates many rather than a single righteous person. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Although the text is vocalized in the plural, it is written in the singular: “His pious one”; God maintains the world even for a single pious individual.

²³⁵ Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Once most of a person’s years have passed and he did not sin, he will never sin, as it is stated: “He will keep the feet of His pious ones” (I Samuel 2:9). Once a person has established himself as righteous, God will keep him from failing thereafter. In the school of Rabbi Sheila they say: Once the opportunity to perform a sinful act presents itself to a person a first time and a second, and he does not sin, he will never sin, as it is stated: “He will keep the feet of His pious ones” (I Samuel 2:9). Once he has refrained from sin several times, he has established himself as pious and God will protect him thereafter.

²³⁶ Reish Lakish said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “If it concerns the scorners, He scorns them, but to the humble He gives grace” (Proverbs 3:34)? If one comes to impurify, they open before him the opportunity to exercise his free will and do as he pleases. If one comes to purify, they assist him. In the school of Rabbi Yishmael it was taught with regard to this verse: This is comparable to the case of a man who was selling both crude naphtha [nest], whose odor is vile, and balsam, whose fragrance is pleasant.

²³⁷ In the case of one who comes to measure and purchase naphtha, the merchant says to him: Measure it for yourself, as I prefer to keep my distance from the foul odor. With regard to one who comes to measure and purchase balsam, the merchant says to him: Wait for me until I can measure it with you, so that you and I will both be perfumed. Similarly, with regard to sin God merely provides an opening, whereas with regard to mitzvot God assists the individual in their performance.

²³⁸ In the school of Rabbi Yishmael it was taught: Sin stupefies the heart of a person who commits it, as it is stated: “And do not impurify yourselves with them, so that you should not be thereby impurified” (Leviticus 11:43) Do not read that term as: “And be impurified [venitmetem]”; rather, read it as: And your hearts will be stupefied [venitamtem].

²³⁹ The Sages taught the following with regard to the verse: “And do not impurify yourselves with them, so that you should not be thereby impurified”; a person who impurifies himself a bit, they impurify him greatly. If a person impurifies himself of his own volition below, on earth, they impurify him even more so above, in Heaven. If a person impurifies himself in this world, they impurify him in the World-to-Come.

²⁴⁰ Conversely, the Sages taught the following with regard to the verse: “Sanctify yourselves and you will be sanctified” (Leviticus 11:44); a person who sanctifies himself a bit, they sanctify him and assist him greatly. If a person sanctifies himself below, they sanctify him above. If a person sanctifies himself in this world, they sanctify him in the World-to-Come.

Chapter 4

¹ MISHNA: The High Priest would mix the lots in the lottery receptacle used to hold them and draw the two lots from it, one in each hand. Upon one was written: For God. And upon the other one was written: For Azazel. The deputy High Priest would stand to the High Priest’s right, and the head of the patrilineal family would stand to his left. If the lot for the name of God came up in his right hand, the Deputy would say to him: My master, High Priest, raise your right hand so that all can see with which hand the lot for God was selected. And if the lot for the name of God came up in his left hand, the head of the patrilineal family would say to him: My master, High Priest, raise your left hand.

² Then he would place the two lots upon the two goats, the lot that arose in his right hand on the goat standing to his right side and the lot in his left hand on the goat to his left. And upon placing the lot for God upon the appropriate goat, he would say: For God, as a sin-offering. Rabbi Yishmael says: He need not say: As a sin-offering. Rather, it is sufficient to say: For God. And upon saying the name of God, the priests and the people respond after him: Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and all time.

³ GEMARA: Why do I need the High Priest to have mixed the lots in a receptacle before he draws the lots? In order that he not be able to intentionally take the lot for God specifically with his right hand. Since it is a fortuitous omen for the lot for God to arise in his right hand, there is a concern that he might force the result, in contravention of the requirement that the designation of the goats be made through a random lottery.

⁴ Rava said: The receptacle was made out of wood and did not have the status of a sacred vessel. Rather, it was unconsecrated, and it had enough space inside only for the High Priest’s two hands.

⁵ Ravina strongly objects to this: Granted, it was constructed so that it had enough space inside it only for the High Priest's two hands. This was done so that he could not maneuver his hands inside the box to feel and examine the lots, in order that he not be able to intentionally take the lot for God specifically with his right hand. But why was the receptacle unconsecrated? Let it be consecrated as a sacred vessel. If so, if it were to be consecrated, it would be a sacred vessel made of wood, and the halakha is that we do not make a sacred vessel from wood. But if this is the only issue, let it be made out of silver or let it be made out of gold. However, the Torah spared the money of the Jewish people and did not want to burden them with the expense of having to make the receptacle from expensive materials. Therefore, it is made from wood, and as such it is precluded from being a sacred vessel.

⁶ The Gemara comments: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of this tanna whose opinion was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: The Deputy and the High Priest insert their hands into the receptacle. If the lot for God comes up in the High Priest's right hand, the Deputy says to him: My master, High Priest, raise your right hand. And if the lot for God comes up in the right hand of the Deputy, the head of the patrilineal family says to the High Priest: Speak your word and declare the goat to your left side to be the sin-offering for God.

⁷ The Gemara asks: Why should the head of the patrilineal family instruct the High Priest to speak? Let the Deputy say this to him. The Gemara answers: Since the lot for God did not come up in the High Priest's hand, rather in the Deputy's, he might be discouraged if the Deputy himself instructs him to speak, as it may appear that he is mocking him.

⁸ With regard to what do the tanna'im of the mishna and baraita disagree? One Sage, the tanna of the baraita, holds that the Deputy's right hand is preferable to the High Priest's left hand. As such, the ideal way for the lots to be drawn is for both the Deputy and High Priest to use their right hands. And the other Sage, the tanna of the mishna, holds they are equivalent. Therefore, there is no reason for the Deputy to be involved, and the entire process is performed by the High Priest.

⁹ And who is this tanna who argues with Rabbi Yehuda? It is Rabbi Ḥanina, the Deputy of the priests, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Ḥanina, the Deputy of the priests, says: Why did the Deputy remain at the High Priest's right side throughout the day's service? Because if some disqualification befalls the High Priest, the Deputy can step in and serve in his stead. It is apparent from Rabbi Ḥanina's statement that as long as the High Priest remains qualified, the Deputy has no role in the day's service, which disputes Rabbi Yehuda's opinion.

¹⁰ § The Sages taught: During all forty years that Shimon HaTzaddik served as High Priest, the lot for God arose in the right hand. From then onward, sometimes it arose in the right hand and sometimes it arose in the left hand. Furthermore, during his tenure as High Priest, the strip of crimson wool that was tied to the head of the goat that was sent to Azazel turned white, indicating that the sins of the people had been forgiven, as it is written: "Though your sins be as crimson, they shall be white as snow" (Isaiah 1:18). From then onward, it sometimes turned white and sometimes it did not turn white. Furthermore, the western lamp of the candelabrum would burn continuously as a sign that God's presence rested upon the nation. From then onward, it sometimes burned and sometimes it went out.

¹¹ And during the tenure of Shimon HaTzaddik, the fire on the arrangement of wood on the altar kept going strongly, perpetually by itself, such that the priests did not need to bring additional wood to the arrangement on a daily basis, except for the two logs that were brought in order to fulfill the mitzva

of placing wood upon the arrangement. From then onward, the fire sometimes kept going strongly and sometimes it did not, and so the priests could not avoid bringing wood to the arrangement throughout the entire day.

¹² And a blessing was sent upon the offering of the omer; and to the offering of the two loaves from the new wheat, which was sacrificed on Shavuot; and to the shewbread, which was placed on the table in the Temple. And due to that blessing, each priest that received an olive-bulk of them, there were those who ate it and were satisfied, and there were those who ate only a part of it and left over the rest because they were already satisfied from such a small amount. From then onward, a curse was sent upon the omer, and to the two loaves, and to the shewbread, that there were not sufficient quantities to give each priest a full measure. Therefore, each priest received just an amount the size of a bean; the discreet, pious ones would withdraw their hands, a bean-bulk being less than the quantity needed to properly fulfill the mitzva, and only the voracious ones would take and eat it. And an incident occurred with one who took his portion and that of his fellow, and they called him: Son of ¹³ a robber [ḥamtzan] until the day of his death.

¹⁴ Rabba bar bar Sheila said: What is the verse that indicates that a ḥamtzan is a robber? The verse states: “O, my God, rescue me out of the hand of wicked, out of the hand of the unrighteous and robbing man [ḥometz]” (Psalms 71:4). Rava said: From here: “Learn to do well, seek justice, strengthen the robbed [ḥamotz]” (Isaiah 1:17), which teaches that one should strengthen the robbed, but not strengthen the robber.

¹⁵ § The Sages taught: During the year in which Shimon HaTzaddik died, he said to them, his associates: In this year, he will die, euphemistically referring to himself. They said to him: How do you know? He said to them: In previous years, on every Yom Kippur, upon entering the Holy of Holies, I was met, in a prophetic vision, by an old man who was dressed in white, and his head was wrapped up in white, and he would enter the Holy of Holies with me, and he would leave with me. But today, I was met by an old man who was dressed in black, and his head was wrapped up in black, and he entered the Holy of Holies with me, but he did not leave with me. He understood this to be a sign that his death was impending. Indeed, after the festival of Sukkot, he was ill for seven days and died.

¹⁶ Without the presence of Shimon HaTzaddik among them, the Jewish people were no longer worthy of the many miracles that had occurred during his lifetime. For this reason, following his death, his brethren, the priests, refrained from blessing the Jewish people with the explicit name of God in the priestly blessing.

¹⁷ The Sages taught: During the tenure of Shimon HaTzaddik, the lot for God always arose in the High Priest’s right hand; after his death, it occurred only occasionally; but during the forty years prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, the lot for God did not arise in the High Priest’s right hand at all. So too, the strip of crimson wool that was tied to the head of the goat that was sent to Azazel did not turn white, and the westernmost lamp of the candelabrum did not burn continually.

¹⁸ And the doors of the Sanctuary opened by themselves as a sign that they would soon be opened by enemies, until Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai scolded them. He said to the Sanctuary: Sanctuary, Sanctuary, why do you frighten yourself with these signs? I know about you that you will ultimately be destroyed, and Zechariah, son of Ido, has already prophesied concerning you: “Open your doors,

O Lebanon, that the fire may devour your cedars” (Zechariah 11:1), Lebanon being an appellation for the Temple.

¹⁹ Rabbi Yitzḥak ben Tavlai said: Why is the Temple called Lebanon [Levanon]? Because it whitens [malbin] the Jewish people’s sins, alluded to by the root lavan, meaning white.

²⁰ Rav Zutra bar Toviya said: Why is the Temple called: Forest, as it is written: “The house of the forest of Lebanon” (I Kings 10:17)? To tell you: Just as a forest blooms, so too the Temple blooms. As Rav Hoshaya said: When Solomon built the Temple, he planted in it all kinds of sweet fruit trees made of gold, and miraculously these brought forth fruit in their season. And when the wind blew upon them, their fruit would fall off, as it is stated: “May his fruits rustle like Lebanon” (Psalms 72:16). And through selling these golden fruits to the public, there was a source of income for the priesthood.

²¹ But once the gentile nations entered the Sanctuary the golden trees withered, as it states “And the blossoms of Lebanon wither” (Nahum 1:4). And in the future hour of redemption, the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore them to us as it is stated: “It shall blossom abundantly, it shall also rejoice and shout, the glory of Lebanon will be given to it” (Isaiah 35:2).

²² § The mishna states that after selecting the two lots, the High Priest places them upon the two goats. Upon placing the lot for God upon the appropriate goat, he says: For God, as a sin-offering. This is just one of the occasions on which he mentions God’s name, as the Sages taught in the Tosefta (Yoma 2:2): The High Priest mentions the name of God ten times on that day: Three times during the first confession; and three times during the second confession, over the bull; and three times when he confesses over the scapegoat to Azazel; and one time with the lots, when placing the lot for God upon the goat.

²³ And there already was an incident when the High Priest said the name of God and his voice was so strong that it was heard even in Jericho. Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: The distance from Jerusalem to Jericho is ten parasangs. Despite the great distance, his voice was miraculously heard there.

²⁴ The Gemara describes similar miracles in which events in the Temple were sensed a great distance away. And the sound of the doors of the Sanctuary opening was heard from a distance of eight Shabbat limits, which is eight mil. Furthermore, goats that were in Jericho would sneeze from smelling the fragrance of the incense that burned in the Temple; the women that were in Jericho did not need to perfume themselves, since they were perfumed by the fragrance of the incense, which reached there; a bride that was in Jerusalem did not need to adorn herself with perfumes, since she was perfumed by the fragrance of the incense, which filled the air of Jerusalem.

²⁵ Rabbi Yosei ben Dolgai said: Father had goats in the hills of Mikhmar, a district some distance from Jerusalem, and they would sneeze from smelling the fragrance of the incense. Similarly, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Avin said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa said: An old man reported to me: One time I went to the ruins of the Tabernacle in Shiloh, and I smelled the smell of the incense from between its walls. The Tabernacle stood there during the period of the Judges, and more than a thousand years had passed since its destruction.

²⁶ § Rabbi Yannai said: The drawing of the lot from inside the receptacle is an indispensable part of the service, as it determines which goat will be for God and which for Azazel. However, the actual placing of the lots upon the goats is not indispensable. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even the drawing of

the lots from inside the receptacle is not indispensable, since the High Priest may designate the goats himself, without employing the lottery.

²⁷ The Gemara explains the dispute: In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that matters that are performed in the white garments outside of the Holy of Holies are not indispensable, everyone agrees that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable, since it is held outside the Holy of Holies. When they disagree, it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Neḥemya. He holds that all matters performed in the white garments, even those performed outside the Holy of Holies, are indispensable. The one who said the drawing of the lots is indispensable holds in accordance with the straightforward application of the principle of Rabbi Neḥemya. And the one who said the drawing of the lots is not indispensable claims that this principle applies only with regard to matters that are classified as a Temple service. The drawing of the lots is not a Temple service, therefore it is indispensable, even according to Rabbi Neḥemya's principle.

²⁸ Some say a different version of the dispute:

²⁹ In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Neḥemya, who said that all matters performed in the white garments, even those performed outside the Holy of Holies, are indispensable, everyone agrees that the drawing of the lots is indispensable.

³⁰ When they disagree, it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that matters that are performed in the white garments outside of the Holy of Holies are not indispensable. The one who said that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable holds in accordance with the straightforward application of the principle of Rabbi Yehuda. And the one who said that the drawing of the lots is indispensable claims that although Rabbi Yehuda's principle is generally true, it is different here, in the case of the lottery, because the verse repeated the phrase "which came up" (Leviticus 16:9) "which came up" (Leviticus 16:10) two times. In the laws of sacrifices, a repeated phrase indicates the matter is indispensable.

³¹ The Gemara raises an objection from that which was taught in a baraita: It is a mitzva to draw the lots, and if the High Priest did not draw the lots but instead designated the goats without using the lots, the designation is valid.

³² The Gemara considers the opinion presented in the baraita: Granted, according to that first version of the dispute, in which you said: In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda everyone, i.e., Rabbi Yannai and Rabbi Yoḥanan, agrees that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable, in accordance with whose opinion is this baraita taught? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, according to all opinions.

³³ But according to that second version of the dispute, in which you said that Rabbi Yannai and Rabbi Yoḥanan disagree whether the drawing of the lots is indispensable according to Rabbi Yehuda, but according to Rabbi Neḥemya it certainly is indispensable, then granted, according to the one, i.e., Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable, in accordance with whose opinion is this baraita taught? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

³⁴ However, according to the one, i.e., Rabbi Yannai, who said that both according to Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Neḥemya the drawing of the lots is indispensable, then in accordance with whose opinion could this baraita be taught? It would appear that, according to Rabbi Yannai, the baraita does not

reflect anyone's opinion. Perforce, the baraita cannot be referring to drawing the lots, and one must emend and teach the baraita as saying that it is a mitzva to place the lots on the goats.

³⁵ Come and hear another challenge to Rabbi Yannai's opinion, as presented in the second version of the dispute, which maintains that both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Nehemya hold that drawing of the lots is indispensable. A baraita teaches: It is a mitzva for the High Priest to draw the lots and to confess upon the goat to be sent to Azazel. If he did not draw the lots or did not confess, the service is still valid. This baraita also appears to say that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable, in contradiction to Rabbi Yannai's opinion. And if you say: So too, the baraita should be emended to say it is a mitzva to place the lots on the goats, this is problematic. How will you then say, i.e., explain, the latter clause of that baraita, which teaches: Rabbi Shimon says: If he does not draw the lots, it is valid. If he does not confess, it is invalid?

³⁶ The Gemara clarifies the challenge from the latter clause: In this baraita, what is the meaning of: He did not draw the lots? If we say it means he did not place the lots on the goats, then by inference Rabbi Shimon holds that while the placing is not indispensable, the drawing of the lots is indispensable. But this is incorrect, since wasn't it taught in a baraita: If, following the designation of the goats, one of them died, a new goat is brought to be the counterpart of the surviving goat and is designated without drawing lots; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. It would therefore appear that the baraita should not be understood as referring to the mitzva to place the lots, but as referring to the drawing of the lots themselves. Therefore, the challenge to Rabbi Yannai's opinion remains.

³⁷ The Gemara responds: Rabbi Yannai's opinion can still be defended by claiming that Rabbi Shimon did not know precisely what the Sages were saying, i.e., whether they were referring to the drawing or the placing of the lots. Therefore, in his response to them, this is what he is saying: If when you say: Drawing of the lots, you are saying that the actual drawing of the lots is not indispensable, as I also hold, then I disagree with you only with regard to one halakha, namely with regard to the indispensability of the confession. But if, when you say: Drawing of the lots, you are saying only that the placing of the lots is not indispensable, but you assume that the drawing of the lots is indispensable, then I disagree with you with regard to two halakhot, i.e., with regard to the indispensability of both the drawing of the lots and of the confession.

³⁸ Come and hear another challenge to Rabbi Yannai's opinion that all agree that the drawing of the lots is indispensable, from a baraita: Various services are performed with the bull and the goat and their blood. These services must be performed in a specific sequence, often alternating between the bull and the goat. If one service is neglected and a later service is advanced to be before it, the halakha is as follows: Failure to perform a service of the bull that was to precede a service of the goat disqualifies the service of the goat, if it was performed without that service of the bull preceding it.

³⁹ However, failure to perform a service of the goat that was to precede a service of the bull does not disqualify the service of the bull; rather, it is valid after the fact. This last rule applies to the applications of blood performed inside the Holy of Holies.

⁴⁰ The Gemara explains the challenge from the baraita: Granted, failure to perform the service of the bull disqualifies the service of the goat that is advanced ahead of it. This can be understood to mean that if he advanced the service of the goat ahead of the service of the bull, it is considered as though he has not performed anything at all. Once the service of the bull has been performed, the service of the goat must be repeated. However, the rule in the baraita that failure to perform a service of the

goat does not disqualify the service of the bull that was advanced ahead of it. To what case is it referring?

⁴¹ If we say that that the baraita means that if one advanced the applications of the blood of the bull in the Sanctuary made toward the curtain ahead of the applications of the blood of the goat inside the Holy of Holies, then the baraita should not rule that it is valid. The term “statute” (Leviticus 16:29) is written concerning the applications of the blood of the goat inside the Holy of Holies, which implies that their performance is indispensable to any subsequent services.

⁴² Rather, is it not that the baraita must be referring to a case in which one advanced the applications of the blood of the bull inside the Holy of Holies ahead of the drawing of the lots? If so, from the fact that the sequencing of drawing the lots is not indispensable, one may infer that the drawing of the lots itself is also not indispensable. This would then refute Rabbi Yannai’s opinion.

⁴³ The Gemara questions whether this is the only possible interpretation of the baraita: No, the baraita could be referring to a case in which one advanced the applications of the blood of the bull upon the altar ahead of the applications of the blood of the goat in the Sanctuary made toward the curtain. And as such, ruling in the baraita that this is valid after the fact is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said: Matters that are performed in the white garments outside of the Holy of Holies are not indispensable. Therefore, the applications of the bull’s blood upon the altar cannot disqualify a different service.

⁴⁴ The Gemara rejects this as a possible interpretation of the baraita: But didn’t the conclusion of the baraita teach that the rule applies to the applications of blood performed inside the Holy of Holies? If so, the baraita cannot be referring to application of blood made upon the altar.

⁴⁵ Rather, the baraita must understood in the way suggested by the Gemara previously, which implies that the drawing of the lots is not indispensable. However, this is not necessarily a refutation of the opinion of Rabbi Yannai. One could say: In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who said: The drawing of the lots is not indispensable. Rabbi Yannai claimed only that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Nehemya agreed that it is indispensable.

⁴⁶ And if you wish, say: Actually, the baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Nevertheless, Rabbi Yannai’s opinion may still be defended: Granted, the baraita teaches that the sequencing of the drawing of the lots is not indispensable; however it may still be true that the drawing itself is nevertheless indispensable. This contradicts what was suggested previously, that one may infer from the indispensability of the sequencing to the indispensability of the drawing itself.

⁴⁷ And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon follow their lines of reasoning, as it was taught in a baraita:

⁴⁸ The verse states: “But the goat on which the lot came up for Azazel shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:10). The verse indicates that the goat must remain alive until a certain time. Were it to die beforehand, it would have to be replaced. Until when is the goat for Azazel required to stand alive? Until the time of the application of the blood of its counterpart, i.e., the goat for God; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Shimon says: It must remain alive until the time of the verbal confession over it.

⁴⁹ With regard to what do they disagree? As it was taught in a baraita: The verse states that the goat should remain alive “to make atonement” (Leviticus 16:10). This indicates that it must remain alive until it effects atonement. Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon dispute which atonement the verse is referring to. The verse speaks of atonement through the application of the blood of the sin-offering goat. And similarly it states: “When he has made an end of atoning for the Sanctuary, and the Tent of Meeting, and the altar, he shall present the live goat” (Leviticus 16:20). Just as there the reference is to atonement through blood, so too here the verse is referring to atonement through blood. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

⁵⁰ Rabbi Shimon says: “To make atonement over it”; the verse speaks of atonement through speech, i.e., the verbal confession that is recited over it.

⁵¹ Come and hear a proof that the drawing of lots is not indispensable. A baraita teaches: Rabbi Akiva’s students asked him: If the lot for God was drawn by the High Priest’s left hand, what is the halakha with regard to whether he may transfer the lot to his right hand? He said to them: Do not give the heretics an opportunity to dominate. If it is allowed, they will adduce this as proof of their claim that the halakhot are not absolute, and the Sages have the power to change them as they see fit.

⁵² The Gemara infers: The only reason Rabbi Akiva provided to disallow it was so as not to give heretics an opportunity to dominate, which implies that if not for this reason, it would be permitted to transfer the lot to the right hand. How could this be true? Didn’t you say that the drawing of the lots is indispensable? And, consequently, once the designation of the goat has been defined by the drawing of the left hand, how then could we transfer the lot to the right hand? Perforce, the designation is not created by the actual drawing, and as such it is not indispensable.

⁵³ The Gemara explains the baraita can be understood in a way in which it does not provide a proof: Rava said: This is what Rabbi Akiva’s students are saying: If the lot was drawn by his left hand, what is the halakha with regard to whether he may transfer it, the lot, and its associated goat to his right side. He said to them: Do not give the heretics an opportunity to dominate. Accordingly, there was never any suggestion of changing the designation of the goats. Therefore, no proof can be brought concerning the indispensability of the drawing of the lots.

⁵⁴ Come and hear a proof that the drawing of lots is indispensable. A baraita teaches (Sifra, Aharei Mot 2:4): If the verse had stated only: “The goat upon which the lot” (Leviticus 16:9), I would have said the intention is that he must physically place the lot upon it. Therefore, the verse also states: “On which it came up” (Leviticus 16:9), indicating that once the lot has come up from the receptacle, it is not necessary to do more, i.e., the lot does not have to be physically placed upon the goat.

⁵⁵ The Gemara clarifies: To what does the baraita refer when it says it is not necessary to actually place the lot upon the goat? If we say it means that it is no longer necessary to do so even as a mitzva, then, by inference, one must conclude that the placement of the lot upon the goat is not even a mitzva. This is problematic. Since it is clearly part of the Yom Kippur service, it must at least be a mitzva. Rather, is it not that when the baraita teaches that the placing of the lot is not necessary, it means only that the placing of the lot is not indispensable? And conclude from it that the drawing of lots is indispensable, but the placement of the lot upon the goat is not indispensable.

⁵⁶ Rava rejects the proof: Rava said: This cannot serve as a proof, since this is what the baraita is saying: If the verse had stated only: “The goat upon which the lot,” I would have said that the intention is that he should physically place the lot upon the goat, and the lot should remain upon it

until the time of its slaughter. Therefore, the verse also states: “On which it came up,” indicating that once the lot has come up from the receptacle and been placed upon the goat for even one moment, it is not necessary to do more, i.e., the lot does not have to remain on the goat anymore. Understood in this way, it cannot be determined from this baraita whether or not the placement is indispensable.

⁵⁷ Come and hear a proof that Rabbi Yehuda holds that the drawing of the lots is indispensable. A baraita in the Sifra teaches: The verse states: “Aaron shall bring forward the goat upon which the lot came up for the Lord, and he shall offer it for a sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:9). The verse indicates that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

⁵⁸ The baraita continues: A verse is needed to teach this halakha, as I might have thought to come to the opposite conclusion. Is there not an a fortiori inference as follows: Just as in a case in which the use of a lottery does not consecrate the animals with a specific designation, e.g., a woman who has given birth and must bring two birds, one as a sin-offering and one as a burnt-offering, nevertheless a verbal designation of the animals with the required status does consecrate them, so too, in a case in which the use of a lottery does consecrate the animals, is it not logically right that verbally designating the animals with the required status should consecrate them?

⁵⁹ In contradiction of this reasoning, the verse states, with regard to the goat: “He shall offer it for a sin-offering” to indicate that the lottery makes it a sin-offering; verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

⁶⁰ The Gemara now formulates the proof: Who is the author of anonymous halakhic statements made in the Sifra? Rabbi Yehuda. And this baraita from the Sifra teaches: The lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering. Apparently, according to Rabbi Yehuda, the lottery is indispensable. This refutation of the opinion of the one who says that the lottery is not indispensable, i.e., Rabbi Yannai, according to the second version of his dispute, is indeed a conclusive refutation.

⁶¹ § The Gemara addresses a similar case of designating offerings: Rav Ḥisda said: Nests, a pair of birds of which one bird must be sacrificed as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering become designated for the specific type of offering only at one of two distinct points: Either upon the owner’s taking of them, when he initially purchases and consecrates them for his offering, or upon the priest’s actual performance of the sacrificial rite upon them.

⁶² Rav Shimi bar Ashi said: What is the reason of Rav Ḥisda? As it is written in one verse: “And she shall take two turtledoves or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt-offering and the other for a sin-offering” (Leviticus 12:8). In another verse, it is also written: “And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin-offering and the other for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 15:15). The verses mention only the possibility of designating the offering either upon taking them or upon the performance of the sacrificial rite.

⁶³ The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Ḥisda’s ruling from the baraita cited above: The verse states, with regard to the goat of Yom Kippur: “And Aaron shall...offer it for a sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:9). This indicates that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

⁶⁴ A verse is needed to teach this halakha, as I might have come to the opposite conclusion: Is there not an a fortiori inference: Just as in a case in which the use of a lottery does not consecrate the animals with a specific designation, nevertheless verbally designating the animals with the required status does consecrate them, so too, in a case in which the use of a lottery does consecrate the animals, is it not logically right that verbally designating the animals with the required status should consecrate them?

⁶⁵ To counter this reasoning, the verse states: “He shall make it a sin-offering” to indicate that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

⁶⁶ The Gemara explains the challenge to Rav Ḥisda’s ruling: But here, in the case of designating the goats, the baraita is focusing on the moment at which the lottery is held, which is neither the time of taking the goats nor the time of performing the sacrificial rite. Yet the baraita teaches that were it not for a verse that teaches otherwise, it would be possible to permanently establish the animals’ designation through a verbal designation at that time. This contradicts Rav Ḥisda’s ruling.

⁶⁷ The Gemara rejects the challenge: Rava said: The baraita does not contradict Rav Ḥisda’s ruling. This is what the baraita is saying: Just as in a case in which the use of a lottery does not consecrate the animals with a specific designation, even if it is held at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite, nevertheless verbally designating the animals with the required status does consecrate them if that is done at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite; so too, in a case in which the use of a lottery does consecrate the animals, although it is held neither at the time of taking the animals nor at the time of performing the sacrificial rite, is it not logically right that verbally designating the animals with the required status should consecrate them, if it is done at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite?

⁶⁸ To counter this reasoning, the verse states: “He shall make it a sin-offering” to indicate that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering. Rava has thereby explained the reasoning of the baraita in accordance with Rav Ḥisda’s ruling.

⁶⁹ Come and hear another challenge to Rav Ḥisda’s ruling: One who inadvertently enters the Temple while ritually impure is required to bring a sliding-scale offering to achieve atonement. This offering is unique in that the specific offering one is required to bring depends upon his financial situation. With regard to this offering, a baraita teaches about the case of a poor person who ritually impurified the Temple, i.e., entered the Temple while ritually impure; and he set aside money for his nests, his bird pair, as he is required, as a poor person, to bring one bird as a sin-offering and one bird as a burnt-offering for atonement; and then he became wealthy, and he is consequently required to bring an animal sin-offering; and afterward, unaware of the halakha that he is no longer required to bring a bird pair, he separates his money into two portions and said that these coins are for his sin-offering and those coins are for his burnt-offering.

⁷⁰ Then, in such a case, he adds more money and brings his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money set aside for his sin-offering, but he may not add more money and bring his obligation of an animal offering from the money set aside for his burnt-offering.

⁷¹ The Gemara explains the challenge to Rav Ḥisda's ruling: But here, in the case of designating the money, the baraita is focusing on a moment which is neither the time of taking the money nor the time of performing the sacrificial rite with the birds. And yet the baraita teaches that through a verbal designation one can permanently establish the status of the money, as is apparent from the fact that the money set aside for the burnt-offering may not be used toward the sin-offering. This contradicts Rav Ḥisda's ruling.

⁷² Rav Sheshet said: But how can you understand the baraita that way? Didn't Rabbi Elazar say that Rabbi Hoshaya said: A wealthy person who ritually impurifies the Temple and brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring does not fulfill his obligation. Since he does not and cannot fulfill his obligation with that offering, how can that designation permanently establish the status of the money?

⁷³ Rather, what have you to say in order for the baraita to make sense? That he had already said his designation of the money while in his impoverished state. Here also, in order for the baraita not to contradict Rav Ḥisda's ruling, it may be explained in a similar vein, that he had already said at the time of taking and setting aside his money, which monies were for his sin-offering and which were for his burnt-offering.

⁷⁴ The Gemara asks: But according to Rabbi Ḥaga, who said that Rabbi Yoshiya said that a wealthy person who brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring does fulfill his obligation,

⁷⁵ what can be said? According to this opinion, there is no inherent difficulty in the baraita that requires interpreting it as Rav Sheshet explained; read simply, it appears to contradict Rav Ḥisda's ruling. The Gemara answers: The baraita should be emended: Do not say that the baraita says: If afterward he said. Rather, say that the baraita says: If afterward he took, i.e., purchased and consecrated the bird pair, and said.

⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: How can the baraita be referring to a case where he had taken the birds for his offering? If so, the next statement in the baraita: He adds more money and brings his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money set aside for his sin-offering, what does it mean? If he had taken them, then clearly he is not holding onto money with which to purchase them.

⁷⁷ The Gemara suggests a solution: That statement in the baraita is referring to a case in which he redeemed the bird by transferring its sanctity to money that can then be used toward the purchase of an animal. The Gemara rejects this possibility: But there is no redemption for a bird, so this could not possibly be the case of the baraita.

⁷⁸ Rav Pappa said: That statement in the baraita is referring to a case where he took only one bird. As such, the baraita means: If he purchased the bird for his burnt-offering, then he should add more money and bring his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money he had intended to use to purchase the second bird for his sin-offering. And this bird, which was purchased for his burnt-offering, goes toward a free-will offering. However, if he purchased the bird for his sin-offering, then he cannot add more money and bring his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money he had intended to use to purchase the second bird for his burnt-offering. And this bird, which was purchased for his sin-offering, goes to its death, i.e., it is left to die, as is the halakha of a sin-offering whose owner has achieved atonement with another offering.

⁷⁹ The Gemara proceeds to examine the dispute cited above. Returning to the matter itself, Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Hoshaya said: A wealthy person who ritually impurifies the Temple, and brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring, i.e., a bird pair, he does not fulfill his obligation. Rabbi H̳aga said that Rabbi Hoshaya said: He does fulfill his obligation.

⁸⁰ The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna: A poor leper who brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring fulfills his obligation. A wealthy person who brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring does not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara answers: It is different there, in the case of leper, as it is written: “This shall be the law of the leper on the day of his purification” (Leviticus 14:2). The word “this” serves to emphasize that the details of the purification process must be carried out without any deviation.

⁸¹ The Gemara asks: If so, if any deviation is unacceptable, then in the case of the first clause, in which a poor leper brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring, he should also not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara answers: The Merciful One includes that case by stating: “The law of” (Leviticus 14:2). As it was taught in a baraita: “The law of” was stated in order to include a poor leper who brought the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring. One might have thought that even a wealthy person who brought the offering that a poor person is required to bring also fulfills his obligation. Therefore, the verse states “this” to indicate that the wealthy person may not deviate from what is required of him.

⁸² The Gemara asks: And let us derive the halakha for the parallel case of a sliding-scale offering from the halakha with regard to the offering of leper. Consequently, in the case of a sliding-scale offering, if a wealthy person brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring, he does fulfill his obligation, contrary to Rabbi H̳aga’s opinion. The Gemara answers: With regard to a sliding-scale offering, the Merciful One excludes the validity of such an offering by stating: “If he be poor” (Leviticus 14:21). The word “he” serves to emphasize that the offering required for a poor person is valid only for him.

⁸³ MISHNA: The High Priest tied a strip of crimson wool upon the head of the scapegoat and positioned the goat opposite the place from which it was dispatched, i.e., near the gate through which it was taken; and the same was done to the goat that was to be slaughtered, opposite the place of its slaughter.

⁸⁴ He comes and stands next to his bull a second time, and places his two hands upon it, and confesses. And this is what he would say: Please God, I have sinned, I have done wrong, and I have rebelled before You, I and my family and the children of Aaron, your sacred people. Please God, grant atonement, please, for the sins, and for the wrongs, and for the rebellions that I have sinned, and done wrong, and rebelled before You, I, and my family, and the children of Aaron, your sacred people, as it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant: “For on this day atonement shall be made for you to cleanse you of all your sins; you shall be clean before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:30). And they, the priests and the people in the Temple courtyard, respond after him upon hearing the name of God: Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and all time.

⁸⁵ GEMARA: A dilemma was raised before them: The mishna teaches two halakhot with regard to the scapegoat: A strip of crimson is tied to it, and it is positioned opposite the place from which it will be dispatched. When the mishna continues: And the same is done to the slaughtered one opposite its place of slaughter, is it referring to the tying of a strip of crimson, and it is teaching that a strip is

also tied on the goat being sacrificed around the place of its slaughter, i.e., its neck? Or, is it referring to the positioning of the goat, and it is teaching that the goat being sacrificed should be stood opposite the place where it will be slaughtered?

⁸⁶ Come and hear a resolution from a baraita that Rav Yosef taught: He ties a strip of crimson to the head of the scapegoat and positions it opposite the place from which it will be sent; and the same is done to the slaughtered one, opposite its place of slaughter. This is done for two reasons: So that each goat, i.e., the goat for God and the goat for Azazel, cannot become mixed up with the other one, and so that the goats cannot become mixed up with other goats.

⁸⁷ The Gemara explains the proof from the baraita. Granted, if you say that the baraita is referring to tying, it works out well. Since both goats have a strip tied to them and to different places upon them, they will always be distinguishable both from one another and also from any other animals. But, if you say that it is referring to positioning the goat being sacrificed, but no strip of crimson is tied to it, granted, each one cannot be mixed up with its counterpart, since this one, the goat to be sent away, has a strip of crimson tied to it, and that one, the goat being sacrificed, does not have a strip of crimson tied to it. However, the goat being sacrificed could still be mixed up with other animals, since it has no strip tied to it. Rather, must one not conclude from the baraita that it is referring to tying? The Gemara confirms: Indeed, learn from it that it is so.

⁸⁸ The Gemara discusses halakhot pertaining to the strip of crimson wool: Rabbi Yitzḥak said: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between two strips of crimson, one of the red heifer and one of the scapegoat. One of them requires a minimum amount, and one does not require a minimum amount. But I do not know to which of them the requirement to have a minimum amount pertains.

⁸⁹ Rav Yosef said: Let us see and examine the matter. It is logical that since the strip of the scapegoat, which requires division, it requires a minimum amount to be able to achieve this. Before the goat descends into Azazel, the strip is cut into two; half of it is tied between the goat's horns and half of it is tied to a nearby rock. However, the crimson strip of the heifer does not require division, therefore it does not require a minimum amount.

⁹⁰ Rami bar Ḥama strongly objects to this: The strip of the heifer also requires a minimum amount because it needs to have weight, in order to be heavy enough to fall into the heart of the fire in which the heifer is being burned (see Numbers 19:6). Rava said to him: The requirement for the strip to have weight is the subject of a dispute between tanna'im, and Rav Yosef holds in accordance with the opinion that it does not need to have weight.

⁹¹ The Gemara asks: Is it true that the strip of the red heifer does not require division? Abaye raised an objection to this from a mishna in tractate Para: How does he perform the burning of the items that are burned together with the red heifer? He wraps the cedar wood and the hyssop with the remnants of the strip of crimson and casts them into the fire in which the heifer is being burnt. The reference to the remnant of the strip of crimson indicates that only part is burned. This suggests that it also requires division. The Gemara answers: Emend the mishna in tractate Para. Instead of saying: The remnants of the strip, say: It was done with the tail end of the strip of crimson.

⁹² The Torah requires that as part of the preparation of the ashes of the red heifer, cedar wood, hyssop, and a strip of crimson be cast "into the midst of the burning of the heifer" (Number 19:6). The Gemara discusses what happens if these items burn before actually reaching the burning mass of the heifer: Rabbi Ḥanin said that Rav said: If the cedar wood and the strip of crimson were caught by

the flame of the burning heifer, and they burned in the air before coming into contact with the mass of the heifer itself, it is valid. The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: If the strip of crimson was singed before reaching the heart of fire, he brings another strip and sanctifies it by ensuring it burns together with the mass of the heifer.

⁹³ Abaye said: This is not difficult: Here, the baraita is dealing with a case in which the flame blazes high. Since the strip was still a significant distance from the burning mass, its burning is invalid. There, Rabbi Ḥanin is dealing with a case in which the flame blazes low, in close proximity to the mass of the heifer. Therefore, it is considered to have been burned together with it and is valid.

⁹⁴ Rava said: The baraita and Rabbi Ḥanin's ruling follow different opinions with regard to whether the strip of crimson needs to have weight. The baraita assumes the items must reach the heart of the fire; therefore, they must have weight. Rabbi Ḥanin assumes the items don't need to reach the heart of the fire; therefore, they do not need to have weight. The issue of whether the strip of crimson needs to have weight is a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: Why does he wrap the cedar wood and the hyssop together using the strip of crimson? So that they will all be in a single bundle and burn simultaneously, as implied by the fact the Torah mentions all three together; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: So that they will have weight and fall into the burning heifer.

⁹⁵ When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between three strips of crimson: One of the red heifer, and one of the scapegoat, and one of the leper. One of them must have the weight of ten zuz; and one of them must have the weight of two sela, which is eight zuz; and one of them must have the weight of a shekel, which is two zuz, but I cannot explain which is which.

⁹⁶ When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he explained in the name of Rabbi Yonatan which weight each item requires, as follows:

⁹⁷ The strip of crimson of the red heifer has the weight of ten zuz; and the strip of the scapegoat has the weight of two sela, which is eight zuz; and the strip of the leper has the weight of a shekel, which is two zuz.

⁹⁸ And Rabbi Yoḥanan further said: Rabbi Shimon ben Ḥalafta and the Rabbis disagree with regard to the strip of crimson of the red heifer. One said: It has the weight of ten zuz. And one said: It has the weight of one shekel. And your mnemonic for remembering that while both assume that only one of the extreme values was required no one suggests the middle value of two sela is required, is the aphorism from a mishna: God equally values both the one who gives much and the one who gives little as long as his intention is to Heaven.

⁹⁹ Rabbi Yirmeya of Difti said to Ravina: It is not with regard to the strip of the red heifer that they disagree; rather, it is with regard to the strip of the scapegoat that they disagree. And on that very day that they disputed this issue, Ravya bar Kisi died, and they made a mnemonic out of it, associating the halakha with his name: The death of Ravya bar Kisi atones like the scapegoat, since the death of the righteous person atones for his generation.

¹⁰⁰ Rabbi Yitzḥak said: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between two slaughters: One of the red heifer, and one of the bull of the High Priest on Yom Kippur. The slaughter of one of them is

valid even if done by a non-priest, and the slaughter of the other one is invalid if done by a non-priest. But I do not know which of them is which.

¹⁰¹ An amoraic dispute was stated: With regard to the slaughter of the red heifer and the bull of the High Priest on Yom Kippur, there is a dispute between Rav and Shmuel: One said: A red heifer slaughtered by a non-priest is invalid, whereas the bull of the High Priest slaughtered by a non-priest is valid. And the other one said: His bull is invalid, but the red heifer is valid.

¹⁰² The Gemara comments: Conclude that it is Rav who said that if the heifer is slaughtered by a non-priest it is invalid, as Rabbi Zeira said: The slaughter of the heifer by a non-priest is invalid. And Rav said concerning this statement of Rabbi Zeira: This is because we learned in the Torah's description of the slaughter of the red heifer both "Elazar the priest" (Numbers 19:3) and "statute" (Numbers 19:2). Because Elazar is mentioned, it indicates the slaughter should be performed by a priest, and the use of the term "statute" teaches that one may not deviate from any of the details of the service as delineated in the verses; if one does deviate, the service is invalid. Clearly then, Rav held that if the heifer is slaughtered by a non-priest it is invalid.

¹⁰³ The Gemara analyzes Rav's opinion: And according to Rav, what is different with regard to the red heifer, that if it is slaughtered by a non-priest it is invalid? As Rav explained, it is different in that, with regard to it, it is written "Elazar" and "statute." But with regard to the bull of the High Priest it is also written "Aaron" the High Priest (Leviticus 16:11) and "statute" (Leviticus 16:34). Based on Rav's logic, that indicates that the priest is indispensable.

¹⁰⁴ The Gemara explains: The slaughter of the bull by a non-priest is valid because slaughtering is not classified as a sacrificial service; therefore, it does not have to be done by a priest. The Gemara challenges this answer: If so, by the same logic, the red heifer should also be valid when slaughtered by a non-priest. The Gemara concludes: The logic that slaughtering is not classified as a sacrificial service does not apply in the case of the red heifer because the red heifer is different. It has the sanctity of items consecrated for Temple maintenance, and therefore the principles that apply to other offerings do not necessarily apply to it.

¹⁰⁵ But is it not arguable, by an a fortiori inference, that the slaughter of the red heifer by a non-priest is valid? If the slaughter of the bull of the High Priest, which is an actual offering, is valid when performed by a non-priest, then all the more so the slaughter of the red heifer, which is not an offering, should be valid when similarly performed by a non-priest. Rav Shisha, son of Rav Idi, said: The slaughter of the red heifer by a non-priest is invalid. The halakha is just as in the case of appearances of leprosy, which, despite their not being a sacrificial service, still require the priesthood. Only a priest may declare the signs of leprosy to be pure or impure. It is apparent from this case that the logic of the a fortiori inference does not hold.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara analyzes Shmuel's opinion: And according to Shmuel, who said that if a non-priest slaughters the bull of the High Priest it is invalid, what is different with regard to his bull that this is the halakha? It is different in that, with regard to it, it is written "Aaron," indicating that a priest is required, and "statute," indicating that the requirements of the Yom Kippur service are indispensable. But with regard to the red heifer it is also written: "Elazar" and "statute" which by the same logic should indicate the need for a priest is indispensable. The Gemara concludes: It is different there as it is written: "And he shall slaughter it before him" (Numbers 19:3), i.e., in front of Elazar, which suggests that it could be that a non-priest slaughters and Elazar watches.

¹⁰⁷ And Rav, who assumes the slaughter is performed by the priest himself, how does he interpret the phrase: “Before him”? He understands it to mean that he should not divert his attention from the heifer from the moment of slaughtering until the completion of the process. As with other matters of purification, one is required to maintain his attention on the matter; any distraction can invalidate the process. And from where does Shmuel, who already derived something from this verse, derive that he should not divert his attention from it? He derives it from the verse: “And he shall burn the heifer in his sight” (Numbers 19:5).

¹⁰⁸ And what does Rav learn from this verse? He holds that one verse is needed to teach the requirement to maintain one’s attention with regard to slaughtering, and one verse is needed to teach the requirement with regard to burning.

¹⁰⁹ And it is necessary to have the requirement stated in both cases since, if the Merciful One had written it only with regard to slaughtering, I might have limited the requirement to that case because it is the start of the Temple service; but with regard to burning, I could say that no, there is no requirement. Therefore, it is necessary to teach the requirement also in the case of burning. And if the Merciful One had written the requirement only with regard to burning, I might have limited it to that case, because it is now that the heifer is actually being made ready to be used; but with regard to slaughtering, I could say that no, there is no requirement. Therefore, it is necessary to teach the requirement also in that case.

¹¹⁰ As the requirement is mentioned with regard to two stages of the rite of the red heifer, this suggests that it does not exist for every stage. Therefore, the Gemara asks: It is written this way in order to exclude what stage? If we say, to exclude from the requirement the stages of gathering its ashes and filling the water for sanctification, i.e., taking the water in order to pour it on the ashes and mix them together,

¹¹¹ this is mistaken because: “And it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water of sprinkling” (Numbers 19:9) was written, and the use of the term “shall be kept” indicates that one must maintain attention even during these stages. Rather, it is to exclude from the requirement the stage of casting the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the strip of crimson into the fire. The requirement does not apply to this stage, as they do not pertain to the heifer itself.

¹¹² An amoraic dispute was stated with regard to the slaughter of the red heifer by a non-priest: Rabbi Ami said: It is valid. And Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa said: It is invalid. Ulla said: It is valid, but some say that he said: It is invalid.

¹¹³ Rabbi Yehoshua bar Abba raised an objection to the opinion of Shmuel that the slaughter is valid, thereby providing a support for opinion of Rav, who holds that it is invalid: I have a derivation only with regard to the sprinkling of the red heifer’s waters, that they are not valid if sprinkled by a woman as opposed to when sprinkled by a man, and that the sprinkling is valid only during the day. The verse states: “And the pure one shall sprinkle upon the impure on the third day” (Numbers 19:19). The use of the terms “pure one,” in the masculine form, and “day,” indicate that the sprinkling is valid only if performed by a man during the day.

¹¹⁴ From where is it derived to include the following stages among those stages that must be performed by a man during the day in order to be valid: Its slaughter; and the collection of its blood; and the sprinkling of its blood; and its burning; and the casting of the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the strip of crimson into the fire? The verse states: “Law” (Numbers 19:2), at the beginning of

the section on the red heifer, to indicate that the same rules govern all stages of the rite. As such, I might have thought that I should include even the collection of its ashes, and the filling of waters, and the sanctification. Therefore, the verse states: “This is the statute of the law” (Numbers 19:2). The word *this* limits the scope of the requirement that the rite must be performed by a man and during the day from applying to these stages.

¹¹⁵ And if the word “law” serves to include all stages in the halakha and the word “this” serves to exclude some stages, what did you see to include these stages and to exclude those? After noting that the verse includes some stages and excludes others, you should say the following logical argument: Indeed, we learn all the stages from the sprinkling of its waters: Just as the sprinkling of its waters is not valid if done by a woman as opposed to when done by a man, and it is valid only during the day, so too I will include in the same requirement its slaughter; and the collection of its blood; and the sprinkling of its blood; and its burning; and the casting of the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the strip of crimson.

¹¹⁶ Since these stages are not valid if done by a woman as opposed to when done by a man, as indicated by the verses that state that they are to be done by a serving priest, who by definition is a man, then it is logical to also include these cases in the halakha that they are valid only during the day. And I exclude the collection of its ashes, and the filling of water, and the sanctification, since these stages are valid when done by a woman as they are when done by a man, as the verses never suggest a requirement that they be done by a man. Therefore, it is logical that these stages are valid both during the day and during the night.

¹¹⁷ Rabbi Yehoshua bar Abba originally cited the baraita to challenge Shmuel’s opinion that the slaughter of the red heifer by a non-priest is valid. The Gemara asks: And what is the challenge from this baraita? If we say that since that these stages are invalid if done by a woman one should conclude that they are also invalid if done by a non-priest, then let the stage of sprinkling the waters serve as a proof that one should not necessarily connect these two halakhot, because the sprinkling is invalid if done by a woman and yet valid if done by a non-priest. If so, what was the basis for the challenge?

¹¹⁸ Abaye said: This is the challenge: With regard to a woman, what is the reason she may not perform these stages? The verse states “Elazar,” indicating the requirement for a man and not a woman. The same logic should also apply to a non-priest: The verse states: “Elazar,” indicating the requirement for a priest and not a non-priest.

¹¹⁹ The Gemara considers other aspects of the rite of the red heifer: Ulla said: Throughout the entire passage of the red heifer, certain conditions apply to some stages of the rite, but not to others. These conditions are derived from the phrasing of the verses. In some stages, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse preclude the application of conditions that are implied by a previous verse describing a previous stage. A verse describing one stage may imply the existence of a certain condition which applies to that stage but a verse describing a subsequent stage indicates that that condition does not apply to the subsequent stage. However, in other stages, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse stand on their own and continue to apply in subsequent stages, i.e., the verses in subsequent stages do not exclude the application of the condition derived from the verses in a previous stage.

¹²⁰ The Gemara proceeds to demonstrate Ulla's claim by expounding the verses throughout the passage of the red heifer: The verse states with regard to the red heifer: "And you shall give it to Elazar the priest and he shall take it out to the outside of the camp, and he shall slaughter it before him" (Numbers 19:3). The word "it" implies that only that red heifer, i.e., the first one, was to be given to Elazar, who was the deputy High Priest, to perform its rite, but that the red heifer in future generations does not need to be given to Elazar, i.e., to a priest of similar rank. If so, who does perform the rite of the red heifer? Some say: In future generations, it should be done by the High Priest. And some say: In future generations, it can be done even by a common priest.

¹²¹ Granted, according to the one who says that in future generations it can be done even by a common priest, it works out well, since there is no indication to the contrary. But according to the one who says that in future generations it should be done by the High Priest, from where does he derive this requirement? He derives the halakha from the service of Yom Kippur through a verbal analogy between the word "statute" (Numbers 19:2) written with regard to the red heifer and the word "statute" (Leviticus 16:34) written with regard to the Yom Kippur service: Just as on Yom Kippur the entire service is performed by the High Priest, so too, in future generations the rite of the red heifer must be done entirely by the High Priest.

¹²² The Gemara expounds the next phrase in the verse: "And he shall take it out to the outside of the camp" (Numbers 19:3). The use of the word "it" implies that only it should be taken out, but he should not take out another heifer with it. As we learned in a mishna: If the heifer did not want to go out by itself, we do not take out a black cow with it in order to encourage it to leave, so that people will not mistakenly say that they slaughtered the black cow. And we do not take out an additional red heifer with it, so that people will not mistakenly say that they slaughtered two heifers. Slaughtering an additional heifer would invalidate the rite, since performing any additional labor during the rite of the red heifer disqualifies it. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: This is not for that reason, rather it is due to the fact that it is stated "It," which implies only one heifer may be taken out.

¹²³ And even according to the first tanna, is it not written "it"? Why does he not derive the halakha from the word "it"? The Gemara explains: Who is the first tanna? It is Rabbi Shimon, who interprets the rationale for the mitzva in the verse and draws halakhic conclusions based on that interpretation. Therefore, he accepts that the halakha is derived from the word "it," but he also provides a rationale for the halakha. If so, what is the practical difference between them? The practical difference between them is in a case

¹²⁴ where one took out a donkey with it. According to the first tanna, this would be permitted, since there is no concern that people would think that the wrong cow or cows were slaughtered. However, according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who maintains that this rationale is irrelevant, even this case would be excluded by the word "it."

¹²⁵ The Gemara expounds the next phrase in the verse: "And he shall slaughter it," means that "it," the red heifer, should be slaughtered and that no other should be slaughtered with it. And the next phrase: "Before him"; according to Rav, it means that he should not divert his attention from it. According to Shmuel, it indicates that a non-priest can slaughter it and Elazar the priest observes.

¹²⁶ The Gemara proceeds to expound the next verse: "And Elazar the priest shall take some of its blood with his finger" (Numbers 19:4). What is indicated by specifying Elazar? According to Shmuel, since the phrase "before him" in the previous verse indicates that Elazar himself did not

need to slaughter the red heifer but that rather a non-priest could, it is necessary in this stage to return it to Elazar, to indicate that he must himself take the blood with his finger. According to Rav, this is an example of a restrictive expression following a restrictive expression, as both verses indicate that the rite may be performed only by a priest. And there is a hermeneutical principle that a restrictive expression following a restrictive expression comes only to amplify the halakha and include additional cases. In this case, it serves to teach that even a common priest may perform the rite.

¹²⁷ The Gemara expounds another verse in the same passage: “And the priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop, and a strip of crimson” (Numbers 19:6). What is indicated by specifying that this is done by the priest? According to Shmuel, who holds that in the previous stage the verse stated: “And Elazar the priest” to indicate that Elazar, i.e., a deputy High Priest, was required to perform that stage, the use of the term “the priest” in this stage indicates that a deputy High Priest is no longer required for this stage; rather, even a common priest may perform this stage. According to Rav, who holds that even in the previous stage a common priest may perform the rite, the term “and the priest” is necessary here, as it could enter your mind to say that since these stages do not involve the heifer itself, they do not require a priest at all. Therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not correct.

¹²⁸ The Gemara expounds the next verse: “Then the priest shall wash his clothes” (Numbers 19:7). Why is there a need to restate the involvement of the priest? To teach that he should be in his priestly state, i.e., wearing his priestly garments and fit for service. In the next phrase of the verse, the involvement of the priest is restated: “And the priest shall be impure until evening” (Numbers 19:7). This repetition is to teach that even in future generations the rite is to be performed only by a priest in his priestly state.

¹²⁹ The Gemara analyzes this derivation according to the two sides of the dispute the Gemara cited previously: It works out well according to the one who said that for future generations the rite of the red heifer may be performed by a common priest. It is therefore understandable that the verse emphasizes that the priest has to perform the rite in his priestly state. But according to the one who said that for future generations it must be performed by a High Priest, now that we require the High Priest, is it necessary to mention that he must be in his priestly state? Yes, sometimes there is a matter that could be derived by means of an a fortiori inference, and the verse nevertheless unnecessarily writes it explicitly.

¹³⁰ The Gemara expounds another verse in the passage: “And a man who is pure shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and place them” (Numbers 19:9). The verse states “a man” to qualify a non-priest to perform this stage of the rite. The verse states “pure” to qualify even a woman to perform this stage. The verse states “and place” to indicate that only one who has the basic level of intelligence to be able to intentionally place the ashes in their place is qualified to do so, thereby excluding a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor, since they do not have the basic level of intelligence to be able to intentionally place the ashes in their place.

¹³¹ The Gemara prefaces its exposition of another verse in the passage, which details the sanctification of the ashes of the red heifer, by citing a dispute concerning that stage: We learned in a mishna there, in tractate Para: Everyone is qualified to sanctify the ashes of the red heifer, i.e., to pour the water over them, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda qualifies a minor, but disqualifies a woman and a hermaphrodite.

¹³² What is the reason of the Rabbis, i.e., the first tanna? As it is written: “And they shall take for the impure of the ashes of the burning of the purification from sin, and he shall put running water thereto in a vessel” (Numbers 19:17). The word “they” is understood as referring to those who perform the previous stage of gathering the ashes. The verse therefore indicates: Those whom I disqualified for you for gathering the ashes, I have disqualified for you also for sanctification; and those whom I have qualified for you for gathering the ashes, I have qualified for you for sanctification.

¹³³ And why does Rabbi Yehuda not accept this reasoning? If so, let the verse say: And he shall take. What is the meaning of “and they shall take”? The use of the plural serves to qualify additional people who were excluded from the previous stage. It means that with regard to even a minor, who I disqualified there with regard to collecting the ash, here, with regard to sanctification, he is qualified.

¹³⁴ From where does Rabbi Yehuda derive that a woman is unfit? The verse states “and he shall put” and not: And she shall put. How do the Rabbis interpret this verse? They assume that if the Merciful One had written: And he shall take...and he shall put, I would have said the rite is not valid unless one person takes and the same one puts the ashes in the water. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “and they shall take” to indicate that the taking and the putting need not necessarily be executed by the same individual.

¹³⁵ And if the Merciful One had written two plural forms such as: And they shall take...and they shall put, I would have said the rite is not valid unless two people take and two people put. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “and they shall take” and “and he shall put” (Numbers 19:17), to indicate that even if two take and one puts the rite is nevertheless valid.

¹³⁶ The Gemara continues to expound the verses: “And a man who is pure shall take hyssop and dip it into the water” (Numbers 19:18). According to the Rabbis, who hold that the sanctification of the ashes in the previous stage may be performed by woman but not a minor, the word “man” indicates that for this stage, the taking and dipping of hyssop, only a man is qualified but not a woman, and the word “pure” is written to qualify even a minor for this stage. And according to Rabbi Yehuda, who holds the previous stage may be performed by a minor but not by a woman, the word man indicates that for this stage only an adult is qualified but not a minor, and the word pure is written to qualify even a woman for this stage.

¹³⁷ The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna in tractate Para: Everyone is qualified to sprinkle the purification waters, except for a person whose sexual organs are concealed [tumtum], and a hermaphrodite [androgynus], and a woman. And concerning a minor who has a basic level of intelligence, a woman may assist him and he sprinkles the purification waters. The mishna disqualifies a woman for the sprinkling but qualifies a minor.

¹³⁸ And Rabbi Yehuda does not disagree. The mishna implies that even he agrees with the mishna’s ruling.

¹³⁹ Abaye said: Since the Master, i.e., Ulla, said: In some stages, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse precludes the application of conditions that are implied by a previous verse describing a previous stage, whereas in other stages, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse stand on their own and also apply in subsequent stages. Since it is clear from the opinion of the Rabbis that the verse describing the taking and dipping of hyssop is to be understood as indicating a change of conditions, perforce Rabbi Yehuda must also assume that there is a change in conditions,

as explained above. Therefore, he certainly disagrees with the mishna's ruling, even though his dissenting opinion is not recorded in the mishna.

¹⁴⁰ The Gemara expounds the next verse: "And the pure one shall sprinkle upon the impure" (Numbers 19:19). The previous verse already states that the one who sprinkles must be ritually pure. This requirement is repeated here to make the following inference: He is pure, which by inference suggests that initially he was ritually impure and has now removed that impurity. This fact is significant only if the reference is to a person who has still not completed his purification process. As such, the repetition of the requirement that the one who sprinkles be pure teaches about one who immersed that day, that he is qualified to sprinkle the waters in the rite of the red heifer. This is one who was rendered ritually impure with a type of ritual impurity from which he will become fully ritually pure only upon nightfall.

¹⁴¹ Rabbi Asi said: When Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish analyzed the passage of the red heifer to try to identify a consistent pattern in the way the implied conditions should be understood, i.e., when they exist to preclude conditions implied in previous stages, and when they imply conditions that remain in force in subsequent stages. They brought up from it only as the amount of earth that the fox brings up from a plowed field, meaning that they reached few conclusions. Rather, they said in conclusion that in some verses the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse preclude the application of conditions that are implied by a previous verse; whereas in other verses, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse stand on their own and apply also in subsequent verses. However, there is no obvious pattern of how to determine which verse employs which style.

¹⁴² A tanna who would recite baraitot in the study hall recited a baraita before Rabbi Yoḥanan: All slaughterings are valid if performed by a non-priest, except that of the red heifer. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Go out and teach that baraita outside the house of study, but not inside, as it is incorrect. We have not found any case of a slaughtering by a non-priest that is invalid.

¹⁴³ The Gemara comments: And Rabbi Yoḥanan was very convinced of this. Needless to say that he did not listen to that tanna, but he did not even listen to his own teacher, who maintained the same opinion as cited by the tanna, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzadak: The slaughtering of the red heifer by a non-priest is invalid. Rabbi Yoḥanan added: And I say it is valid, for we have not found any case of a slaughtering by a non-priest that is invalid.

¹⁴⁴ The mishna states: The High Priest comes and stands next to his bull a second time and confesses: Please God, I have sinned...I and my family and the children of Aaron, your sacred people. The Gemara asks: What is different about the first confession that he made over the bull, in which he did not say: And the children of Aaron, your sacred people, and what is different about the second confession in which he said: And the children of Aaron, your sacred people?

¹⁴⁵ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: That is the method to which the attribute of justice lends itself: Better that an innocent person should come and gain atonement on behalf of the guilty, and a guilty person should not come and gain atonement on behalf of another guilty person. At the first confession, the High Priest has still not achieved atonement for himself. Therefore, it is more appropriate for him to wait until the second confession to seek atonement for the priesthood.

¹⁴⁶ MISHNA: The High Priest would slaughter the bull and receive its blood in a bowl, and give it to the one who stirs it. The stirrer would stand on the fourth row of tiles in the Sanctuary and stir the blood lest it coagulate while the High Priest sacrificed the incense. He would take a coal pan and

ascend to the top of the altar and clear the upper layer of coals to this side and to that side and with the coal pan scoop up coals from among the inner, consumed coals. And he would then descend and place the coal pan with the coals on the fourth row of tiles in the Temple courtyard.

¹⁴⁷ The mishna comments on some of the contrasts between the service and protocols followed on Yom Kippur and those followed throughout the rest of the year: On every other day, a priest would scoop up the coals with a coal pan made of silver and pour the coals from there into a coal pan of gold. But on this day, on Yom Kippur, the High Priest scoops up with a coal pan of gold, and with that coal pan he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies.

¹⁴⁸ On every other day, a priest scoops up the coals with a coal pan of four kav and pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. But on this day, the High Priest scoops with one of three kav, and with it he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Yosei says a variation of this distinction: On every other day, a priest scoops up the coals with a coal pan of a se'a, which is six kav and then pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. But on this day, the High Priest scoops with a coal pan of three kav, and with it he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies.

¹⁴⁹ On every other day, the coal pan was heavy. But on this day it was light, so as not to tire the High Priest. On every other day, its handle was short, but on this day it was long so that he could also use his arm to support its weight. On every other day, it was of greenish gold, but on this day it was of a red gold. These are the statements of Rabbi Menahem.

¹⁵⁰ On every other day, a priest sacrificed a peras, half a maneh, of incense in the morning, and a peras in the afternoon, but on this day the High Priest adds an additional handful of incense and burns it in the Holy of Holies. On every other day, the incense was ground fine as prescribed by the Torah, but on this day it was superfine.

¹⁵¹ On every other day, priests ascend on the eastern side of the ramp and descend on its western side, but on this day the High Priest ascends in the middle of the ramp and descends in the middle. Rabbi Yehuda says: There was no difference in this regard. Even during the rest of the year, the High Priest always ascends in the middle of the ramp and descends in the middle, due to his eminence.

¹⁵² On every other day, the High Priest sanctifies his hands and his feet from the laver like the other priests, and on this day he sanctifies them from the golden flask, due to the eminence of the High Priest. Rabbi Yehuda says there was no difference in this regard. Even during the rest of the year, the High Priest always sanctifies his hands and his feet from the golden flask.

¹⁵³ On every other day there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar, but on this day there were five; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: On every other day there were three, but on this day there were four. Rabbi Yehuda says: On every other day there were two, but on this day there were three.

¹⁵⁴ GEMARA: The mishna states that the blood of the bull is stirred by a priest standing on the fourth row of tiles in the Sanctuary, while the High Priest sacrifices the incense in the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: But is it not written “And there shall be no man in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, until he comes out” (Leviticus 16:17). How then could the stirrer be standing in the Sanctuary? Rav Yehuda said: Emend and teach the mishna as saying: The fourth row of tiles of the Sanctuary, i.e., outside the Sanctuary on the fourth row from its entrance.

¹⁵⁵ The Sages taught in a baraita: The verse states: “And there shall be no man in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, until he comes out.” The verse prohibits anyone to be inside the Tent of Meeting during the burning of the incense.

¹⁵⁶ I might have thought nobody should be present, even in the Temple courtyard. Therefore, the verse states “in the Tent of Meeting,” limiting the prohibition to the Temple itself. I have derived only that a prohibition exists in the Tent of Meeting of the Tabernacle that was in the desert, from where do I derive that the prohibition applies also to the Tabernacle that stood in Shiloh, and that it applies also to the Eternal House, i.e., the Temple in Jerusalem? The verse states “in the Sanctuary,” indicating that the prohibition applies to any Sanctuary.

¹⁵⁷ I have derived only that a prohibition exists during the burning of the incense; from where do I derive that the prohibition applies also during the presentations of the bull’s blood in the Holy of Holies? The verse states: “When he goes in to make atonement,” and atonement is achieved through the presentations of blood. I have derived only that a prohibition exists from the time of his entrance into the Holy of Holies; from where is it derived that the prohibition remains in force until his exit? The verse states: “Until he comes out.”

¹⁵⁸ The baraita concludes by expounding the final part of the verse: “And have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel” (Leviticus 16:17). This teaches that his atonement precedes the atonement of his household; the atonement of his household precedes that atonement of his brethren, the priests; the atonement of his brethren, the priests, precedes the atonement of the entire community of Israel.

¹⁵⁹ The Gemara analyzes the baraita: The Master said in the baraita: I have derived only that a prohibition exists during the burning of the incense. From where in the verse could this have been inferred? Rava said, and similarly Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Avdimi said, and similarly Rabbi Elazar said: The conclusion of that verse states: “And have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel.” Which act of atonement is the same for him, and for his household, and for his brethren, the priests, and for the entire community of Israel? You must say this is the burning of the incense.

¹⁶⁰ Does incense effect atonement? The Torah mentions the concept of atonement only with regard to offerings. Yes, as Rabbi Ḥananya teaches in a baraita: We learned of the incense that it effects atonement, as it is stated: “And he put on the incense and made atonement for the people” (Numbers 17:12). And the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: For what does incense effect atonement? For slander. And why is that? Let something that is done in secret, i.e., the incense, which is burned in seclusion within the Sanctuary, come and effect atonement for an act done in secret, i.e., slander, which is generally said in private.

¹⁶¹ We learned in a mishna there: They remove themselves from the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar during the burning of the incense. Rabbi Elazar said: They taught that this is true only during the burning of the incense of the Sanctuary, but during the burning of the incense in the innermost chamber, i.e., the Holy of Holies, people are required to remove themselves only from the Sanctuary. They do not need to remove themselves from the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar.

¹⁶² Rav Adda bar Ahava raised an objection to Rabbi Elazar’s opinion from a baraita, and some say it unattributed: Rabbi Yosei says: Just as they remove themselves from the area between the Entrance

Hall and the altar during the burning of the incense, they similarly remove themselves during the blood presentations of the bull of the anointed priest, i.e., of the High Priest, which he brings if he issues an erroneous halakhic ruling and acts upon it; and also during the blood presentations of the bull for an unwitting communal sin brought if the Sanhedrin issues an erroneous halakhic ruling and the community acts upon it; and also during the blood presentations of the goats of idol worship brought for an inadvertent communal transgression of idol worship.

¹⁶³ The baraita continues: If so, what higher standard is applicable to the Sanctuary relative to the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar? Only that those in the Sanctuary remove themselves both during the incense burning and also during the blood presentations, which is not during the incense burning. Those who are in the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar remove themselves only during the incense burning but not during the blood presentations.

¹⁶⁴ The Gemara explains the challenge: In any case, it is evident from the baraita that during the incense burning they do remove themselves. What, is it not referring to during the burning of the incense of the innermost chamber, i.e., the Holy of Holies? This would contradict Rabbi Elazar's opinion.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara defends his opinion: No, it is referring to during the burning of the incense of the Sanctuary. The Gemara asks: If so, how can the baraita say: What higher standard is applicable to the Sanctuary? This implies that it is superior only with respect to one higher standard. Are there not more? Surely, there is this higher standard, that whereas the people in the Sanctuary remove themselves both during its own, i.e., the Sanctuary's, incense burning and during the incense burning of the innermost chamber, i.e., the Holy of Holies, but in the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar they remove themselves only during the burning of the incense of the Sanctuary.

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara explains: This is in fact what the baraita is teaching: It is teaching only that those in the Sanctuary remove themselves both during the burning of the incense and also during the blood presentations, which is not during the burning of the incense; from the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar they do not remove themselves,

¹⁶⁷ except during the burning of the incense.

¹⁶⁸ But there is also this higher standard, that whereas from the Sanctuary they remove themselves both during its own sanctification, i.e., the blood presentations in the Sanctuary, and during the sanctification of the innermost chamber, i.e., the Holy of Holies, but from the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar, they remove themselves only during the sanctification of the Sanctuary. Rava said: Indeed, there are numerous distinctions, but the baraita teaches only one because all the distinctions fit into one category of removal.

¹⁶⁹ The Gemara continues to analyze the baraita: The Master said in the baraita: Just as they remove themselves from the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar during the burning of the incense, they similarly remove themselves during the blood presentations of the bull of the anointed priest; of the bull for an unwitting communal sin; and of the goats of idol worship. From where do we derive this? Rabbi Pedat said: It is derived by a verbal analogy between the word atonement said in connection with those offerings and the word atonement from the prohibition on Yom Kippur.

¹⁷⁰ Rav Aḥa bar Ahava said: Learn from this that there is a prohibition in the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar. The higher standards applied to the various areas in the Temple are defined by Torah law, and the Sages learned them as a tradition.

¹⁷¹ As if it could enter your mind that these standards are defined by rabbinic law, what is different about the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar that the prohibition applies only there? Perhaps other priests would accidentally happen to enter the Sanctuary while incense is burning there. But if that is the reason, then the rabbinic decree should require that they remove themselves also from the entire Temple courtyard, since perhaps they would accidentally happen to enter. The fact that the prohibition does not extend to the Temple courtyard suggests that the standards are defined by Torah law.

¹⁷² The Gemara rejects Rav Aḥa bar Ahava's reasoning: The prohibition could indeed be rabbinic. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to limit it to the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar, as follows: Since there is nothing that separates it from the Sanctuary, the distinction between the two areas is not conspicuous, and therefore people may err and enter. But with regard to the Temple courtyard, since there is the outer altar that separates the rest of the Temple courtyard from the Sanctuary, the distinction between the areas is conspicuous, and therefore there is no need to extend the prohibition throughout the Temple courtyard.

¹⁷³ Rava said: Learn from this fact that there is a rabbinic prohibition in the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar. The sanctity of the Entrance Hall and the sanctity of the Sanctuary is one matter, i.e., there they share the same sanctity, and therefore the Torah prohibition applies to the Entrance Hall as well. For if it could enter your mind to say that these areas have two distinct levels of sanctity, it would emerge that the prohibition to be in the Entrance Hall is itself a rabbinic decree. But will we arise and issue one decree to prevent violation of another decree by prohibiting being present in the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar, lest one enter the Entrance Hall itself?

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara rejects Rava's reasoning: No, this would not be a case of issuing one decree to prevent violation of another decree, because the Entrance Hall and the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar share one sanctity. Consequently, any prohibition applied to one will certainly also apply to the other. However, the Sanctuary and the Entrance Hall have two distinct sanctities.

¹⁷⁵ § The mishna states: On every other day, a priest would scoop up the coals with a coal pan made of silver and pour the coals from there into a coal pan of gold. The Gemara asks: What is the reason the gold pan was not used to scoop the coals? The Gemara answers: Because the Torah spared the money of the Jewish people. Since the pan is worn away with use, it is preferable to use a less expensive silver pan.

¹⁷⁶ § The mishna continues: But on this day, on Yom Kippur, the High Priest scoops up with a coal pan of gold, and with that coal pan, he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that on Yom Kippur only one pan is used? Due to the weakness of the High Priest. He has to perform the entire service by himself while fasting; using only one pan minimizes his exertion.

¹⁷⁷ § The mishna states: On every other day, a priest scoops up the coals with a coal pan of four kav and pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. Rabbi Yosei says: On every other day, a priest scoops with a coal pan of a se'a, which is six kav, and then pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. It was taught in a mishna (Tamid 33a): As he poured from a pan of four kav to a pan of three kav, a kav

of coals became scattered, and he swept them into the canal that passed through the Temple and ran to the Kidron brook.

¹⁷⁸ It was taught in one baraita: A kav of coals was scattered. And it was taught in another baraita: Two kav were scattered. The Gemara comments: Granted, this baraita, which teaches that a single kav was scattered, is understandable. It is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, the first tanna of the mishna, who maintain that coals are poured from a coal pan of four kav to one of three. But that baraita, which teaches that two kav of coals were scattered, in accordance with whose opinion is it? It is not in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis and not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. According to Rabbi Yosei, three kav of coals would have been scattered.

¹⁷⁹ Rav Ḥisda said: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, says: With a coal pan of two kav he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies. If one accepts the opinion of the Rabbis that the coals were scooped with a coal pan of four kav, two kav were scattered.

¹⁸⁰ Rav Ashi said: You can even say that this baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and this is what he is saying: On every other day, a priest scooped with a coal pan of a desert se'a, which is five Jerusalem kav, and then he poured the coals into a coal pan of three Jerusalem kav. Therefore, two kav would be scattered.

¹⁸¹ § The mishna states: On every other day, the coal pan was heavy, but on this day it was light. It was taught in a baraita: On every other day its side was thick but on this day it was soft and thin. On every other day its handle was short but on this day it was long. What is the reason? So that the arm of the High Priest could assist him in carrying the coal pan, i.e., he could support the coal pan by resting it against his arm rather than bear the entire weight in his hand.

¹⁸² It was taught in a baraita: On every other day it did not have a ring, but on this day it has a ring on the end of the handle, which clatters against it and makes a noise in fulfillment of the verse “And the sound thereof shall be heard when he goes in to the Sanctuary” (Exodus 28:35); this is the statement of the son of the Deputy.

¹⁸³ § The mishna states: On every other day, it was of greenish gold but on this day it was of a red gold. Rav Ḥisda said: There are seven types of gold mentioned in the Bible: Gold, and good gold, and gold of Ophir (I Kings 10:11), and glistening gold (I Kings 10:18), and shaḥut gold (I Kings 10:17), and closed gold (I Kings 10:21), and parvayim gold (II Chronicles 3:6). The Gemara explains the reason for these names: There is a distinction between gold and good gold, as it is written in the verse: “And the gold of that land is good” (Genesis 2:12), which indicates the existence of gold of a higher quality. Gold of Ophir is gold that comes from Ophir. Glistening [mufaz] gold is so named

¹⁸⁴ because it resembles the luster of pearls [paz] in the way it glistens. Shaḥut gold is named as such because it is very malleable and is spun like thread [shenitve keḥut]. Shaḥut is a contraction of the words shenitve keḥut. Closed gold is so called because when a shop opens to sell it, all the other shops close, as no one is interested in purchasing any other type of gold. Parvayim gold is so called because its redness resembles the blood of bulls [parim].

¹⁸⁵ Rav Ashi said: There are in fact only five types of gold, the last five in Rav Ḥisda's list. Gold and good gold are not independent categories; rather, each and every one of the types of gold has two

varieties: Regular gold and a superior variety called good gold. That was also taught in a baraita with regard to parvayim gold: On every other day the coal pan was made of greenish gold, but on this day it was made of a red gold, and this is the parvayim gold which resembles the blood of bulls.

¹⁸⁶ § The mishna states: On every other day, a priest sacrificed a peras, half of a maneh, of incense in the morning, and a peras in the afternoon, but on this day the High Priest adds an additional handful of incense and burns it in the Holy of Holies. On every other day, the incense was ground fine as prescribed by the Torah, but on this day it was superfine. The Sages taught in a baraita: The verse states with regard to the incense on Yom Kippur that it is “finely ground aromatic incense” (Leviticus 16:12). What does the verse mean to teach by this? Has it not already been stated: “And you shall grind some of it finely” (Exodus 30:36)? Rather, it teaches that on Yom Kippur the incense has to be superfine.

¹⁸⁷ § The mishna states: On every other day, priests ascend on the eastern side of the ramp. A baraita explains the reason for this: As the Master said: All the turns that you turn should be only to the right, which, after ascending the altar, means one will turn to the east and will mean one will circulate the altar in a counter-clockwise fashion. When they descended, they again turned to the right, which is to the west of the ramp.

¹⁸⁸ § The mishna continues: But on this day the priests ascend in the middle of the ramp and descend in the middle. What is the reason? Due to the eminence of the High Priest he should not walk on the side but in the middle.

¹⁸⁹ § We learned in the mishna that every other day the High Priest sanctifies his hands and his feet from the laver like the other priests, and on this day he sanctifies them from the golden flask. What is the reason? Due to the eminence of the High Priest.

¹⁹⁰ § The mishna states: On every other day, there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar, but on this day there were five. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: On every other day there were two arrangements of wood on the altar, but on this day there were three: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for coals for the incense; and one, the additional arrangement of wood, which they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

¹⁹¹ Rabbi Yosei says: On every other day there were three arrangements, but on this day there were four: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for the incense; and one, for the upkeep of the fire, so that if the fire of the large arrangement begins to die down, wood from this arrangement may be added to it to raise the flames; and one, the additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies.

¹⁹² Rabbi Meir says: On every other day there were four arrangements of wood on the altar but on this day there were five: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for the incense; and one, for the upkeep of the fire; and one, for burning the limbs and fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening; and one, the additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies.

¹⁹³ The Gemara analyzes the different opinions: At any rate, everyone has at least two arrangements in their calculations. From where do we derive this? The verse states: “It is the burnt-offering on the flame on the altar all night” (Leviticus 6:2); this is referring to the large arrangement. It states further:

“And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:2), this additional mention of a fire is referring to the second arrangement, which is for the incense. And from where does Rabbi Yosei learn about the additional arrangement for the upkeep of the fire? He derives it from the verse: “And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:5), which mentions fire for the third time.

¹⁹⁴ And how does Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that normally there are only two arrangements, explain this third mention of a fire? That additional mention comes to teach about the kindling of the thin wood chips, which were used to ignite the fires on the altar, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda would say: From where is it derived that the kindling of the wood chips should be done only at the top of the altar, rather than setting them alight at the bottom of the altar and carrying them up? The verse states: “And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:5), which indicates that the fire that is brought there has to be lit on the altar itself. Rabbi Yosei said: From where is it derived that an arrangement for the upkeep of the fire is made? The verse states: “And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:5).

¹⁹⁵ And from where does Rabbi Yosei derive that the kindling of the wood chips should be at the top of the altar? He derives it from the same place that Rabbi Shimon derives it. As it was taught in a baraita: The verse states: “And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar” (Leviticus 1:7), which teaches about the kindling of the wood chips that it may be done only by a fit priest and one who is robed in the priestly vestments of service; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Shimon said to him: There is no need for a verse to teach that a priest must kindle the chips, for could it enter your mind that a non-priest could approach the altar? Rather, this verse teaches about the kindling of the wood chips, that they may be lit only at the top of the altar.

¹⁹⁶ And what would Rabbi Yehuda respond to Rabbi Shimon’s reasoning? If this halakha was derived from there, I would have said a non-priest could light the fire on the altar by standing on the ground below and using a bellows to fan the flames on the top of the altar. Therefore, this verse teaches us that in all circumstances the person kindling the fire must be a priest.

¹⁹⁷ And from where does Rabbi Meir learn about an additional arrangement for the limbs and the fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening? He derives it from the phrase “and the fire.” The apparently superfluous word “and” alludes to the existence of an additional arrangement. And the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Yehuda, who disagree, do not expound the word “and.”

¹⁹⁸ And according to the Rabbis, what do they do with the limbs and the fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening? Where are they burned? A priest returns them to the large arrangement, where the process of their burning is completed. As it was taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that for limbs and fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening,

¹⁹⁹ that they are arranged upon the altar, and if the space on the altar cannot hold them, that they are arranged upon the ramp or upon the ledge that protrudes from the altar, until the large arrangement is made the following day and then they are arranged upon it? The verse states: “That which the fire will consume of the burnt-offering, on the altar” (Leviticus 6:3). This is taken to mean that those items that the fire already consumed are once again placed upon the altar.

²⁰⁰ And how does Rabbi Meir expound this verse? He derives from it that if parts of a burnt-offering that were already partially consumed on the altar fell off the altar, you should return them to continue burning; but you do not return incense that was consumed and fell off of the inner incense altar. As Rabbi Ḥananya bar Minyomi from the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov taught in a baraita: The verse states: "That which the fire will consume of the burnt-offering on the altar" (Leviticus 6:3). This teaches that if parts of a burnt-offering that were partially consumed fell off the altar, you should return them; but you do not return incense that was partially consumed and fell off the altar.

²⁰¹ At any rate, everyone assumes there is an additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day, i.e., Yom Kippur, for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies. From where do they derive this? They derive it from the verse "And the fire upon the altar" (Leviticus 6:5). The apparently superfluous words "and the" allude to an additional fire. And even one who does not generally expound the word "and" does expound the phrase "and the."

²⁰² The Gemara notes that there is an additional mention of the altar fire, which has not yet been explained: The phrase "a perpetual fire" (Leviticus 6:6), for what halakha does it come to teach? It is required for the halakha that was taught in the following baraita: The verse states: "A perpetual fire shall be kept burning on the altar, it shall not go out" (Leviticus 6:6). This teaches about the second arrangement of wood to produce coals for the incense, that it is set up only on the outer altar.

²⁰³ From where is it derived that coals of fire that are taken with a coal pan for the incense on Yom Kippur and for the fire for lighting the candelabrum must also be from the outer altar? It is a logical derivation. "Fire" is stated with regard to the daily incense offering, and "fire" is stated with regard to the incense coal pan and the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from upon the outer altar, so too here, in the case of the incense coal pan and the candelabrum, the fire should be taken from upon the outer altar.

²⁰⁴ If the matter is derived through reasoning, it is also possible to posit an alternative argument: Or, alternatively, one could go this way. "Fire" is stated with regard to the daily incense offering, and "fire" is stated with regard to the incense coal pan and the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from a place near to it, i.e., the outer altar, so too, in the case of the incense coal pan and the candelabrum, the fire should be taken from a place near to it, i.e., the inner altar.

²⁰⁵ Since there are two equally logical derivations, a verse is required to teach the halakha. The verse states: "A perpetual fire shall be kept burning on the altar, it shall not go out" (Leviticus 6:6). The "perpetual fire" that I told you, i.e., the fire of the candelabrum, about which the Torah states "a lamp to burn continually" (Exodus 27:20), should be lit only from a fire that is upon the top of the outer altar.

²⁰⁶ We have therefore learned the source for the fire for the candelabrum. From where do we derive the same halakha for the fire for the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur? It is a logical derivation. "Fire" is stated with regard to the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur, and "fire" is stated with regard to the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the candelabrum, the fire is taken from upon the outer altar, so too, here, in the case of the incense coal pan, the fire should be taken from upon the outer altar.

²⁰⁷ If the matter is derived through reasoning, it is also possible to posit an alternative argument: Or, alternatively, one could go this way: "Fire" is stated with regard to the daily incense offering, and

“fire” is stated with regard to the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from a place near to it, i.e., the outer altar, so too, here, in the case of fire for the incense coal pan, the fire should be taken from a place near to it, i.e., the inner altar.

²⁰⁸ Since there are two equally logical derivations, a verse is required to teach the halakha: The verse states: “And he shall take a pan full of coals of fire from upon the altar from before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:12). The description of the altar being “from before the Lord” suggests it is not entirely before the Lord. Which altar is only partially before the Lord, but not all of it is before the Lord, i.e., part of it lies directly parallel to the Sanctuary, but part of it does not? You must say that this is the outer altar. Only the western side of it lies parallel to the entrance to the Sanctuary. In contrast, the inner altar is entirely within the Sanctuary and so is considered entirely before the Lord.

²⁰⁹ And it is necessary to write “from upon the altar” and it is necessary to write “from before God” because if the Merciful One had written only “from upon the altar” I would have said: What altar is the verse referring to? The inner altar. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “from before God.” And if the Merciful One had written only “from before God,” I would have said it means specifically from the part of the altar that lies before God, i.e., from the northwestern corner, which lies directly parallel to the entrance of the Sanctuary;

²¹⁰ but from this side or from that side of the altar, both of which are not directly in front of the Sanctuary’s entrance, I would say that no, the fire may not be taken from there. Therefore, it is necessary to write both terms in order to teach this halakha.

²¹¹ Rabbi Elazar said in the name of bar Kappara: Rabbi Meir would say: With regard to limbs of a burnt-offering that remained on the altar from the previous night and which were not fully consumed, one should make a separate arrangement of wood for them and arrange them upon it to be burned. And this is done even on Shabbat.

²¹² What is bar Kappara teaching us when he informs us that Rabbi Meir requires a separate arrangement to be made? Surely, we already learned this in the mishna that cites Rabbi Meir as saying: On every other day, there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Avin said: Bar Kappara’s teaching is needed only in order to teach the requirement to set up a fourth arrangement, even though it is only for limbs of disqualified offerings. As certain disqualifications apply only ab initio, if the offering is nevertheless brought upon the altar it should not then be removed. Bar Kappara teaches that Rabbi Meir’s ruling applies in the event that limbs of such an offering were not fully consumed.

²¹³ The Gemara qualifies this: But this applies specifically when the fire has already taken hold of them and they have begun to burn. But if the fire has not yet taken hold of them, no, a separate arrangement is not made in order to burn them.

²¹⁴ There are those who say a different version of this qualification: Both with regard to the limbs of valid offerings and of disqualified offerings, if the fire has already taken hold of them and they have begun to burn, yes, a separate arrangement is made to burn them, but if the fire did not take hold of them, no, a separate arrangement is not made in order to burn them.

²¹⁵ Bar Kappara concluded: And this is done even on Shabbat. But surely, we already learned this in the mishna that cites Rabbi Meir as saying: But on this day, on Yom Kippur, there are five. This

means that the arrangement for burning any remaining limbs is made also on Yom Kippur, despite the fact that all the Shabbat prohibitions apply.

²¹⁶ The Gemara answers: Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Nevertheless, bar Kappara's teaching is necessary, for it could enter your mind to say that this applies only when Yom Kippur occurs after Shabbat, i.e., on Sunday. Perhaps only in such a case is a separate arrangement made, based on the accepted law that leftover fats of Shabbat offerings are sacrificed and burned on Yom Kippur. However, if Yom Kippur occurs in the middle of the week, then perhaps no, a separate arrangement is not made in order to burn them. Therefore, bar Kappara teaches us that Rabbi Meir's ruling applies in all cases.

²¹⁷ Rava said: Who is this that does not care about his flour, i.e., he does not truly care about what he says and speaks imprecisely? Did we not learn in the mishna: On every other day. This clearly implies that Rabbi Meir's ruling applies equally to all days of the week. As such, Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov's justification for bar Kappara's teaching is already implied in Rabbi Meir's words in the mishna. The Gemara comments: Indeed, it is difficult.

²¹⁸ The Gemara comments: Both Rava and bar Kappara hold that a separate arrangement is made even on Shabbat. This disagrees with the opinion of Rav Huna, who said: The beginning of the sacrificial service of the daily offering, i.e., its slaughter, the sprinkling of its blood, and its burning overrides Shabbat; the end of its service, i.e., the burning of its sacrificial parts, does not override Shabbat.

²¹⁹ The Gemara analyzes Rav Huna's statement: Returning to the matter itself: Rav Huna said: The beginning of the sacrificial service of the daily offering overrides a halakha, whereas the end of its service does not override a halakha.

²²⁰ Previously, the Gemara assumed that Rav Huna was discussing the possibility that the sacrifice of the daily offering overrides Shabbat. The Gemara now clarifies if this was his intention: What is meant by saying that the end of its service does not override the halakha? Rav Ḥisda said: Although the end of its service does override Shabbat, it does not override the halakha that it should not be brought in a state of ritual impurity. This is true although the beginning of the sacrificial service of the daily offering may, if necessary, be brought in a state of ritual impurity. And Rabba said: The end of its service overrides only the halakha that it should not be brought in a state of ritual impurity, but it does not override Shabbat.

²²¹ Abaye said to Rabba: It poses a difficulty to your opinion, and it poses a difficulty to the opinion of Rav Ḥisda. It is difficult to your opinion as follows: What is different about the prohibition of bringing an offering in a state of ritual impurity that the daily offering overrides it? Because it is written with regard to the daily offering "in its season" (Numbers 28:2), to emphasize that it should be brought under all circumstances, even if that means that it will be brought in a state of ritual impurity. But, by that logic, the daily offering should also override Shabbat. Because the term "in its season" emphasizes that it should be brought under all circumstances, this means even on Shabbat.

²²² And it is difficult to the opinion of Rav Ḥisda: What is different about Shabbat that the daily offering overrides it? Because it is written "in its season," to emphasize that it should be brought under all circumstances, even on Shabbat. But by that logic, the daily offering should also override the prohibition of bringing an offering in a state of ritual impurity. Because the term "in its season"

emphasizes that it should be brought under all circumstances, this means even in a state of ritual impurity.

²²³ Rabba said to him: It is not difficult to my opinion and it does not pose a difficulty to the opinion of Rav Ḥisda. It is not difficult to my opinion, because I hold that the end of its sacrificial rite is like its beginning.

²²⁴ Therefore, with regard to overriding the prohibition to bring an offering in a state of ritual impurity, since the beginning of the sacrifice of the daily offering is fit to override the prohibition of offering it in a state of ritual impurity, so too, its end also overrides the prohibition. However, in the case of Shabbat, the beginning of a daily offering of the weekday is not fit to override Shabbat, since by definition it must be brought on its appropriate day. Therefore, its end also does not override Shabbat in the event that limbs remain from Friday's daily offering.

²²⁵ And it is also not difficult to the opinion of Rav Ḥisda, because he does not hold that its end is like its beginning. Rather, he has the following reasoning: The prohibitions of Shabbat are not merely overridden in the case of a communal offering, but they are actually permitted, such that there is no need to try to avoid performing the necessary labors when sacrificing it. Therefore, its end also overrides Shabbat.

²²⁶ However, in the case of the prohibition to bring an offering in a state of ritual impurity, which is merely overridden in the case of a communal offering, it is preferable to avoid doing so. Therefore, the beginning of its sacrifice, i.e., its slaughter and the sprinkling of its blood, and its burning, which is the essential stage that provides atonement, overrides the prohibition and should be done even in a state of ritual impurity. However, its end, i.e., the burning of the sacrificial parts, which is not the essential stage that provides atonement, does not override the prohibitions.

²²⁷ The Torah prohibits the fire on the altar to be extinguished: "A perpetual fire shall be kept burning on the altar, it shall not go out" (Leviticus 6:6). With regard to this prohibition, an amoraic dispute was stated: With regard to one who extinguishes the fire of the coals that are taken with the coal pan for the incense on Yom Kippur or the fire of the coals that are taken in order to light the candelabrum, Abaye said: He is liable. Rava said: He is not liable.

²²⁸ The Gemara elaborates on the dispute: In a case where one extinguished a coal while still standing upon the top of the altar, everyone agrees that he is liable. This is because the verse explicitly is referring to extinguishing a flame "upon the altar." When they disagree, it is in a case where he brought the coals down to ground level and extinguished a coal there. Abaye said: He is liable, since it is still considered fire of the altar. Rava said: He is not liable, because once it has been removed from the altar it is considered removed and no longer part of the altar's fire. Therefore, the prohibition does not apply to it.

²²⁹ The Gemara asks: But if so, with regard to this ruling that Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: One who takes down a coal from upon the altar and extinguishes it is liable, in accordance with whose opinion is he ruling? Could he possibly be ruling in accordance with the opinion of Abaye? Certainly not. In disputes between Abaye and Rava, the halakha follows Rava.

²³⁰ The Gemara explains: You can even say his ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rava by making the following distinction: There, in the ruling of Rav Naḥman, the coal was not removed to fulfill its mitzva. Therefore, it is still considered to be part of the fire of the altar and the prohibition

still applies. Whereas, here, in the dispute between Abaye and Rava, this is a case of coal that was removed to fulfill its mitzva. Therefore, it is associated with its mitzva and no longer considered the fire of the altar.

²³¹ There are those who say a different version of the dispute:

²³² In a case where he brought the coals down to the ground and extinguished a coal there, everyone agrees that he is not liable. When they disagree it is in a case where one extinguished a coal while still standing upon the top of the altar. Abaye said: He is liable, since it is still considered fire of the altar. Rava said: He is not liable, because once it has been removed from the altar it is considered removed and no longer part of the altar's fire. Therefore, the prohibition does not apply to it.

²³³ The Gemara asks: But if so, with regard to this ruling that Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: He who takes down a coal from upon the altar and extinguishes it is liable, in accordance with whose opinion is his ruling? It would appear that it is neither in accordance with the opinion of Abaye, nor in accordance with the opinion of Rava. The Gemara explains: You can even say that his ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rava by making the following distinction: There, in the ruling of Rav Naḥman, the coal was not removed to fulfill its mitzva; it is therefore still considered to be part of the fire of the altar and the prohibition applies. Whereas, here, in the dispute between Abaye and Rava, this is a case of coal that was removed to fulfill its mitzva, and it is therefore associated with its mitzva and no longer considered the fire of the altar.

Chapter 5

¹ MISHNA: They brought out the spoon and the coal pan to the High Priest so he may perform the service of the incense. He scoops his handfuls from the incense and places it into the spoon. The High Priest with large hands fills the spoon with incense in an amount corresponding to the large size of his hands, and the High Priest with small hands fills the spoon with incense in an amount corresponding to the small size of his hands. And this was the measure of the spoon, i.e., it was made to correspond to the size of his hands. He took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand.

² GEMARA: The Gemara expresses surprise at the statement of the mishna. In an earlier mishna, the tanna already taught that the High Priest must bring the coal pan: He takes a coal pan and ascends to the top of the altar and rakes and descends. Why does the tanna mention the taking of the coal pan again? The Gemara explains: There the mishna deals with the coal pan of burning coals, and here the mishna is referring to the coal pan of incense, which he would later scoop out. As it was explicitly taught in a baraita: They brought out an empty spoon for him from the chamber of vessels, and a coal pan heaped with incense from the Chamber of the House of Avtinas.

³ § The mishna taught: He scoops his handfuls from the incense and places it into the spoon. The High Priest with large hands fills the spoon with incense corresponding to the large size of his hands, and the High Priest with small hands fills the spoon corresponding to the small size of his hands, and this was the measure of the spoon, according to the size of his hands. The Gemara asks: Why do I need a spoon on Yom Kippur? After all, the Merciful One states: "And he shall take a coal pan full of coals of fire from off the altar from before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small

and bring it within the veil” (Leviticus 16:12). This verse suggests that the handfuls are brought by hand rather than in a vessel.

⁴ The Gemara answers: The High Priest uses a spoon because it is impossible to perform the service otherwise. The Gemara elaborates: As what should we do? Let him bring in the coal pan and then bring in the incense? The Merciful One states one act of bringing for the coals and the incense, and not two acts of bringing.

⁵ Instead, let him take the incense by his handfuls and place the coal pan on top of his two handfuls and enter, carrying it all in one go. This suggestion is also impractical, as when he arrives there, in the Holy of Holies, what should he do? How can the High Priest put down the coal pan where it is? Let him take the coal pan in his teeth and lower it. Now, before a king of flesh and blood one would not do so, as it is disrespectful. All the more so, one would not act in this manner before the King of kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He.

⁶ The Gemara concludes: Therefore, it is impossible for the High Priest to behave in another way, and since it is impossible to act in any other manner, he acts as we find with regard to the sacrifices of the princes during the dedication of the Tabernacle. On that occasion, the princes brought spoons filled with incense: “One golden spoon of ten shekels full of incense” (Numbers 7:14).

⁷ § The mishna taught that the High Priest took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand. The Gemara questions this arrangement by citing a well-known maxim: The native is on the ground and the stranger is in the heavens; i.e., this is the opposite of what one would expect. The main component of the mitzva is the incense, while the coal pan is required only for burning the incense. Consequently, the High priest should carry the spoon, which contains the main component of the service, in his right hand, and the accessory in his left hand.

⁸ The Gemara explains: The service is performed in this manner for reasons of comfort, as this coal pan is greater in weight, since it holds the coals, and that spoon of incense weighs less. And even when the two of them are equal, when the spoon contains three kav of incense like the action of Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit, who could hold several kav in his exceptionally large hands, nevertheless, this coal pan is hot and must be held carefully in the right hand, and that spoon of incense is cold and is easily carried in the left.

⁹ § Since the Gemara has mentioned Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit, it discusses him further. They said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit that his hands were so large that he would scoop up four kav, which he would hold by his handfuls, and say: All the women selected the best they could for their children, but the selection of my mother rose to the roof, i.e., my mother chose the best. Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit is referring to himself, as he matured to a great height and stature. Some say he was referring to his mother’s selection of flour, in accordance with the statement of Rabba bar Yonatan. As Rabba bar Yonatan said that Rabbi Yehiel said: Flour is beneficial and healthy for the sick. Since his mother ate this flour when she was pregnant with him, her son grew heartily.

¹⁰ And some say this reference to selection is a euphemism for semen, in accordance with a statement of Rabbi Abbahu, as Rabbi Abbahu raised a contradiction between two verses. It is written: “For You have girded me [vatazreni] with strength for battle” (II Samuel 22:40), and it is written in a parallel verse: “Who girds me [hame’azreni] with strength” (Psalms 18:33). What is the difference between these two expressions? David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe: You selected me [zeritani] with the best drop of semen that my mother absorbed, with

which, You fashioned me [zeraztani] within her. This accounts for the variant forms of this expression.

¹¹ The Gemara continues to discuss Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit. They said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit: Once he was talking to a certain Arab in the market on Yom Kippur, and a drop of saliva sprayed from the Arab's mouth onto the clothes of Rabbi Yishmael, who was the High Priest at the time. This spittle rendered him ritually impure by rabbinic law, like the ritual impurity of a zav, preventing him from serving in the Temple. And his brother Yeshevav entered and served as High Priest on that day in his stead. And, consequently, their mother saw two of her sons serving as High Priests on a single day.

¹² And they further said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimḥit: Once he went out and talked to a certain officer [hegmon] in the market, and a drop of saliva sprayed from the officer's mouth onto the clothes of Rabbi Yishmael, and his brother Yosef entered and served as High Priest in his stead. And, again, their mother saw two of her sons serving as High Priests on a single day.

¹³ The Sages taught in a baraita: Kimḥit had seven sons, and they all served in the office of the High Priesthood, as High Priests or as his substitute. The Sages said to her: What good deeds did you perform to merit this? She said to them: In all my days, the beams of my house never saw the braids of my hair, as she was extremely modest and was strict about covering her hair even inside her own house. They said to her: Many women did so and did not succeed to such a degree; you must have been granted a special gift from God.

¹⁴ § The Sages taught: “And he shall take up from it his handful, of the fine flour of the meal-offering, and of its oil” (Leviticus 6:8). This verse teaches that he should not measure an amount for the handful of a meal-offering with a utensil, but he should separate it directly by hand. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is the halakha as to whether the High Priest may measure an amount for the handful of incense? Must the incense also be scooped by hand?

¹⁵ The Gemara explains the two sides of the dilemma: Perhaps there, in the case of the handful of a meal-offering, it is different, as it is written “in his handful,” which indicates that he must use his hand rather than a vessel. However here, where it is not written: In his hands, but “and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small” (Leviticus 16:12), perhaps this teaches that the handfuls of incense need not be taken directly by hand, and the High Priest may use a vessel to scoop out the required amount. Or perhaps this halakha is derived by means of a verbal analogy between “full” and “full,” from “his handful,” which is stated regarding the meal-offering. If this verbal analogy is accepted, the High Priest may likewise scoop the incense only by hand.

¹⁶ The Gemara suggests: Come and hear an answer from the mishna: And this was the measure of the spoon. What, is it not correct to infer from the mishna that although the required measure is a handful, the High Priest is not obligated to scoop with his hand, and if he wanted to measure a different amount, he may measure the incense with a vessel? The Gemara rejects this contention: No, this is what the mishna said; this is what it means: And so too, the High Priest would return and scoop the incense inside the Holy of Holies in precisely the same manner.

¹⁷ The Gemara asks: If so, I can learn from this that the High Priest scoops the incense, and again scoops. That is, after scooping once, the High Priest repeats the action and scoops again in the Holy of Holies. This issue is subject to a dispute in the Gemara below.

¹⁸ The Gemara rejects this claim: No; perhaps the mishna indeed means that if he wanted to measure a different amount, he may measure the incense with a vessel. The language of the mishna does not conclusively prove which interpretation is correct, and it is possible that the Gemara's previous inference from the mishna is accurate. Consequently, the issue of whether or not the High Priest scoops incense a second time in the Holy of Holies cannot be considered resolved. Alternatively, the mishna may mean that the High Priest must take neither less nor more, and therefore this statement has no bearing on the dispute with regard to his scooping.

¹⁹ § The Sages taught: "His handfuls" (Leviticus 2:2). I might have thought it should be overflowing from the handful, and therefore the verse states: "His handful" (Leviticus 6:8), which indicates a precise amount. If the halakha is based solely on the phrase "his handful," I might have thought the priest may pinch a small amount even with just his fingertips, not with his entire finger. Therefore, the verse states: "His handfuls" (Leviticus 2:2), meaning as people usually take a handful, i.e., with their whole hand. How should he perform this service? He scoops by closing his three fingers over the palm of his hand, and takes a handful from the flour of the meal-offering.

²⁰ And in a case of a meal-offering prepared in a pan and with regard to a meal-offering prepared in a deep container, when the flour was fried before being scooped and was therefore hard, the priest smooths with his thumb any flour that was overflowing above his handful, and with his little finger he smooths the flour that was pushing out below. And this precise taking of a handful of a meal-offering is the most difficult sacrificial rite in the Temple. The Gemara asks: This one is the hardest rite, and no other? But there is pinching, which is also considered extremely difficult, and there is taking the handful of incense, another complex rite. Rather, this taking of a handful of a meal-offering is one of the most difficult rites in the Temple.

²¹ § Rabbi Yoḥanan said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Uza'a raised a dilemma: What is the halakha with regard to the flour that remains between the fingers of his handfuls? Is this flour considered to be part of his handful, or is it considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering? The Gemara elaborates: Rav Pappa said that with regard to the flour that is on the inside, toward the hand, do not raise the dilemma, as it is certainly part of the handful. Likewise, with regard to the flour that is on the outside, do not raise the dilemma, as it is certainly part of the remainder of the flour, like the rest of the meal-offering.

²² Rather, let the dilemma be raised with regard to the flour between the inside and the outside. What is the status of this flour? Rav Yoḥanan said: Yehoshua ben Uza'a then resolved his own dilemma: The flour that is between is doubtful, and should be treated as questionable in status.

²³ The Gemara asks: How does one perform the Temple service in this doubtful case? Rabbi Ḥanina said: The priest first burns the handful by itself, and then he burns the flour that was between. For if you say that he should first burn the flour that was between, perhaps they are remainders, and they are therefore considered like remainders that became reduced between taking the handful and burning, as the priest has taken flour from the remainders of the meal-offering. And the Master said: With regard to remainders that became reduced between taking the handful and the burning, one may not burn the handful on their account.

²⁴ The Gemara asks: If so, that there is uncertainty as to whether or not this flour is considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering, now too, if the priest burns the in-between flour after burning the handful, one should apply here the principle: Whatever is partly burned in the fire of the altar is

subject to the prohibition do not burn. This principle states that if part of an item is burned on the altar, one who burns any other part of it, which is not designated for burning, has violated a prohibition. In this case, if the in-between flour is considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering, the priest who burns it transgresses that prohibition.

²⁵ Rav Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, said that the priest does not burn the flour as part of the meal-offering but burns it for the purpose of wood. In other words, he does not burn the flour as part of an offering but merely as fuel for the altar, which is permitted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: “But they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar” (Leviticus 2:12). This verse indicates that you may not bring up leaven and honey as a “sweet savor,” an offering. However, you may bring up leaven and honey and other materials for the purpose of wood.

²⁶ The Gemara asks: It works out well according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, but according to the opinion of the Rabbis, who reject Rabbi Eliezer’s halakha, what can be said? Rav Mari said: The solution is that fat priests take the handfuls of meal-offerings, as their fleshy fingers press against everything between them, and therefore no flour remains between the fingers. The Gemara states: Now that you have arrived at this conclusion, according to Rabbi Eliezer as well, it is appropriate that fat priests should take the handfuls *ab initio*, to avoid a situation of doubt.

²⁷ § *Bein habeinayim, pashat, umaḥatz, ufizer, veḥishev, baḥafinat, ḥaveiro*: This is a mnemonic for the ensuing questions of Rav Pappa. Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the halakha with regard to the in-between incense of his handfuls? The Gemara asks: What is his dilemma? If he derives the verbal analogy between “full” and “full” from his handfuls there, the case of the meal-offering handful, this case is the same as that one, and therefore the incense between his fingers is invalid. If Rav Pappa does not accept this verbal analogy, what is the basis of his dilemma?

²⁸ The Gemara explains that Rav Pappa raised the dilemma as follows: When the verse states: “And his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil” (Leviticus 16:12), does it mean that we merely require him to bring his handfuls, and that is fulfilled here, as in practice the High Priest brought full handfuls? Or perhaps we require that he must fulfill the following two commands in a similar manner: “And he shall take...and he shall bring” (Leviticus 16:12)? In other words, just as he must have the intention to take the incense, so too, he must intend to bring all of it. And that requirement is not fulfilled here, as he did not intend to bring the extra incense between his fingers. No answer was found for this question, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

²⁹ Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that the act of his handfuls of a meal-offering should be performed *ab initio* in the manner that people usually take a handful, with their fingertips pointed downward. However, Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the halakha if he took a handful with his fingertips, i.e., if he first put his palm into the vessel and filled his palm with flour by extending his fingers and drawing them in? Does this invalidate the taking of the handful or not?

³⁰ Furthermore, what is the halakha if he took the handful with the back of his hand placed downward in the vessel, and with his fingers collected the flour upward into his palm? Lastly, what is the halakha if he took the flour from the sides, by passing the back of his hand to and fro over the flour in the vessel with his fingers spread apart, so that the flour collects in his palm? As no answers were found for these dilemmas, the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

³¹ Likewise, Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that when the Torah states: “His hands full” (Leviticus 16:12), it means in the manner that people usually fill their hands, by placing the backs of their hands into the vessel and bringing their hands together. However, Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the halakha if the High Priest scooped a handful with his fingertips? Again, what is the halakha if he took a handful from downward to upward? What is the halakha if he took a handful from the side? And what is the halakha if he scooped a handful with this hand and with this hand and brought them together? These questions are not answered either, and the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

³² § Another dilemma was raised by

³³ Rav Pappa: What is the halakha in a case where he stuck the handful of flour onto the side of the vessel? After the flour of a meal-offering has been separated, it must be placed in a vessel for burning, an action that sanctifies the flour. Rav Pappa inquires as to what the halakha is if the priest places the flour on the sides, instead of on the bottom of the vessel. The Gemara clarifies the two sides of the dilemma: Do we require the handful to be inside the vessel, and that is the case here? Or perhaps we require the handful to be placed properly inside the vessel, and that is not fulfilled in this instance. No answer is found for this question, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

³⁴ Mar bar Rav Ashi raised a similar dilemma: What is the halakha if the priest overturned the vessel and stuck the handful to an indentation in the underside of the vessel? Do we require the handful to be inside the vessel, and that requirement is fulfilled here; or perhaps we require it to be placed properly in the vessel, and that is not the case here? With regard to this question as well, the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

³⁵ § Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: Should the handfuls to which the Sages referred be smoothed over or slightly overflowing? Rabbi Abba said to Rav Ashi: Come and hear an explicit statement in a baraita: The handfuls to which the Sages referred should be neither smoothed over nor overflowing, but full, without any flour spilling out.

³⁶ § We learned in a mishna there, in Zevaḥim 32a: If the blood of the sacrificial animal spilled on the floor instead of being collected directly into a vessel, and a priest collected it from there into a vessel, it is disqualified, as it was not collected properly. Conversely, if the blood spilled from the vessel onto the floor, after it was collected properly, and a priest collected it and put it back in the vessel, it is valid.

³⁷ The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? As the Sages taught in a halakhic midrash: “And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bull” (Leviticus 4:5); this means that the priest shall take from the blood of the soul, i.e., the bull’s blood that flows from the place of slaughter as the animal dies, and not from the blood of the skin, which bleeds out when the skin is cut before the slaughter, nor from the blood squeezed from an animal after the initial spurt.

³⁸ The baraita interprets the phrase “from the blood of the bull,” as though these words were written in a different order: Blood from the bull, i.e., the priest shall receive it directly. For if it should enter your mind that the letter mem, which means “from” in the phrase “from the blood of the bull,” is limiting and indicates that even if the priest received some of the blood, his action is acceptable, didn’t Rav Yehuda say: He who receives the blood must receive all of the blood of the bull, as it is stated: “And all the blood of the bull he shall pour out on the base of the altar” (Leviticus 4:7)? This

verse emphasizes that the priest must pour all of the bull's blood, which is possible only if he has collected all of it.

³⁹ Rather, learn from this that what is the meaning of the phrase: "From the blood of the bull"? It means that the priest must receive the blood directly from the bull. And this Sage maintains that the Sages subtract and add and interpret homiletically, i.e., one may take a letter from one word, insert it into a second word, and explain the phrase in that manner.

⁴⁰ § Rav Pappa raised a dilemma based on the above ruling: What is the halakha if the incense from his handfuls scattered? Is his hand considered like the neck of the animal, and the incense is disqualified? Or perhaps his hand is considered like a vessel used in the Temple service, and if the incense fell from his hand it is not disqualified. No answer was found for this question either, and the Gemara again concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

⁴¹ § Rav Pappa raised another dilemma: What is the halakha if the High Priest thought a disqualifying thought during the taking of the handful of the incense, e.g., if he intended to burn it after its appropriate time? Does this thought invalidate the rite or not? Do we say that this halakha is derived by means of a verbal analogy of "handfuls" and "handfuls," from the case of a meal-offering, as follows: Just as there, with regard to the meal-offering, thought is effective to invalidate it, so too here, with regard to taking a handful of incense, thought is effective to invalidate it? Or should the two cases not be compared?

⁴² Rav Shimi bar Ashi said to Rav Pappa: Come and hear a resolution to your dilemma: Rabbi Akiva added the handful of fine flour and the incense, and the frankincense, and the coals that are collected in a vessel, to the ruling of the Sages that if one who immersed himself during the day touched part of them, he disqualifies all of them. Due to the respect in which sacred objects are held, these objects are treated as one solid unit. This is so despite the fact that its parts are not really attached to each other but are separate small segments and therefore, logically, one who immersed himself during the day should disqualify only those parts of the item with which he came into direct contact.

⁴³ The Gemara explains: It enters your mind that from the fact that one who immersed himself during the day disqualifies these items by touch, therefore leaving them after their permitted time likewise disqualifies them; and from the fact that leaving them after their time disqualifies them, therefore thought likewise disqualifies them. Consequently, as incense is similar to flour with regard to ritual impurity, it is also disqualified by the priest's improper thought.

⁴⁴ § Rav Pappa raised another dilemma:

⁴⁵ What is the halakha if he thought invalidating thoughts during the raking of the coals? Does this thought invalidate the incense? The Gemara elaborates: The question here is whether actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are considered like the mitzva itself. If so, merely raking the coals, which facilitates the mitzva of the incense, is like burning the incense itself; therefore, an improper thought would disqualify the incense. Or perhaps actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are not considered part of the mitzva itself. No answer was found for this question either, and the Gemara once again concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

⁴⁶ § The Sages raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the halakha with regard to carrying the blood in one's left hand? Is this action valid, or is carrying, like receiving and sprinkling the blood, an act that must be performed with the right hand? Rav Sheshet said to them: We already learned it;

there is an answer to this question from the mishna: He took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand. This proves that although the spoon is carried in the left hand to the place of the service, the rite is valid.

⁴⁷ The Gemara asks: And let us resolve this dilemma for them from that which we learned in a mishna: The priest who is privileged to carry the head and the leg of the daily offering to the ramp carried the right leg in his left hand, with its entire hide facing outward and the place of the slaughter on the neck facing the priest. This mishna also proves that carrying with the left hand is acceptable.

⁴⁸ The Gemara rejects this contention: If the proof is from there, I would have said: That applies only to a type of carrying that does not invalidate atonement, as even if the limbs are not carried up to the altar, atonement is nevertheless achieved through the sprinkling of the blood. The rite is valid even if the limbs of the daily offering are not burned at all. However, with regard to the type of carrying that does invalidate atonement, e.g., carrying the blood to the altar, no, perhaps it must be done specifically with the right hand. Rav Sheshet therefore teaches us from the mishna that although carrying the spoon is necessary for the mitzva, the rite is nevertheless valid if it is carried in the left hand.

⁴⁹ The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: With regard to receiving, carrying, or sprinkling blood, if a non-priest, a mourner on his first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest, performed the rite, it is disqualified. And likewise if the priest was sitting, and likewise if he performed one of these rites with his left hand, it is disqualified. This statement contradicts the ruling of Rav Sheshet. The Gemara concludes: This is indeed a conclusive refutation, and Rav Sheshet's opinion is rejected.

⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: But wasn't Rav Sheshet the one who objected on the basis of this very baraita? As Rav Sheshet said to the interpreter of Rav H̥isda: Raise the following dilemma before Rav H̥isda: What is the halakha with regard to carrying the blood performed by a non-priest? He said to him: It is valid, and a verse supports me: "And they slaughtered the Paschal offering and the priests sprinkled with their hand, and the Levites flayed" (II Chronicles 35:11). This verse indicates that the priests took the blood from the hands of the Levites, from which it can be inferred that the Levites carried the blood from the place of slaughtering to the place of sprinkling.

⁵¹ And Rav Sheshet objected based on the aforementioned baraita: With regard to receiving, carrying, or sprinkling blood, if a non-priest, a mourner on his first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest, performed the rite, it is disqualified. This statement proves that carrying cannot be performed by a non-priest. Since Rav Sheshet himself cited this baraita in his objection, he was certainly familiar with it. How, then, could he issue a ruling in contradiction to the baraita?

⁵² The Gemara explains: After Rav Sheshet heard the baraita that was cited against his opinion, he objected to the ruling of Rav H̥isda from that same baraita. At first Rav Sheshet was unaware of the baraita, which is why he ruled against it, but when he learned it, he relied upon it to object to Rav H̥isda's statement. The Gemara asks: But didn't Rav H̥isda cite a verse in support of his opinion? How can a baraita contradict a verse? The Gemara answers: The verse does not mean that the Levites walked with the blood, but rather that they acted like benches and merely stood holding the bowls of blood in their hands.

⁵³ § The Gemara returns to the issue of appropriate methods for taking handfuls of incense. Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the halakha with regard to a case where another priest scooped and

placed the incense into the hands of the High Priest? The Gemara clarifies the two sides of the question: Do we require: “His full hands,” and that is fulfilled here, as in practice the High Priest has a handful of incense? Or perhaps we require that the High Priest must fulfill the mitzvot: “And he shall take...and he shall bring” (Leviticus 16:12), and that is not the case here, as the High Priest did not scoop and take the incense himself? This question was also left unanswered, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

⁵⁴ § Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi raised a dilemma: If the High Priest scooped and died, what is the halakha with regard to the possibility that another High Priest may replace him and enter with his handful? May the second priest enter the Holy of Holies with the incense that the first priest scooped, or must he start from the beginning of the process? Rabbi Ḥanina said to his students in excitement: Come and see that Sages from a later generation were able to ask a difficult question on par with the question of the earlier generations. Even I, Rabbi Ḥanina, asked this same question, which was posed by my elder, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi.

⁵⁵ The Gemara analyzes this comment: Is that to say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi was older than Rabbi Ḥanina, which is why Rabbi Ḥanina referred to him as an early Sage? But didn’t Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: Rabbi Ḥanina permitted me to drink cress juice on Shabbat for medicinal purposes. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s deference to Rabbi Ḥanina shows that Rabbi Ḥanina was older than him.

⁵⁶ Since it has been raised, the Gemara addresses the issue of cress juice on Shabbat: Did Rabbi Ḥanina permit him to drink cress juice? It is obvious that it is permitted to drink this juice; why would it be prohibited? As we learned in a mishna: All types of food that healthy people eat may be eaten by people even for medicinal purposes, and one may likewise drink all drinks for medicinal purposes, as the Sages did not include these in their decree against taking medicine on Shabbat.

⁵⁷ Rather, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s question was: Is it permitted to grind and drink cress on Shabbat? The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? If it involves a situation where there is danger to life, and this is the prescribed cure, it is certainly permitted; and if it is a case where there is no danger, it is prohibited as labor on Shabbat. The Gemara answers: Actually, the question concerns a case where there is a life-threatening danger, and this is the dilemma that he raised before him: Does this drink heal, which would mean that it is appropriate to violate Shabbat for it, or does it not heal, and therefore one should not violate Shabbat for it?

⁵⁸ The Gemara asks: And if this was not a halakhic question but a medical one, what is different about this question that led him to ask it specifically of Rabbi Ḥanina? The Gemara explains: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked Rabbi Ḥanina because he is an expert in medicines, as Rabbi Ḥanina said: No man ever consulted me about a wound inflicted by a white mule and recovered. This shows that people came to Rabbi Ḥanina for medical advice.

⁵⁹ The Gemara expresses surprise at this claim: But we see that people who are kicked by mules do survive. The Gemara answers that instead it should say: No man ever consulted me about a wound of this kind and the wound survives, i.e., the wound never heals. The Gemara challenges this statement as well: But we see that it does heal. The Gemara responds: We say that the wound will never heal only when the mules are red and the tops of their legs are white.

⁶⁰ The Gemara returns to its previous question. In any event, one can learn from this discussion that Rabbi Ḥanina was older than Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. Why, then, does Rabbi Ḥanina refer to

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi as a member of an earlier generation? Rather, we must explain that this is what he said, i.e., that Rabbi Ḥanina's statement should be understood as follows: Their question is like the question of the early ones. In other words, Rabbi Ḥanina meant that this question, posed by a member of a later generation, is as difficult as that of the early Sages.

⁶¹ The Gemara asks: And did Rabbi Ḥanina actually say that this question, of one High Priest using the incense scooped by another, was difficult to answer? But didn't Rabbi Ḥanina say: "With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull" (Leviticus 16:3); this means that the High Priest must enter with the offering of a bull and not with the blood of the bull? In other words, the High Priest himself must slaughter his bull. Should a different priest slaughter the bull, receive its blood, and then die, the priest who replaces him may not enter the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bull slaughtered by his predecessor. Instead, he must bring a new bull, slaughter it, collect its blood, and take that blood inside.

⁶² And likewise, Rabbi Ḥanina said: If the priest scooped the incense before the slaughtering of the bull, he did nothing, as the handful of incense must be taken after the slaughter of the bull. If so, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina, it is impossible for a priest to enter the Sanctuary with the handful taken by his fellow priest. The reason is that if the first priest died after the handful was taken, he certainly has not yet entered with the blood he collected from the bull. Consequently, his slaughter was not effective for the substitute priest, who must repeat the entire service from the slaughter onward.

⁶³ The Gemara explains that this is what Rabbi Ḥanina said: From the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi raised this dilemma, it can be understood by inference that he holds that the verse "with a bull" means that the High Priest may enter the Holy of Holies even with the blood of a bull. This means that the second priest does not have to go back and slaughter a second bull. And according to that which Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi maintains, his question is like the question of the earlier generations. Although the question does not arise according to the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina himself, according to the ruling of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, the question is indeed a difficult one.

⁶⁴ The Gemara asks: What halakhic conclusion was reached about this matter? What in fact is the ruling in a situation where the High Priest took a handful of incense and then died? May the newly appointed High Priest use the handful that has already been scooped, or does he require a new handful? Rav Pappa said: The resolution of this question depends on a different problem. If the High Priest scoops the handful when he takes the incense from the coal pan, and again scoops a handful in the Holy of Holies, this would mean that another priest may enter with the handful of the first High Priest, as the mitzva of scooping the handful has been fulfilled. However, if the High Priest does not scoop and again scoop, let the dilemma be raised.

⁶⁵ Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rav Pappa: On the contrary, if the High Priest scoops and again scoops, another priest should not be permitted to enter with his handful, as it is impossible that the new handful will be neither less nor more than the amount of the first handful, which means the handful will not have been taken properly. But conversely, if he does not scoop and again scoop, let the dilemma be raised, as the mitzva of taking a handful has already been fulfilled by the first priest, and the second priest has merely to place the incense on the coals.

⁶⁶ The Gemara explains the background to this problem. As a dilemma was raised before the Sages: Does the High Priest scoop a handful from the incense once and again scoop a handful a second time

in the Holy of Holies, or does he not scoop a second time? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from the mishna: This was the measure of the spoon. What, is it not correct to infer from the mishna that just as its measure is on the outside, so is its measure on the inside, i.e., there is no need to scoop another handful, as this is its fixed measure that he pours onto the coal pan.

⁶⁷ The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, that is not necessarily the correct interpretation of the mishna. Perhaps it means that if he wants to measure a precise amount for his handful, he may measure with a utensil for this purpose. Alternatively, it could mean that he may take neither less nor more than the measure he initially took. Consequently, there is no proof from the mishna with regard to whether the High Priest must scoop a second handful.

⁶⁸ The Gemara further suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from a baraita:

⁶⁹ How should the High Priest act in the Holy of Holies, when he needs to place the incense on the coals by taking a handful from the spoon and placing it in his hands? After he places the coal pan on the ground, he holds the front of the ladle, i.e., the spoon of incense, with his fingertips, and some say he holds it with his teeth. At this stage the handle of the spoon rests between his arms. And he pushes it and raises it up slowly with his thumb toward his body until it reaches between his elbows, which he then uses to turn it over. He then returns the incense into his palms, after which he pours it from his hands into the coal pan. And he heaps the incense into a pile on the coals so that its smoke rises slowly. And some say he does the opposite, that he scatters it so that its smoke rises quickly.

⁷⁰ And this taking of a handful of incense is the most difficult sacrificial rite in the Temple. The Gemara asks: This one is the hardest rite, and no other? But there is pinching, which is also considered extremely difficult; and there is taking a handful of a meal-offering, another complex rite. Rather, this taking of a handful of incense is one of the most difficult rites in the Temple, rather than the single most difficult one. In any event, you can learn from this that the High Priest scoops a handful and again scoops. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is so.

⁷¹ § A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If a High Priest slaughtered the bull and died, what is the halakha with regard to whether another High Priest may enter the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bull that his predecessor slaughtered? Do we say that the verse: “With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull” (Leviticus 16:3) teaches that the priest must enter with the blood of a bull, but it need not necessarily be the blood of the bull he himself slaughtered, and in that case he may enter even with the blood of a bull slaughtered by someone else? Or perhaps the verse should be interpreted precisely: “With a bull,” and not with the blood of a bull slaughtered by another?

⁷² The Sages disputed this matter. Rabbi Ḥanina says: “With a bull,” and not with the blood of a bull, which means that the newly appointed High Priest must slaughter another bull, as he can enter only with the blood of a bull he himself slaughtered. And Reish Lakish said: “With a bull,” and even with the blood of a bull. Likewise, Rabbi Ami said: “With a bull” and not with the blood of a bull; Rabbi Yitzḥak said: “With a bull,” and even with the blood of a bull.

⁷³ Rabbi Ami raised an objection to Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa, the smith: To join a group of people who arranged to partake together of a single Paschal offering, individuals may register as part of a group and they may withdraw from it and join another group until the offering is slaughtered. And if it is so, that the blood of an animal is considered part of the offering, this tanna who authored this statement should have said that they may withdraw until the blood is sprinkled. If, as you maintain,

the blood of an offering is part of the offering itself, why can't a person register to or withdraw from a group of a Paschal offering until its blood is sprinkled?

⁷⁴ He answered him: It is different there, as it is written: "And if the household is too small for a lamb [mehiyot miseh], he and his neighbor who is next to his house" (Exodus 12:4). The phrase "mehiyot miseh" is read as meihiyutei deseh, from the life of a lamb. In other words, one can withdraw from a group only as long as the lamb is alive. If so, its blood is not considered part of the Paschal lamb by a special decree of the Torah, which does not apply to Yom Kippur.

⁷⁵ Mar Zutra raised an objection: And one may not redeem a male firstborn donkey with a calf, nor with an undomesticated animal, nor with a slaughtered lamb, nor with an animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa], nor with the product of the prohibited crossbreeding of a lamb and a goat, nor with a koy, a kosher animal with characteristics of both a domesticated animal and a non-domesticated animal, but with a lamb. This proves that a slaughtered animal is not considered a lamb. The Gemara rejects this claim: It is different there, as that tanna derives a verbal analogy of "lamb" (Exodus 13:13) and "lamb" (Exodus 12:4) from the Paschal offering: Just as a slaughtered lamb cannot be used for a Paschal offering, the same applies to the case of a firstborn donkey.

⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: If so, just as there, the Paschal offering must be male, unblemished, and a year old, so too here, for the redemption of a firstborn donkey, one should be obligated to use a male that is unblemished and a year old. Therefore the verse states: "And every firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb; and if you shall not redeem it, then you shall break its neck" (Exodus 13:13). The repetition of: "You shall redeem," "you shall not redeem," serves to amplify the definition of the offering and include other animals as acceptable for this redemption, not merely those fit for the Paschal offering.

⁷⁷ The Gemara asks: If the phrases "You shall redeem" "you shall redeem" serve to amplify, even all animals should also be fit for the redemption of a firstborn donkey, including a calf, undomesticated beast, a slaughtered animal, and the other exceptions listed above. The Gemara answers: If so, what purpose does the verbal analogy of "lamb" serve? Rather, it is evident that certain animals are included while others are excluded. In any case, it is clear that the halakha of the blood of the bull on Yom Kippur cannot be derived from here.

⁷⁸ § Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa raised an objection to Rabbi Ami: "And he shall remove the entire bull outside the camp" (Leviticus 4:12). This verse speaks of a bull that has been slaughtered and its fats and sacrificial parts have been burned, which proves that even after it has been slaughtered, it is still called a bull. Rabbi Ami replied: The animal itself is not called a bull at this stage; rather, it means that he should remove the entire carcass, all that remains of the bull.

⁷⁹ The Gemara raises another difficulty by citing a verse: "And the bull of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, shall be taken outside the camp" (Leviticus 16:27). Once again, the verse proves that even after it has been slaughtered and its blood is brought into the Holy of Holies, the animal is still called a bull. Rav Pappa said: Everyone agrees that when it is intact, with its hide, its flesh, and its excrement, it is called a bull. When they disagree is with regard to the blood. One Sage holds that its blood is called a bull, and one Sage holds that blood alone is not called a bull.

⁸⁰ Rav Ashi said: It is reasonable to say in accordance with the one who said that blood is called part of the bull, as it is written: “With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull” (Leviticus 16:3). Is that to say that he brings it in, to the Holy of Holies, with its horns? Rather, he enters with its blood, and yet the Torah calls that “a bull.” This proves that the blood itself is called a bull.

⁸¹ The Gemara asks: And the other one, who maintains that blood is not called a bull, how does he interpret this verse? The Gemara answers that he can explain the verse as follows: With what did Aaron become qualified to enter the sacred place? With his bringing of a young bull for a sin-offering. However, the blood itself, which he brings inside, is not called a bull.

⁸² § The Gemara returns to the issue of a replacement High Priest entering with the blood of the first bull: And let him derive the answer to this problem from the fact that it is a sin-offering whose owners have died. After all, the bull of the first High Priest is a sin-offering and its owner has died. Since there is a principle that a sin-offering whose owners have died is left to die, this should resolve the dilemma. Ravin bar Rav Adda said to Rava: Your students say that Rav Amram said that the sin-offering bull of the High Priest is a communal sin-offering, as the High Priest brings it both on his own behalf and for his fellow priests, and a communal sin-offering is not left to die.

⁸³ As we learned in a mishna in tractate Temura that tanna'im debate which offerings override Shabbat and ritual impurity. Rabbi Meir said to him: But consider the Yom Kippur bull, and the meal-offering resembling a wafer brought specially by the High Priest, and the Paschal offering, each of which is an individual offering and overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity. Since Rabbi Meir says that these are individual offerings, is it not correct to say by inference that there is one who says that these offerings are communal?

⁸⁴ The Gemara rejects this proof. And according to your reasoning, consider that which was taught there: Rabbi Ya'akov said to him: But there are the cases of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, and the goats for a sin of idolatry, and the Festival peace-offering, which are all communal offerings and override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity. According to the above reasoning, it can be claimed by inference that there is one who says that these are individual offerings, which is incorrect.

⁸⁵ Rather, Rabbi Meir responded to the first tanna, as he heard him say in the form of a general principle: Communal sacrifices override Shabbat and ritual impurity, but individual sacrifices override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity. In response to this claim, Rabbi Meir said to him: Is this statement with regard to an individual offering a general principle? But consider the Yom Kippur bull, and the meal-offering resembling a wafer of the High Priest, and the Paschal offering, each of which is an individual offering and overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity.

⁸⁶ And Rabbi Ya'akov responded to the first tanna from a different perspective: Is this statement with regard to a communal offering a general principle, which overrides ritual impurity? But there are the cases of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, and the goats for a sin of idolatry, and the Festival peace-offering, which are all communal offerings and override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity.

⁸⁷ Rather, grasp this principle: Any offering that has a fixed time for its sacrifice overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity even if it is an individual offering; and any offering of no fixed time overrides neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity, and this is the case even if it is a communal offering. With regard to the issue at hand, as the emphasis of both Rabbi Meir's and Rabbi Ya'akov's statements is whether the offerings they referred to override Shabbat and ritual impurity, not their classification as

individual or communal offerings, nothing can be inferred from their comments in this regard. Consequently, it remains possible that the bull of the High Priest is an individual offering.

⁸⁸ § Abaye raised an objection to Rava: Is the bull of the High Priest an individual offering? But we learned in a baraita: With regard to the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur that were lost, and he separated others in their stead, and the first animals were subsequently found, all of the second set shall be left to die. And likewise, goats for a sin of idolatry that were lost and he separated others in their stead, all of them shall be left to die. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: They shall be left to graze until they become unfit, whereupon they are sold and their proceeds go for a free-will offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This proves that the Yom Kippur bull is called a communal sin-offering.

⁸⁹ Rava said to Abaye: What bull is referred to here? A bull for an unwitting communal sin. Abaye retorted: But the baraita taught: Of Yom Kippur, which clearly indicates that it is referring to the bull of Yom Kippur. Rava answered: When the tanna of this baraita taught: Of Yom Kippur, he was referring only to the goat. That is, the baraita should be read as follows: The communal bull and the goat of Yom Kippur, which is also a communal offering.

⁹⁰ Abaye further asks: But wasn't it taught in a baraita: With regard to the bull of Yom Kippur and the goat of Yom Kippur that were lost and he separated others in their stead, and the first animals were subsequently found, all of the second set shall be left to die. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: They shall be left to graze until they become unfit, whereupon they are sold and their proceeds go for a free-will offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This baraita explicitly states that the bull of Yom Kippur is considered a communal offering.

⁹¹ Rava answered him: Do not say: As a communal sin-offering is not left to die. Rather, say: As a sin-offering of partners is not left to die. Since some of the partners are still alive, the sin-offering is not left to die. The bull of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is considered a sin-offering of partners because it atones not only for the High Priest, but for his fellow priests, as well. The Gemara asks: And if ultimately the bull is not left to die, what is the practical difference whether the bull of the High Priest is considered a communal sin-offering or a sin-offering of partners? Why did Rava insist on calling it a sin-offering of partners?

⁹² The Gemara answers that there is a difference between these two categories with regard to a court that issues an incorrect ruling to an entire community, e.g., a tribe of Israel, and the people act in accordance with that ruling. The halakha in this case is that the court must bring a bull for an unwitting communal sin. Rava insisted on referring to the bull that atones for all of the priests on Yom Kippur as a sin-offering of partners, not a communal sin-offering, for the following reason: If a court composed of priests issued a mistaken ruling, and the priests acted in accordance with that teaching, the priests do not bring a bull for this ruling, as they are not considered a community but a large partnership.

⁹³ The Gemara offers another solution to the question. Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar raised the following dilemma:

⁹⁴ According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an offering of an individual, can one perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution in this case? In other words, if the High Priest violated a prohibition and designated a substitute by saying that this bull

should be switched with another, does the substitution take effect or not? Is it not correct to say by inference from the wording of Rabbi Elazar's dilemma that there is one who says that these offerings are communal?

⁹⁵ The Gemara rejects this contention: No, this is no proof, as one can say by inference that there is one who says that these offerings are of partners. There is no definitive proof that the bull of Yom Kippur is a communal sacrifice. In any event, the question of why the bull is not invalidated upon the death of the High Priest has been resolved, as the reason is either because it is a communal sacrifice or because it is a sacrifice of partners.

⁹⁶ § Since the Gemara has mentioned Rabbi Elazar's dilemma, the Gemara addresses the matter itself. Rabbi Elazar asked: According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an individual offering, can one perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution? The Gemara asks: What is the dilemma he is raising? What is the basis of his inquiry?

⁹⁷ The Gemara suggests that his dilemma is as follows: Do we follow the one who consecrates the animal, i.e., the High Priest, as he was the one who paid for it, in which case it is considered an individual sacrifice and his substitution is effective? Or do we follow the one who seeks atonement by the offering, and as this bull atones both for the High Priest and the entire community of his fellow priests, it is considered a communal sacrifice, and therefore his substitution is not effective? The question is: Which party is followed for the purposes of substitution?

⁹⁸ The Gemara expresses surprise at this possible interpretation of Rabbi Elazar's dilemma: It is obvious that we follow the one who seeks atonement, as Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to one who consecrates his animal for an offering but intends it for someone else's atonement, if he subsequently redeems the animal, he adds a fifth to it. This is in accordance with the halakha that one who redeems an animal that he himself dedicated must add a fifth of its value to the redemption, whereas if the person for whom it atones redeems it, he does not add a fifth. And the one for whom the sacrifice atones can perform substitution for it, whereas the one who consecrated the animal cannot effect substitution, as he is not considered its owner for the halakhot of substitution.

⁹⁹ And likewise, with regard to one who separates teruma from his wheat for the wheat of another, to spare his friend from having to separate his own teruma, although the friend's produce is now exempt from the obligation of teruma, the benefit of discretion is his, the one who separated the teruma. The one who separated the teruma is entitled to determine which priest receives the teruma, despite the fact that the teruma was separated for the crop of another. Similarly, when someone consecrates an animal for another person, it is the one who gains atonement that can perform substitution. If so, there is no place for Rabbi Elazar's dilemma.

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara rejects this suggested explanation of Rabbi Elazar's dilemma: Actually, it is obvious to Rabbi Elazar that we follow the one who seeks atonement by the offering, and this is his dilemma: Do his fellow priests achieve atonement by the essence of the offering, i.e., part of the offering is sacrificed on their behalf, which means they are partners in the bull? Or perhaps they achieve atonement incidentally, while the main atonement is that of the High Priest. If the atonement of the other priests is merely incidental, the High Priest can effect substitution with this bull.

¹⁰¹ The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma: There is a stricture that applies to the initial sacrifice, beyond the strictures that apply to the designated substitute; and there is a stricture that applies to the substitution, beyond the strictures that apply to the sacrifice. The

baraita elaborates: There is a stricture that applies to the initial sacrifice, as the sanctity of the sacrifice applies to an individual as it does to a community, and the sacrifice overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity, and one can perform substitution for the original sacrifice, which is not the case with regard to the substitute, to which these halakhot do not apply.

¹⁰² The baraita continues: There is a stricture that applies to the substitute beyond the strictures that apply to the initial sacrifice, in that the sanctity of the substitution takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal. And the substitute cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred status; that is, it may only be sacrificed as an offering and eaten but under no circumstance can it be redeemed for its wool to be sheared and to be worked, which is not the case with regard to the initial sacrifice, as it can be redeemed in certain situations.

¹⁰³ The Gemara explains: What are the circumstances of this sacrifice? What exactly is the sacrifice referred to in this baraita? If we say it is the sacrifice of an individual, does the sacrifice of an individual override Shabbat and ritual impurity? Rather, if you say that we are dealing with the sacrifice of a community, can one perform substitution for a communal sacrifice? Rather, is it not the case that we are dealing here with the Yom Kippur bull, which overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity, as it is a sacrifice that has a fixed time? And likewise, one can perform substitution for this offering, as it is an offering of an individual. This interpretation resolves Rabbi Elazar's dilemma.

¹⁰⁴ The Gemara rejects this contention. Rav Sheshet said: No, this is no proof, as it can be claimed that the baraita is referring to the ram of Aaron that the High Priest sacrifices as a burnt-offering on Yom Kippur, as the verse states: "With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 16:3). This offering is certainly the High Priest's alone and is therefore classified as the offering of an individual.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara comments: So, too, it is reasonable that this is the offering referred to in the baraita, for if it should enter your mind to say that we are dealing with the bull of the High Priest, consider the following: Is it only Shabbat and ritual impurity that the substitution of the bull does not override, which indicates that one may sacrifice this substitute on a weekday? It is a substitute for a sin-offering, and the halakha is that the substitute for a sin-offering is left to die. Rather, we certainly must be dealing with the ram for a burnt-offering, as the substitute for a burnt-offering cannot be sacrificed.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara rejects this supporting argument: No, it is actually possible that the offering referred to in the baraita is the Yom Kippur bull of the High Priest, and what is the substitution that was mentioned? It does not refer to a substitution of the bull, but rather the baraita deals with the general category of substitution, i.e., it means that the phenomenon of substitution in general includes halakhot that do not apply to offerings.

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: If so, one can also say that the sacrifice mentioned in the baraita means the general category of sacrifices, rather than a specific offering. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: The baraita is not teaching about a general category of sacrifices, i.e., it is definitely not dealing with the phenomenon of offerings in general.

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara continues: From where do I know that this is so? From the fact that it is taught: There is a stricture that applies to the substitution beyond the strictures that apply to the initial offering, in that the sanctity of the substitution takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and the substitute cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred status for its wool to be

sheared and to be worked. And should it enter your mind to say: What is the sacrifice mentioned here, it means the general category of sacrifices; this cannot be the case, as there is an example of an offering to which these halakhot also apply,

¹⁰⁹ e.g., a firstborn or an animal tithe, the sanctity of which takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and this offering cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred status for its wool to be sheared and to be worked. Rather, you must say that the baraita is not teaching a general category of sacrifices, but when it states: Offering, it is referring to a particular one.

¹¹⁰ The Gemara asks: And what is different about the two statements, i.e., why does the tanna deal with a specific case in one area, but a general category in the other? The Gemara explains: Substitution is one category, as there is no difference between one case of substitution and another. By contrast, with regard to sacrifices, there is a firstborn and there is the animal tithe, whose halakhot differ from other offerings, and therefore one cannot establish a single general principle. Consequently, the tanna certainly is referring to a specific offering.

¹¹¹ The Gemara continues the previous discussion: And according to the opinion of Rav Sheshet, who explains that the offering in question is not the bull of the High Priest but his ram, rather than establishing and interpreting this baraita as referring to the ram of Aaron, let him establish that it deals with the Paschal offering, which overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity and one can perform substitution for it, as according to all opinions, it is the offering of an individual. The Gemara answers: Rav Sheshet maintains that one may not slaughter the Paschal lamb on behalf of an individual, but only for a group. This means that it is not an offering of an individual but, at the very least, that of partners. For this reason, one cannot perform substitution for a Paschal lamb.

¹¹² The Gemara asks: And let Rav Sheshet establish the baraita as referring to the second Pesah, which is slaughtered by an individual. The Gemara answers: Does the second Pesah override ritual impurity? Since this offering does not override ritual impurity, it cannot be the offering referred to in the baraita.

¹¹³ § Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rava: And according to the tanna of the aforementioned baraita, concerning the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Ya'akov, what is different with regard to the Paschal offering, that he calls it the offering of an individual? And what is different with regard to the Festival peace-offering, which is eaten with the Paschal offering, that he calls it a communal offering? If this distinction is because the Festival peace-offering is brought by a multitude, i.e., the entire nation brings it, the Paschal offering is also brought by a multitude, not as an individual offering. Rava replied: There is the second Pesah, which is not brought by a multitude, and therefore the tanna does not call the Paschal offering a communal offering.

¹¹⁴ He said to him: If so, that the second Pesah is a communal offering, it should override Shabbat and ritual impurity. He said to him: Yes, as the opinion of this tanna is in accordance with the one who said that the second Pesah overrides ritual impurity. As it was taught in a baraita: The second Pesah overrides Shabbat, but it does not override ritual impurity. Rabbi Yehuda says: It even overrides ritual impurity. The Gemara asks: What is the reason of the first tanna? The first tanna could have said to you that one brings a second Pesah solely because ritual impurity overrode his obligation to sacrifice the first Pesah, i.e., he did not sacrifice the first Pesah because he was impure at that time. And should he now perform the second Pesah in a state of ritual impurity?

¹¹⁵ And Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you that, with regard to the second Pesah, the verse states: “According to all the statute of the Paschal offering they shall keep it” (Numbers 9:12), which indicates that it should even be brought in a state of ritual impurity, unlike the first Pesah. As for the claim of the first tanna, that the whole reason for the second Pesah is due to ritual impurity, Rabbi Yehuda could respond: The Torah sought an opportunity for one who was impure at the time of the first Pesah to perform it in a state of ritual purity; if he did not merit to perform it in purity, he should nevertheless perform it even in a state of ritual impurity.

¹¹⁶ § Returning to Rabbi Elazar’s question as to whether a High Priest can perform substitution for his bull, the Gemara seeks to prove that the other priests were not full partners in this offering but only gained atonement incidentally. And let me derive this halakha from the fact that the Merciful One states: “And Aaron shall sacrifice the bull of the sin-offering, which is for himself” (Leviticus 16:11), indicating that the High Priest brings the bull from his own property.

¹¹⁷ As it was taught in a baraita: “Which is for himself” means that he brings it from his own property and not from the property of the community. I might have thought that the High Priest may not bring this offering from the property of the community because the community as a whole does not gain atonement through it, but he may bring it from the property of his fellow priests, as his fellow priests do gain atonement through it. Therefore the verse states: “Which is for himself,” i.e., it must belong to him and no one else.

¹¹⁸ I might have thought that the High Priest should not bring the bull from the property of the other priests *ab initio*, but if he did bring it from their property, the offering is valid. Therefore, the verse continues and states again: “And he shall slaughter the bull for the sin-offering, which is for himself” (Leviticus 16:11); the text repeats this phrase: “Which is for himself,” to emphasize that this requirement is indispensable and that if the High Priest brings a bull that belongs to someone else, the offering is invalid.

¹¹⁹ The Gemara rejects this proof: And according to your reasoning, if his fellow priests do not acquire a share in the bull, how does it atone for them? Since they achieve atonement through the offering, they must own a share in it. Rather, you must say that the property [*bei gazza*] of Aaron the High Priest is different in that the Merciful One rendered it ownerless with regard to his fellow priests. Although the High Priest brings a bull from his own funds, it is as though he sanctifies it on behalf of all of the priests. But if so, here too, with regard to substitution, we could likewise say that the property of Aaron is different in that the Merciful One rendered it ownerless with regard to his fellow priests. Consequently, there is no proof from here that a High Priest can perform substitution for his bull.

¹²⁰ MISHNA: The High Priest would then walk west through the Sanctuary until he reaches the area between the two curtains that separated the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies, and the space between them was one cubit. Rabbi Yosei says: There was only one curtain there, as it is stated: “And the curtain shall divide for you between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies” (Exodus 26:33).

¹²¹ GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Rabbi Yosei is saying well to the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Yosei provides solid support for his opinion. And the Rabbis could say to you: This applies only in the Tabernacle, which had but one curtain. However, in the Second Temple, since there was no one-cubit partition [*teraksin*] separating the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary of the Temple, as it was only in the First Temple that there was a one-cubit partition, and the Rabbis were uncertain with regard to the

sanctity of the space occupied by the one-cubit partition, whether it had the sanctity of the inside of the Holy of Holies, or the sanctity of the outside area of the Sanctuary, therefore the Sages of the time prepared two curtains to enclose this space of uncertain status.

¹²² § The Sages taught: When the High Priest walked to the Holy of Holies, he walked on the south side between the inner altar and the candelabrum. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Meir says that he walked on the north side between the table and the altar. And some say he passed between the table and the wall. The Gemara asks: Whose opinion is introduced by the title: Some say? Rav H̥isda said: It is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei in our mishna, according to whom there is only one curtain and who said that the entrance was positioned in the north. According to all opinions, the entrance to the Holy of Holies was located in the north, and since Rabbi Yosei believed that there was just one curtain, the High Priest would walk in a straight line toward this entrance along the north side of the Sanctuary.

¹²³ And Rabbi Yehuda maintains that there were two curtains, and therefore he could have said to you that although the entrance to the Holy of Holies was on the north side, because there were two curtains, one behind the other, the entrance was positioned in the south. The High Priest entered on the south side and walked between the curtains to the north of the inner curtain where he entered the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Meir, in accordance with whose opinion does he hold? If he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to the place of the entrance, the High Priest should enter as explained by Rabbi Yehuda; conversely, if he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, he should enter as explained by Rabbi Yosei.

¹²⁴ The Gemara answers: Actually, Rabbi Meir holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and he could have said to you: The tables, the one holding the shewbread and other tables next to it, were arranged north to south, and the table blocked him on the north side, and therefore the High Priest could not enter in a direct line, as the space was too narrow.

¹²⁵ And if you wish, say instead: Actually the tables were arranged east to west, and due to the honor of the Divine Presence, it was not proper conduct

¹²⁶ to enter directly, as it is more appropriate for the High Priest to approach the Holy of Holies somewhat circuitously. And in response to this Rabbi Yosei could have said to you: The Jewish people are beloved by God, as the Torah did not require them to make use of an agent, e.g., an angel, to intercede on their behalf. Instead, God hears the nation's prayers directly. Consequently, the High Priest, who represents the people on Yom Kippur, need not approach in a roundabout fashion.

¹²⁷ The Gemara asks: But if an indirect approach is a mark of respect, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, too, let the High Priest enter indirectly between the candelabrum and the wall. The Gemara answers: If the High Priest walks by that route, he might blacken his clothes through the soot left on the wall by the candelabrum.

¹²⁸ Rabbi Natan said: With regard to the one-cubit partition, the Sages did not determine its status, whether it was part of the inside of the Holy of Holies or part of the outside area of the Sanctuary.

¹²⁹ Ravina strongly objects to this opinion: What is the reason for this uncertainty? If we say it is because it is written: "And the House that King Solomon built for the Lord was sixty cubits in length, and its width was twenty cubits, and its height was thirty cubits" (I Kings 6:2), and it is written: "And the House, that is, the Sanctuary, was forty cubits long" (I Kings 6:17), and it is written: "And before

the partition twenty cubits in length, and twenty cubits in width, and twenty cubits in height” (I Kings 6:20), and therefore we do not know whether the one-cubit partition was part of these twenty cubits of the Holy of Holies or part of these forty cubits of the Sanctuary, then this problem can be resolved.

¹³⁰ Ravina explains the resolution of the problem: But perhaps it was not part of these twenty cubits nor part of these forty cubits, as in establishing the measurements the verse counts the space but does not count the walls themselves, i.e., the cubit of the wall is not included in either measurement. Know that it is so, as anywhere that the verse counts the area of the walls in addition to the spaces they contain, it also counts the one-cubit partition.

¹³¹ Ravina cites a proof for the previous claim. As we learned in a mishna: The Sanctuary was one hundred cubits by one hundred cubits, with a height of one hundred cubits. From east to west, the hundred cubits were divided as follows: The wall of the Entrance Hall was five cubits; and the Entrance Hall itself was eleven cubits; the wall of the Sanctuary was six cubits; the length of the Sanctuary itself was forty cubits; and there was the one-cubit partition; the Hall of the Holy of Holies was another twenty cubits; the outer wall of the Sanctuary was six cubits; and the chamber behind it was six cubits; and the wall of the chamber was five cubits. This mishna proves that when the walls are counted in addition to the spaces, the one-cubit partition is included in the calculation.

¹³² Rather, the uncertainty does not concern the location of the one-cubit partition, which was certainly positioned between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies. Instead, the issue is its sanctity, whether it was considered like the inside of the Holy of Holies or like the outside area of the Sanctuary. Since there was no such wall in the Second Temple, the Sages were uncertain with regard to the status of the extra cubit.

¹³³ § And this is what Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Yosef of Hutzal raised a dilemma with regard to the verse: “And he prepared a partition in the midst of the House within to set there the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord” (I Kings 6:19). This was his dilemma that was raised before the Sages: With regard to what case is the verse speaking?

¹³⁴ The Gemara explains the dilemma. Should it be read: And Solomon prepared a partition in the midst of the House within to set there, meaning that he placed the partition within the Temple and behind it he prepared a space to place the Ark, and the partition itself did not possess the sanctity of the Holy of Holies? Or perhaps this is what the verse states: A partition in the midst of the House within, i.e., the verse ends there, while the rest of the text forms a new verse. According to this interpretation, the place of the partition itself was part of the Holy of Holies, and that was where Solomon prepared a place for the Ark.

¹³⁵ The Gemara is surprised at this explanation: And was Yosef of Hutzal really uncertain how to punctuate this verse? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita that Isi ben Yehuda says: There are five verses in the Torah whose meaning cannot be decided, i.e., it is unclear from the text how the verses should be read.

¹³⁶ The first example is the term: “Se’et” (Genesis 4:7). It is unclear whether the verse should be read: “If you do well, shall it not be lifted up [se’et]?” in which case se’et involves forgiveness and pardon; or: “If you do well, but you will lift up [se’et] your sin if you do not do well.” According to this interpretation, se’et is referring to remembrance: If you do not do well, your sin will be remembered.

¹³⁷ The second uncertain case is the term: “Meshukkadim” (Exodus 25:34). This verse can be read: “And in the candelabrum four cups made like almond blossoms [meshukkadim]”; or as: “Its knops and its flowers made like almond blossoms [meshukkadim].” In other words, the term meshukkadim can be read either with the first part or the last part of the verse.

¹³⁸ Likewise, the term: “Maḥar” (Exodus 17:9) can be read: “And go out, fight with Amalek tomorrow [maḥar]”. Alternatively, it can mean that Joshua must go out to war with Amalek immediately, and Moses added: “Tomorrow [maḥar] I will stand on the top of the hill” (Exodus 17:9), but today you do not need my prayer. Once again, the issue is whether this term belongs to the beginning or the end of the verse.

¹³⁹ The fourth case is the term: “Arur” (Genesis 49:7). This verse can be read: “Cursed [arur] be their anger for it was fierce, and their wrath for it was cruel,” on account of Levi and Simeon’s treatment of Shechem. Alternatively, this term, which appears at the beginning of the verse, can be read as the last word of the previous verse: “And in their anger they cut off cursed [arur] oxen” (Genesis 49:6–7). According to this interpretation, “cursed oxen” is referring to the oxen of Shechem, who descended from the accursed Canaan.

¹⁴⁰ Finally, the term: “Vekam” (Deuteronomy 31:16) can be read as: “Behold, you are about to sleep with your fathers and rise up [vekam]” at the time of the resurrection of the dead; or: “And this people will rise up [vekam] and go astray.”

¹⁴¹ The Gemara explains the objection presented by this baraita. And wasn’t it taught in a baraita that Yosef of Hutzal is the one called Yosef the Babylonian, as Hutzal is a city in Babylonia; and he is also the person called Isi ben Yehuda, as Isi is a shortened form of Yosef; he is Isi ben Gur Arye, a nickname for Yehuda; he is Isi ben Gamliel; he is Isi ben Mahalalel? And what is his real name? Isi ben Akiva is his name. If they are indeed the same person, Isi ben Yehuda, who is Yosef of Hutzal, says that there are only five verses whose punctuation is unclear, whereas here he adds an additional verse. The Gemara explains: In the Torah itself, there are indeed no more than five verses, but in the Prophets there are more examples of equivocal punctuation, one of which is the verse from I Kings.

¹⁴² The Gemara raises a difficulty: And in the Torah itself, are there no other examples of indeterminate punctuation? But there is this dilemma that Rav Ḥisda raised with regard to the verse: “And he sent the young men of the children of Israel who sacrificed burnt-offerings” (Exodus 24:5); were these burnt-offerings sheep, and when the verse continues: “And sacrificed peace-offerings of bulls to the Lord,” these peace-offerings alone were bulls? Or perhaps these and these were bulls, as the word “bulls” is referring both to the burnt-offerings and the peace-offerings? This is another verse whose punctuation is unclear. The Gemara rejects this contention: This is not difficult; according to Rav Ḥisda it was uncertain how to read the verse, but the interpretation was obvious to Isi ben Yehuda.

¹⁴³ MISHNA: The outer curtain between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies was hooked [perufa] slightly open on the south side of the Sanctuary, and the inner curtain hooked slightly open on the north side of the Sanctuary, and therefore the High Priest could not enter the Holy of Holies directly. Rather, he enters through the southern opening and walks between the curtains until he reaches the opening to the north. When he reaches the opening to the north, he enters the Holy of Holies through that opening, turns his face to the south, and walks to his left along the curtain until he reaches the area before the Ark.

¹⁴⁴ When he reaches the Ark, he places the coal pan between the two staves. He piles the incense atop the coals, and the whole chamber in its entirety would fill with smoke. He then exits and comes out the way that he entered. He does not turn around but leaves the Holy of Holies walking while facing the Ark. And he recites a brief prayer in the outer chamber, in the Sanctuary. And he would not extend his prayer there so as not to alarm the Jewish people, who would otherwise conclude that something happened and that he died in the Holy of Holies.

¹⁴⁵ GEMARA: The Gemara asks: With what are we dealing here? To which time period is the mishna referring? If we say it is speaking about the First Temple, were there curtains then? There was only one curtain over the one-cubit partition. Rather, if we say that the mishna is dealing with the Second Temple, was there an Ark there?

¹⁴⁶ The Gemara elaborates: But wasn't it taught in a baraita that when the Ark was buried, along with it was buried the jar of manna that was next to it, and the flask of oil used for anointing, and Aaron's staff with its almonds and blossoms, and the chest that the Philistines sent as a gift [doron] to the God of Israel after they captured the Ark and were stricken by several plagues, as it is stated: "And put the jewels of gold that you return to Him for a guilt-offering, in a coffer by its side, and send it away that it may go" (I Samuel 6:8)?

¹⁴⁷ § And who buried the Ark? Josiah, king of Judea, buried it. And what did he see that he decided to bury it? He saw that it is written: "The Lord will bring you, and your king whom you shall set over you, to a nation that you have not known" (Deuteronomy 28:36). Since he knew that the Jewish people would ultimately be exiled, he felt it was better that the Ark should not be disgraced in exile, and therefore he arose and buried it.

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara cites the source for the tradition that Josiah buried the Ark. As it is stated: "And he said to the Levites who taught all of Israel, who were sacred to the Lord: Put the sacred Ark in the house that Solomon, son of David, king of Israel, built. There shall no more be a burden upon your shoulders; now serve the Lord your God, and His people Israel" (I Chronicles 35:3). In other words, from now onward the Levites will no longer carry the Ark on their shoulders, and they should dedicate themselves to their service of singing and locking the gates of the Temple.

¹⁴⁹ And Rabbi Elazar said: The matter is derived by means of a verbal analogy, as it is written with regard to the Ark: "That is by the Ark of the Testimony, before the Ark cover that is above the testimony, there will I meet with you" (Exodus 30:6), and it is written: "Take a jar and put a full omer of manna there, and place it before the Lord for safekeeping throughout your generations" (Exodus 16:33). And it is further derived by verbal analogy from the term "Generations" written here and "generations" written with regard to the oil used for anointing: "This shall be a sacred anointing oil for Me throughout your generations" (Exodus 30:31).

¹⁵⁰ Rabbi Elazar continued: And it is likewise derived by verbal analogy from the term "safekeeping" stated here and "safekeeping" stated in connection to the staff of Aaron: "Place back the rod of Aaron before the testimony for safekeeping" (Numbers 17:25). These verbal analogies teach that all of these items were hidden together with the Ark. Evidently, there was no Ark in the Holy of Holies even before the First Temple period ended. How, then, can the mishna speak of the Ark during the Second Temple period?

¹⁵¹ The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna is referring to the Second Temple, and what is the meaning of the phrase: Reaches the Ark? It means the place of the Ark. The Gemara raises a

difficulty: But it is taught that he places the coal pan between the two staves, which indicates that the staves of the Ark were present. The Gemara answers: Emend the text and say: As though it was between the two staves, i.e., in the place where the staves had been located when the Ark was there.

¹⁵² § The mishna taught: He piles the incense atop the coals. The Gemara comments: We learned in the mishna in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that he piles the incense on the coals and does not scatter it there. It was taught in one baraita: He piles the incense in the section of the coal pan closest to the Ark, which is farthest from the High Priest, until he reaches the other side of the coal pan. And it was taught in another baraita: He piles it in the section of the coal pan farthest from the Ark, which is closest to him.

¹⁵³ Abaye said that this issue is a dispute between tanna'im. And Abaye said: It is reasonable to explain in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that he piles the incense in the section of the coal pan closest to the Ark, which is farthest from him. As we learned in a mishna that they would teach the priest who burns the incense: Be careful

¹⁵⁴ not to begin piling the incense in front of you, i.e., from the side closest to you, lest you be burned. If the priest were to place the incense on the side directly in front of him and then proceed to spread it toward the Ark, his hands would pass over the incense that is already burning and he might burn himself.

¹⁵⁵ § The Sages taught in a baraita: "And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord" (Leviticus 16:13); this means that he should not prepare by placing the incense outside, in the Sanctuary, and bring into the Holy of Holies a coal pan holding the burning incense. This was emphasized in order to exclude the opinion of the Sadducees, who say that he should prepare the incense outside and then bring it in.

¹⁵⁶ The Gemara asks: What did the Sadducees interpret; what verse do they cite as the basis for their opinion? The Gemara answers that it was the verse: "For I will appear in a cloud upon the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:2), which the Sadducees say teaches that he should prepare it outside, so there would already be a cloud of incense, and only then should he bring it inside the Holy of Holies.

¹⁵⁷ The Sages said to them: Wasn't it already stated explicitly: "And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord" (Leviticus 16:13), which indicates that the High Priest should present the incense only when he stands before God in the Holy of Holies? If so, what is the meaning when the verse states: "For I will appear in a cloud upon the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:2)? This verse does not mean that there should already be an incense cloud before he enters.

¹⁵⁸ Instead, this verse is referring to the shape of the incense cloud, and it teaches that he includes a smoke-raiser in its spices, a plant that causes the smoke to rise straight up like a staff. And from where is it derived that he includes a smoke-raiser in its spices? As it is stated: "And the incense cloud shall cover the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:13). Therefore, if he did not include a smoke-raiser, or if he omitted any one of its spices, he is liable to receive the death penalty.

¹⁵⁹ The Gemara analyzes this last halakha: Why does one incur the death penalty for omitting one of the spices? And let the tanna derive the fact that he incurs the death penalty for a different action, as his entry into the Holy of Holies is for no purpose. It is prohibited to enter the Holy of Holies unless one is performing a mitzva. If the incense lacks an ingredient, the High Priest is not truly performing

the mitzva, and therefore he has entered the Holy of Holies for no purpose. Consequently, he incurs the death penalty on account of his entry, even without burning the incense.

¹⁶⁰ Rav Sheshet said: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where he acted unwittingly with regard to the entry, i.e., he was unaware that entering for no reason renders him liable, or he did not mean to enter the Holy of Holies at all; and he acted intentionally with regard to the burning, knowing that one who burns incense that lacks an ingredient incurs the death penalty. In that case, he is liable to receive the death penalty only for burning incomplete incense.

¹⁶¹ Rav Ashi said a different explanation: Even if you say that he acted intentionally with regard to both this and that, i.e., he knew full well that he would be liable to receive the death penalty both for burning incomplete incense and for entering the Holy of Holies for no purpose, it is nevertheless possible that he is not liable to receive the death penalty for his entry. And Rav Ashi explains that this is the halakha in a case where he brought two sets of incense into the Holy of Holies, one complete with all the spices and one incomplete, both of which he burned. For his entry to the Holy of Holies he is not liable to be put to death, as he brought in a coal pan with complete incense and thereby fulfilled the mitzva. However, for burning he is liable to receive the death penalty, as he burns incomplete incense.

¹⁶² § The Gemara analyzes the above baraita. The Master said in the baraita: And from where is it derived that he includes a smoke-raiser in its spices? The verse states: “And it shall cover” (Leviticus 16:13). The Gemara expresses surprise at this statement: One verse for another verse? The requirement of a smoke-raiser was already proven from the verse: “For I will appear in a cloud upon the Ark cover” (Leviticus 16:2); why cite a second verse in support of the first one?

¹⁶³ Rav Yosef said: This is what the baraita said; this is how to understand the matter: I have derived nothing other than the obligation to bring a leaf of a smoke-raising plant. From where is it derived that he must also bring a root of a smoke-raiser? The verse states: “And it shall cover,” which indicates the requirement for more of the smoke-raiser than might have been supposed from the other verse.

¹⁶⁴ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Your interpretation indicates that the leaf of the smoke-raiser raises smoke better than its root, as the requirement for a root is merely considered an addition. But wasn’t the opposite taught in a baraita? As it was taught in a baraita: He put into the incense a root of a smoke-raiser, and the smoke would rise in a column like a staff until it reached the Temple ceiling. When it reached the ceiling there was nowhere for the smoke to exit the building, and therefore it slowly descended the walls until the entire House was filled with smoke, as it is stated: “And the House was filled with smoke” (Isaiah 6:4). This baraita indicates that the root of the smoke-raiser raises smoke better than its leaf.

¹⁶⁵ Rather, Abaye said that this is what the baraita said; this is how it should be understood: I have derived nothing other than the obligation to bring a root of a smoke-raising plant. From where is it derived that he must also bring a leaf of a smoke-raiser? The verse states: “And it shall cover.”

¹⁶⁶ Rav Sheshet said that the baraita means the following: I have derived nothing other than the inclusion of a smoke-raiser amongst the other spices in the Tent of Meeting that was in the wilderness; from where is it derived that this obligation extends to the Tabernacle at Shiloh and in the eternal Temple in Jerusalem? The verse states: “And it shall cover,” which indicates that wherever

the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies to burn incense, he must include a smoke-raiser in its ingredients.

¹⁶⁷ The Gemara raises a difficulty with regard to this interpretation: This halakha is derived from the verse: “And so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting that dwells with them” (Leviticus 16:16). This verse teaches that this rite must be performed not only that first time in the wilderness, but wherever the Divine Presence dwells.

¹⁶⁸ Rather, this is what the baraita said: I have derived nothing other than the obligation to include a smoke-raiser in the spices of the incense offered on Yom Kippur in the Holy of Holies; from where is it derived that this obligation applies to the incense offered on the rest of the days of the year in the Sanctuary? The verse states: “And it shall cover,” to teach that every incense burned in the Temple must include a smoke-raiser.

¹⁶⁹ Rav Ashi said: One verse teaches us the mitzva itself, and one verse teaches that this requirement is indispensable, i.e., the rite is invalid if one omits this ingredient. Rava said: One verse teaches that the omission of the smoke-raiser renders one liable to receive the punishment of death, and one verse serves as a warning that it is prohibited to omit it, as the Torah does not require punishment without issuing a warning.

¹⁷⁰ § It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: “Speak to Aaron your brother that he should not come at all times into the sacred place within the curtain, before the Ark cover that is upon the Ark; that he not die” (Leviticus 16:2). This verse teaches the punishment for the omission of the smoke-raiser from the spices of the incense. With regard to the verse: “For I will appear in a cloud upon the Ark cover” (Leviticus 16:2); this is the warning that it is prohibited to omit the smoke-raiser, which causes the cloud to rise.

¹⁷¹ One might have thought that both verses were said before the deaths of Aaron’s sons, who died upon entering the sacred place. Therefore, the verse states: “After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron” (Leviticus 16:1). One might have thought that both of them, the punishment and the warning, were said after the deaths of Aaron’s two sons. Therefore, the verse states: “For I will appear in a cloud upon the Ark cover.” How so; how should these verses be understood? The warning was said before the death of Aaron’s sons, and the punishment associated with it was stated after the death of his sons.

¹⁷² The Gemara expresses puzzlement at Rabbi Eliezer’s statement: What is the biblical derivation? How does Rabbi Eliezer learn from the phrase “I will appear” that the warning was stated earlier? Rava said that the verse states: “For I will appear in a cloud”; the future tense indicates that the cloud over the Ark cover had not yet appeared, as the Tabernacle had not been built, which means that this command was issued before Aaron’s sons entered and died. The Gemara asks: Rather, what is the reason that Aaron’s sons were punished with death, if the punishment had not been stated? The Torah does not punish one who is unaware of the sin’s punishment.

¹⁷³ The Gemara answers: They were not punished for their entry into the sacred place but for a different reason, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: Aaron’s sons died only because they taught a halakha before Moses their teacher; they should have asked him for his ruling, but they neglected to do so. The Gemara asks: What did they interpret from the verse that led them to enter the sacred place with fire? The verse states: “And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar” (Leviticus 1:7), which indicates that although fire descends from the heavens, it is a mitzva to

bring man-made fire. To fulfill this mitzva, Aaron's sons entered and brought fire to the altar. Although their ruling was in accordance with the halakha, they incurred the death penalty for failing to ask Moses.

¹⁷⁴ § The mishna teaches that the High Priest exits and comes out the way that he entered, i.e., he does not turn around, but walks backward with his face toward the Ark. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived; what is the source in the Torah for this halakha? Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said that the verse states: "And Solomon came to the high place that was at Gibeon, Jerusalem" (II Chronicles 1:13). Now, what does Gibeon have to do with Jerusalem? Either he came to Gibeon or to Jerusalem; these are two different places.

¹⁷⁵ Rather, the verse compares his exit from Gibeon to Jerusalem to his arrival from Jerusalem to Gibeon. Just as in the case of his arrival from Jerusalem to Gibeon his face was necessarily turned toward the high place, in the usual manner of a person's arrival, so too, upon his exit from Gibeon to Jerusalem his face was still turned toward the high place, in the manner of his arrival. This teaches that one does not turn his face away from a sacred place; rather, he must walk backward.

¹⁷⁶ And likewise, with regard to priests in their service; and Levites on their platform in the Temple, where they recited songs; and Israelites at their watches, where they observed the sacrifice of the daily offering: When they departed from the sacred place, they would not turn their faces and walk but would turn their faces sideways and walk, so as not to turn their backs on the sacred place.

¹⁷⁷ And likewise, a student who takes leave of his teacher should not turn his face and walk but turn his face sideways and walk. This is in accordance with that practice of Rabbi Elazar when he took leave of his teacher, Rabbi Yoḥanan. When Rabbi Yoḥanan wanted to leave him, Rabbi Elazar would bend down and stand in his place as a sign of respect and humility, until Rabbi Yoḥanan disappeared from his sight; only then would Rabbi Elazar turn to leave.

¹⁷⁸ And when Rabbi Elazar wanted to leave, he would walk backward until he disappeared from Rabbi Yoḥanan's sight, and only then would he walk normally, so as not to turn his back on his teacher. The Gemara further relates: When Rava took leave of Rav Yosef, he would walk backward, paying no attention to the obstacles in his path, until his legs were bruised and the threshold of Rav Yosef's house was bloodied from Rava's wounds.

¹⁷⁹ They said to Rav Yosef: This is what Rava does. Rav Yosef was blind and could not see for himself. Rav Yosef said to him: May it be God's will that you lift your head over the entire city, in reward for honoring your teacher.

¹⁸⁰ § Apropos the obligation of a student to walk backward when taking leave of his teacher, the Gemara discusses a similar topic. Rabbi Alexandri said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who prays must take three steps backward upon concluding his prayer and then recite: Peace, in a manner befitting one who departs from before the Holy One, Blessed be He. Rav Mordekhai said to him: Since he has taken three steps backward, he should stand there and not return to his place immediately. This is analogous to a student who takes leave of his teacher. If he returns immediately to the place where was first standing, he is similar to a dog who returns to its vomit, and his previous action is spoiled.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara comments that this was also taught in a baraita: One who prays must take three steps backward upon concluding his prayer and then recite: Peace. And if he did not do so, it is better for

him not to have prayed, as his actions are disrespectful toward God. And they said in the name of Shemaya the Sage that when one recites: Peace, he first bows to the right and then to the left, as it is stated: “At His right hand was a fiery law to them” (Deuteronomy 33:2), and it says: “A thousand may fall at your side, and ten thousand at your right side” (Psalms 91:7).

¹⁸² The Gemara asks: What is the reason for: And it says? Why is it necessary to cite another source? The Gemara explains: If you say that it is merely the usual manner to give an object with the right hand, but this bears no special significance, come and hear: “A thousand may fall at your side, and ten thousand at your right side,” which indicates that the right side is the more significant one.

¹⁸³ The Gemara relates that Rava saw Abaye reciting: Peace, by bowing at the end of his prayer to his right first. Rava said to him: Do you maintain that you should bow to your right? I say you should bow to your left first, as it is the right of the Holy One, Blessed be He, since He is opposite you face-to-face, as it were. Rav Ḥiyya, son of Rav Huna, said: I observed that Abaye and Rava both took those three steps all in one act of bowing, without standing upright in between, by way of submission to and acceptance of God’s authority.

¹⁸⁴ § The mishna taught: And the High Priest recites a brief prayer in the outer chamber. The Gemara asks: What does he pray? Rava bar Rav Adda and Ravin bar Rav Adda both said in the name of Rav that this was his prayer: May it be your will, Lord our God, that this year shall be rainy and hot. The Gemara immediately expresses surprise at this request: Is heat a good matter? Why should he request that the year be hot? Rather, say and emend it as follows: If the upcoming year is hot, may it also be rainy, lest the heat harm the crops.

¹⁸⁵ Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, concluded the language of this prayer in the name of Rav Yehuda: May the rule of power not depart from the house of Judah; and may your nation Israel not depend on each other for sustenance, rather, they should be sustained from the produce of their land; and let not the prayer of travelers enter Your presence when they pray for the rain to stop on their travels.

¹⁸⁶ The Gemara relates: Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa was walking on the road when rain fell upon him. He said: Master of the Universe, the entire world is comfortable and Ḥanina is suffering. The rain stopped. When he came to his house he said: Master of the Universe, the entire world is suffering for lack of rain and Ḥanina is comfortable. The rain came back. Rav Yosef said: What effect does the prayer of the High Priest have with regard to Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa? Notwithstanding the prayer of the High Priest in the Holy of Holies, Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa’s sanctity is greater, as God fulfills his bidding.

¹⁸⁷ § The mishna stated that the High Priest would not extend his prayer. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: There was an incident involving a certain High Priest who extended his prayer, and his fellow priests took a vote, counted, and decided to go in after him out of concern that he had died or fainted and required assistance. They began to enter and at that moment he emerged. They said to him: Why did you extend your prayer? He said to them: Why not? Does it trouble you that I prayed for you and for the Temple not to be destroyed? They said to him: Do not make a habit of doing so, as we learned: He would not extend his prayer, so as not to alarm the Jewish people, who might fear he had died.

¹⁸⁸ MISHNA: After the Ark was taken into exile, there was a rock in the Holy of Holies from the days of the early prophets, David and Samuel, who laid the groundwork for construction of the Temple, and this stone was called the foundation rock. It was three fingerbreadths higher than the

ground, and the High Priest would place the incense on it. After the High Priest left the Holy of Holies, he took the blood of the bull sacrificed as a sin-offering from the one who was stirring it, so it would not coagulate. He entered into the place that he had previously entered, the Holy of Holies, and stood at the place where he had previously stood to offer the incense, between the staves. And he sprinkled from the blood, one time upward and seven times downward.

¹⁸⁹ And he would neither intend to sprinkle the blood upward nor to sprinkle it downward, but rather like one who whips, with the blood sprinkled in a single column, one drop below the other. And this is how he would count as he sprinkled, to avoid error: One; one and one; one and two; one and three; one and four; one and five; one and six; one and seven. The High Priest then emerged from there and placed the bowl with the remaining blood on the golden pedestal in the Sanctuary.

¹⁹⁰ They brought him the goat to be sacrificed as a sin-offering to God. He slaughtered it and received its blood in the bowl. He again entered into the place that he had previously entered, the Holy of Holies, and stood at the place that he previously stood, and sprinkled from the blood of the goat one time upward and seven times downward. And this is how he would count, just as he counted when sprinkling the blood of the bull: One; one and one; one and two; etc. The High Priest then emerged from the Holy of Holies and placed the bowl with the remaining blood on the second golden pedestal in the Sanctuary. Rabbi Yehuda says: There was only one pedestal there, and he took the blood of the bull from the pedestal and placed the blood of the goat in its place.

¹⁹¹ And he sprinkled from the blood of the bull on the curtain opposite the Ark from outside the Holy of Holies, one time upward and seven times downward, and he would not intend, etc. And this is how he would count, etc. When he concluded, he took the blood of the goat from the pedestal and placed blood of the bull in its place on the pedestal. And he sprinkled from the goat's blood on the curtain opposite the Ark from outside, just as he did with the blood of the bull, one time upward and seven times downward, etc. Afterward, he poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat and placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl, so that the blood would be mixed well.

¹⁹² GEMARA: The Gemara comments with regard to the wording of the mishna: It does not teach: After the Ark was buried, but: After it was taken. If so, we learned this mishna in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that the Ark was exiled to Babylonia and was not buried in its place, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Eliezer says: The Ark was exiled to Babylonia, as it is stated: "And at the turn of the year King Nebuchadnezzar sent and brought him to Babylonia, along with the precious vessels of the House of the Lord" (II Chronicles 36:10). These precious vessels must include the Ark.

¹⁹³ Likewise, Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai says: The Ark was exiled to Babylonia, as it is stated: "Behold, the days come that all that is in your house, and that which your fathers have stored until this day, shall be carried to Babylonia; nothing [davar] shall be left, says the Lord" (Isaiah 39:6). These are the Ten Commandments [dibrot] that are inside it; they too shall not be left behind.

¹⁹⁴ Rabbi Yehuda ben Lakish says: The Ark was buried in its place, as it is stated: "And the ends of the staves were seen from the sacred place before the partition, but they could not be seen without; and they are there to this day" (I Kings 8:8). The expression "to this day" means forever, as the text might be read at any time. This teaches that the Ark is hidden in its place.

¹⁹⁵ The Gemara comments: And this opinion that the Ark was exiled to Babylonia disagrees with that of Ulla, as Ulla said: Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash asked Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai in Rome: And since

Rabbi Eliezer taught us once and twice, i.e., from two separate verses, that the Ark was exiled to Babylonia. The Gemara interrupts its citation of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash's question to identify these two verses. The first verse is that which we said: "And brought him to Babylonia, along with the precious vessels of the House of the Lord." What is the second verse? Rabbi Eliezer said: As it is written: "And gone from the daughter of Zion is

¹⁹⁶ all her splendor" (Lamentations 1:6). What is the meaning of: "All her splendor [hadara]"? It means: Her chamber [ḥadra], i.e., something that was hidden within the innermost chambers, namely the Ark. You, Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai, what do you say in response to this? He said to him: As I say, the Ark was buried in its place and not exiled, as it is stated: "And the staves were so long that the ends of the staves were seen from the sacred place before the partition, but they could not be seen without; and they are there to this day" (I Kings 8:8).

¹⁹⁷ Rabba said to Ulla: From where in this verse may it be inferred that the Ark was buried in its place? Ulla replied that the source is as it is written: "And they are there to this day," which is referring to any day when one might read this sentence, i.e., forever. Rabba objected to this explanation: And is it the case that anywhere that it is written "to this day" it means forever, as opposed to the time when the verse was written? But isn't it written: "And the children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites who inhabited Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, to this day" (Judges 1:21)? So too here, let us say that the Jebusites were not exiled from Jerusalem.

¹⁹⁸ But wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: No person passed through the land of Judea for fifty-two years after the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar, as it is stated: "I will raise crying and wailing for the mountains, and a lamentation for the pastures of the wilderness, for they have been burned, with no person passing through. And they do not hear the sound of the cattle; from the bird of the heavens to the beast [behema], all have fled and gone" (Jeremiah 9:9). Behema, spelled beit, heh, mem, heh, has a numerical value of fifty-two, alluding to the fact that no one passed through the land for fifty-two years.

¹⁹⁹ And it was taught in another baraita that Rabbi Yosei says: For seven years a curse of brimstone and salt endured in Eretz Yisrael, rendering it unfit for human habitation. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: What is the rationale of Rabbi Yosei; from where does he learn this? It is derived from a verbal analogy between "covenant" and "covenant." It is written here: "And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week" (Daniel 9:27), i.e., seven years. And it is written there: "And that its entire land is brimstone and salt...They shall say: Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord, the God of their fathers" (Deuteronomy 29:22; 24). Evidently, the Jebusites must have been exiled from Jerusalem, which proves that the phrase "to this day" does not always mean forever.

²⁰⁰ Ulla said to him: Here, with regard to the Ark, it is written: "And they are there"; whereas there, in the verse that deals with the Jebusites, it is not written. And anywhere that "there" is written with the phrase "to this day" it means forever. The Gemara raises an objection from the following verse: "And some of them, even of the sons of Simeon, five hundred men, went to Mount Seir having for their captains Pelatiah and Neariah and Rephaiah and Uzziel, the sons of Ishi. And they smote the remnant of the Amalekites who escaped, and dwelt there to this day" (I Chronicles 4:42–43).

²⁰¹ The Gemara explains its objection: But Sennacherib, king of Assyria, had already come, and through his policy of forced population transfer he had scrambled all the nations of the lands, as it is

stated in reference to Sennacherib: “And I have removed the bounds of the peoples, and have robbed their treasures” (Isaiah 10:13). This indicates that the children of Simeon were also exiled, despite the fact that the verse states: “There to this day.” The Gemara concludes: Indeed, this is a conclusive refutation of Ulla’s statement.

²⁰² Rav Naḥman said that a Sage taught in the Tosefta: And the Rabbis say that the Ark of the Covenant was buried in the Chamber of the Woodshed. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We, too, have learned in a mishna: There was an incident involving a certain priest who was occupied with various matters, and he saw a floor tile in the woodshed that was different from the others. One of the marble floor tiles was higher than the rest, suggesting it had been lifted out and replaced. He came and informed his friend of the uneven tile, but was unable to finish his report and provide the exact location of the tile before his soul departed from his body. And consequently they knew definitively that the Ark was buried there, but its location was meant to be kept secret.

²⁰³ The Gemara asks: What was he doing, that priest who noticed the misplaced tile? Rabbi Ḥelbo said: He was occupied with his axe, i.e., he was banging the floor with his axe. He thereby discovered an empty space under a tile, which he guessed was the opening of a tunnel. The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Two blemished priests were sorting wormy wood when the axe of one of them dropped and fell there, into the hole in the floor. Blemished priests were appointed to inspect the wood for worms, as these logs were unfit for use on the altar. And fire burst out and consumed that priest, so the exact location remains unknown.

²⁰⁴ § Rabbi Yehuda raised a contradiction. It is written: “The ends of the staves were seen,” and it is written in that same verse: “But they could not be seen without” (I Kings 8:8). How can one reconcile this contradiction? They were seen and yet not seen, i.e., the staves were partially visible. This was also taught in a baraita: “The ends of the staves were seen”; one might have thought that they did not move from their position and did not protrude at all. Therefore, the verse states: “And the staves were so long.” One might have thought that they ripped through the curtain and emerged on the other side; therefore, the verse states: “They could not be seen without.”

²⁰⁵ How is this so? The staves of the Ark pushed and protruded and stuck out against the curtain toward the outside, and appeared like the two breasts of a woman pushing against her clothes. As it is stated: “My beloved is to me like a bundle of myrrh, that lies between my breasts” (Song of Songs 1:13). For this reason the Ark of the Covenant, where the Divine Presence rests, is positioned so that its staves protrude through the curtain, like the breasts of a woman.

²⁰⁶ Continuing the previous discussion, Rav Ketina said: When the Jewish people would ascend for one of the pilgrimage Festivals, the priests would roll up the curtain for them and show them the cherubs, which were clinging to one another, and say to them: See how you are beloved before God, like the love of a male and female. The two cherubs symbolize the Holy One, Blessed be He, and the Jewish people.

²⁰⁷ Rav Ḥisda raised an objection: How could the priests allow the people to see this? After all, it is stated with regard to the Tabernacle: “But they shall not go in to see the sacred objects as they are being covered, lest they die” (Numbers 4:20), and Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: When the vessels were put into their containers for transport, it was prohibited even for the Levites to look at them. The prohibition against viewing the vessels should be even more severe when they are fixed in their sacred place within the Temple. How could they be publicly displayed?

²⁰⁸ Rav Naḥman said in answer: This is analogous to a bride; as long as she is engaged but still in her father's house, she is modest in the presence of her husband. However, once she is married and comes to her father-in-law's house to live with her husband, she is no longer modest in the presence of her husband. Likewise, in the wilderness, when the Divine Presence did not dwell in a permanent place, it was prohibited to see the sacred objects. By contrast, all were allowed to see the sacred objects in their permanent place in the Temple.

²⁰⁹ Rav Ḥana bar Rav Ketina raised an objection from the aforementioned mishna: There was an incident involving a certain priest who was occupied and discovered the place where the Ark was hidden, and he subsequently died before he could reveal its location. Since he was prevented from seeing the Ark, it was evidently prohibited to see the sacred objects even after the Temple was built. Rav Naḥman said to him: This is not difficult, as you are speaking of when she was divorced. Since the Jewish people were exiled after the destruction of the First Temple, they are compared to a woman divorced from her husband, and when a woman is divorced she returns to her original beloved but reserved state. She is once again modest and does not reveal herself. Likewise, the Divine Presence will remain hidden until the glory of the First Temple is restored.

²¹⁰ The Gemara poses a question concerning Rav Ketina's statement: With what are we dealing here; in what circumstance did the priests roll up the curtain to show everyone the cherubs? If we say this is referring to the First Temple, was there a curtain between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies? In the First Temple, there was a wall there. Rather, we will say this is referring to the Second Temple; but were there cherubs there? Since there was no Ark, it follows that there were no cherubs on it. The Gemara answers: Actually, Rav Ketina is referring to the First Temple, and what is the curtain that he mentioned? It is the curtain of the gates. For all of the Jewish people to be able to see, they had to raise the curtains hanging on all the gates.

²¹¹ As Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: There were thirteen curtains in the Second Temple: Seven opposite, i.e., on the inside of, seven gates; two additional ones within the Temple, one of which was at the entrance to the Sanctuary and the other one of which was at the entrance to the Entrance Hall. Two additional curtains were within the partition, in the Holy of Holies in place of the one-cubit partition, and two corresponding to them were above in the upper chamber. Above the Holy of Holies, there was another level in the same layout as the one below, and a curtain was affixed there, too, as no one climbed up to the higher chamber above the Holy of Holies without a pressing need. These curtains were most likely hanging in the First Temple as well.

²¹² Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Actually, Rav Ketina's statement is referring to the Second Temple: There was a curtain at the entrance of the Holy of Holies, and indeed there were images of cherubs there, i.e., drawn or engraved pictures of the cherubs on the walls. As it is written: "And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubs and palm trees and open flowers, within and without" (I Kings 6:29), and it is further stated: "And he overlaid them with gold fitted upon the graven work" (I Kings 6:35), which teaches that in addition to the cherubs within the sacred place, other cherubs were drawn on the walls.

²¹³ And it is written: "According to the space of each with *loyot*" (I Kings 7:36). The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: "According to the space of each with *loyot*"? Rabba bar Rav Sheila said:

²¹⁴ It means like a man joined and clinging to his *livaya*, his partner, i.e., his wife. In other words, the cherubs appeared to be embracing one another. Reish Lakish said: When gentiles destroyed the

Second Temple and entered the Sanctuary, they saw these drawings of cherubs clinging to one another. They peeled them from the wall, took them out to the market, and said: These Jews, whose blessing is a blessing and whose curse is a curse, due to their great fear of God, should they be occupied with such matters, making images of this kind? They immediately debased and destroyed them, as it is stated: “All who honored her debase her because they have seen her nakedness” (Lamentations 1:8).

²¹⁵ § The mishna taught that a stone sat in the Holy of Holies and it was called the foundation [shetiyya] rock. A Sage taught in the Tosefta: Why was it called shetiyya? It is because the world was created [hushtat] from it. The Gemara comments: We learned the mishna in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that the world was created from Zion. As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: The world was created from its center, as it is stated: “When the dust runs into a mass, and the clods cleave fast together” (Job 38:38). The world was created by adding matter to the center, like the formation of clumps of earth.

²¹⁶ Rabbi Yehoshua says: The world was created from the sides, as it is stated: “For He said to the snow: Become the earth, likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of His mighty rain” (Job 37:6). This verse indicates that the rains fell from all sides, which led to the creation of the earth. Rabbi Yitzhak Nappaḥa said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, cast a stone into the sea, from which the world was created, as it is stated: “Upon what were its foundations fastened; or who laid its cornerstone?” (Job 38:6).

²¹⁷ And the Rabbis say: The world was created from Zion, as it is stated: “A Psalm of Asaph. God, the Lord God has spoken and called the earth, from the rising of the sun to its place of setting” (Psalms 50:1), and it states: “Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God has shined forth” (Psalms 50:2), i.e., from Zion the beauty of the world was perfected. The mishna is taught in accordance with this last opinion.

²¹⁸ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer the Great says: “These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created, on the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven” (Genesis 2:4) means that the generations of the heavens, i.e., all things found in the heavens, were created from the heavens, while the generations of the earth were created from the earth.

²¹⁹ And the Rabbis say: Both these and those were created from Zion, as it is stated: “A Psalm of Asaph. God, the Lord God has spoken and called the earth, from the rising of the sun to its place of setting,” and it says: “Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God has shined forth,” i.e., from Zion the beauty of the world was perfected, which includes both the generations of the heavens and the generations of the earth.

²²⁰ § The mishna taught that the High Priest took the blood of the bull from the one who was stirring it so it would not coagulate, and he entered and sprinkled it like one who whips. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: Like one who whips? Rav Yehuda demonstrated the action with his hand,

²²¹ like one who lashes with a whip on the back of another and who occasionally strikes lower down. A Sage taught in the Tosefta: When the High Priest sprinkles the blood, he does not sprinkle on the top of the Ark cover; rather, he does so against the thickness of the Ark cover. When he sprinkles once upward, he turns his hand so that the back of his hand faces downward, and he then sprinkles upward. And when he sprinkles seven times downward, he turns his hand so its back is upward.

However, he does not sprinkle on the Ark cover or below it, so that the blood does not actually come into contact with it.

²²² The Gemara asks: From where are these matters, that the sprinklings do not actually touch the Ark cover, derived? Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said that Rabbi Zeira said: The verse states with regard to the goat sacrificed as a sin-offering: "And he shall do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bull, and sprinkle it upon the Ark cover and before the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:15). The verse should not say downward, i.e., "before the Ark cover," with regard to the goat, as this is unnecessary; this requirement is derived from the term downward in connection with the bull.

²²³ Since the rite performed with the blood of the goat is compared to the rite of the blood of the bull, why is the requirement that the High Priest must sprinkle downward stated twice? It is to juxtapose the phrase "upon the Ark cover" to "before the Ark cover"; just as "before" means that it is not actually on the Ark cover but merely in front of it, so too, "upon" means that it is not actually on the Ark cover but in front of it, and the High Priest simply turns his hand upward.

²²⁴ The Gemara raises a difficulty: On the contrary, the verse should not say upward, i.e., "before the Ark cover," with regard to the bull, as this is unnecessary; it is derived from the term upward stated in connection to the goat. Since the verse equates the two rituals, why does it state the upward sprinkling of the blood of the bull? It is to juxtapose the phrase "before the Ark cover," stated with regard to the bull, to "upon the Ark cover," stated with regard to the goat; just as "upon" stated by the goat means actually upon, as indicated by the literal meaning of the verse, so too, "before" means actually upon it, i.e., the blood of the goat should touch the thickness of the Ark cover.

²²⁵ The Gemara expresses surprise at this suggestion: What is this comparison? Granted, if you say that downward stated with regard to the goat is mentioned to juxtapose it to upward stated with regard to the bull, one needs the phrase "upon the Ark cover," which deals with the blood of the bull, for that which the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov taught. As the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov taught: "Upon [al penei] the Ark cover to the east" (Leviticus 16:14); this forms an analogy that applies to the entire Torah: Any place where it is stated "face [penei]," it is referring to nothing other than the eastern side. However, if you say, as suggested by the question, that upward with regard to the bull is mentioned to juxtapose it to "upward" stated with regard to the goat, for what purpose does downward stated with regard to the goat come; what do we learn from this phrase? Rather, the first interpretation of the verse must be correct.

²²⁶ § The Sages taught: "And sprinkle it upon the Ark cover and before the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:15). We have thereby learned how many times the High Priest must sprinkle upward for the goat, that is, one sprinkling, as it states: "And sprinkle." However, with regard to the sprinkling downward for the goat, before the Ark cover, I do not know how many times he must sprinkle.

²²⁷ I therefore derive the halakha from the verses. It states that blood is sprinkled downward in the case of the bull, and it states that blood is sprinkled downward in the case of the goat. Just as the blood that he sprinkles downward in the case of the bull consists of seven sprinklings, as the verse explicitly states: "And before the Ark cover he shall sprinkle seven times" (Leviticus 16:14), so too, the sprinkling of the blood downward in the case of the goat is performed seven times.

²²⁸ The Gemara raises a difficulty: Or one can go and reason this way: It states that blood is sprinkled upward in the case of the goat, and likewise it states that blood is sprinkled downward in the case of the goat. Just as with regard to sprinkling upward in the case of the goat there is one

sprinkling, so too, with regard to sprinkling downward in the case of the goat there is only one sprinkling. The Gemara comments: Let us see what case this resembles: One derives an act performed downward from another act that is downward, and one does not derive an act performed downward from an upward act.

²²⁹ The Gemara retorts: On the contrary, one derives one aspect of a matter from another aspect of that same matter, i.e., one should infer the halakha with regard to the blood of the goat from another halakha involving that same blood, and one does not derive the halakha of that matter from an external matter. Therefore, the verse states: “And he shall do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bull” (Leviticus 16:15). As there is no need for the verse to state: “As he did,” because the whole process is explicitly stated a second time, what then is the meaning when the verse states: “As he did”? It comes to teach that all his actions should be alike, down to every detail. Consequently, just as the sprinklings downward in the case of the bull are seven, so too, the sprinklings downward in the case of the goat are seven.

²³⁰ We have thereby learned how many sprinklings are performed downward in the case of the bull and by the goat: Seven. However, I do not know how many times the High Priest must sprinkle upward in the case of the bull. And I therefore derive the halakha as follows: It states that blood is sprinkled upward in the case of the goat, and it states that blood is sprinkled upward in the case of the bull. Just as with regard to the sprinkling upward in the case of the goat he sprinkles one time, as stated explicitly, so too, in the case of the bull he sprinkles upward one time.

²³¹ The Gemara raises a difficulty: Or one can go and reason this way: It is stated that blood is sprinkled downward in the case of the bull, and likewise it is stated that blood is sprinkled upward in the case of the bull. Just as with regard to sprinkling downward in the case of the bull there are seven sprinklings, so too, with regard to sprinkling upward in the case of the bull there should be seven sprinklings. The Gemara comments: Let us see what case this resembles: One derives an act performed upward from another act that is performed upward, and one does not derive an act performed upward from a downward act.

²³² The Gemara retorts: On the contrary, one derives one aspect of a matter from another aspect of that same matter, and one does not derive the halakha of that matter from an external matter. Therefore, the verse states: “And he shall do with its blood as he did.” As there is no need for the verse to state: “As he did,” because the whole process is explicitly stated a second time, what then is the meaning when the verse states: “As he did”? It comes to teach that all his actions should be alike: Just as the sprinklings downward in the case of the bull are seven, so too, the sprinklings downward in the case of the goat are seven; and just as the sprinkling upward in the case of the goat is one, so too, the sprinkling upward in the case of the bull is one.

²³³ § The mishna states that the High Priest counted: One; one and one; one and two. The Sages taught in a baraita that when sprinkling, the High Priest counted: One; one and one; one and two; one and three; one and four; one and five; one and six; one and seven. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says that he counted: One; one and one; two and one; three and one; four and one; five and one; six and one; seven and one.

²³⁴ The Gemara comments: They do not disagree about the matter itself that the High Priest sprinkles once upward and seven times downward. Rather, this Sage rules in accordance with the norm in his

place, and this Sage rules in accordance with the norm in his place. In one place they counted the smaller number first, while in the other place they would count the larger number first.

²³⁵ The Gemara asks: In any case, everyone, both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, agrees that the first sprinkling upward must be counted together with each and every one of the subsequent sprinklings. What is the reason for this? Why can't the High Priest count the downward sprinklings separately? The Sages debated this matter. Rabbi Elazar said: The reason is so that he does not err in the sprinklings. If the High Priest were to count downward without including the first upward sprinkling, he might mistakenly think that his calculation includes the first sprinkling, which would lead him to add another one.

²³⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan said that the reason is that the verse states: "And he shall sprinkle it with his finger upon the Ark cover, and before the Ark cover he shall sprinkle" (Leviticus 16:14). As there is no need for the verse to state: He shall sprinkle" again, what is the meaning when the verse states: "He shall sprinkle"? This teaches with regard to the first sprinkling that it must be counted with each and every subsequent one, i.e., he must mention the first sprinkling every time.

²³⁷ The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two explanations? The Gemara answers: The practical difference between them concerns a case where he did not count the first sprinkling and did not err. That is acceptable according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, whereas according to Rabbi Yoḥanan the High Priest acted incorrectly, as it is a mitzva to count the first one.

²³⁸ § The mishna taught that the High Priest emerged and placed the bowl with the remaining blood of the bull on the golden pedestal in the Sanctuary, and later he placed the goat's blood on a second pedestal, whereas according to Rabbi Yehuda there was only one pedestal. The Gemara comments: We learned in a mishna there (Shekalim 6:6) that Rabbi Yehuda says: There were no collection horns for obligatory nests, i.e., the pairs of pigeons or turtledoves brought as sin- and burnt-offerings by women after childbirth or other individuals, due to the concern of mixtures.

²³⁹ The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: Due to a mixture? Rav Yosef said: It means due to the possible mixture of obligatory nests with free-will ones. There was concern lest the priests mix the money given for obligatory nests, which are sacrificed as a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, with the money for free-will nests, which are sacrificed as a pair of burnt-offerings. Mixing the funds in this way would disqualify the birds. Abaye said to him: And let us prepare two collection horns and write on them which is the container for obligatory offerings and which is the one for free-will offerings. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda

²⁴⁰ does not accept that one may rely on writing in a situation where an error is possible. As we learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: There was only one pedestal in the Temple on which to place the blood. What is the reason that they did not place two pedestals there? The reason is because the pedestals might be exchanged for one another, and he might take the goat's blood instead of that of the bull. But in that case, let us place two pedestals and write on them which one is for the bull and which is for the goat. Rather, it is clear that Rabbi Yehuda does not accept that one may rely on writing in a situation where error is possible.

²⁴¹ The Gemara raises an objection against this conclusion: There were thirteen collection horns in the Temple, and they were each inscribed with different names. On one container was written: New shekels. In this horn they placed shekels that were donated at the correct time that year. And on another horn the phrase old shekels was written, referring to coins from the past year that did not

reach the Temple during the allotted period. On the other horns, the following phrases were written: Nests, for obligatory offerings consisting of pairs of pigeons or turtledoves; young birds for burnt-offerings; wood, for anyone who wished to donate wood; frankincense; and gold for the Ark cover. And there were six additional boxes designated for communal free-will offerings of all kinds.

²⁴² The Gemara explains: New shekels, these are the shekels of each and every year that arrive on time; old shekels, these are for one who did not donate a shekel the previous year, who must donate the next year; nests, these are the turtledoves brought as offerings; young birds for burnt-offerings, these are pigeons; and all these birds are burnt-offerings; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yehuda maintains that there was no container for nests of obligatory sin-offerings and burnt-offerings, due to the potential mixture between the two. In any case, this shows that Rabbi Yehuda does rely on inscriptions written on containers, which contradicts the above claim that he does not rely on writing in these situations.

²⁴³ When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: They say in the West, Eretz Yisrael, that this is a rabbinic decree due to the possible presence in the mixture of a sin-offering whose owners have died. Since a sin-offering of this kind must be left to die, if one of the donors of the coins in the sin-offering horn passes away, his funds cannot be used. The Gemara asks: And are we concerned about the possible death of a donor? But didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to one who sends his sin-offering from overseas, they sacrifice it for him on the presumption that he is alive, although he might have died in the meantime. This shows that the possibility of death is not taken into account.

²⁴⁴ Rather, Rabbi Yehuda's concern is due to a sin-offering whose owner has certainly died, lest it be confirmed that one of the people who donated money for a sin-offering bird has indeed died. The Gemara asks: Even so, this can be rectified, as let us select four zuz, the price of such an offering, and throw them into the water to be destroyed. It may be said that the money removed from the box was the money for the sin-offering whose owner died, and these other coins will be permitted. It will be clarified retroactively that these coins were designated for that purpose. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda does not accept the rule of retroactive clarification. In his opinion, one cannot issue a designation after the fact. Consequently, he rejects this solution.

²⁴⁵ The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that this is indeed Rabbi Yehuda's opinion? If we say it is derived from that which we learned in the following mishna, there is a difficulty. The mishna states: With regard to one who buys wine from among the Samaritans, who do not tithe their produce properly, on Shabbat eve at nightfall and has no time to separate the tithe before Shabbat and to place the separated portions in distinct locations, he may arise and say: Two log of the one hundred log present here, which I will separate in the future, after Shabbat, shall be the teruma gedola given to a priest, as the Sages mandated that one-fiftieth of one's produce constitutes an average measure of teruma;

²⁴⁶ ten log that I will later separate shall be the first tithe; and another tenth from the rest, which equals nine log of the remaining ninety, shall be second tithe. And he redeems the second tithe with money that he will later take to Jerusalem, and he may then immediately drink the wine. After Shabbat, when he removes portions from the mixture and places them in vessels, they are retroactively designated as terumot and tithes. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

²⁴⁷ Rabbi Yehuda, Rabbi Yosei, and Rabbi Shimon prohibit this practice. Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda maintains that there is no retroactive clarification.

²⁴⁸ The Gemara explains the difficulty: From where do you reach this conclusion? Perhaps it is different there, as the reason is taught: The Rabbis said to Rabbi Meir: Do you not concede that the jug might split open before he removes the portions of terumot and tithes from the mixture, causing all the wine to spill out? And he will then be found drinking untithed wine retroactively. Therefore, he cannot rely on separation that has not yet occurred. And he said to them: Although there will be a problem if it splits open, there is no cause to be concerned for this contingency in advance. Since this reasoning is based on the possibility that the jug might break, there is no proof from here that Rabbi Yehuda rejects the principle of retroactive clarification.

²⁴⁹ Rather, the proof that Rabbi Yehuda does not accept the principle of retroactive clarification is from a baraita the Sage Ayo taught. As Ayo taught that Rabbi Yehuda says: A person cannot stipulate conditions about two matters at once, e. g., one cannot establish a joining of Shabbat boundaries [eiruv] in each of two different directions on Friday afternoon while making the following stipulation: If tomorrow, on Shabbat, two Sages arrive from two different directions, I will decide then which of the two lecturers I prefer to hear at that point in time, which will determine which eiruv is in effect.

²⁵⁰ Rather, he may say that if the Sage comes to the east, his eiruv is to the east, and if the Sage comes to the west, his eiruv is to the west. However, he may not say that if one Sage comes from here, and another Sage comes from there, he will go wherever he wishes, in either direction.

²⁵¹ And we discussed this passage in the Gemara and asked: What is different about a case in which one stipulated that if Sages came from here and from there that he may go to whichever side he chooses, such that his eiruv is not effective? Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda maintains that there is no retroactive clarification, i.e., this person cannot claim after the fact that the place where he walked is designated as the place that he initially intended for his eiruv.

²⁵² However, according to this principle, when an individual establishes an eiruv to the east and to the west for the anticipated arrival of a single Sage, one should also invoke the principle that there is no retroactive clarification. Why does Rabbi Yehuda agree that if one anticipates the arrival of a single Sage and stipulates that if he comes to the east his eiruv will be to the east, the eiruv is valid?

²⁵³ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is not a true case of retroactive clarification, as the Sage had already come by twilight, but the one who established the eiruv did not yet know at which side of the town the Sage had arrived. Therefore, at the time the eiruv establishes his Shabbat residence, it is clear which eiruv he wants, although he himself will become aware of that only later. In this case, Rabbi Yehuda agrees that the eiruv is valid, but he nonetheless maintains in general that there is no retroactive clarification. This accounts for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion that there was no container for nests of obligatory sin-offerings and burnt-offerings, as he maintains that there is no solution for the possible mixture of the different coins.

²⁵⁴ The Gemara asks: And now that we have said and proven that according to Rabbi Yehuda there is no retroactive clarification, nevertheless he is of the opinion that one may rely on writing, as proven from the halakha of the collection horns. If so, on Yom Kippur as well, let us place two pedestals and write on them which one is for the blood of the bull and which is for the blood of the goat.

²⁵⁵ The Gemara answers: The reason they did not place two pedestals with writing on them is due to the High Priest's weakness. Since he is fasting during the entire day's service, the writing will not be on his mind; he will pay no attention to it and might become confused. As, if you do not say so, that there is concern for the High Priest's weakness, even without writing he should also not err, as this bowl in which he collects the bull's blood is relatively large and this one for the goat's blood is small.

²⁵⁶ And if you say that he does not collect all the bull's blood but only some of it, so that the bowls are of equal size, didn't Rav Yehuda say: One who slaughters the bull must receive all of the blood of the bull, as it is stated: "And all the blood of the bull he shall pour out on the base of the altar" (Leviticus 4:7).

²⁵⁷ And if you say that perhaps some of the bull's blood might spill, yielding equal amounts of blood, there should still be no mistake, as this blood, that of the goat, is white and bright compared to the blood of the bull, and this blood of the bull is red and darker than the other. Rather, the reason must be that due to the High Priest's weakness, these differences will not be on his mind. Here, too, the writing will not help, as due to the High Priest's weakness the inscriptions will not be on his mind.

²⁵⁸ § The Gemara relates: A certain person descended to lead the prayer service on Yom Kippur before Rava. He included the order of the High Priest's Yom Kippur service in his prayer, and he recited: The High Priest then emerged from the Holy of Holies and placed the bowl on the second golden pedestal in the Sanctuary; he took the blood of the bull from the pedestal and placed the blood of the goat in its place.

²⁵⁹ Rava said to him: This is problematic, as one statement is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the other one is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. According to the Rabbis, each of these bowls sat on its own pedestal in the Sanctuary, whereas Rabbi Yehuda maintains that the High Priest must first lift up the container with the blood of the bull and then put down that of the goat. Rather, you should recite the entire order of the service entirely in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis: He placed the blood of the goat on its designated pedestal and took the blood of the bull from the second stand.

²⁶⁰ § The mishna taught: And the High Priest sprinkled from the blood of the bull on the curtain opposite the Ark from outside the Holy of Holies. The Sages taught: "And he shall make atonement for the sacred place because of the impurities of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins; and so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting that dwells with them in the midst of their impurity" (Leviticus 16:16). What is the meaning when the verse states this? Just as he sprinkles in the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary, the Tent of Meeting, toward the curtain.

²⁶¹ Furthermore: Just as in the innermost sanctum he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward from the blood of the bull, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary. And just as in the innermost sanctum he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward from the blood of the goat, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary. The last part of the verse: "That dwells with them in the midst of their impurity," teaches that even when the Jewish people are impure, the Divine Presence is with them.

²⁶² With regard to this verse, the Gemara relates: A certain Sadducee said to Rabbi Ḥanina:

²⁶³ Now you are certainly impure, as it is written about the Jewish people: "Her impurity was in her skirts" (Lamentations 1:9), and the Divine Presence does not dwell upon the Jews when they are

impure. Rabbi Ḥanina said to him: Come and see what is written about the Jewish people: “That dwells with them in the midst of their impurity” (Leviticus 16:16). This indicates that even when they are impure, the Divine Presence dwells among them.

²⁶⁴ The Gemara raises a difficulty with regard to the aforementioned halakha. It was stated above that the comparison to the goat teaches that the High Priest sprinkles the bull’s blood once upward; and the seven downward sprinklings of the goat’s blood are derived from the rite of the blood of the bull. Subsequently, the order of sprinkling toward the curtain in the Sanctuary is again derived by means of a similar comparison. The Gemara asks: And does a matter derived by juxtaposition, i.e., a halakha not written explicitly in the Torah but learned by means of a comparison, again teach by juxtaposition? There is a general principle that a halakha derived by juxtaposition with regard to offerings cannot subsequently teach another halakha by juxtaposition.

²⁶⁵ The Gemara answers that the first juxtaposition was not a proper inference by verbal analogy, as this halakha that the High Priest must sprinkle once upward and seven times downward is derived both from that juxtaposition and something else as well. Since the basic requirement that he must sprinkle upward and downward for the bull and the goat is stated explicitly in both cases, and the comparison was necessary only to teach the precise number of sprinklings, this inference is not considered a juxtaposition to the extent that one cannot derive further comparisons from it.

²⁶⁶ The Gemara continues to question this explanation: It works out well according to the one who said that a juxtaposition that is also inferred from something else is not considered a juxtaposition in this regard; but according to the one who says that this too is called a juxtaposition, what can be said?

²⁶⁷ The Gemara answers: It is the locations that are derived from one another. The halakha of the blood of the bull was not derived from that of the goat, nor the halakha of sprinkling the bull’s blood outside the curtain from that of sprinkling the bull’s blood inside. Instead, the first comparison equates the sprinkling of the bull’s blood and the goat’s blood, while the second comparison equates the locations, i.e., he sprinkles outside the curtain in the same manner that he sprinkles inside. Consequently, the two juxtapositions are not connected to each other, which means that there is no problem of a halakha derived by juxtaposition itself teaching by juxtaposition.

²⁶⁸ If you wish, say instead a different resolution: The sprinkling outside is derived from the sprinkling inside all at once, i.e., the juxtaposition includes not only the blood of the bull and the goat, but also the manners of sprinkling the blood inside and outside. There are not two comparisons here, one derived from the other, but a single, complex juxtaposition.

²⁶⁹ § A Sage taught: When the High Priest sprinkles the blood, he does not actually sprinkle on the curtain but opposite the curtain. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: I saw the curtain in Rome. After a miracle was performed on his behalf and he healed the daughter of the Roman emperor, Rabbi Elazar was permitted to view the ruler’s treasures and take whatever he wanted. He saw the Temple vessels that the Romans captured, including the curtain. Rabbi Elazar continued: And on the curtain were several drops of blood from the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur. This shows that the blood was actually sprinkled on the curtain.

²⁷⁰ The Gemara questions this conclusion: But how can Rabbi Elazar be sure that these drops of blood were from the bull and goat of Yom Kippur? Perhaps they were from the bull for an unwitting communal sin or the goats for a sin of idolatry, both of whose blood is also sprinkled on the curtain.

²⁷¹ The Gemara explains that he saw that these sprinklings of blood were performed in their order, one drop after another, a sequence that is followed only in the Yom Kippur service. And we also learned in a mishna about a case like this with regard to the bull for an unwitting communal sin: When he sprinkles, the blood would not touch the curtain, but if it did touch, it touched, and this did not invalidate the service.

²⁷² Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: I saw the curtain in Rome, and there were several drops of blood on it from the bull for an unwitting communal sin and the goats for a sin of idolatry. The Gemara asks: But how could he identify the source of the blood; perhaps they were from the bull and goat of Yom Kippur? The Gemara answers: He saw that they were performed not in their order and inferred that they must be sprinklings from communal sin-offerings, which are not presented in a sequence.

²⁷³ The Gemara asks a question: What should the High Priest do if the blood of the bull became mixed with the blood of the goat before he finished all the sprinklings? Rava said: He should present from the mixture once upward and seven times downward, and that counts toward both this one and that one, as he has sprinkled from both of them.

²⁷⁴ They said this answer before Rabbi Yirmeya in Eretz Yisrael, whereupon he said: Foolish Babylonians! Because they live in a dark, low land, they speak darkened halakhot, devoid of logic. If this solution is followed, when the High Priest sprinkles the mixture of bull and goat blood, he thereby presents the upward sprinklings of the goat before he sprinkles the downward presentations of the bull; and the Torah said: “And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place” (Leviticus 16:20), which teaches: He finishes the blood of the bull by sprinkling upward and downward, and only afterward he finishes the blood of the goat.

²⁷⁵ Rather, Rabbi Yirmeya said that the High Priest proceeds as follows: He presents once upward and seven times downward for the purpose of sprinkling the blood of the bull, as the blood of the bull is in this mixture. And he again presents once upward and seven times downward for the purpose of sprinkling the blood of the goat. Although the blood is mixed together and by sprinkling for the purpose of the bull’s blood he also sprinkles some of the goat’s blood, since he has only the bull’s blood in mind it is as though he did not sprinkle the blood of the goat at all.

²⁷⁶ The Gemara asks another question: What should the High Priest do if the blood of the bull became mixed with the blood of the goat during the final presentations that he performs in the Sanctuary? Rav Pappa, who was sitting before Rava, thought to say: He presents seven times downward for the purpose of the bull and for the purpose of the goat, and he again presents once upward for the purpose of the goat.

²⁷⁷ Rava said to him: Until now they called us Babylonians merely foolish, and now they will call us the foolish of the foolish, as they will say that we teach them and yet they do not learn. In response to your statement one could simply repeat Rabbi Yirmeya’s previous argument: But he presents downward sprinklings for the goat before the upward sprinklings for the goat, and the Torah said: Present upward and then downward.

²⁷⁸ Rather, Rava said: He presents downward seven times for the purpose of the bull, and he again presents upward once and downward seven times for the purpose of the goat.

²⁷⁹ The Gemara asks another question: What if the cups became mixed, i.e., if the bowl containing the blood of the bull was confused with that of the blood of the goat? The Gemara explains: He presents blood from one cup by sprinkling upward once and downward seven times, and he again presents a second set of sprinklings from the second cup.

²⁸⁰ And he again presents another set of sprinklings, again from the first cup, which amounts to a total of three times. In this manner, he fulfills the obligation no matter which cup was which. If the first cup was that of the bull's blood and the second was that of the goat, he fulfilled his obligation with the first and second sprinklings. If the first cup contained the blood of the goat, he performed the sprinkling of the goat's blood before that of the bull, which means his first set of sprinklings are discounted. Consequently, when he sprinkled from the second cup, which contains the bull's blood, and a third time from the cup of the goat's blood, he fulfilled his obligation with the second and third sets of sprinklings.

²⁸¹ The Gemara asks yet another question: If only part of the blood became mixed together and part of the blood did not become mixed, e.g., if some of the blood spilled and became mixed in a third vessel, the solution is obvious: When he presents, he presents from the blood of certain identity.

²⁸² However, one could still ask a question with regard to this case: What is the status of the mixed blood in the other vessel or vessels? Are they considered the remainder of the blood, and the remainder of the blood goes to the base of the altar like the remainder of all blood of sin-offerings? Or perhaps this mixture of blood is rejected, as the blood from this vessel was not used for the first sprinklings, and therefore the two types of blood are spilled and go to the canal beneath the altar, which rinses all the dirt from the courtyard into the Kidron River.

²⁸³ Rav Pappa said: Even according to the one who says that one cup renders its counterpart a remainder, i.e., if a one collected blood in two cups, the blood in the second cup is considered the remainder of the first cup, this applies only in a case where he could present blood from the second cup if he wanted to, i.e., if both cups were filled with blood from the offering. However, in this case, as the blood in this vessel could not be presented even if he wanted to, it does not become a remainder, and it is therefore certainly rejected.

²⁸⁴ Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rav Pappa: On the contrary, even according to the one who says that when blood is collected in two cups one cup renders the blood of its counterpart rejected, that applies only when he rejects the second cup with his own hands, i.e., by means of a direct act. However, in a case where he does not reject it with his own hands, as no act of rejection was performed but rather the blood became a remainder by itself, the blood is not rejected.

²⁸⁵ As it was taught in a baraita: In the verse above, it says: "And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the corners of the altar of the burnt-offering, and he shall pour its blood out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering" (Leviticus 4:25). And in the verse below it says: "And the priest shall take of its blood with his finger, and put it upon the corners of the altar of burnt-offering, and he shall pour all its blood out at the base of the altar" (Leviticus 4:30). The second verse adds the word "all."

²⁸⁶ The baraita explains: From where is it derived with regard to a sin-offering that if one collected its blood in four cups and presented blood from each of them by sprinkling once from this cup and once from that cup until he has sprinkled four times, once from each cup, that the leftover blood in

all the cups is poured out as remainders on the base of the altar? The verse states: “And he shall pour all its blood.”

²⁸⁷ One might have thought that even if he presented four presentations from one of them, all the rest should be spilled on the base of the altar as remainder; therefore, the verse states: “And he shall pour its blood.” This indicates that not all the blood, but only that blood in the bowl from which blood was sprinkled on the altar, is poured on the base as a remainder, and the rest of the cups of blood are poured into the canal. Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: From where is it derived with regard to a sin-offering that if one collected its blood in four cups and presented four presentations from one of them, that they are all poured at the base of the altar? The verse states: “And he shall pour all its blood.”

²⁸⁸ The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, isn't it also written: “And he shall pour its blood”? How does he explain this difference between the verses? Rav Ashi said: When the Torah states “its blood,” it comes to exclude the remainders that are in the throat of the animal. If more blood comes out of the throat after the collection of the blood, that blood is certainly not poured on the base of the altar but is swept into the canal of the Temple.

²⁸⁹ § The mishna states that after the High Priest sprinkled the blood toward the curtain he poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat. The Gemara comments: We learned this mishna in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that the High Priest mixes the two types of blood before placing them on the corners of the inner altar, and he does not present each one separately. As it was stated: The later tanna'im, Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan, debated this issue. One of them said: The High Priest mixes the blood for the purpose of placing the blood on the altar's corners, and one of them said: He does not mix the blood.

²⁹⁰ The Gemara comments: Conclude that Rabbi Yoshiya was the tanna who said that the High Priest mixes the blood. In general, he maintains that whenever a verse mentions two matters, although the term: Together, is not written explicitly, it is considered as though the term: Together, is indeed written. In other words, two items that appear in the same verse are treated as combined unless expressly stated otherwise. By contrast, Rabbi Yonatan maintains that even if two matters are mentioned together they are treated separately unless the verse uses the term: Together. In this case, the verse states: “And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat” (Leviticus 16:18). Therefore, Rabbi Yoshiya rules that the High Priest must place the two sets of blood together.

²⁹¹ The Gemara rejects this contention. Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yonatan, it remains possible to explain its ruling, since it is different here, as it is written “once” (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that there must be one act of sprinkling and not two. Consequently, the High Priest must mix the blood to ensure that there is only one presentation.

²⁹² The Gemara comments: It was taught in a baraita contrary to our response, but in accordance with the initial assumption: “And he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; and he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, and put it on the corners of the altar round about” (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed. This is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya.

²⁹³ Rabbi Yonatan says: He presents from this one, the bull's blood, by itself, and he presents from that one, the goat's blood, by itself and does not mix them. Rabbi Yoshiya said to him: But wasn't it already stated: “And Aaron shall make atonement upon its corners once a year; with the blood of the

sin-offering of atonement” (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that the High Priest does not present twice?

²⁹⁴ Rabbi Yonatan said to him: But wasn’t it already stated: “Of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat” (Leviticus 16:18), which teaches that each set of sprinklings must be performed by itself? If so, why is “once” stated? This verse comes to tell you that he must perform the rite once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the bull; and likewise he must perform the rite once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the goat. From the blood of each of the animals, the High Priest presents only one set of sprinklings. This shows that Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan indeed disagree with regard to this issue.

²⁹⁵ It was taught in another baraita: “And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat” (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed together. Do you say that they should be mixed together, or perhaps that is not the case; rather, he presents from this blood by itself and from that by itself? Therefore, the verse states: “Once.” The Gemara comments: And this unattributed baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiya, who said the two sets of blood are mixed, as stated in the mishna.

²⁹⁶ § It was taught in the mishna that after the High Priest poured the bull’s blood into the goat’s blood, he placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl, to mix the blood well. Rami bar Ḥama raised a dilemma before Rav Ḥisda: What is the halakha if he placed one bowl inside a second bowl and collected the blood in the inner bowl? Does one type of object mingled with another of its own type interpose, which would mean that the priest has not collected the blood himself, as the outer bowl interposed between him and the vessel? Or perhaps an object of one type does not interpose for another object of the same type, and therefore the two bowls are considered one object.

²⁹⁷ Rav Ḥisda said to him: We have already learned the answer to this question in the mishna: He placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl. What, is it not correct to infer from this statement that he inserted the full bowl into the empty bowl?

²⁹⁸ Rami bar Ḥama responded: No, it means that he poured the full bowl into an empty bowl. Rav Ḥisda said to him: But this statement is unnecessary, as the tanna of the mishna already taught the requirement to pour from one vessel into another in the first clause: He poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat. The subsequent phrase: He placed the full into the empty, must therefore refer to the placement of one vessel inside another. Rami bar Ḥama responded: No, it means that he pours the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl a second time in order to mix them very well. To this end, he pours from one vessel into the other before again pouring the mixture back into the first vessel, thereby mixing them thoroughly.

²⁹⁹ The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a solution to this question: If a priest performed the Temple service while he was standing on top of a vessel, or on the foot of another priest, his service is disqualified, as the priest must stand directly on the floor of the Temple. The fact that the foot of another person is considered an interposition proves that one type serves as an interposition with regard to another object of the same type. The Gemara rejects this contention: A foot is different, as he cannot nullify it. The foot of another person cannot be considered nullified with respect to the priest’s foot, but in the case of a vessel it is possible to say that one vessel is nullified in favor of another vessel.

³⁰⁰ Some say that Rami bar Ḥama did not refer to the issue of interposition at all. Rather, this is the dilemma he raised before Rav Ḥisda: Is placing one vessel inside another vessel a proper manner of service; or is this not a proper manner of service, and if one does so his service is disqualified? The Gemara answers: Come and hear that which the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: “And they shall take all the service vessels, with which they serve in the Sanctuary” (Numbers 4:12). This verse is referring to two vessels and one service, which indicates that this is a proper manner of service.

³⁰¹ § Rami bar Ḥama raised another dilemma before Rav Ḥisda along the same lines: What is the halakha if he placed bast, the material that grows around palm trees, inside the bowl, and collected the blood in the bowl through the bast, such that the blood seeps through into the bowl? Does one type of object mixed with another not of its own type interpose; or perhaps it does not interpose? Could one say that since the blood seeps through, it therefore does not interpose? Or perhaps this case is no different, and as there is a foreign object in the vessel it is considered an interposition even if the blood seeps through.

³⁰² Rav Ḥisda said to him in response: We already learned this matter with regard to sanctifying the purification waters, i.e., the water mixed with ashes of the red heifer. If a sponge was placed inside the container of water, the water in the sponge is disqualified and the priest may not sprinkle with it. How should he proceed? He sprinkles from the water and continues until he reaches the sponge. This shows that the presence of the sponge in the water container is not considered an interposition for the water in the container, despite the fact that it itself is unfit for the service. Rami bar Ḥama replied: This is no proof. Water is different, as it is thin and therefore it certainly seeps through the sponge and reaches the bowl; whereas the thicker blood will perhaps not seep into the fiber.

³⁰³ Some say that this is how Rav Ḥisda resolved the problem of placing the bast in the bowl for Rami bar Ḥama: In the case of the blood it is valid, as blood passes through, and the bast does not obstruct it. However, in the case of the handful of a meal-offering, which must be sanctified in a vessel immediately after the handful is taken, if he put bast in a vessel and placed the handful on top of it, it is disqualified. The reason is that the handful of a meal-offering consists of dough, which does not pass through the bast, and it is therefore considered a proper interposition.

³⁰⁴ MISHNA: It is stated: “And he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; and he shall take of the blood of the bull, and of the blood of the goat, and place it upon the corners of the altar round about” (Leviticus 16:18). This altar is the golden altar, since the outer altar is not before the Lord in the Sanctuary. He began to cleanse the altar, sprinkling the blood downward. From where does he begin? He begins from the northeast corner, and proceeds to the northwest corner, and then to the southwest corner, and finally to the southeast corner. A way to remember this is: At the place where he begins sprinkling the blood for a sin-offering sacrificed on the outer altar, the southeast corner, there he finishes sprinkling the blood on the inner altar.

³⁰⁵ Rabbi Eliezer says: The priest would not circle the altar; rather, he stood in one place and sprinkled the blood from there. Since the altar was only one square cubit, he could sprinkle the blood on all four corners without moving.

³⁰⁶ And on all the corners he would present the blood from below upward, except for that corner that was directly before him, on which he would present the blood from above downward. He sprinkled blood on the pure gold of the altar seven times after clearing away the ashes. And he would pour the remainder of the blood on the western base of the outer altar. On a related topic, the mishna teaches

that he would pour the remaining blood of an offering, after it was sprinkled, on the outer altar, on its southern base. 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. This water was sold to gardeners for use as fertilizer. The gardeners paid for this water and thereby redeemed it from its sanctity. Failure to do so would render them guilty of misuse of consecrated property.

³⁰⁷ GEMARA: The Sages taught: “And he shall go out to the altar” (Leviticus 16:18). What is the meaning when the verse states this? Upon his exit, after sprinkling toward the curtain, the High Priest must necessarily reach the golden altar. Rabbi Neḥemya said: It is because we find with regard to the bull brought for a violation of all the mitzvot, i.e., the bull that must be brought in the event that the community errs with regard to any of the mitzvot, which is called the bull for an unwitting communal sin, that when the priest sprinkles toward the curtain he stands past the altar and sprinkles back toward the curtain; therefore, one might have thought that here, too, the rite should be performed in the same manner.

³⁰⁸ Therefore, the verse states: “And he shall go out to the altar.” Where was he before? He was on the inner side of the altar, i.e., the western side, close to the curtain, when he sprinkled, not on the outer side of the altar.

³⁰⁹ It was taught in another baraita: With regard to the bull for an unwitting communal sin the verse states: “And he shall sprinkle seven times before the Lord in front of the curtain” (Leviticus 4:17). What is the meaning when the verse states: Before the Lord? Rabbi Neḥemya said: It is because we find with regard to the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur that when he sprinkles the High Priest stands on the inner side of the altar, close to the curtain, and sprinkles toward the curtain; therefore, one might have thought that here, too, in the case of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, it should be the same rite.

³¹⁰ Therefore, the verse states: “And the priest shall put the blood upon the corners of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 4:7). This verse teaches that the altar is before the Lord, but the priest is not before the Lord. How so? The priest stands on the outer side of the altar and sprinkles.

³¹¹ § The mishna taught: He began to cleanse the altar, sprinkling the blood downward. The Sages taught in a baraita: He began to cleanse downward. From where would he begin? He would begin from the southeast corner of the altar, and from there he would turn to the southwest corner, onward to the northwest corner, and finally to the northeast corner. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: He began from the northeast corner, from which he turned to the northwest corner, then to the southwest corner, and finished at the southeast corner.

³¹² The Gemara notes: The place where the High Priest begins according to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, i.e., the northeast corner, there is where Rabbi Akiva says he ends; and the place where the High Priest begins according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, the southeast corner, there is where Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says he ends.

³¹³ The Gemara asks: Everyone agrees, in any case, that he does not perform the service at the corner that he encounters first. Since the High Priest approaches the altar from the west side, the first corner he encounters is located on the west side. What is the reason for this? Shmuel said: The reason is that the verse states: “And he shall go out to the altar,” which indicates that he does not begin until he

goes out from the sacred area beyond the entire area of the altar. At this stage, he is no longer on the western side of the altar but on its eastern side.

³¹⁴ The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, let him go around via the right. Since the High Priest is standing at the eastern side of the altar facing the west, the corner on his right is the northeast one. Let us say that they disagree with regard to the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel.

³¹⁵ 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.

³¹⁶ 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.

³¹⁷ § 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 right 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.

³¹⁸ 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.

³¹⁹ 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.

³²⁰ 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 Yosei, 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 Akiva, holds that we do not derive the encircling performed by hand from the encircling done by foot.

³²¹ § 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.

³²² 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.

³²³ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yishmael said: Two High Priests remained from the days of the First Temple. 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.

³²⁴ 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.

³²⁵ § 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] across from him. Since it was difficult for him to sprinkle on that corner from top to bottom, he sprinkled from below upward.

³²⁶ 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.

³²⁷ § The mishna taught: He sprinkled blood on the pure gold [tohor] of the altar. 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.

³²⁸ The Gemara raises an objection: When he sprinkles on the inner altar, he sprinkles neither on top of the ash 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.

³²⁹ § It was taught in a baraita that Ḥananya 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, Ḥananya, 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, and he therefore begins to sprinkle on the altar from the north side.

³³⁰ 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.

³³¹ § 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.

³³² § 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?

³³³ 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.

³³⁴ 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 Yoḥai 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.

³³⁵ 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.

³³⁶ 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, 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.

³³⁷ § 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, 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.

³³⁸ The Gemara comments: The Rabbis disagree only with regard to misuse of consecrated property that applies by rabbinic law, 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. Clearly, the Temple treasurers would not have sold it to gardeners *ab initio* had the Torah prohibited the use of this blood (Tosafot).

³³⁹ 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.

³⁴⁰ 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.

³⁴¹ 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 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.

³⁴² The Gemara answers: The reason is because the mitzva of the removal of the ashes 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, 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.

³⁴³ 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.

³⁴⁴ 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?

³⁴⁵ The Gemara responds: The reason is because the cases of the removal of the ashes and the heifer whose neck is broken are two verses that come as one, as it is prohibited to derive benefit from either of them even after their mitzva is completed, and any two verses that come as one do not teach their common feature to other cases. The heifer whose neck is broken is a ritual performed when a murder victim’s body is found outside a town, and it is not known who caused his death.

³⁴⁶ The Gemara challenges this reply from a different angle: It works out well according to the one who said that two verses that come as one do not teach their common feature to other cases, but according to the one who says that two verses that come as one do teach with regard to other cases, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: Two exclusions are written in these two cases, which indicate that this halakha applies to them alone. With respect to the removal of ashes, it states: “And he shall put it” (Leviticus 6:3), implying “it” and nothing else. With regard to the heifer whose neck is broken, it is written: “Whose neck was broken” (Deuteronomy 21:6), which teaches that this halakha applies solely to this case.

³⁴⁷ The Gemara asks: And if this halakha is derived from those two cases, why do I need these three verses stated with regard to blood, from which it is derived that the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects does not apply to the remainder of blood that flows to the Kidron River? The reference is to the three phrases singled out above from the verse: “I have given it to you upon the

altar to make atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life” (Leviticus 17:11).

³⁴⁸ The Gemara answers: One of those phrases comes to exclude the blood from the prohibition of notar, offerings that remain after the time when they may be eaten has expired. If one ate leftover blood, he is not punished with karet, as generally incurred by one who consumes notar. Rather, he is liable only for violating the prohibition against eating blood. And one phrase comes to exclude it from the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects, and one other phrase comes to exclude it from ritual impurity. If one ate this blood in a state of ritual impurity, he is liable only for the transgression of eating blood, but not on account of eating consecrated food while ritually impure.

³⁴⁹ However, no verse is required to exclude this blood from the halakha of piggul, an offering disqualified by improper intention, because this is already derived from another source, as we learned in a mishna: With regard to any offering that has another rite that permits it, e.g., an offering that is permitted by the sprinkling of blood or by means of a second offering, one is liable to receive karet if he eats it after it is rendered piggul. This is the case whether the other rite permits it for human consumption or whether it enables the offering to be sacrificed on the altar. However, the permitting factor itself is not subject to piggul. Consequently, piggul does not apply to blood itself, as it renders the offering permitted for human consumption or for the altar.

³⁵⁰ MISHNA: Each action performed in the context of the service of Yom Kippur stated in the mishna, as in the Torah, is listed in order. If the High Priest performed one of the actions before another, he has done nothing. If he performed the sprinkling of the blood of the goat before the sprinkling of the blood of the bull, he must repeat the action and sprinkle the blood of the goat after sprinkling the blood of the bull, so that the actions are performed in the proper order. And if the blood spills before he completed the presentations that were sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies, he must slaughter another bull or goat, and bring other blood, and then repeat all the services from the beginning inside the Holy of Holies.

³⁵¹ And similarly, if the blood spills before he finishes the presentations in the Sanctuary, he must begin the service in the Sanctuary from the beginning, and likewise with regard to the sprinkling of blood on the golden altar. Since they are each acts of atonement in and of themselves, there is no need to repeat the service of the entire day from the beginning. Rather, he need only repeat the specific element that he failed to complete. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: From the place that he interrupted that particular service, when the blood spilled, there he resumes performance of that service. In their opinion, each individual sprinkling in each of these services is an act in and of itself, and there is no need to repeat what he has already done.

³⁵² GEMARA: The Sages taught: Each action performed in the context of the service of Yom Kippur stated in the Torah is listed in order. If the High Priest performed one of the actions before another, he has done nothing. Rabbi Yehuda said: When does this apply? It applies to those actions performed in white garments inside the Sanctuary, e.g., burning the incense and sprinkling the blood, which are the essential services of the day. However, with regard to those actions performed in white garments outside, such as the lottery and the confession, if he performed one action before another, what he did is done and he need not repeat the rite.

³⁵³ In contrast, Rabbi Neḥemya says: In what case is this statement said, that the order is indispensable? It is said with regard to actions performed in white garments, whether inside or

outside the Sanctuary. However, with regard to those actions performed in golden garments outside the Sanctuary, the regular Temple service and additional services, if the order was altered, what he did is done. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: And both of them, Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Neḥemya, derived their opinions from one verse: “And this shall be an everlasting statute to you, to make atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year” (Leviticus 16:34).

³⁵⁴ Rabbi Yehuda maintains that this is referring to the place where atonement is achieved once a year, namely the Holy of Holies. In his opinion, the order of actions is indispensable for the services performed in the Holy of Holies. And Rabbi Neḥemya maintains that the verse is referring to the actions through which atonement is achieved once a year, meaning both the place and the garments. Consequently, in the opinion of Rabbi Neḥemya, the order for all actions performed in white clothes is indispensable.

³⁵⁵ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda the word place is written? The verse merely states “once a year,” which apparently is referring to the order of the service in general but not to a specific place. Rather, the Gemara retracts the previous explanation in favor of the following: This is the reasoning of Rabbi Yehuda: It is written: “This” (Leviticus 16:34), which is a term of restriction and limitation, and it is written: “Once a year” (Leviticus 16:34), another term of restriction. One restriction comes to exclude actions performed in the white garments outside the Sanctuary, meaning that they are not indispensable; and one restriction comes to exclude actions performed in the gold garments.

³⁵⁶ And how does Rabbi Neḥemya interpret these two restricting expressions? In his opinion, one of the restrictions comes to exclude actions performed in the gold garments, and one restriction comes to exclude the remainders of blood that are poured at the base of the altar, meaning that these are not indispensable. If the High Priest performed a service that is supposed to come after the spilling of the blood too early, the service is valid, despite the fact that the spilling of the blood is performed in white garments. The Gemara asks: And what does Rabbi Yehuda maintain with regard to the remainders of blood? The Gemara answers: In his opinion, if the other actions performed outside are indispensable, this too is indispensable; and if the other acts performed outside are not indispensable, the remainders are not indispensable either. The pouring of the remainders of blood is no different from the sprinkling of blood in this regard.

³⁵⁷ In proof that Rabbi Yehuda maintains that pouring the remainders of blood is no different from the sprinkling of blood, the Gemara cites a baraita that is referring to a case where the pouring of the remainders of the blood is entirely omitted. As it was taught in a baraita: “And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place” (Leviticus 16:20). This verse indicates that if he performed the atonement, he has finished the order of the service; and if he did not perform the atonement, he has not finished. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yehuda said to him: Why do we not say that if he finished sprinkling all the blood, he has performed atonement; and if he did not finish, he has not performed atonement? This would indicate that if one of the presentations is lacking it is as though he did nothing.

³⁵⁸ And we say in this regard: What is the practical difference between them? Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi debated this point. One of them said: There is a difference between them with regard to the source from which they derive their interpretation, i.e., there is no halakhic difference between them but only a dispute as to how to interpret the verses. And the other one said:

There is a difference between them with respect to whether pouring the remainders of blood at the base of the altar is indispensable to the atonement. According to Rabbi Akiva, it is not indispensable, whereas Rabbi Yehuda maintains that it is indispensable.

³⁵⁹ The Gemara asks: And did Rabbi Yoḥanan actually say this, that in Rabbi Neḥemya's opinion pouring the remainders of blood is not indispensable? But didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan himself say in tractate Zevaḥim (111a): Rabbi Neḥemya taught in accordance with the statement of the one who said that the remainders of blood are indispensable? The Gemara comments: Indeed, this is difficult.

³⁶⁰ § Rabbi Ḥanina said: With regard to incense that the High Priest scooped before the slaughtering of the bull, it is as though he did nothing. The Gemara comments: In accordance with whose opinion is this statement? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. As, if you say it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't Rabbi Yehuda say that when it is written "statute" (Leviticus 16:34), a term that indicates that no details may be altered, it is written with regard to actions performed in white garments within the Sanctuary, whereas scooping incense is done outside?

³⁶¹ The Gemara rejects this claim: Even if you say that Rabbi Ḥanina holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, it is possible that in his opinion scooping the incense for the purpose of it being taken inside is considered like an action actually performed inside. The Gemara raises a difficulty: We learned in the mishna that if the blood spills before the High Priest completed the presentations that were sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies, he must slaughter another bull or goat, bring other blood, and then sprinkle again from the beginning inside. And if it is so, that an action performed outside the Sanctuary for the purpose of a service inside the Sanctuary is considered like an action actually performed inside, merely slaughtering the bull and sprinkling the blood again should be insufficient. Instead, the mishna should have said that he must return and scoop the incense anew. The fact that the mishna did not say this proves that the order of scooping the incense is not indispensable.

³⁶² The Gemara answers that this is no proof, as he is not dealing with the incense. In practice, the High Priest must indeed go back and scoop new incense after slaughtering the bull. The mishna did not mention this detail because it is discussing the issue of the sprinkling of blood, not the incense service.

³⁶³ § Ulla said: With regard to a goat that he slaughtered before presentation of the blood of the bull, it is as though he did nothing. The Gemara asks: But we learned in the mishna that if he performed the sprinkling of the blood of the goat before the sprinkling of the blood of the bull, he must repeat the action and sprinkle the blood of the goat after sprinkling the blood of the bull. And if it is so that Ulla is correct, the mishna should have said that he must return and slaughter another bull. The Gemara answers: Ulla interpreted the mishna as referring only to the presentations in the Sanctuary that were performed out of order. However, it is essential that the presentations in the Holy of Holies must be performed before the slaughter of the goat. And likewise, Rabbi Afes said that the mishna is referring to the presentations in the Sanctuary.

³⁶⁴ § The mishna states: And similarly in the Sanctuary, and likewise on the golden altar, if the blood spills he must go back and begin that cycle of sprinklings afresh. The Sages taught: "And he shall make atonement for the most sacred place, and he shall make atonement for the Tent of Meeting and for the altar; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly"

(Leviticus 16:33). “And he shall make atonement for the most sacred place,” this is the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies; “the Tent of Meeting,” this is the Sanctuary; “altar” is meant as per its plain meaning; “he shall make atonement,” is referring to the second mention of this phrase in the verse, these are the courtyards.

³⁶⁵ “The priests” is meant as per its plain meaning; “people of the assembly,” these are the Israelites; “he shall make atonement,” these are the Levites, who also gain atonement. They are all equated in this verse in that they achieve one atonement in this verse, which indicates that they all achieve atonement through the scapegoat for all other transgressions, apart from the ritual impurity of the Temple and consecrated objects, i.e., entering the Temple or eating consecrated food while ritually impure. The bull presented inside atones only for the priests, while the goats atone solely for Israelites. Only the scapegoat atones equally for all Jews. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

³⁶⁶ Rabbi Shimon says: Just as the blood of the goat presented inside atones for Israelites who sinned with the ritual impurity of the Temple and its consecrated objects, so too, the blood of the High Priest’s bull atones for the priests who sinned with the ritual impurity of the Temple and its consecrated objects. And just as the confession over the scapegoat atones for Israelites with regard to all other transgressions, so too, the confession over the bull atones for the priests with regard to all other transgressions, and therefore the priests do not require atonement through the scapegoat.

³⁶⁷ The Sages taught in another baraita: “And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place, and the Tent of Meeting, and the altar, he shall present the live goat” (Leviticus 16:20). “And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place,” this is the sprinklings in the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies; “Tent of Meeting,” this is the sprinklings toward the curtain in the Sanctuary; “altar,” as per its plain meaning. This teaches that they each constitute a separate atonement unto themselves, i.e., each one of these actions achieves a distinct atonement. If a disqualification occurs in any of the atoning actions, he must return to the beginning of that action.

³⁶⁸ From here the Sages stated: If the High Priest presented some of the presentations inside the Holy of Holies and then the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins from the start of the presentations inside. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He need not start the cycle of sprinklings again; rather, he begins only from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations inside and then the blood spilled, he brings other blood and starts at the beginning of the presentations in the Sanctuary. However, he does not begin the presentations inside anew, as he has already sprinkled all the required blood inside, and that stage of the service is complete.

³⁶⁹ If he presented some of the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins again from the start in the Sanctuary, as he has not yet completed all the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins only from the place where he stopped.

³⁷⁰ If he finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins at the start of the presentations at the altar, as he has already achieved the atonement of the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. If he presented some of the presentations at the altar and the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins at the start of the presentations at the altar, as the atonement of the altar has yet not been completed. In this case, too, Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say that he begins from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations at the altar and the blood

spilled before he poured the remainder of the blood at the base of the outer altar, everyone agrees that the remainders are not indispensable, and he need not slaughter another offering for this mitzva.

³⁷¹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: And both of them, meaning the first tanna, i.e., Rabbi Meir, the accepted author of unattributed mishnayot, Rabbi Elazar, and Rabbi Shimon, derived their opinions from one verse: “And Aaron shall make atonement upon its corners once a year; with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement once a year he shall make atonement for it throughout your generations; it is most sacred to the Lord” (Exodus 30:10).

³⁷² Rabbi Yoḥanan elaborates: Rabbi Meir holds that God said: I said to you to bring one sin-offering and not two sin-offerings. In other words, the High Priest may not sprinkle the blood of two offerings on the inner altar. Consequently, if the blood of the sin-offering spilled in the middle of the rite, he may not complete the presentation with the blood of another animal; rather, he must slaughter new offerings so that he can present all the sprinklings at the altar from one sin-offering. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon hold that God said: I said to you to perform one sprinkling and not two sprinklings. If he already sprinkled once, the High Priest need not sprinkle again, and if the blood spilled in the middle, the rite is completed with the blood of another offering.

³⁷³ § It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Rabbi Ya’akov differentiated for me with respect to lugin. In other words, Rabbi Ya’akov said that although Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon disagree with Rabbi Meir with respect to the sprinkling on Yom Kippur, maintaining that the High Priest restarts from where he stopped, if some of the oil from the log used for purifying the leper spills in the middle of the sprinkling, these tanna’im do not disagree that the priest must start that rite afresh.

³⁷⁴ The Gemara expresses surprise at this claim: And do they not disagree with regard to this issue as well? But wasn’t it taught explicitly in a baraita: If he presented some of the presentations of oil that he sprinkles inside the Temple and the log spilled, he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations in the Sanctuary; and Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins from the place where he stopped.

³⁷⁵ Likewise, if he finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the log spilled, he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations that he puts on the thumbs of the leper. If he put some of the presentations on the leper’s thumbs and the log spilled, he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations on his thumbs. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations on his thumbs and the log spilled, everyone agrees that the presentations on the head are not indispensable. This baraita proves that Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon also disagree with Rabbi Meir with regard to the purifying oil of the leper.

³⁷⁶ The Gemara answers: Rather, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s statement must be amended, as one should say: Rabbi Ya’akov taught me this dispute with regard to lugin. Just as there is a dispute with regard to spilled blood during the presentations on Yom Kippur, Rabbi Ya’akov taught that a similar dispute applies to the leper’s log of oil.

³⁷⁷ The Gemara analyzes this issue: The Master said above that everyone agrees that the presentations of oil placed on the head of the leper are not indispensable. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? If we say it is because it is written: “And the rest of the oil that is in the priest’s hand he shall put upon the head of him that is to be purified, to make atonement for him before the

Lord” (Leviticus 14:29), which indicates that this presentation involves only the rest of the oil and is therefore not an essential element of atonement, however, if that is so, consider the verse: “But the rest of the meal-offering shall be for Aharon and his sons; it is one of the sacred offerings of the Lord by fire” (Leviticus 2:3). Should we say, so too, that they are not indispensable? This cannot be the case, as the halakha is that if the remnants of the meal-offering are lost before the handful is burnt, the owner of the offering must bring another handful.

³⁷⁸ The Gemara answers: It is different there, with regard to the leper’s log of oil, as it is written earlier: “And of the rest of the oil that is in his hand, the priest shall put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be purified, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the big toe of his right foot” (Leviticus 14:17), and it is also written: “And of the rest of the oil that is in the priest’s hand, he shall put upon the head of him that is to be purified” (Leviticus 14:18). This shows that the presentation on the head is performed only with the remainder of the oil, and therefore this action is certainly not indispensable.

³⁷⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said:

³⁸⁰ With regard to a leper’s guilt-offering that was slaughtered not for its own sake but for the purpose of a burnt-offering or peace-offering, we have arrived at the dispute between Rabbi Meir on the one hand and Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon on the other hand. Rabbi Yoḥanan clarifies his statement: According to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said that in the case of a service that was not completed he brings another animal and starts from the beginning, here too, in the case of the leper’s guilt-offering, he brings another animal and slaughters it, as Rabbi Meir maintains that a service that has not been completed is considered as though it had not been performed at all.

³⁸¹ And according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon, who say that he begins from the place where he stopped, here he has no remedy. According to their opinion, a service that has not been completed properly remains valid. In this case, once he has slaughtered the animal he cannot bring a second guilt-offering, as the verse states: “And offer it for a guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:12), and not two guilt-offerings.

³⁸² Rav Ḥisda strongly objects to this: But isn’t it written: “And offer it for a guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:12), which indicates that he must offer that same guilt-offering he waved earlier, and if he does not do so the rite is invalid? If so, even according to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, he cannot use another offering. The Gemara comments: Indeed, this is difficult for Rabbi Yoḥanan.

³⁸³ Even so, it was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan: With regard to a leper’s guilt-offering that the priest slaughtered not for its own sake, or if the priest did not put some of its blood on the leper’s thumbs, this guilt-offering is raised and sacrificed on the altar and requires libations as though it were valid. And yet the leper must bring another guilt-offering to make him eligible, i.e., pure of his leprosy. Evidently, there is an opinion that he may offer another guilt-offering, which apparently contradicts the opinion of Rav Ḥisda that everyone agrees that he cannot use another offering. And Rav Ḥisda could have said to you: What is the meaning of the term: Must, stated here? It means that he must do so, but since it is impossible he has no remedy.

³⁸⁴ The Gemara expresses surprise at this contention: But would a tanna teach: Must, when he means that he has no remedy? The Gemara answers: Yes, and indeed it was taught in a baraita: With regard to a totally bald nazirite, who cannot shave his hair with a razor as required, Beit Shammai say: He must perform the act of the passing of a razor anyway, and Beit Hillel say: He need not perform the

act of the passing of a razor. And Rabbi Avina said that when Beit Shammai say: Must, they mean he must do so, but since it is impossible, he has no remedy.

³⁸⁵ The Gemara comments: And Rabbi Avina, in his interpretation of this matter, disagrees with Rabbi Pedat. As Rabbi Pedat said: Beit Shammai and Rabbi Elazar said the same thing, i.e., they have the same opinion in this regard. The opinion of Beit Shammai is that which we said, that a bald nazirite must pass a razor over his head. The opinion of Rabbi Elazar is as it was taught in a mishna: A leper who has no thumb or big toe on which to sprinkle can never attain ritual purity. Rabbi Elazar says: The priest puts it on the spot where the thumb was, and he thereby fulfills his obligation. Rabbi Shimon says: If he put it on the left hand or foot, he has fulfilled his obligation. According to Rabbi Pedat, Rabbi Elazar and Beit Shammai both maintain that even if the rite cannot be performed in the precise manner, one fulfills his obligation regardless.

³⁸⁶ § The Sages taught: “And the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall put it upon the tip of the right ear of him who is to be purified, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the big toe of his right foot” (Leviticus 14:14). One might have thought that he should take it in a vessel; therefore, the verse states: “And put.” Just as putting means with the priest’s own body, so too, taking means with the priest’s own body.

³⁸⁷ The baraita continues: One might have thought that even with regard to the blood of the leper’s guilt-offering that he presents on the altar, like the blood of other guilt-offerings, it is so that he collects the blood in his hand rather than with a vessel. Therefore, the verse states: “For as the sin-offering is, so is the guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:13): Just as a sin-offering requires a vessel for collection of its blood, so too, the blood of a guilt-offering requires collection in a vessel. And you find that you must say: The leper’s guilt-offering requires two priests to collect its blood; one collects by hand, and the other one collects in a vessel. The one who collected in a vessel comes to the altar and sprinkles some of the blood on it, and the one who collected by hand comes to the leper and sprinkles some of the blood on him.

³⁸⁸ § We learned in a mishna there: And all of the animals whose blood was spilled, as stated in the mishna, render ritually impure the garments of those who are occupied with burning them. If a bull or goat was slaughtered, but their blood spilled after one stage of atonement, and another animal is brought to complete the sprinkling, the first animal is burned, an action that renders ritually impure the garments of the individuals who perform the burning. And each of these first animals is burned in the place of the ashes, in accordance with the halakha of inner sin-offerings. This is the statement of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon. And the Rabbis say: They do not render the garments impure and they are not burned in the place of the ashes, except for the last animal, since the atonement is completed with it.

³⁸⁹ Rava inquired before Rav Naḥman: How many goats does he send away? If the blood of the goat presented inside is spilled, the High Priest must bring an additional pair of goats and perform a new lottery. This might even happen several times, which would mean that one goat is offered on the altar while several goats are designated for sending away. What should be done with those goats? He said to him: Does he send away his flock? In other words, the Torah said to send only one goat, not an entire flock. Rava said to him:

³⁹⁰ And does he burn his flock? The Torah obligated him to burn only one goat, and yet there are times when he must burn several, as stated in the mishna. Rabbi Naḥman retorts: Is it comparable?

There, with respect to burning the goats, it is not written: “It,” which would restrict the burning to only one animal, whereas here, with regard to the scapegoat, it is written: “It,” which indicates that one animal alone is sent away. The objection has been refuted and indeed only one scapegoat is used.

³⁹¹ § It was stated that amora'im disagreed about the following issue. Rav Pappi said in the name of Rava: He sends the first goat; and Rav Shimi said in the name of Rava: He sends the last of them. The Gemara analyzes the matter: Granted, according to the opinion of Rav Shimi bar Ashi in the name of Rava, who said that he sends the last of them, it works out well, as he probably holds as stated above, that the last goat is used, since the atonement is completed with it. However, with regard to Rav Pappi in the name of Rava, what does he hold? The Gemara answers: He holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that when several identical items are available for a mitzva, the mitzva is performed with the first of them.

³⁹² The Gemara asks: To which of the halakhot of Rabbi Yosei is this referring? From which of Rabbi Yosei's statements is this conclusion derived? If we say it is the statement of Rabbi Yosei with regard to containers, this is problematic. As we learned in a mishna that Rabbi Yosei says: There were three containers of three se'a each, with which they collect the donation from the chamber. Every year the money donated to the Temple by the people in the month of Adar was placed in a special chamber. The treasurers subsequently filled three containers with these coins and used the funds to purchase the communal offerings, e.g., the daily offerings and the additional offerings for Festivals. And the letters alef, beit, gimmeil were written on the containers.

³⁹³ And it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei said: Why were the letters alef, beit, gimmeil written on them? It was to ascertain from which of them the donation was collected first, so that they could bring the money from it first, as the mitzva is to use the coins of the first container. This apparently proves that according to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, it is a mitzva to use the first item.

³⁹⁴ The Gemara responds: This is no proof, as perhaps at the time when the first container was fit to be used, the last was not yet fit to be used. When the first container was brought it was fit and designated for the offerings, whereas the coins in the second container had not yet been collected, and therefore the coins in the first container must be used first as they were sanctified first. Here, however, the scapegoat is consecrated only when its pair is sacrificed, and therefore the two cases are dissimilar.

³⁹⁵ Rather, the principle that one uses the first item is derived from the statement of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the Paschal offering, as it was taught in a baraita: With regard to one who separated a sheep for his Paschal offering and the sheep was lost, and he separated another sheep in its stead, and afterward the first sheep was found, and they both stand before him, he sacrifices whichever of them he wants; this is the statement of the Rabbis. Rabbi Yosei says: The mitzva is performed with the first sheep. And if the second was of superior quality to it, he brings the second sheep. This proves that according to Rabbi Yosei, if there are two animals equally fit for an offering, one brings the animal that was chosen first.

Chapter 6

¹ MISHNA: The mitzva of the two Yom Kippur goats, the goat sacrificed to God and the goat sent to Azazel that are brought as a pair, is as follows, ab initio: That they will both be identical in appearance, i.e., color, and in height, and in monetary value, and their acquisition must be as one, i.e., they must be purchased together. And even if they are not identical, nevertheless, they are valid. And similarly, if he acquired one today and one tomorrow, they are valid.

² If one of the goats died, if it died before the High Priest drew the lots, he immediately takes a counterpart for the second, since neither has yet been designated. And if it died after the High Priest drew the lots, he brings another pair of goats and draws lots over them from the start.

³ After that lottery he utters a stipulation: If the one to be sacrificed to God died, that goat upon which the lot for God was drawn in the second lottery shall stand in its stead; and if the one to be sent to Azazel died, that goat upon which the lot for Azazel was drawn shall stand in its stead. And the second, superfluous goat, i.e., in the case where a new pair of goats was brought, should graze until it becomes unfit, at which point it will be sold, and the money received from its sale will go toward the purchase of a public gift-offering. Although for individual sin-offerings in similar circumstances there is no remedy and it is left to die, that is not the case here, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. On the other hand, Rabbi Yehuda says: In this it should be left to die.

⁴ And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat is left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled, and two other goats are brought and lots are drawn.

⁵ GEMARA: The Sages taught: It states: “He shall take two goats” (Leviticus 16:5). The minimum number indicated by a plural term, as the word goats is here, is two. If so, what is the meaning when the verse states: Two? It teaches that the two should be identical. And from where do we derive that even if the two goats are not identical they are nevertheless valid? The verses state and repeat the word goat, goat (Leviticus 16:9–10) to amplify and indicate that the goats are valid even if they are not identical.

⁶ The Gemara asks: The reason is specifically because the Merciful One in the Torah amplified and thereby indicated that the goats are valid even if they are not identical. Doesn’t this indicate that if the Merciful One did not amplify, I would have said the goats are disqualified? From where do we derive that the goats are prevented from being sacrificed if they are not identical? The principle with regard to sacrificial offerings is that if the Torah indicates a requirement only once, it is a mitzva ab initio, and if the Torah repeats the requirement, it is considered indispensable in order for the offering to be valid.

⁷ The Gemara answers: It could enter your mind to say that since the word two, two, two, is written three times in the relevant passage, the repetition indicates that the goats are disqualified if they are not identical. Therefore, the Torah had to indicate that the goats are valid even if they are not identical.

⁸ The Gemara asks: And now that the Merciful One has amplified by repeating the word goat, goat, why do I need the threefold repetition of two, two, two? The Gemara answers that it teaches how the mitzva should be performed ab initio: One of the terms indicates that the goats should be identical in

appearance, one indicates they should be identical in height, and one indicates they should be identical in monetary value.

⁹ The Gemara comments that this was also taught in a baraita with regard to the lambs brought by a leper, based upon the verse: “He shall take two lambs” (Leviticus 14:10). The minimum number of lambs, which is a plural term, is two. If so, what is the meaning when the verse states “two”? It teaches that the two should be identical. And from where do we derive that even if the two lambs are not identical they are nevertheless valid? The verses state: Lamb, lamb, repetitively, to amplify and indicate that the lambs are valid even if they are not identical.

¹⁰ The Gemara asks: The reason is specifically because the Merciful One in the Torah amplified and thereby indicated that the lambs are valid even if they are not identical. Doesn’t this indicate that if the Merciful One did not amplify, I would have said the lambs are disqualified? From where do we derive that the lambs are prevented from being sacrificed if they are not identical? The Gemara answers: It could enter your mind to say that since it is written: “This shall be the law of the leper” (Leviticus 14:2), the verse indicates that every detail stated in this context is indispensable. Therefore, it was necessary for the Torah to indicate that the lambs are valid even if they are not identical.

¹¹ The Gemara asks: And now that the Merciful One has amplified by repeating the word lamb, lamb, why do I need the phrase “this shall be”? The Gemara answers: This phrase applies to the rest of the halakhot that are included in the atonement ritual of the leper, which are indispensable.

¹² The Gemara comments: And we also learned similarly with regard to the birds used for the purification of a leper. The verse states that the priest should take “two birds” (Leviticus 14:4), and the minimum number indicated by the plural term birds is two. What is the meaning when the verse states: Two? It indicates that the two birds should be identical. And from where do we derive that even if they are not identical they are valid? The verses state: Bird, bird (Leviticus 14:5–6), repetitively, to amplify.

¹³ The Gemara asks: The reason is specifically because the Merciful One in the Torah amplified and thereby indicated that the birds are valid even if they are not identical. Doesn’t this indicate that if the Merciful One did not amplify, I would have said the birds are disqualified? From where do we derive that the birds are prevented from being used if they are not identical? The Gemara answers: It could enter your mind to say that since it is written: “This shall be the law of the leper,” the verse indicates that every detail stated in this context is indispensable. Therefore, it was necessary for the Torah to indicate that the birds are valid even if they are not identical.

¹⁴ The Gemara asks: And now that the Merciful One has amplified by repeating the word bird, why do I need the phrase “this shall be”? The Gemara answers: This phrase applies to the rest of the halakhot that are included in the atonement ritual of the leper, which are indispensable.

¹⁵ The Gemara suggests: If so, this line of reasoning should be applied to the daily offerings as well. Let us say that when the verse states: “Two lambs of the first year, day by day, continually” (Exodus 29:38), the minimum number indicated by the word lambs is two. What is the meaning when the verse states “two”? It indicates that the two lambs should be identical. And from where do we derive that even if the two are not identical they are valid? The verse states the word lamb, lamb (Exodus 29:39), repetitively, to amplify. Let us learn from here that in order to fulfill the mitzva in the preferred manner, we also require that the two lambs used for the daily offering be identical.

¹⁶ The Gemara responds: That verse is needed for that which was taught in a baraita: “Two lambs of the first year, day by day” (Exodus 29:38), indicates that the lambs must be slaughtered opposite the location of the sun at that time of day.

¹⁷ The Gemara asks: Do you say it means opposite the location of the sun at that time of day, or does it only mean to say that two lambs must be sacrificed for the obligation of each day? The Gemara answers: When it states: “One lamb you shall offer in the morning, and the other lamb you shall offer in the afternoon” (Numbers 28:4), the obligation of each day is stated explicitly. And how do I uphold the verse: “Two lambs of the first year, day by day”? It teaches that the lambs must be slaughtered opposite the location of the sun at that time of day.

¹⁸ How is this done in actuality? The daily offering of the morning was slaughtered in the Temple courtyard opposite the northwest corner of the altar, on the second ring, across from the sun, which rises in the east. And the daily offering of the afternoon was slaughtered opposite the northeast corner of the altar, on the second ring, across the sun, which is located in the west in the afternoon.

¹⁹ The Gemara comments: When the Torah states: “Two lambs” (Numbers 28:9) with regard to the additional offerings brought on Shabbat, the word two, which is unnecessary, certainly indicates that the two should be identical *ab initio*.

²⁰ § The Sages taught: If the High Priest slaughtered the two Yom Kippur goats outside the Temple courtyard when he had not yet drawn lots to determine which of them is to be sacrificed to God and which is to be sent to Azazel, he is liable to receive the punishment of *karet* for both of them, as they are both fit for use as an offering. If he slaughtered them after he drew lots for them, he is liable for slaughtering the goat designated for God, which is a sacrificial offering, and he is exempt for slaughtering the goat designated for Azazel, as it is not a sacrificial offering.

²¹ The Gemara clarifies the meaning of this baraita. With regard to the statement that if he slaughtered the goats when he had not yet drawn lots, he is liable for both of them, the Gemara asks: For what are they fit? Before the lots are drawn, neither goat is fit for use as an offering. The Gemara answers that Rav Ḥisda said: He is liable since they are fit to be used as the goat whose sacrificial rites are performed outside. These two goats are fit for use as the additional offerings of Yom Kippur, whose sacrificial rites are performed outside of the Sanctuary, in the Temple courtyard. Therefore, the goats have the status of sacrificial offerings.

²² The Gemara asks: What is different about the goat whose sacrificial rites are performed inside the Sanctuary, i.e., the goat selected to be sacrificed as a sin-offering, for which the goats are not valid because they lack the lottery? They are also unfit to be used as the goat whose rites are performed outside the Sanctuary, as they lack the service of the day. The entire Yom Kippur service must be performed in the proper sequence, and several steps have to be executed before the additional offerings are sacrificed, including the sprinkling of the bull’s and goat’s blood, and the burning of the handful of incense. Since the additional offerings cannot yet be sacrificed, the goats cannot be considered fit for these offerings, and one should not be liable to receive *karet* for slaughtering the goats outside the Temple courtyard.

²³ The Gemara answers: Rav Ḥisda holds that an offering is not considered to be lacking time if it is to be brought on that day. An offering is considered lacking time, and therefore unfit, if it is supposed to be brought on a different day. However, if it is the proper day but the right moment has not yet arrived, the offering is considered valid. On the other hand, before the High Priest draws lots to

determine which of the goats will be sacrificed to God and which sent to Azazel, even though it is the proper day, the goats are not yet considered valid offerings because there is a necessary action that the High Priest must take with regard to the goat itself before it can be brought as an offering.

²⁴ Ravina said: Now that Rav Ḥisda said that although the drawing of lots is external to the animals themselves, an animal lacking the lottery is comparable to an animal lacking an action and is not yet considered a valid offering, a statement can be made with regard to that which Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Peace-offerings that one slaughtered in the Temple before the doors of the Sanctuary were opened are disqualified, as it is stated with regard to peace-offerings: “And he shall slaughter it at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 3:2), which teaches that it must be slaughtered when the entrance is open and serves as an actual entrance, but not when it is locked. As long as the entrance to the Tent of Meeting, or in the Temple the doors to the Sanctuary, remain closed, one may not sacrifice the peace-offerings, and if they are sacrificed, they are disqualified.

²⁵ Based on Rav Ḥisda’s statement, if he slaughtered them outside the Temple before the doors of the Sanctuary were opened he is exempt. What is the reason? Lacking the opening of the doors is comparable to lacking an action. Therefore, the offering was not yet fit to be sacrificed in the Temple, and when he slaughtered it outside, despite doing so with the intention that it is a sacrificial offering, he is not considered to have violated the prohibition against sacrificing an offering outside the Temple.

²⁶ Rav Ḥisda stated above that since the Yom Kippur goats could be used for the additional offerings, one is liable for slaughtering them outside the Temple. The Gemara asks: Does Rav Ḥisda accept the principle: Since a particular situation could come to be in the future, it is viewed as though it existed already in the present?

²⁷ And didn’t Rav Ḥisda say: If one slaughtered a Paschal lamb outside the Temple during the rest of the days of the year other than Passover eve, if he slaughtered it for its own sake, i.e., as a Paschal lamb, he is exempt, since at that time it is not fit to be sacrificed as a Paschal lamb. If he sacrificed it not for its own sake but rather as a peace-offering, he is liable. A Paschal lamb that is slaughtered as a peace-offering on any day of the year other than Passover eve is considered a valid peace-offering. Therefore, it has the status of an offering that is fit to be sacrificed in the Temple, and he is liable for slaughtering it outside the Temple.

²⁸ The Gemara comments: The reason he is liable is because he specifically slaughtered it not for its own sake. However, if he slaughtered it without specifying what offering he had in mind, it is considered to have been slaughtered for its own sake and he is exempt. But why is he exempt? Let us say: Since it is fit to be sacrificed within the Temple not for its own sake, i.e., as a peace-offering, it should be considered as though he slaughtered it as a peace-offering outside the Temple, and he should be liable.

²⁹ The Gemara responds: How can these cases be compared? There, with regard to the Paschal lamb, it requires explicit uprooting from the status of a Paschal lamb in order to be considered a peace-offering. Therefore, if he did not specify his intent, it is still considered a Paschal lamb, which is not fit to be sacrificed. These Yom Kippur goats do not require uprooting from their previous status. The Yom Kippur goats have the status of a sin-offering and the goats sacrificed as part of the additional offerings of the day are also considered sin-offerings. Therefore, one who slaughters them outside the

Temple is liable, as they are fit to be sacrificed at that time as sin-offerings, even without the principle: Since, etc.

³⁰ Rabba bar Shimi taught these two halakhot, cited above in the name of Rav Ḥisda, in the name of Rabba, and he found a difficulty between one statement of Rabba and another statement of Rabba. And he resolved the apparent contradiction as we resolved it.

³¹ § When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yirmeya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If one slaughtered a Paschal lamb outside the Temple during the rest of the days of the year, whether he slaughtered it for its own sake, as a Paschal lamb, or not for its own sake, as a peace-offering, he is exempt.

³² Rav Dimi said: I said this halakha before Rabbi Yirmeya and asked him: Granted, when he slaughters it outside the Temple for its own sake he is exempt, because it is not fit to be brought as a Paschal lamb at that time, and one is liable for slaughtering an offering outside the Temple only if it was fit to be sacrificed in the Temple. However, if he slaughters it not for its own sake, why is he exempt? Isn't it fit to be sacrificed not for its own sake as a peace-offering inside the Temple?

³³ And Rabbi Yirmeya said to me in response: Uprooting an offering's designation outside the Temple is not called uprooting. Since he slaughtered it outside, the status of the offering does not change from that of a Paschal lamb to that of a peace-offering, despite his intention to this effect.

³⁴ When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said a different version of the statement that Rabbi Yirmeya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If one slaughtered a Paschal lamb outside the Temple during the rest of the days of the year, whether he slaughtered it for its own sake or not for its own sake, he is liable.

³⁵ The Gemara expresses surprise: Is he liable even if he slaughtered it for its own sake? Didn't we learn in a mishna in tractate Zevaḥim that one is exempt for sacrificing an offering that was not yet fit for sacrifice because it was lacking time? This is so whether it itself was lacking time, such as if it was less than eight days old, or it was lacking time due to its owners.

³⁶ The Gemara explains: And what is an offering that is lacking time due to its owners? A zav, a zava, a woman after childbirth, and a leper, who sacrificed their offerings before the appropriate time. A zav, a zava, and a leper bring their offerings after counting seven days; a woman after childbirth brings hers when her purification period is complete.

³⁷ Any of these people who sacrificed their sin-offering and, in the case of lepers, their guilt-offering outside the Temple are exempt. Since they would not fulfill their obligations to bring these offerings if they would sacrifice them in the Temple, and the offerings are unfit to be brought as voluntary offerings, because sin-offerings and guilt-offerings are not brought as voluntary offerings, one who slaughters them outside the Temple is not liable. However, if they sacrifice their burnt-offerings and peace-offerings outside the Temple, they are liable. This is because these offerings could be valid as voluntary offerings if they were sacrificed in the Temple.

³⁸ And Rav Ḥilkiya bar Tovi said: They only taught that one is exempt for the guilt-offering when it is slaughtered for its own sake, but if it is slaughtered not for its own sake, he is liable, because a guilt-offering slaughtered in the Temple not for its own sake is valid.

³⁹ The Gemara considers this: If he slaughtered it for its own sake, in any event he is exempt. Why? Let us say: Since they are fit to be sacrificed inside the Temple not for their own sake, he should be

liable for sacrificing them outside. The Gemara responds: How can these cases be compared? There, the guilt-offering requires explicit uprooting of its designation in order to be valid. Here, a Paschal lamb during the rest of the days of the year is considered a peace-offering, even if its status is not explicitly uprooted.

⁴⁰ The Gemara continues to discuss the case of a Paschal lamb that was slaughtered outside the Temple during the rest of the year, and not for its own sake. Rav Ashi taught: He is liable, as we stated. Rav Yirmeya of Difti taught: He is exempt. Rav Yirmeya held that a Paschal lamb during the rest of the days of the year requires uprooting of its previous designation, and uprooting an offering's designation outside the Temple is not called uprooting. And this halakha disagrees with the statement of Rav H̥ilkiya bar Tovi, who held that uprooting an offering's designation outside the Temple is considered an effective uprooting of that designation.

⁴¹ § The Master said: If he slaughtered the two Yom Kippur goats outside the Temple after he drew lots to determine which of them is to be sacrificed to God and which is sent to Azazel, he is liable for slaughtering the one designated for God, and exempt for the one designated to be sent to Azazel.

⁴² The Sages taught in a baraita based upon the verses: “Any man of the house of Israel who shall slaughter a bull, or a lamb, or a goat in the camp, or who slaughters it outside the camp, and has not brought it to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting to present it as an offering to the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord, blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people” (Leviticus 17:3–4).

⁴³ If it would have mentioned just the word offering, I would derive that one is liable even for slaughtering animals consecrated for Temple maintenance outside the Temple, which are also called offering, as it is stated: “And we have brought the Lord's offering, what every man has found: Articles of gold, armlets, and bracelets, rings, earrings, and pendants” (Numbers 31:50). Therefore, the verse states: “And has not brought it to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 17:4), to teach that with regard to any animal fit to be sacrificed within the entrance to the Tent of Meeting or the Temple, one is liable for slaughtering it outside the Temple. Conversely, with regard to any animal that is not fit to be sacrificed within the entrance to the Tent of Meeting, one is not liable for slaughtering it outside the Temple.

⁴⁴ Furthermore: I might exclude these animals consecrated for Temple maintenance, which are not fit to be sacrificed within the entrance to the Tent of Meeting because they are blemished, and I will not exclude the heifer of a purification offering and the scapegoat, which are fit to come to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting. Therefore, the verse states “to the Lord” to indicate that one is liable only for those animals that are designated exclusively for God as offerings. These, the heifer of a purification offering and the scapegoat, are excluded, as they are not designated exclusively for God as sacrificial offerings but are used for some other purpose.

⁴⁵ The Gemara asks about this halakhic midrash: Does the expression “to the Lord” come to exclude? The Gemara raises a contradiction based upon the verse: “When a bull, or a lamb, or a goat, is born it shall be seven days under its mother; but from the eighth day on it may be accepted as an offering by fire to the Lord” (Leviticus 22:27). An offering by fire to the Lord: These are offerings by fire, which are sacrificed on the altar and which may not be sacrificed before their proper time.

⁴⁶ From where do we derive that he may not consecrate an animal when it is lacking time, i.e., before the eighth day? The verse states: An offering, which indicates that it should not be designated as an

offering before the eighth day. The expression: To the Lord comes to include the scapegoat, which is also brought for the sake of God. In other words, the expression: To the Lord, not only does not exclude the scapegoat from the category of offerings, but specifically includes it in this category.

⁴⁷ Rava said that this can be resolved as follows: There the expression is understood in the context of the verse and here it is understood in the context of the verse. There, with regard to consecrated animals slaughtered outside the Temple, where the phrase: To the entrance, in that same verse comes to include other offerings, the phrase: To the Lord necessarily comes to exclude. Conversely, here, with regard to consecrating animals before the proper time, where the phrase: Offering by fire comes to exclude, the phrase: To the Lord comes to include.

⁴⁸ Once the contradiction has been reconciled, the Gemara challenges the reasoning of the argument. The reason the scapegoat may not be consecrated before it is eight days old is because the Merciful One specifically included it among the other offerings. But had it not included it I would have said: The scapegoat may be consecrated even when it is lacking time. However, this is difficult: Isn't it true that the lottery establishes as the goat that is sacrificed to God, only one that is fit to be sacrificed to God? Since it is not known in advance which goat will be designated for this purpose, both goats must be eight days old and thereby fit to be sacrificed to God.

⁴⁹ Rav Yosef said: In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? It is the opinion of Ḥanan the Egyptian, as it was taught in a baraita that Ḥanan the Egyptian says: Even if the goat sacrificed to God has already been slaughtered and its blood has been collected in the cup, if the scapegoat dies, he brings another goat as a counterpart and pairs it with the goat that has already been slaughtered. Since in this case the priest need not draw new lots and the second goat is immediately designated to be sent to Azazel, it was necessary to teach that this goat must not be lacking time.

⁵⁰ The Gemara presents a challenge with regard to this answer. Say that you heard Ḥanan the Egyptian say that he does not hold that if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the other goat is rejected. Did you also hear him say that he does not require a new lottery for the second goat? Perhaps he meant that one brings two new goats and draws lots, and whichever is designated to be sent to Azazel is the counterpart to the goat that was already slaughtered.

⁵¹ The Gemara presents another explanation of why it was necessary for the Torah to indicate that the scapegoat must not be lacking time. Rather, Rav Yosef said: In accordance with whose opinion is this? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as it was taught in a baraita: If one of the goats dies, he brings another goat in its place without a lottery; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. Therefore, if the scapegoat would die, another goat would be designated as the scapegoat without a lottery, and it was necessary for the Torah to indicate that this goat had to be eight days old.

⁵² Ravina said that it is possible to answer according to all opinions. The derivation was necessary in a case where the scapegoat became blemished after the lottery and they redeemed it with another. In that situation, all agree that the new scapegoat does not need to be designated through a lottery, because the status of the original scapegoat was transferred to its replacement.

⁵³ The Gemara asks: From where do you say that the scapegoat is disqualified by a blemish? A blemish disqualifies only a sacrificial offering, and the scapegoat is not a sacrificial offering. The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita based upon the verse: "Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a growth, or scurvy, or scabbed, you shall not offer these to the Lord, nor make an offering by

fire of them upon the altar to the Lord” (Leviticus 22:22). The phrase: Nor make an offering by fire of them; these are the fats of blemished animals, which may not be sacrificed on the altar.

⁵⁴ I have only derived that it is prohibited to sacrifice all the fats of a blemished animal; from where do I derive that it is prohibited to sacrifice some of them? The verse states “of them,” which indicates that the prohibition applies even to some of them. “The altar”; this is referring to the prohibition against sprinkling the blood of blemished animals. The phrase “to the Lord” comes to include the scapegoat, which is also disqualified by a blemish.

⁵⁵ The Gemara comments: And it is necessary to write that a blemished scapegoat is disqualified and it is necessary to write that a scapegoat may not be lacking time. Since if the Merciful One had written only that a scapegoat is disqualified if it is lacking time, one might have said that this is because its time has not yet come and therefore it is unable to become consecrated. However, with regard to a blemished animal whose time has already arrived, say that it is not disqualified. And conversely, if the Merciful One had written only that a blemished scapegoat is disqualified, one might have said that this is because it is considered abhorrent to sacrifice a blemished animal as an offering. However, with regard to a goat that is lacking time, which is not abhorrent, say that it is not disqualified. It is therefore necessary for the Torah to include the scapegoat in both disqualifications.

⁵⁶ The Gemara presents another explanation as to why a verse is needed to indicate that the scapegoat may not be lacking time. Rava said: It is referring to a case where the one who sold the two goats had a critically ill person in his household, and he slaughtered the mother of the scapegoat in order to save the ill person’s life on Yom Kippur. Although the scapegoat is more than eight days old, it is considered lacking time because it is prohibited to slaughter a mother animal and its offspring on the same day.

⁵⁷ The Gemara asks: Is it prohibited in a case like this? The Merciful One stated in the Torah: “And whether it be a cow or ewe, you shall not slaughter it and its young on one day” (Leviticus 22:28), and this act of pushing the scapegoat off the cliff is not a ritual slaughter. Consequently, the prohibition against slaughtering a mother animal and its offspring should not apply. The Gemara answers: They say in the West, i.e., Eretz Yisrael, that pushing it off the cliff, which is the manner in which the scapegoat is supposed to be killed, is considered its slaughter.

⁵⁸ § It was taught in the mishna that if one of the goats dies after the lottery, a second pair of goats is sought and new lots are drawn. After that lottery, the priest utters a stipulation: If the one to be sacrificed to God died, that goat upon which the lot for God was drawn shall stand in its stead; and if the one to be sent to Azazel died, that goat upon which the lot for Azazel was drawn shall stand in its stead. The second, superfluous goat should graze until it becomes blemished, at which point it will be sold and the money received in its sale will go to the purchase of a public gift-offering. The Gemara discusses which goat is set to pasture: The one that remains from the first lottery or the one that remains from the second lottery?

⁵⁹ Rav said: If the goat to be sent to Azazel died, he should sacrifice the second goat of the first pair to God, and the second goat of the second pair should graze until it becomes unfit. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The second goat of the first pair is the one that should graze, whereas he should sacrifice the second goat of the second pair.

⁶⁰ The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do they disagree? The Gemara explains: Rav holds that animals are not rejected. An animal that was consecrated as an offering but later became

unfit for sacrifice is not considered disqualified forever. Therefore, although the remaining goat was not eligible to be sacrificed when its counterpart died, once another goat has been paired with it following a new lottery, it is no longer rejected and should be sacrificed. And Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that animals are rejected. Therefore, once the remaining goat from the first pair became disqualified, it remains disqualified forever.

⁶¹ The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rav? The Gemara answers: He derives it from the halakha applicable to an animal that is lacking time. In the case of an animal that is lacking time, is it not true that although it is unfit now, when it again becomes fit, it seems well, i.e., it may be sacrificed as an offering? Here, too, it is no different. The Gemara rejects this answer: Is it comparable? There, when the animal is lacking time, it was never fit to be sacrificed. Here, the animal was fit as an offering and later became unfit and was therefore rejected. Perhaps in this case it is permanently disqualified.

⁶² Rather, the Gemara retracts the first explanation and says that this is the reasoning of Rav: He derives it from the case of an animal with a temporary blemish. The animal is disqualified as an offering as long as the blemish remains, but is eligible for sacrifice once the blemish has healed. In the case of an animal with a temporary blemish, is it not true that although it is unfit now, when it again becomes fit, it seems well, i.e., it may be sacrificed as an offering? Here too, it is no different.

⁶³ The Gemara asks: There, in the case of an animal with a temporary blemish, from where do we derive this halakha? As it is written: “Because their corruption is in them, there is a blemish in them; they shall not be accepted for you” (Leviticus 22:25), which teaches us: It is when the blemish is in them that they shall not be accepted; but if their blemish passes, they shall be accepted.

⁶⁴ The Gemara asks: And what does Rabbi Yoḥanan respond to this proof? The Merciful One limited this halakha by using the term: In them, which indicates that it is they, animals with temporary blemishes, that are accepted when their blemishes pass, but with regard to all other animals that become disqualified, once they are rejected they remain rejected.

⁶⁵ The Gemara asks: And how does Rav answer Rabbi Yoḥanan? That term: In them, should be understood as follows: It is on their own that they are not accepted; but in mixtures with animals that are fit to be sacrificed, animals that have a temporary blemish are accepted.

⁶⁶ As we learned in a mishna: If limbs from unblemished burnt-offerings became mixed with limbs from blemished burnt-offerings, which are disqualified, Rabbi Eliezer says: If the head of one of them is sacrificed on the altar before they knew of the blemish, they should sacrifice all the heads, as it is assumed that the head of the disqualified animal was the one already sacrificed on the altar. Similarly, if the legs of one of them were sacrificed, they should sacrifice all the legs. And the Rabbis say: Even if all of them were sacrificed except for one, that one should be taken out to the place designated for burning disqualified offerings, as it is not assumed that the limbs of the disqualified animal have already been brought.

⁶⁷ The Gemara asks: And how does the other Sage, Rabbi Yoḥanan, derive the halakha that the limbs are acceptable if they are in a mixture? The Gemara answers: He derives it from the Torah’s choice of terminology: It could have written: “In them,” as bam, but instead it used the term bahem, with the extra letter heh, and therefore an extra halakha can be derived from this word. The Gemara comments: And the other Sage, Rav, does not expound the difference in terminology between the words bam and bahem, as he does not consider the distinction significant enough to teach a halakha.

⁶⁸ The Gemara asks: According to Rav, although living beings are not permanently rejected, that only explains why the remaining goat of the first pair is acceptable for sacrifice, but why must it be the one to be sacrificed? If he wants this one from the first pair he should sacrifice it, and if he wants that one from the second pair, he should sacrifice that.

⁶⁹ Rava said: Rav holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said: The mitzva should be fulfilled with the goat from the first pair. The Gemara asks: Which statement of Rabbi Yosei indicates that this is his opinion? If we say it is the statement of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the containers, as we learned in a mishna: There were three containers, each of which held three se'a, with which they collected coins from the chamber. And the letters ales, beit, and gimmel were written on them. And it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei said: Why were ales, beit, and gimmel written on them? In order to know which of them was collected from the chamber first, in order to bring an offering from it first, as the mitzva is performed with the first one.

⁷⁰ That statement of Rabbi Yosei cannot serve as the source for Rav's opinion. Perhaps it is different there, in the case of the containers, because at the time when the first container of coins was fit for use, the containers used later were not yet fit for use. Therefore, it cannot serve as a precedent with regard to a case in which both became fit for use at the same time. In the case of the Yom Kippur goats, none of the goats are actually fit for sacrifice until the point in the Temple service when they are supposed to be sacrificed. By that time, lots have already been drawn for the second pair of goats.

⁷¹ Rather, the source of Rav's opinion is the statement of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the Paschal lamb. As we learned in a baraita: With regard to one who separated an animal as his Paschal lamb and it became lost, and he separated another in its stead, and afterward, but before midday on the eve of Passover, the first one is found, and they are both standing before him, the owner may bring whichever of them he wishes. This is the statement of the Rabbis. Rabbi Yosei says: The mitzva should be performed with the first one.

⁷² And if the second one was superior to it, he brings that one. This demonstrates that according to Rabbi Yosei, when the two animals become fit for sacrifice at the same time, preference should be given to the first one unless the second one is superior.

⁷³ Rava said: The language of the mishna is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and the language of the baraita is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan. The Gemara explains: The language of the mishna is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rav, as it teaches: If the one to be sacrificed to God died, that goat upon which the lot for God was drawn shall stand in its stead. And the other goat stands as it stood before, i.e., its status does not change, in accordance with the opinion of Rav.

⁷⁴ The language of the baraita is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, as it teaches: When the mishna says that the second goat is left to graze, I do not know whether it is referring to the second goat of the first pair, or the second goat of the second pair. When the verse states: "It shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him, to send him away to Azazel into the wilderness" (Leviticus 16:10), it is not referring to the goat whose counterpart died. The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred, i.e., how does the verse indicate this point? The Gemara answers that it states: "It shall be stood alive," in the future tense, indicating that it is not referring to the one that already stood with its counterpart that died.

⁷⁵ We learned in the mishna: And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat is left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled, and two other goats are brought and lots are drawn. Granted, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said that animals that become disqualified are permanently rejected, even after the source of their initial disqualification is no longer present, due to that reason the scapegoat is left to die. However, according to Rav, who said that animals are not permanently rejected, why is the scapegoat left to die?

⁷⁶ Rav could have said to you: I did not state my opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. I stated my opinion in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. Rabbi Yehuda holds that disqualified animals are permanently rejected and communal sin-offerings may be left to die. The Rabbis disagree with both issues and hold that disqualified animals are not permanently disqualified, and communal sin-offerings that are disqualified are not left to die, but rather graze until they develop a blemish, and then are sold. Rav, who holds that the remaining goat from the first pair is sacrificed, states his opinion in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, i.e., that disqualified animals are not permanently rejected.

⁷⁷ The Gemara comments: Granted, according to the opinion of Rav, Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree with regard to whether disqualified animals are permanently rejected. However, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that even according to the Rabbis the remaining goat of the first pair is left to graze, with regard to what principle do Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree? Rava said: Didn't we say that the language of the mishna is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and it is difficult to explain the mishna's language in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan?

⁷⁸ We learned in the mishna that a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This indicates that the sin-offering of an individual in a case like this is left to die. Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that the remaining goat from the first pair is left to graze until it develops a blemish, it can be explained that the sin-offering of an individual in a comparable case is killed, in accordance with the opinion that Rabbi Abba said that Rav said. As Rabbi Abba said that Rav said:

⁷⁹ Everyone concedes that if the animal one designated as a sin-offering became lost, and he designated another animal in its stead and then found the first animal, if he gained atonement through the one that was not lost, i.e., the second one, the one that was lost is left to die.

⁸⁰ However, according to the opinion of Rav, who rules that the remaining goat from the first pair is the one that is sacrificed, that goat was never disqualified, and the extra goat from the second pair was designated to serve the same purpose as the remaining goat. This is like one who designates two sin-offerings as a guarantee, so that if he loses one of them he will still be able to bring the other one. And Rabbi Oshaya said that all agree that if one separated two sin-offerings as a guarantee, he gains atonement through one of them, and the second is left to graze until it becomes unfit. Consequently, even the sin-offering of an individual is not left to die in this case.

⁸¹ The Gemara answers: Since Rava said that Rav holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that the mitzva should be performed with the first animal, when one designates the second animal, it is considered from the beginning to be comparable to an offering separated in order to be lost. In that case, if it is the sin-offering of an individual, the second animal is left to die.

⁸² We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: It should be left to die. Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said that the second goat of the first pair should be left to graze, according to Rabbi Yehuda, who said it should be left to die, he nonetheless gains atonement with the second goat of the second pair.

⁸³ However, according to Rav, who said that the second goat of the second pair should be left to graze, and according to Rabbi Yehuda it should be left to die, then according to Rabbi Yehuda he cannot sacrifice either of the two goats: The first goat may not be sacrificed because Rabbi Yehuda holds that disqualified animals are permanently rejected, and the second goat must be left to die. With which goat will he gain atonement? The Gemara answers: Do you maintain that Rabbi Yehuda was referring to the second goat of the second pair when he said it should be left to die? Rabbi Yehuda was referring to the second goat of the first pair. The second goat of the second pair is sacrificed.

⁸⁴ There are those who raised this objection from the statement of Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna. And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat is left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled, and two other goats are brought and lots are drawn.

⁸⁵ Granted, according to Rav, in the first clause of the mishna they disagree with regard to a communal sin-offering. According to the Rabbis the second animal is left to graze, whereas according to Rabbi Yehuda it is left to die. And in the latter clause they disagree with regard to whether animals that become disqualified as offerings are permanently rejected. According to the Rabbis they are not rejected and therefore the first goat is sacrificed, whereas Rabbi Yehuda holds that they are rejected and therefore the first goat is left to die and the second goat is sacrificed. However, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, what does the term: And furthermore, in the mishna indicate? Even the Rabbis agree that the remaining goat from the first pair is permanently disqualified. The Gemara comments that indeed, this is difficult.

⁸⁶ § It was taught in the mishna: And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat should be left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled. The Gemara asks: Granted, if the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled, the scapegoat should be left to die, as the mitzva of the blood has not yet been performed, as it was not sprinkled in the prescribed manner.

⁸⁷ However, if the scapegoat dies, why should the blood of the goat sacrificed to God be spilled? The mitzva of the scapegoat has already been performed. The only essential detail with regard to the scapegoat is the lottery, which has already been performed by the priest. Sending it to Azazel and pushing it off a cliff are carried out by an appointed person and while they are prescribed ab initio, they are not indispensable. After the fact, if the goat dies in some other way, the obligation has been fulfilled.

⁸⁸ The Sages of the house of Rabbi Yannai said that the verse states: “But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him, to send him away to Azazel into the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:10). Until when must the scapegoat be alive? Until the blood of its counterpart is sprinkled, and if it dies before, the blood is disqualified.

⁸⁹ We learned in a mishna there (Shekalim 2:1): If residents of a city sent their shekels to the Temple with a messenger, and the shekels were stolen or were lost along the way; if the funds were already

collected, i.e., the coins for the new year's offerings were taken from the chamber before the money was stolen, the messengers take an oath to the treasurers of the Temple that they did not unlawfully use the shekels, but that they were taken unbeknownst to them or by force. This is because once the necessary coins have been removed, all other coins that have been dedicated for this purpose are considered Temple property wherever they are, and their subsequent theft does not change that status. If the messengers take this oath, they are exempt from monetary liability.

⁹⁰ And if the funds were not yet collected when these coins were stolen, the coins are still considered the property of those who dedicated them to the Temple, and therefore the messengers take an oath to the residents of the city, and the residents of the city donate other shekels to the Temple in their stead.

⁹¹ If the shekels that were lost are found or the thieves returned them, both these and those are shekels, i.e., they remain sanctified, but they do not count toward the amount due the following year. The next year the members of that city must donate new shekels; they have not fulfilled the second year's obligation by having given twice the previous year. Rabbi Yehuda says: They do count toward the following year.

⁹² The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda? Rava said: Rabbi Yehuda holds that the obligations of this year are also brought the following year, and therefore it is possible to fulfill one's obligation for the next year by using the shekels of this year.

⁹³ Abaye raised an objection to this explanation. It was taught that if the bull and goat of Yom Kippur were lost and one designated others in their stead, and similarly if the goats which atone for a communal transgression of idol worship by instruction of the court were lost and he designated others in their stead, and the original animals were found, all the original animals should be left to die, and cannot be sacrificed at a later time. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon say: They should be left to graze until they become unfit. Then they are sold, and the money received in their sale will go to the purchase of a public gift-offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. According to Rabbi Yehuda, if the obligations of this year may be brought the following year, the bull and goat of Yom Kippur that were lost should be sacrificed the following year, and not left to die. Rava said to him:

⁹⁴ You speak of communal offerings? Communal offerings are different, in accordance with what Rabbi Tavi said in the name of Rabbi Yoshiya. As Rabbi Tavi said that Rabbi Yoshiya said that the verse states: "This is the burnt-offering for every New Moon upon its renewal throughout the months of the year" (Numbers 28:14). The Torah said: Renew and bring Me an offering from the new contribution. This indicates that communal offerings must be brought from the donations of the current year and not from the donations of the previous year.

⁹⁵ The Gemara challenges this solution: This works out well with regard to the Yom Kippur goat, which is a communal offering and is purchased with money from the Temple treasury. However, with regard to the High Priest's bull which he pays for himself and which is considered an individual offering, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat.

⁹⁶ The Gemara expresses surprise: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? And furthermore, this statement that Rabbi Tavi said in the name of Rabbi Yoshiya is itself a mitzva ab initio, but is not indispensable. As Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: With regard to communal offerings that are brought on the first of Nisan, it is a mitzva

to bring them from the new year's shekel contributions. However, if he brought them from the old shekels that were donated during the previous year he has fulfilled his obligation, but he lacked the mitzva, i.e., he did not perform the procedure in the proper manner. It is difficult to argue that due to this inessential detail the Sages would issue a decree that the High Priest's bull should be left to die.

⁹⁷ Rather, Rabbi Zeira said that the reason the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are left to die is because the lottery does not establish designations from one year to another. Therefore, a goat designated by the lottery one year is not eligible for use the next year. The Gemara challenges this explanation: But let us bring this goat and another one and draw lots again. The Gemara responds: It is a rabbinic decree that was enacted lest people say that the lottery establishes designations from one year to another.

⁹⁸ The Gemara challenges: This works out well with regard to the goat, but with respect to the bull of the High Priest, which is not chosen by lottery, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat. The Gemara challenges further: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? Therefore, this answer should be rejected.

⁹⁹ The Rabbis stated another solution before Abaye: It is a rabbinic decree, due to a concern that the bull will become a sin-offering whose owners have died, since the High Priest might die during the year. The Gemara responds: This works out well with regard to the bull, but as for the goat, which is a communal offering, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the goat due to the bull.

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara asks: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? Rather, it is a rabbinic decree due to a concern that the goat will become a sin-offering whose year has passed. A goat may not be brought as a sin-offering once it is more than a year old, and there is a concern that the goat will be too old by the Yom Kippur of the following year. The Gemara expresses surprise: Is this a rabbinic decree? It is certainly a sin-offering whose year has passed, as the goat will certainly be more than a year old by the following Yom Kippur.

¹⁰¹ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as it is possible that the goat will not be disqualified, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it was taught in a baraita: With regard to redeeming houses in a walled city the Torah states: "And if it not be redeemed within the space of a full year" (Leviticus 25:30), which indicates that he counts 365 days, in accordance with the number of days in a solar year; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: He counts twelve months from day to day. Therefore, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, if the goat was less than eleven days old on the first Yom Kippur, it will not be disqualified on the following Yom Kippur because it will still be less than 365 days old, as long as the first year was not a leap year. Nevertheless, it is disqualified by rabbinic decree due to a concern that other goats would be used in similar circumstances even if they were more than a year old.

¹⁰² And if the year was extended and made into a leap year, it is extended for the benefit of the seller, and according to the Sages he has an additional month in which to redeem his house. The Gemara asks: This works out well with regard to the goat, but with regard to the bull, what is there to say? The bull remains valid even if it is more than a year old. The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat.

¹⁰³ The Gemara asks: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? And furthermore, a sin-offering whose year has passed is not left to die but rather goes to graze. As Reish Lakish said: We consider a sin-offering whose year has passed as though it stands in a cemetery, and the priest cannot take it out in order to sacrifice it because he is not permitted to become ritually defiled. Therefore, it grazes until it becomes unfit and is then sold.

¹⁰⁴ Rather, Rava said: The bull and goat of Yom Kippur may not be left from one year to the next by rabbinic decree due to a concern that a mishap may occur. As it was taught in a baraita: One may neither consecrate objects, nor value, i.e., take a vow to donate one's value to the Temple treasury, nor dedicate items for sacred use at this time, when the Temple no longer exists.

¹⁰⁵ And if one did consecrate, value, or dedicate items for sacred use: If he dedicated an animal it is uprooted, i.e., he arranges for it to die quickly. If he dedicated agricultural produce, garments, or vessels made from materials that decompose, he should store them until they decompose. And if he dedicated money or metal vessels, he should redeem them and transport the value of their benefit to the Dead Sea. This baraita indicates that animals that cannot be sacrificed at this time must be left to die so that they are not used improperly. The Gemara explains: And what constitutes uprooting? He locks the door before it, and it dies on its own from hunger.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara asks: What mishap might occur if the bull and goat are left until the next year? If you say it is a mishap of offering the animal as a different offering, a similar concern should exist even with regard to all animals that have been disqualified for use as offerings that one leaves to graze. If it is a mishap of shearing the animal's wool and working the animal, which would constitute unlawful use of consecrated property, a similar concern should exist even with regard to all animals that have been disqualified for use as offerings that are left to graze. Why are these animals in particular left to die?

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara answers: Actually, the concern is for a mishap of sacrifice. And those other disqualified animals that are left to graze, which are not fit for sacrifice, he is not preoccupied with, and will not accidentally sacrifice them. This bull and goat, which are fit for sacrifice next year, he is preoccupied with them. Therefore, there is a greater concern that one may sacrifice them as offerings, and they may not be left to graze.

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara comments: This issue itself, i.e., whether decrees are instituted due to a concern about a possible mishap, is a dispute between tanna'im. As it was taught in one baraita: A Paschal lamb that was not sacrificed on the first Pesah is sold to someone who was impure on the first Pesah or who was distant from Jerusalem, so that it may be sacrificed on the second Pesah. If it was not sacrificed on the second Pesah, it is sacrificed the following year. And it was taught in another baraita: If it was not sacrificed on the second Pesah, it is not sacrificed the following year. What, is it not that they disagree about the question of whether a decree was issued prohibiting keeping the animal for an entire year due to a concern about the possibility of a mishap?

¹⁰⁹ The Gemara responds: No, these sources do not prove that the tanna'im disputed this issue. It is possible that everyone agrees that we are not concerned about a mishap, and here they disagree about the dispute between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis with regard to whether it is possible that the lamb will still be fit for sacrifice the following year. And the apparent contradiction between the baraitot is not difficult. This baraita, which says that the lamb is brought the following year, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. That baraita, which says that the lamb may

not be sacrificed the following year, is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who hold that by the following year, the lamb will certainly be more than a year old and will therefore be unfit as a Paschal offering.

¹¹⁰ The Gemara challenges this rejection: Wasn't it taught in a baraita: And, so too, money that was dedicated for purchasing a Paschal lamb is subject to dispute about whether it may be kept for the following year. In the case of money, the dispute between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis is irrelevant. Rather, isn't it correct to conclude from this that they disagree with regard to whether a decree is issued due to a concern about a mishap? The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is so.

¹¹¹ MISHNA: The Yom Kippur service continues: The High Priest comes over to the scapegoat, places both his hands upon it, and confesses. And he would say as follows: Please, God, Your people, the house of Israel, have sinned, and done wrong, and rebelled before You. Please, God, grant atonement, please, for the sins, and for the wrongs, and for the rebellions that they have sinned, and done wrong, and rebelled before You, Your people, the house of Israel, as it is written in the Torah of Moses Your servant, saying: "For on this day atonement shall be made for you to cleanse you of all your sins; before the Lord you shall be purified" (Leviticus 16:30).

¹¹² And the priests and the people standing in the Temple courtyard, when they would hear the Explicit Name emerging from the mouth of the High Priest, when the High Priest did not use one of the substitute names for God, they would kneel and prostrate themselves and fall on their faces, and say: Blessed is the name of His glorious kingdom forever and ever. After the confession over the scapegoat, the priest passed the goat to the one who was to lead it to the wilderness. According to the halakha, everyone is eligible to lead it, but the High Priests established a fixed custom and did not allow an Israelite to lead it.

¹¹³ Rabbi Yosei said: That was not always the case. There was an incident where a person named Arsela led the goat to the wilderness, and he was an Israelite. And they made a ramp for the goat due to the Babylonian Jews who were in Jerusalem, who would pluck at the goat's hair and would say to the goat: Take our sins and go, take our sins and go, and do not leave them with us.

¹¹⁴ GEMARA: In the confession over the scapegoat, the High Priest confessed the sins of the Jewish people, whereas he did not say: The children of Aaron, Your sacred people, in order to confess the sins of the priests. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna that taught this mishna? Rabbi Yirmeya said: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, for if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't Rabbi Yehuda say: The priests receive atonement through the scapegoat, which indicates that their sins must be mentioned in the confession over the scapegoat?

¹¹⁵ Abaye said: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, is that to say that priests are not included among: Your people, the house of Israel? Nothing can be proven from the fact that the High Priest did not list every segment of the Jewish people separately.

¹¹⁶ It was taught in the mishna that the priest passed the goat to the one who was to lead it to the wilderness. The Sages taught, with regard to the verse: "And he shall send it away with an appointed man into the wilderness" (Leviticus 16:21), that the halakhic midrash interprets the word man as mentioned in order to qualify a non-priest for this task. The word appointed indicates

¹¹⁷ that he should be designated the day before. The word appointed also indicates that the scapegoat is always sent away at the appointed time, and even on Shabbat. Similarly, the word appointed indicates that the scapegoat is always sent away at the appointed time, and even when the appointed man is in a state of ritual impurity.

¹¹⁸ The baraita stated that the word man is mentioned to qualify a non-priest. The Gemara expresses surprise: It is obvious that a non-priest is qualified for this service; why would one have thought otherwise? The Gemara answers: Lest you say: The term atonement is written with regard to it, and atonement is achieved only through services performed by priests. Therefore, it teaches us that this atonement is not achieved through a sacrificial offering, and consequently the service may be performed even by an Israelite.

¹¹⁹ The baraita stated that the word appointed indicates that the service is performed even on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: With regard to what halakha is this stated? There is no apparent desecration of Shabbat by escorting the goat, since the halakha of Shabbat boundaries is merely Rabbinic. Rav Sheshet said: It is mentioned in order to state that if the goat were ill and could not walk the whole way, the one who escorts the goat carries it on his shoulder.

¹²⁰ The Gemara comments: In accordance with whose opinion was this stated? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, as, if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, didn't he say that a living being carries itself? Because a living being is lighter than dead weight, the living being is considered to be aiding the one carrying it, and therefore carrying a living being is not considered an act of prohibited labor according to Torah law. The Gemara rejects this: Even if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, a living being that is ill is different. Since the goat cannot walk on its own strength, despite the fact that it is alive, all agree that the one who carries it is performing a prohibited labor.

¹²¹ Based on the fact that the word appointed indicates that the scapegoat is sent away even on Shabbat, Rafram said: That is to say that the concept of eiruv and the prohibition against carrying out apply to Shabbat, but eiruv and carrying out do not apply to Yom Kippur. If these halakhot applied equally to Yom Kippur, and nevertheless the Torah commanded that the scapegoat be sent away, it would be unnecessary to derive that the same is true even if Yom Kippur occurs on Shabbat.

¹²² The baraita stated that the word appointed indicates that the service is performed even in a state of ritual impurity. The Gemara asks: With regard to what halakha is this stated? Rav Sheshet said: The verse comes to tell you that if the one sending the goat away became impure, he nevertheless enters the Temple courtyard while he is impure and sends it away.

¹²³ § Apropos this discussion, the Gemara mentions that the students once asked Rabbi Eliezer: If the goat became ill, what is the halakha with regard to whether the escort may carry it on his shoulder? He said to them: That goat can carry me and you, meaning the goat designated healthy was unlikely to become ill. Rabbi Eliezer thereby avoided the question. They asked him: If the one sending the goat away became ill, what is the halakha with regard to whether they send it with someone else? He said to them dismissively: I and you shall be in peace, i.e., this would never happen.

¹²⁴ The students continued to question Rabbi Eliezer: If he pushed the goat and it did not die upon its fall, what is the halakha with regard to whether he should follow it down and kill it? He said to them: "So may all your enemies perish, Lord" (Judges 5:31). In other words, the goat will certainly die on its own. Rabbi Eliezer did not wish to answer these questions, as will be explained below. However,

the Sages say: If the goat became ill, the escort carries it on his shoulder. If the one sending out the goat became ill, he sends the goat with someone else. If he pushes it and it does not die, he follows it down and kills it.

¹²⁵ The Gemara cites more questions that the students asked Rabbi Eliezer, which he refused to answer. They asked Rabbi Eliezer: What is the fate of so-and-so, a certain man who was known to be wicked, with regard to the World-to-Come? He evaded the question and said to them: You have only asked me about so-and-so, and not a different individual whom you believe to be righteous?

¹²⁶ They asked him: What is the halakha with regard to whether a shepherd may save a ewe from a lion on Shabbat (Me'iri)? He said to them: You have only asked me about the ewe? They asked him: What is the halakha with regard to saving the shepherd from the lion on Shabbat? He said to them: You have only asked me about the shepherd? They asked him: What is the halakha with regard to whether a mamzer inherits from his parents? Rabbi Eliezer responded with a question: Did you not ask me what is the halakha with regard to whether he may perform levirate marriage? They asked him: What is the halakha with regard to whether it is permitted to plaster one's house after the destruction of the Temple? Rabbi Eliezer responded: What is the halakha with regard to plastering one's grave?

¹²⁷ The Gemara explains: It was not because he was distancing them with words, and made irrelevant statements because he did not know the answers to these questions. Rather, Rabbi Eliezer responded in this way because he never said anything that he did not hear from the mouth of his teacher. Since he had not learned these points from his teacher, he did not answer directly, thereby indicating that he did not have a tradition with regard to these questions.

¹²⁸ The Gemara cites another question posed to Rabbi Eliezer. A wise woman asked Rabbi Eliezer: Since all bore equal responsibility for the incident of the Golden Calf, due to what factor were their deaths not equal? Some of the people were killed by the sword of Moses and the Levites, some were killed in a plague, and others were struck with an intestinal illness. He said to her: There is no wisdom in a woman except weaving with a spindle, and so it states: "And any woman who was wise-hearted spun with her hands" (Exodus 35:25). Therefore, it is unbecoming for a woman to concern herself with such questions.

¹²⁹ With regard to this issue, it was stated that the amora'im Rav and Levi disagreed: One of them said: One who sacrificed and burned incense to the calf, which are idolatrous practices that incur capital punishment, was punished by the sword. One who embraced and kissed it, which are not forms of idolatrous worship that incur capital punishment, was subject to a divine punishment of death by a plague. One who rejoiced inwardly but performed no act was killed by the intestinal illness known as hidrokan.

¹³⁰ And one of them said: One who served the calf in the presence of witnesses and after a warning was punished by the sword. One who served the calf in the presence of witnesses but without warning was subject to death by a plague. One who served without witnesses and without warning was killed by hidrokan.

¹³¹ Rav Yehuda said: The entire tribe of Levi did not engage in idol worship, as it is stated: "Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said: Who is for God, let him come to me; and all the children of Levi gathered to him" (Exodus 32:26).

¹³² Ravina sat and related this halakha with regard to the tribe of Levi. The sons of Rav Pappa bar Abba raised an objection to Ravina: The verse states in praise of the tribe of Levi: “Who said of his father and of his mother: I have not seen him, neither did he acknowledge his brothers, nor did he know his sons” (Deuteronomy 33:9). This indicates that some of them did engage in idol worship and were killed by their relatives.

¹³³ Ravina answered them: “His father” does not refer to his actual father, but rather his mother’s father, who was an Israelite. Similarly, the term “his brothers” is referring to his half-brothers from his mother, who were fathered by an Israelite. “His sons” is referring to his daughter’s sons from an Israelite, who are considered Israelites. In fact, however, no one from the tribe of Levi worshipped the calf.

¹³⁴ § It was taught in the mishna that they made a ramp for the goat due to the Babylonian Jews in Jerusalem. Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: They were not actually Babylonians, rather they were Alexandrians from Egypt. And since in Eretz Yisrael they hate the Babylonians, they would call all foreigners who acted inappropriately by their name as an insult. Similarly, it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: They were not Babylonians, rather they were Alexandrians. Rabbi Yosei, whose family was from Babylonia, said to him: May your mind be at ease, since you have put my mind at ease.

¹³⁵ It was taught in the mishna that the Babylonians would say: Take our sins and go. It was taught in the Tosefta that they would say as follows: Why does this goat remain here with the many sins of the generation; let him hurry and leave.

¹³⁶ MISHNA: People from among the prominent residents of Jerusalem would escort the one leading the goat until they reached the first booth. Booths were set up along the path to the wilderness to provide the escort a place to rest. There were ten booths from Jerusalem to the cliff,

¹³⁷ with a distance of ninety ris between them. As there are seven and a half ris for each mil, the total distance was twelve mil. At each and every booth, people there say to him: Here is food; here is water, if you need it. And they escort him from booth to booth, except for the last person at the last booth, who does not reach the cliff with him. Rather, he stands from a distance and observes his actions to ensure that he fulfills the mitzva properly.

¹³⁸ What did the one designated to dispatch the goat do there? He divided a strip of crimson into two parts, half of the strip tied to the rock, and half of it tied between the two horns of the goat. And he pushed the goat backward, and it rolls and descends. And it would not reach halfway down the mountain until it was torn limb from limb. The one designated to dispatch the goat came and sat under the roofing of last booth until it grows dark and only then went home. And from what point are the garments of the man rendered impure, as it is stated that he is impure and his clothes requires immersion? From the moment he emerges outside the wall of Jerusalem. Rabbi Shimon says: His clothes are rendered impure only from the moment that he pushes the goat from the cliff.

¹³⁹ GEMARA: The Sages taught: There were ten booths, and the distance between Jerusalem and the cliff was twelve mil; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: There were nine booths and the distance was ten mil. Rabbi Yosei says: There were five booths and the distance was ten mil, and all of them were able to escort the one leading the goat by establishing a joining of boundaries [eiruv tehumin] before Yom Kippur, allowing those at each booth to walk to the next booth.

¹⁴⁰ Rabbi Yosei said: Elazar my son told me: If they were able to walk to the next booth by establishing an eiruv, I could even make two booths suffice for the distance of ten mil. With the proper placement of an eiruv, an individual is permitted to walk a distance of two mil, which is four thousand cubits. Consequently, the people of Jerusalem could escort the one leading the goat a distance of two mil, and the people of the first booth could walk two mil from the booth toward Jerusalem to meet him, and escort him back to their booth. Others at that booth, who had established their eiruv in the direction of the second booth, could then escort the one leading the goat two mil toward the second booth, where he would be met by people from the second booth, who would escort him the remaining two mil to the booth. This booth would be located only two mil from the cliff.

¹⁴¹ The Gemara comments: In accordance with whose opinion is that which was taught in the baraita: People from all the booths would escort the one leading the goat, except for the last person in the last booth, who did not reach the cliff with him; rather, he stands from a distance and observes his actions? In accordance with whose opinion is this statement? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as he holds that the last booth was too far from the cliff for the people there to escort the one leading the goat the entire way.

¹⁴² It was taught in the mishna: At each and every booth people there say to him: Here is food; here is water, if you need it. It was taught: No man who escorted the goat ever needed this food and water. However, they would offer it to him anyway, because one who has bread in his basket is not similar to one who does not have bread in his basket. One who does not have food available to him is concerned that he will not be able to find any if he really needs it, and he therefore feels his hunger and thirst more acutely.

¹⁴³ § It was taught in the mishna: What did the person designated to dispatch the goat do there? He divided a strip of crimson into two parts, half of the strip tied to the rock, and half of it tied between the two horns of the goat. The Gemara asks: Let him tie the whole strip to the rock. The Gemara answers: Since it is a mitzva to push the goat from the cliff. If he tied the whole strip to the rock, perhaps it would turn white quickly, and his mind would be eased with the knowledge that the sins of the Jewish people had been forgiven. He would then not fulfill the mitzva of pushing the goat off the cliff. He therefore tied part of it between the horns of the goat and looked to see if it became white. Once he was actively involved with the goat, he would remember to push it off the cliff.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara asks: If so, let him tie the whole strip between the goat's horns. The Gemara answers: Sometimes the goat turns its head and he will not know if the strip turns white or not.

¹⁴⁵ The Sages taught: At first they would tie this strip of crimson to the opening of the Entrance Hall of the Temple on the outside. If the strip turned white they would rejoice, as this indicated that their sins had been atoned for. If it did not turn white they would be sad and ashamed. When the Sages saw that people were overly distressed on Yom Kippur, they established that they should tie the strip of crimson to the opening of the Entrance Hall on the inside, since only a few could actually go in to see it. And they would still peek and see: If it turned white, they would rejoice, and if it did not turn white they would be sad. Therefore, the Sages established that they should tie half of the strip to the rock and half of it between the goat's horns, so that the people would not know what happened to the strip until after the conclusion of Yom Kippur.

¹⁴⁶ Rabbi Naḥum bar Pappa said in the name of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar: At first they would tie the strip of crimson to the opening of the Entrance Hall of the Temple on the inside, and when the goat

reached the wilderness, the strip of crimson would turn white, and they knew that the mitzva was fulfilled. The verse alludes to the use of the strip of crimson, as it is stated: “Though your sins be as scarlet, they will become white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they will be as wool” (Isaiah 1:18). This verse indicates that when something scarlet turns white, it is a sign of atonement and forgiveness for the sins of the Jewish people.

¹⁴⁷ § It was taught in the mishna that the goat would not reach halfway down the mountain before it was torn limb from limb. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is the status of those limbs? Is it permitted to derive pleasure from them? Rav and Shmuel disagreed with regard to this issue. One said they are permitted for benefit, and one said they are prohibited.

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara explains their reasoning: The one who said they are permitted for benefit

¹⁴⁹ established his opinion based on a verse, as it is written: “And the goat shall bear upon it all their iniquities to a land which is cut off; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:22). The concluding phrase, “in the wilderness,” is unnecessary, and indicates that the goat shall be available for anyone to use, similar to a wilderness. And the one who said they are prohibited based his opinion on the same verse, as it is written, “cut off” [gezeira], which indicates a prohibition.

¹⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: And the one who said they are prohibited, what does he do with this term wilderness, i.e., what does he derive from it? The Gemara answers: He needs it for that which was taught in a baraita: There are three expressions used to describe the location of the procedure with the scapegoat: “Into the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:10), “into the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:21), and “in the wilderness” (Leviticus 16:22), to include Nov and Givon and Shiloh, when the Tabernacle was located there, and the eternal Temple. The mitzva of the scapegoat applied during the time periods when communal offerings were sacrificed in any of these locations.

¹⁵¹ The Gemara asks: And the other, what does he do with this word gezeira? The Gemara answers: He needs it for that which was taught in a baraita with regard to the word gezeira: Gezeira means nothing other than cut. That is, he must send the goat away to a place cut up by rocks standing upright and sticking out. Alternatively, gezeira is referring to nothing other than something that breaks apart and falls, a reference to the goat, which is torn limb from limb.

¹⁵² Alternatively, the word gezeira is written lest you say the procedure of the scapegoat is a meaningless act, since what sanctity and atonement is achieved in sending the goat to Azazel and pushing it from the cliff? Therefore, the verse states: “I am the Lord” (Leviticus 18:5), i.e., I, the Lord, decreed it [gezartiv], and you have no right to question it.

¹⁵³ Having clarified the reasoning of each opinion, the Gemara concludes its discussion of whether the limbs of the goat are permitted for benefit. Rava said: It is reasonable to rule in accordance with the one that said the limbs of the goat are permitted, since the Torah did not say: “And send the goat” to cause mishap. Once the man pushes the goat off the cliff, he is no longer responsible for it. Therefore, if it were prohibited to derive benefit from the goat’s remains, the mitzva itself could lead to a mishap if someone were to find the goat’s remains and make use of them.

¹⁵⁴ § The Sages taught: The word Azazel indicates that the cliff the goat is pushed from should be rough and hard. I might have thought that it may be located in a settled area. Therefore, the verse states: “In the wilderness.” And from where does one derive that the goat is pushed from a cliff? The verse states “gezeira,” indicating an area that is sharp, like a cliff. It was taught in another baraita:

Azazel is a reference to the hardest mountain, and so it says: “And the mighty [eilei] of the land he took away” (Ezekiel 17:13). Azazel is interpreted as azaz-el, with the term el connoting something rough and hard.

¹⁵⁵ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Azazel is so called because it atones for the actions of Uzza and Azael. These are the names of “sons of God” who sinned with “daughters of men” (Genesis 6:2) and thereby caused the world to sin during the generation of the Flood.

¹⁵⁶ The Gemara cites another baraita related to the scapegoat. The Sages taught with regard to the verse: “You shall do My ordinances, and you shall keep My statutes to follow them, I am the Lord your God” (Leviticus 18:4), that the phrase: My ordinances, is a reference to matters that, even had they not been written, it would have been logical that they be written. They are the prohibitions against idol worship, prohibited sexual relations, bloodshed, theft, and blessing God, a euphemism for cursing the Name of God.

¹⁵⁷ The phrase: And you shall keep my statutes, is a reference to matters that Satan and the nations of the world challenge because the reason for these mitzvot are not known. They are: The prohibitions against eating pork; wearing garments that are made from diverse kinds of material, i.e., wool and linen; performing the ḥalitza ceremony with a yevama, a widow who must participate in a levirate marriage or ḥalitza; the purification ceremony of the leper; and the scapegoat. And lest you say these have no reason and are meaningless acts, therefore the verse states: “I am the Lord” (Leviticus 18:4), to indicate: I am the Lord, I decreed these statutes and you have no right to doubt them.

¹⁵⁸ § It was taught in the mishna that the tanna'im disagreed about from what point the garments of the man who leads the scapegoat are rendered impure. The Sages taught in a baraita: The garments of the one who dispatches the goat are rendered impure, but the garments of the one who dispatches the dispatcher, e.g., those who accompany him, are not rendered impure.

¹⁵⁹ One might have thought that as soon as he leaves the wall of the Temple courtyard he becomes ritually impure. Therefore, the verse states: “He that dispatched” (Leviticus 16:26), to teach that he does not contract impurity until his journey has begun. On the other hand, if the verse had simply stated: He that dispatched, one might have thought he does not become impure until he reaches the cliff. Therefore, the verse states: “And he that dispatched,” with the inclusive term “and.” How is this to be understood? His garments are rendered impure only when he emerged outside the wall of Jerusalem. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

¹⁶⁰ Rabbi Yosei says that the verse states: “And he that dispatched the goat to Azazel shall wash” (Leviticus 16:26), which indicates that his garments are not rendered impure until he has reached Azazel, i.e., the cliff. Rabbi Shimon says: His garments are rendered impure only when he pushes the goat from the cliff, as it says: “And he that dispatched the goat to Azazel shall wash his clothes” (Leviticus 16:26), to indicate that he throws it headlong and only then, once he has fulfilled the mitzva, his garments are rendered impure.

¹⁶¹ MISHNA: After the High Priest passed the goat to the man tasked with dispatching the goat, he came next to the bull and the goat that were to be burned. He tore their flesh but was not required to cut it into pieces, and removed the portions of the offering consumed on the altar and placed them in a large bowl [magis] and burned them on the altar.

¹⁶² He interwove and bound the bull and the goat together into braids as one mass. They were placed in that way upon two poles and carried by four people who took them out to the place designated for burning, outside of Jerusalem. And at what point do the bull and goat render the garments of those who carried them impure, as it is written: “And he who burns them shall wash his garments” (Leviticus 16:28)? They render the garments impure from the moment that they emerged outside the wall of the Temple courtyard. Rabbi Shimon says: They render the garments impure from the moment that the fire has ignited in most of the bull and the goat.

¹⁶³ GEMARA: It was taught in the mishna that the High Priest removed the portions of the offering consumed on the altar and burned them on the altar. The Gemara expresses surprise: Would it enter your mind to say he burned them? He would not burn them right away, since he had to perform other services first. Rather, say that he placed them in a large bowl in order to burn them on the altar later.

¹⁶⁴ It was taught in the mishna that the High Priest interwove and bound the bull and the goat together into braids as one mass before taking them to be burned. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He made them like a braid, whose parts are interwoven. It was taught: He would not dissect the bull and goat in the manner of the dissection of the flesh of a burnt-offering, where the animal is skinned and then cut into parts. Rather, he would leave the skin on top of the flesh and would cut the animal into pieces without skinning it. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It is stated here with regard to the bull and goat, skin and flesh and dung (Leviticus 16:27), and it is stated below, with regard to the bull sin-offerings that are burned, skin and flesh and dung (Leviticus 4:11).

¹⁶⁵ Just as below it is prepared for burning by means of dissection and not by means of skinning, so too here it is by means of dissection and not by means of skinning.

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara asks: And there, with regard to bull sin-offerings that are burned, from where do we derive that they are cut but not skinned? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita: “And the skin of the bull and all its flesh, with its head and with its legs, and its innards, and its dung, even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on wood with fire” (Leviticus 4:11–12). This teaches that he brings it out whole. One might have thought that he should burn it whole. It is stated here: Its head and its legs, and it is stated there, with regard to burnt-offerings, head and legs. Just as there, the burnt-offering is performed by means of dissection, as explicitly stated in the verse, so too here it is by means of dissection.

¹⁶⁷ The Gemara asks: If so, derive the following from the same verbal analogy: Just as there, in the case of burnt-offerings, the dissection is performed with skinning, so too here it is with skinning, and he must remove the skin of the animals before burning them. The Gemara answers: Therefore, the verse states “and its innards, and its dung.” The Gemara asks: What is the derivation from this phrase? Rav Pappa said: Just as its dung is within its innards and they do not remove it, so too, its flesh is in its skin and they do not separate the skin from the flesh.

¹⁶⁸ § It was taught in the mishna that the tanna'im disagree about the question of at what point the bull and goat render the garments of those who carried them impure. The Sages taught a baraita based on the verse: “The bull of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering whose blood was brought in to gain atonement in the sacred place, shall be taken outside the camp and they shall burn” (Leviticus 16:27).

¹⁶⁹ One might wonder: Below, with regard to other bull sin-offerings that are burned, you give them three camps, meaning that the bulls are burned outside the Israelite camp or, in the time of the Temple, outside Jerusalem. And here you give them only one camp, as they are burned as soon as they are taken out of the Temple courtyard, which is considered the camp of the Divine Presence. This seems unreasonable and is not to be accepted. If so, why is it stated: “Outside the camp”? The intention is not that they leave only one camp, but rather, to say to you: Once it has left one camp it immediately renders the garments of those carrying it impure.

¹⁷⁰ The Gemara asks: And there, with regard to other bull sin-offerings that are burned, from where do we derive that they are removed from all three camps? The Gemara explains: As it was taught in a baraita: It is stated about the bull sin-offering of the High Priest: “Even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp...and burn it” (Leviticus 4:12), meaning that he should take it outside of three camps.

¹⁷¹ Do you say that he takes it outside of three camps, or is he required to take it outside of only one camp? When it says with regard to the bull sin-offering brought for the sin of the community: “He shall carry the bull outside the camp” (Leviticus 4:21), that verse requires explanation, as there is no need for the verse to state this, since it was already stated: “And burn it as he burned the first bull” (Leviticus 4:21), which indicates that all the halakhot of the bull sin-offering of a High Priest apply to the bull sin-offering of the community as well. And what is the meaning when the verse states outside the camp? To give it a second camp, i.e., to indicate that it must be removed from the Levite camp in addition to the camp of the Divine Presence.

¹⁷² And when it says: “Outside the camp” (Leviticus 6:4) with regard to removal of the ash, that verse also requires explanation, as there is no need for the verse to state this, since it was already stated with regard to the bull sin-offering of a High Priest: “Even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall it be burned” (Leviticus 4:12). Rather the repetition of the words: Outside the camp, indicates that he should give it a third camp, so that it is burned outside of the Israelite camp as well. Consequently, it has been derived that inner sin-offerings are burned outside of the three camps, and when the Torah states: Outside the camp, with regard to the bull and goat of Yom Kippur, it teaches that as soon as they are taken outside the Temple courtyard, the garments of those carrying them are rendered impure.

¹⁷³ The Gemara asks: And what does Rabbi Shimon do with the phrase outside the camp, as he holds that those carrying the bull and goat are rendered impure only once they leave all three camps? The Gemara answers: He needs it for that which was taught in a baraita, that Rabbi Eliezer says: It is stated here, with regard to the bull of Yom Kippur, outside the camp, and it is stated there, with regard to the red heifer, “outside the camp” (Numbers 19:3). Just as here, it is burned outside three camps, so too there the heifer, it is burned outside three camps. And just as there it is burned east of Jerusalem, since the heifer must be burned “toward the front of the Tent of Meeting” (Numbers 19:4), opposite the entrance to the Temple to its east, so too here the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are burned east of Jerusalem.

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara asks: And according to the Rabbis, where do they burn them? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita: Where are they burned?

¹⁷⁵ North of Jerusalem, and outside of three camps. Rabbi Yosei says: They are burned in the place of the ashes.

¹⁷⁶ Rava said: Who is the tanna who disagrees with Rabbi Yosei on this issue? It is Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, as it was taught in a baraita with regard to the verse: "Where the ashes are poured out [shefekh hadeshen] shall it be burned" (Leviticus 4:12), which means that there shall already be ash there in that place, so that it is known as the ash heap even before this animal is burned there. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: This verse indicates that its place should be slanted [meshupakh] so that ash that is deposited there will roll downhill. Rava understood that whereas Rabbi Yosei requires that there already be ash present when the bull is burned, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov does not.

¹⁷⁷ Abaye said to him: There is no proof from here, as perhaps they disagree only about whether the place must be slanted. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov may agree there should be ash there to begin with, but he adds that the place must also be slanted. Therefore, there is no proof to support Rava's statement.

¹⁷⁸ The Sages taught: It states: "And he who burns them shall wash his garments" (Leviticus 16:28), to indicate that only the garments of the one who burns the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are rendered impure, but not the garments of the one who kindles the fire, and not the garments of the one who arranges the pile of wood. And who is the one who burns? It is the one who assists at the actual time of burning.

¹⁷⁹ One might have thought that garments would be rendered impure even after the bull and goat have become ash. Therefore, the verse states: Them, to indicate that they themselves, the bull and goat of Yom Kippur, render garments impure, but they do not render garments impure once they become ash. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: The bull causes ritual impurity before it is burned, but once the flesh is burned it no longer renders garments impure.

¹⁸⁰ The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between the opinion of the first tanna and the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon? The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them when he turned it into a charred mass and the form of the animal has already become distorted but has not actually become ash. According to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, it no longer causes impurity.

¹⁸¹ MISHNA: They said to the High Priest: The goat has reached the wilderness. And how did they know in the Temple that the goat reached the wilderness? They would build platforms [dirkaot] all along the way and people would stand on them and wave scarves [sudarim] to signal when the goat arrived. And therefore they knew that the goat reached the wilderness.

¹⁸² Rabbi Yehuda said: Why did they need these platforms? Didn't they already have a reliable indicator? From Jerusalem to Beit Hiddudo, the edge of the wilderness, where the mitzva of dispatching the goat was performed, was a distance of three mil. Since the nobles of Jerusalem walked a mil to escort the dispatcher and returned a mil, and waited the time equivalent to the time it takes to walk a mil, they knew that the goat reached the wilderness. There was no need for the platforms.

¹⁸³ Rabbi Yishmael says: Didn't they have a different indicator? There was a strip of crimson tied to the entrance to the Sanctuary, and when the goat reached the wilderness and the mitzva was fulfilled

the strip would turn white, as it is stated: “Though your sins be as scarlet, they will become white as snow” (Isaiah 1:18).

¹⁸⁴ GEMARA: Abaye said: Learn from this that Beit Hiddudo is located in the wilderness, and this comes to teach us that Rabbi Yehuda holds that once the goat has reached the wilderness, its mitzva is complete even before it is pushed off the cliff, and there is no need to wait any longer.

Chapter 7

¹ MISHNA: The High Priest came to read the Torah. If he wished to read the Torah while still dressed in the fine linen garments, i.e., the priestly vestments he wore during the previous service, he may read wearing them; and if not he is permitted to read in a white robe of his own, which is not a priestly vestment.

² The synagogue attendant takes a Torah scroll and gives it to the head of the synagogue that stood on the Temple Mount; and the head of the synagogue gives it to the deputy High Priest, and the Deputy gives it to the High Priest, and the High Priest stands and receives the scroll from his hands. And he reads from the scroll the Torah portion beginning with the verse: “After the death” (Leviticus 16:1) and the portion beginning with the verse: “But on the tenth” (Leviticus 23:26), and furls the Torah scroll and places it on his bosom and says: More than what I have read before you is written here. The Torah portion beginning with the verse: “And on the tenth,” from the book of Numbers (29:7), he then reads by heart.

³ And he recites after the reading the following eight blessings: Concerning the Torah: Who has given us the Torah of truth; and concerning the Temple service: Find favor in Your people Israel and accept the service in Your most holy House... for You alone do we serve with reverence; and concerning thanksgiving: We give thanks to You; and concerning pardon of iniquity: Pardon our iniquities on this Yom Kippur; and concerning the Temple in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose the Temple; and concerning the Jewish People in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose Israel; and concerning Jerusalem in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose Jerusalem; and concerning the priests in and of themselves, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose the priests; and concerning the rest of the prayer, which concludes: Blessed... Who listens to prayer.

⁴ The Mishna comments: One who sees the High Priest reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned; and one who sees the bull and goat that are burned does not see the High Priest reading the Torah. The Mishna explains: And this is not due to the fact that one is not permitted to see both, but because there was a distant path between them, and the performance of both of them is undertaken simultaneously.

⁵ GEMARA: From the fact that it is taught in the mishna that the High Priest is permitted to read in a white robe of his own, one may derive by inference that the reading of the Torah is not classified as a service, which would have required that he wear priestly vestments.

⁶ But the mishna also teaches: If he wished to read the Torah while still dressed in the fine linen garments, he may read wearing them. This is true even though they are consecrated as priestly vestments and the reading of the Torah is not a sacred service. Therefore, the Gemara suggests: Learn

from this that it is permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments, i.e., even when not engaged in performing a service, a priest may derive benefit from the priestly vestments, for example, by wearing them for his own needs. If so, this would settle a long-standing unresolved dilemma concerning this issue. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: A proof may not be adduced from here because perhaps reading from the Torah is different, since it is for the purpose of the service; therefore, even though it is not a true service in its own right, it is nevertheless permitted for the High Priest to continue wearing the priestly vestments.

⁷ As the dilemma was raised before us: Is it permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments, or is it not permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments?

⁸ Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma based on a mishna: The priests would not sleep in the sacred vestments out of concern they might pass wind while sleeping. One may infer: It is specifically sleep which is not permitted, but they may eat while wearing the priestly vestments, even though eating is not a service. This should prove that it is permitted to derive personal benefit from wearing priestly vestments. The Gemara rejects this proof: A proof may not be adduced from here because perhaps eating is different, since it is for the purpose of the Temple service. As it was taught in a baraita that the verse states: “And they shall eat those things with which atonement was made” (Exodus 29:33), which teaches that the priests eat the meat of the offerings and the owners of those offerings thereby achieve atonement.

⁹ The Gemara suggests making a different inference from that mishna cited above: One may infer that it is specifically sleep which is not permitted, but they may walk while wearing the sacred vestments even when not engaged in a service. This should prove that it is permitted to derive benefit from wearing priestly vestments. The Gemara rejects this proof: It is incorrect to make this inference since by right the mishna should have stated that walking in priestly vestments is also not permitted.

¹⁰ That mishna’s teaching highlighting the prohibition to sleep in priestly vestments is needed for the latter clause of that mishna, which states: They remove their priestly vestments and fold them and place them under their heads. Since they are allowed to sleep on them, it must be emphasized that they may not sleep while wearing them.

¹¹ The Gemara considers resolving the dilemma from the latter clause: They remove their priestly vestments and fold them and place them under their heads. The Gemara suggests: Learn from this that it is permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments. Rav Pappa said: Do not say that the mishna means they may actually place the vestments under their heads as a pillow; rather, say that the mishna permits the vestments to be placed only next to their heads. Rav Mesharshiyya said: Given this understanding of that mishna, one can learn from here that one who places phylacteries to the side of his head when he sleeps has done well; there is no concern that he will turn over in his sleep and lie upon them.

¹² So too, it is reasonable to say that the mishna permits the vestments to be placed only next to their heads and not under their heads; as, if it could enter your mind to say that the mishna permits the vestments to be placed under their heads, and I would derive that it is prohibited due to the fact the priestly vestments contain a forbidden mixture of diverse kinds, as among them there is the belt, which is woven from a mixture of wool and linen. And even if it is assumed that it is permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments, it would still be prohibited to lie upon them because by doing so the priests would be deriving benefit from a garment made of diverse kinds.

¹³ The Gemara elaborates on the preceding argument: If one claims that the mishna permits priests to sleep upon their vestments, it works out well according to the one who said: The belt of the High Priest worn on Yom Kippur, which does not contain diverse kinds, is the same as the belt of a common priest. According to this view, the common priest's belt does not contain diverse kinds, and therefore it may be permitted for a priest to sleep upon it. However, according to the one who said that the High Priest's belt on Yom Kippur is not the same as the belt of a common priest, and that the belt of the common priest is made of diverse kinds, what is there to say? How could the mishna possibly permit priests to sleep upon their vestments?

¹⁴ And if you say that with regard to the prohibition of diverse kinds only wearing or placing the garment upon oneself is prohibited, but spreading them out and lying upon them on is permitted, and as such it should be permitted for the priests to sleep upon their vestments, this is incorrect. As, wasn't it taught in a baraita that the verse states: "Neither shall there come upon you a garment of diverse kinds"(Leviticus 19:19), which implies: But you are permitted to spread it beneath you to lie upon. This is true according to Torah law, but the Sages said: It is prohibited to do so, lest a fiber wrap upon his flesh, which would lead to the transgression of the Torah prohibition.

¹⁵ And if you say that a priest could still avoid the prohibition of diverse kinds by placing a separation between himself and the belt containing diverse kinds, didn't Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said in the name of the holy community in Jerusalem: Even if there are ten mattresses piled one atop the other and a garment of diverse kinds is placed underneath them all, it is prohibited to sleep upon them? This is because the rabbinic decree is applied equally to all cases irrespective of whether the original concern exists. Therefore, there can be no way for the priests to sleep upon the vestments without transgressing the prohibition of diverse kinds. Rather, must one not conclude from the preceding discussion that the mishna permits the vestments to be placed only next to their heads? The Gemara concludes: Learn from it that this is indeed so.

¹⁶ Rav Ashi said: Actually, the mishna may be understood as permitting the vestments to be placed under their heads. One should not object that by doing so the priests would be deriving benefit from a garment made of diverse kinds because priestly vestments, and specifically the belt, are stiff, and therefore the prohibition of diverse kinds does not apply to them. This is in accordance with that which Rav Huna, son of Rabbi Yehoshua, said: This stiff felt [namta], made of diverse kinds, that is produced in the city of Neresh, is permitted, since a stiff object does not wrap around the body to provide warmth, and therefore the person wearing is not considered to have derived benefit from it.

¹⁷ Since the mishna's intention is uncertain, it cannot provide a clear proof for the dilemma of whether it is permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments. The Gemara therefore suggests another proof: Come and hear an explicit baraita concerning this issue: With regard to priestly vestments, it is prohibited to go out to the country, i.e., outside the Temple, while wearing them, but in the Temple it is permitted for the priests to wear them, whether during the Temple service or not during the service, due to the fact that it is permitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments. Learn from this that it is indeed permitted.

¹⁸ § The baraita taught that the priestly vestments may not be worn outside the Temple. The Gemara challenges this: Is it really not permitted to wear priestly vestments in the country? Wasn't it taught

in another baraita, in Megillat Ta'anit: The twenty-fifth of Tevet is known as the day of Mount Gerizim, which was established as a joyful day, and therefore eulogizing is not permitted.

¹⁹ What occurred on that date? It was on that day that the Samaritans [kutim] requested the House of our Lord from Alexander the Macedonian in order to destroy it, and he gave it to them, i.e., he gave them permission to destroy it. People came and informed the High Priest, Shimon HaTzaddik, of what had transpired. What did he do? He donned the priestly vestments and wrapped himself in the priestly vestments. And the nobles of the Jewish People were with him, with torches of fire in their hands. And all that night, these, the representatives of the Jewish people, approached from this side, and those, the armies of Alexander and the Samaritans, approached from that side, until dawn, when they finally saw one another.

²⁰ When dawn arrived, Alexander said to the Samaritans: Who are these people coming to meet us? They said to him: These are the Jews who rebelled against you. When he reached Antipatris, the sun shone and the two camps met each other. When Alexander saw Shimon HaTzaddik, he descended from his chariot and bowed before him. His escorts said to him: Should an important king such as you bow to this Jew? He said to them: I do so because the image of this man's face is victorious before me on my battlefields, i.e., when I fight I see his image going before me as a sign of victory, and therefore I know that he has supreme sanctity.

²¹ He said to the representatives of the Jewish people: Why have you come? They said to him: Is it possible that the Temple, the house in which we pray for you and for your kingdom not to be destroyed, gentiles will try to mislead you into destroying it, and we would remain silent and not tell you? He said to them: Who are these people who want to destroy it? The Jews said to him: They are these Samaritans who stand before you. He said to them: If so, they are delivered into your hands to deal with them as you please.

²² Immediately, they stabbed the Samaritans in their heels and hung them from their horses' tails and continued to drag them over the thorns and thistles until they reached Mount Gerizim. When they arrived at Mount Gerizim, where the Samaritans had their temple, they plowed it over and seeded the area with leeks, a symbol of total destruction. This was just as they had sought to do to the House of our Lord. And they made that day a festival to celebrate the salvation of the Temple and the defeat of the Samaritans.

²³ It is apparent from the baraita that Shimon HaTzaddik wore the priestly vestments even outside the Temple. This would seem to be in contravention of the ruling of the other baraita prohibiting this. The Gemara resolves the contradiction: If you wish, say Shimon HaTzaddik did not wear a set of genuine, sanctified priestly vestments; rather, he wore garments that were fitting to be priestly vestments in that they were made of the same material and design. And if you wish, say instead that he indeed wore a set of genuine priestly vestments, but in times of great need, such as when one seeks to prevent the destruction of the Temple, it is permitted to violate the halakha, as indicated by the verse: "It is time to act for the Lord, they have nullified your Torah" (Psalms 119:126).

²⁴ § It was taught in the mishna: The synagogue attendant takes a Torah scroll and gives it to the head of the synagogue, who gives it to the deputy High Priest, who gives it to the High Priest. The Gemara suggests: Learn from here that honor may be given to a student in the presence of the teacher. Although the High Priest is considered everyone's teacher and master, honor was nevertheless extended to other individuals without fear of impugning the High Priest's honor. Abaye

said: A proof may not be adduced from here because the entire process is for the honor of the High Priest. The passing of the Torah scroll to people of increasing importance demonstrates that the High Priest is considered the most important of all those present.

²⁵ § It was further taught in the mishna: The High Priest stands and receives the scroll from the Deputy. By inference, until that point he had been sitting. But didn't we learn in a mishna:

²⁶ Sitting in the Temple courtyard is permitted only for kings of the House of David, as it is stated: "Then King David went in and sat before the Lord" (I Chronicles 17:16)? How, then, could the High Priest have been sitting? The Gemara explains: As Rav Ḥisda said in a similar context: This took place not in the Israelite courtyard, where the prohibition against sitting applies, but in the women's courtyard. Here, too, the reading was in the women's courtyard, where it is permitted to sit.

²⁷ § The Gemara clarifies: And where was this statement of Rav Ḥisda originally stated? It was stated in relation to the following: The Sages raised an objection based on that which was taught in a baraita: Where did they read the Torah scroll in fulfillment of the mitzva of assembly, in which the Torah is publicly read on the Sukkot following the Sabbatical Year? It was read in the Temple courtyard. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: It is read on the Temple Mount, as it is stated concerning the public reading performed by Ezra: "And he read from it before the wide road that was before the Gate of the Water" (Nehemiah 8:3). And Rav Ḥisda said: The courtyard referred to by the first tanna is the women's courtyard.

²⁸ Apropos the verse in Nehemiah, the Gemara interprets an adjacent verse homiletically. It is stated: "And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God" (Nehemiah 8:6). The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of "great" here? Rav Yosef said that Rav said: It means that he ascribed greatness to Him by enunciating God's explicit name. Rav Giddel said: He established that one should say at the conclusion of every blessing: "Blessed be the Lord, God of Israel, from eternity to eternity" (I Chronicles 16:36).

²⁹ Abaye said to Rav Dimi: Why does Rav Giddel interpret it this way? Perhaps the meaning of "great" is that he ascribed greatness to Him by enunciating God's explicit name? Rav Dimi said to him: The explicit name may not be enunciated in the provinces, i.e., outside the Temple courtyard.

³⁰ The Gemara asks: And is this really not permitted? Isn't it written: "And Ezra the Scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose... and Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God" (Nehemiah 8:4-6); and Rav Giddel said: "Great" in this verse means that he ascribed greatness to Him by enunciating God's explicit name. Since this event took place outside the Temple (see Nehemiah 8:3), it suggests that God's explicit name may indeed be enunciated outside the Temple. The Gemara answers: That cannot be proven from here because the permission to use God's explicit name in that context was a provisional edict issued in exigent circumstances, since the people had uniquely come together in a prayerful commitment to God.

³¹ The Gemara recounts the event described in the verses: The verse states: And they cried with a loud voice to the Lord their God (Nehemiah 9:4). What was said? Rav said, and some say it was Rabbi Yoḥanan who said: Woe, woe. It is this, i.e., the evil inclination for idol worship, that destroyed the Temple, and burned its Sanctuary, and murdered all the righteous ones, and caused the Jewish people to be exiled from their land. And it still dances among us, i.e., it still affects us. Didn't You give it to us solely for the purpose of our receiving reward for overcoming it? We do not want it,

and we do not want its reward. We are prepared to forgo the potential rewards for overcoming the evil inclination as long as it departs from us.

³² In response to their prayer a note fell to them from the heavens upon which was written: Truth, indicating that God accepted their request.

³³ The Gemara makes a parenthetical observation. Rav Ḥanina said: Learn from this that the seal of the Holy One, Blessed be He, is truth.

³⁴ In response to the indication of divine acceptance, they observed a fast for three days and three nights, and He delivered the evil inclination to them. A form of a fiery lion cub came forth from the chamber of the Holy of Holies. Zechariah the prophet said to the Jewish people: This is the evil inclination for idol worship, as it is stated in the verse that refers to this event: “And he said: This is the evil one” (Zechariah 5:8). The use of the word “this” indicates that the evil inclination was perceived in a physical form.

³⁵ When they caught hold of it one of its hairs fell, and it let out a shriek of pain that was heard for four hundred parasangs. They said: What should we do to kill it? Perhaps, Heaven forbid, they will have mercy upon him from Heaven, since it cries out so much. The prophet said to them: Throw it into a container made of lead and seal the opening with lead, since lead absorbs sound. As it is stated: “And he said: This is the evil one. And he cast it down into the midst of the measure, and he cast a stone of lead upon its opening” (Zechariah 5:8). They followed this advice and were freed of the evil inclination for idol worship.

³⁶ When they saw that the evil inclination for idol worship was delivered into their hands as they requested, the Sages said: Since it is an auspicious time, let us pray also concerning the evil inclination for sin in the area of sexual relationships. They prayed, and it was also delivered into their hands.

³⁷ Zechariah the prophet said to them: See and understand that if you kill this evil inclination the world will be destroyed because as a result there will also no longer be any desire to procreate. They followed his warning, and instead of killing the evil inclination they imprisoned it for three days. At that time, people searched for a fresh egg throughout all of Eretz Yisrael and could not find one. Since the inclination to reproduce was quashed, the chickens stopped laying eggs. They said: What should we do? If we kill it, the world will be destroyed. If we pray for half, i.e., that only half its power be annulled, nothing will be achieved because Heaven does not grant half gifts, only whole gifts. What did they do? They gouged out its eyes, effectively limiting its power, and set it free. And this was effective to the extent that a person is no longer aroused to commit incest with his close relatives.

³⁸ The Gemara returns to its discussion of the verse in Nehemiah cited above: In the West, i.e., Eretz Yisrael, they taught the debate concerning the verse “the Lord, the great God” as follows: Rav Giddel said: “Great” means that he ascribed greatness to Him by enunciating God’s explicit name. And Rav Mattana said: They reinserted the following appellations of God into their prayers: “The great, the mighty, and the awesome God” (Nehemiah 9:32).

³⁹ The Gemara comments: This interpretation that Rav Mattana said leans to, i.e., is consonant with, the exposition of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. As Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Why are the Sages of those generations called the members of the Great Assembly? It is because they returned the crown

of the Holy One, Blessed be He, to its former glory. How so? Moses came and said in his prayer: “The great, the mighty, and the awesome God” (Deuteronomy 10:17). Jeremiah the prophet came and said: Gentiles, i.e., the minions of Nebuchadnezzar, are carousing in His sanctuary; where is His awesomeness? Therefore, he did not say awesome in his prayer: “The great God, the mighty Lord of Hosts, is His name” (Jeremiah 32:18). Daniel came and said: Gentiles are enslaving His children; where is His might? Therefore he did not say mighty in his prayer: “The great and awesome God” (Daniel 9:4).

⁴⁰ The members of the Great Assembly came and said: On the contrary, this is the might of His might, i.e., this is the fullest expression of it, that He conquers His inclination in that He exercises patience toward the wicked. God’s anger is flared by the gentile nations’ enslavement of His people, yet He expresses tremendous might by suppressing His anger and holding back from punishing them immediately. Therefore, it is still appropriate to refer to God as mighty. And these acts also express His awesomeness: Were it not for the awesomeness of the Holy One, Blessed be He, how could one people, i.e., the Jewish people, who are alone and hated by the gentile nations, survive among the nations?

⁴¹ The Gemara asks: And the Rabbis, i.e., Jeremiah and Daniel, how could they do this and uproot an ordinance instituted by Moses, the greatest teacher, who instituted the mention of these attributes in prayer? Rabbi Elazar said: They did so because they knew of the Holy One Blessed be He, that He is truthful and hates a lie. Consequently, they did not speak falsely about Him. Since they did not perceive His attributes of might and awesomeness, they did not refer to them; therefore, they cannot be criticized for doing so.

⁴² § It was taught in the mishna: And he reads from the scroll the Torah portion beginning with the verse: “After the death” (Leviticus 16:1), and the portion beginning with the verse: “But on the tenth” (Leviticus 23:26). Although both of these portions appear in the book of Leviticus, they are not adjacent to one another. Perforce, the High Priest skipped the sections in between the two portions. The Gemara raises a contradiction: It is taught in a mishna in tractate Megilla: One may skip sections when reading the haftara in the Prophets, but one may not skip sections when reading in the Torah.

⁴³ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: There, in the mishna in tractate Megilla that teaches that one may not skip, the intention is that one should not skip if the sections are so far apart from one another that the delay caused by doing so will be of such length that the translator who recites the Aramaic translation will conclude his translation before the next section is reached. In that case, the community would have to remain in silence while waiting for the next section to be reached, which is considered disrespectful of the community’s honor. Here, in the case of the mishna, where it is permitted to skip, the delay caused is of such short length that the translator will still not conclude his translation before the new section is reached.

⁴⁴ The Gemara challenges this resolution: But it was taught concerning this statement in the continuation of that mishna: One may skip sections when reading in the Prophets, and one may not skip sections when reading in the Torah. And how much may one skip? One may skip when the section skipped is of such short length that when the furling of the scroll is completed the translator will still not have concluded his translation. The baraita implies that the qualification for the length

of the section that may be skipped applies only to reading the Prophets, but when reading the Torah, one may not skip at all. The Gemara's resolution is therefore refuted.

⁴⁵ The Gemara offers a different resolution. Abaye said: This is not difficult. Here, in the case of the mishna here, where it is permitted to skip, it is referring to when both sections pertain to a single topic, and therefore the listeners will be unaware that sections were skipped. There, in the mishna in tractate Megilla, which teaches that one may not skip, it is referring to when the two sections pertain to two different topics.

⁴⁶ As it was taught in a baraita: One may skip sections when reading in the Torah when both sections read pertain to one topic, and in the Prophets one may skip from one section to another even if they pertain to two different topics. Both here and there, one may skip only when the section skipped is of such short length that when furling is completed the translator will still not have concluded his translation. But one may not skip from one book of the Prophets to another book of the Prophets even if both pertain to the same topic, and even if the gap between them is short. However, among the books of the Twelve Prophets one may skip, as the twelve are considered one book for these purposes.

⁴⁷ All this is provided that he does not skip from the end of the book to its beginning, since then it would be clear to everyone that he is skipping text.

⁴⁸ § It was taught in the mishna: The High Priest furls the Torah scroll and places it on his bosom and says: More than what I have read before you is written here. The Gemara comments: And why must he say all this? It is so as not to cast aspersions on the Torah scroll, because people might think that the portion he read by heart is not written there.

⁴⁹ § It was further taught in the mishna: The Torah portion beginning with the verse: "And on the tenth," from the book of Numbers (29:7), he reads by heart. The Gemara asks: Why does he read it by heart? Let him furl the scroll to that portion and read it from the text. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said that Rav Sheshet said: It is because one may not furl a Torah scroll in public, out of respect for the community. It is inappropriate to make the community wait until they have reached the next section.

⁵⁰ But why not let another Torah scroll be brought that has previously been furlled to that portion and read from it? Rav Huna bar Yehuda said: People might mistakenly think the second scroll was brought due to a flaw that was found in the first one. And Reish Lakish said a different reason: A second scroll should not be brought due to the fact that doing so will cause an unnecessary blessing to be recited; before reading from a new scroll the High Priest would have to repeat the blessings required upon reading from the Torah. Therefore, it is preferable that he read by heart.

⁵¹ The Gemara questions Rav Huna bar Yehuda's answer: Are we really concerned that people will think the first scroll had a flaw? Didn't Rabbi Yitzhak Nappaḥa say: When the New Moon of Tevet, which always occurs during Hanukkah, occurs on Shabbat, one brings and reads from three Torah scrolls. One reads from one scroll the topic of the day, i.e., the weekly portion; and from one scroll the portion of the New Moon; and from one scroll a passage related to Hanukkah. It is apparent from the statement of Rabbi Yitzhak Nappaḥa that many Torah scrolls may be used, and there is no concern that people will mistakenly think one or more had a flaw.

⁵² The Gemara explains: When three men read from three scrolls there is no concern that people will think there was a flaw, since people assume that it is befitting for each individual to receive his own scroll. But when one man reads from two scrolls, there is a concern that people will think there is a flaw, and they will not realize that this was done only to avoid forcing the community to wait while the scroll was furled.

⁵³ § It was taught in the mishna: And the High Priest recites eight blessings after the reading. The Sages taught in a baraita that these are the eight blessings: The blessing concerning the Torah is recited in the usual way one recites a blessing in the synagogue: Who gives the Torah; The three blessings: concerning the Temple service, concerning thanksgiving, and concerning pardon of iniquity, are all recited according to their established forms in the prayers; The blessing concerning the Temple in and of itself; The blessing concerning the priests in and of themselves; The blessing concerning the Jewish people in and of itself; The blessing concerning the rest of the prayer.

⁵⁴ The Sages taught in another baraita: And the blessing concerning the rest of the prayer reads: Song, supplication, petition before You for Your people Israel, who need to be saved. And he adds an additional supplication and concludes the blessing with: The One Who hears prayer. And after the High Priest concludes his reading, each and every person present brings a Torah scroll from his house, although in fact each person had already brought one on Yom Kippur eve, and reads from it for himself in order to show its beautiful appearance to the community. This is considered beautification of the mitzva.

⁵⁵ § It was taught in the mishna: One who sees the High Priest reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned, and vice versa. This is not because one is not permitted to see both but because there is a distance between them and they are performed simultaneously. The Gemara comments: It is obvious that this is not due to a prohibition; what possible reason could there be to prohibit this? The Gemara answers: This was taught explicitly lest you say that it is prohibited in accordance with the statement of Reish Lakish, as Reish Lakish said: One does not pass over the opportunity to perform mitzvot, even if it is in order to perform a different mitzva.

⁵⁶ The Gemara clarifies why this principle might have applied here. And what mitzva is there in hearing the reading of the High Priest? It is a fulfillment of the principle expressed in the verse: “The king’s glory is in the multitude of people” (Proverbs 14:28). Having a large assembly involved in a mitzva gives honor to God. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that the problem with seeing both events was only a practical one.

⁵⁷ MISHNA: If the High Priest read the Torah in sacred white fine linen garments, he then sanctified his hands and feet as he did each time before removing the priestly vestments. He then removed the linen garments, descended to the ritual bath, and immersed. Afterward he ascended and dried himself with a towel, and they brought him the golden garments of the High Priesthood, and he dressed in them and sanctified his hands and feet.

⁵⁸ The mishna addresses those offerings whose sacrifice has still not been mentioned. The verses in Leviticus, chapter 16, detail the special offerings of the atonement service of Yom Kippur. Of those offerings, the ram of the High Priest and the ram of the people have still not been addressed. In addition to this, the additional offerings of Yom Kippur detailed in Numbers, chapter 29, have not yet been discussed. These include seven one-year-old lambs and a bull to be brought as a burnt-offering and a goat to be brought as a sin-offering. The mishna continues: He emerged and offered his ram

and the ram of the people and the seven unblemished year-old lambs mandated to be offered that day. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Akiva says: Those offerings were not sacrificed at this point; rather, they were sacrificed with the daily morning offering; and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering; and the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.

⁵⁹ After sacrificing these offerings, he sanctified his hands and feet and removed the golden garments, and he descended into the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself.

⁶⁰ They brought him the white garments again, and he dressed in them and sanctified his hands and feet. Afterward he entered the Holy of Holies to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan, which he had brought there earlier. He again sanctified his hands and feet and removed the white garments and descended to the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself with a towel.

⁶¹ They brought him the golden garments, and he dressed in them and sanctified his hands and feet and entered the Sanctuary to burn the afternoon incense and to remove the ashes from the lamps, which signified the end of the day's service. And he sanctified his hands and feet and removed the golden garments, and he descended to the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself.

⁶² They then brought him his own clothing and he dressed, since the service was complete and Yom Kippur was over; and the people escort him to his house in deference to him. And the High Priest would make a feast for his loved ones and his friends when he emerged in peace from the Sanctuary.

⁶³ GEMARA: It was taught in the mishna: Rabbi Akiva said the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering; and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering; and the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, with the daily afternoon offering. It is unclear whether the middle clause concerning the bull should be read as a continuation of the first clause, or as relating to the latter clause. The Gemara seeks to clarify this ambiguity. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is Rabbi Akiva saying? Does he mean to say the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering, whereas the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the goat whose services are performed outside were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering?

⁶⁴ Or perhaps this is what he is saying: The seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering together with them, whereas the goat whose services are performed outside, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, was sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.

⁶⁵ And furthermore, another dilemma: With regard to the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering, according to Rabbi Eliezer's opinion: Since he omitted mention of it, it must be clarified when the High Priest performs its sacrifice. Is it sacrificed at this point in the day, or at another time?

⁶⁶ And furthermore, another dilemma: According to both Rabbi Eliezer's opinion and according to Rabbi Akiva's opinion, since neither of them mentioned the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, it must be clarified when the High Priest performs their service and places them on the altar.

⁶⁷ Rava said: You will only find it properly explained either according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer as taught by the school of Shmuel, or according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva as taught in the Tosefta.

⁶⁸ The school of Shmuel taught that Rabbi Eliezer says: He came out and offered his ram and the ram of the people and the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar. But the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the seven lambs and the goat whose services are performed outside were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.

⁶⁹ What is Rabbi Akiva's opinion as taught in the Tosefta? As it was taught that Rabbi Akiva says: The bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering, as it is stated with regard to the additional offerings of other Festivals: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), indicating that the additional offerings of the day should be sacrificed together with the daily offering. And afterward the service of the day, which is unique to Yom Kippur, is performed.

⁷⁰ And afterward, the goat whose services are performed outside is sacrificed, as it is stated: "One goat for a sin-offering besides the sin-offering of atonement and the daily burnt-offering, and its meal-offering, and their libations" (Numbers 29:11), indicating that the goat sin-offering is sacrificed after the other offerings of the day. And afterward he offers his ram and the ram of the people, and afterward he places upon the altar the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, and afterward he sacrifices the daily afternoon offering.

⁷¹ What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer? The High Priest acts in accordance with the order in which it is written in the Torah: First he performs the services described in Leviticus, and afterward he performs the additional offerings mentioned in the book of Numbers.

⁷² And what is Rabbi Akiva's reasoning? His reasoning is that as the Tosefta teaches that the verse states: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), it is apparent that the sacrifice of the additional offerings should be performed together with the daily morning offering.

⁷³ The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Eliezer, what does he do with this verse: "Besides the sin-offering of atonement," which was the basis for Rabbi Akiva's opinion? That verse is necessary for him to derive from it that for what this one, the goat sin-offering whose blood is sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies, atones, that one, the goat sin-offering of the additional offerings whose services are performed in the Temple courtyard, also atones.

⁷⁴ § The Tosefta cited above, which recorded the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, also records additional versions of his view: Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Akiva: One of the seven lambs is sacrificed with the daily morning offering, and the other six are sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says in the name of Rabbi Akiva: Six are sacrificed with the daily morning offering and one with the daily afternoon offering.

⁷⁵ What is the rationale of the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who divide the sacrifice of the seven lambs into two parts? Two verses are written that suggest different times at which the additional offerings are sacrificed: It is written with regard to the additional offerings: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), implying that the additional offerings are sacrificed in the morning. But it is also written that upon concluding the service of the day: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people" (Leviticus 16:24). As the phrase: "The burnt-offering of the people," is referring to the additional offerings, this verse implies that the additional offerings are sacrificed in the afternoon. Therefore, in order to fulfill both verses, he

performs the sacrifice of some of them here, in the morning, and some of them there, in the afternoon.

⁷⁶ With regard to what do Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Elazar disagree? Rabbi Yehuda holds that the High Priest performs the sacrifice of one lamb in the morning, as it is written: “Besides the morning burnt-offering,” and then he performs the service of the day before he proceeds to sacrifice the other six lambs. Initially, only the minimum possible number of lambs is sacrificed lest the High Priest become weak by doing more. He might then be unable to complete the service of the day, which cannot be performed by anyone else and without which atonement cannot be achieved.

⁷⁷ And Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, holds: Since he has begun to sacrifice the lambs he performs the sacrifice of six of them, leaving over only one until the afternoon. He sacrifices the maximum possible number of lambs now lest he be negligent later and fail to sacrifice so many at the close of the day. There is no concern that by doing so he might become weak and be unable to perform the service of the day, because with regard to the service of the day, the High Priest is diligent and will always muster the energy needed.

⁷⁸ The Gemara notes: Despite their disagreements, everyone agrees, however, that there is only one ram for the people. In accordance with whose opinion is this? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Only one ram for the people is sacrificed, as the one stated here in Leviticus: “With this shall Aaron come into the Sanctuary: With a young bull for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 16:3), is the same one that is stated in the Book of Numbers: “And you shall sacrifice a burnt-offering to the Lord of pleasing odor: One young bull, one ram, seven unblemished year-old lambs shall be unto you” (Numbers 29:8). Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: There are two rams for the people: One that is stated here in Leviticus, which is part of the service of the day, and one stated in the Book of Numbers, which is part of the day’s additional offerings.

⁷⁹ What is the rationale of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? As it is written: “One,” implying one ram, not two. And according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, what is the meaning of “one”? “One” indicates that the ram used should be the unique one, i.e., the best, of its flock.

⁸⁰ And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive the requirement that the ram be of the best stock? He derives it from the verse: “Your choice vows” (Deuteronomy 12:11), which teaches that all offerings must be from the choicest animals. And according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, why is this additional verse necessary? One verse refers to obligatory offerings, and the other one refers to free-will offerings. And both are necessary because the requirement in one case cannot be learned from the other. It is reasonable that a free-will offering must be from the choicest animal since it is a voluntary gift; and it is also reasonable that an obligatory offering should be the choicest, since an obligation must be fulfilled in the finest possible way.

⁸¹ § It was taught in the mishna: The High Priest sanctified his hands and feet and entered the Holy of Holies to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan. The Gemara cites a related baraita. The Sages taught: The verse states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 16:23), which is taken to mean that he enters the Holy of Holies. Why does he come? He comes in order to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan

⁸² as the whole portion of the service of the day detailed in Leviticus is written in this order, and the service must be performed in that order, except for this verse, which is stated out of order and is

performed only later. The verse detailing his reentry (Leviticus 16:23) is written before the verse detailing the sacrifice of the rams (Leviticus 16:24), but in fact the reentry occurs only after the sacrifice of the rams.

⁸³ The Gemara asks: What is the reason to assume this verse is written out of order? Rav Hisda said: They learned as a tradition that the High Priest performs five immersions and ten sanctifications of his hands and feet when he changes clothing on that day. Each time the High Priest changes between the white and golden garments, he sanctifies his hands and feet, immerses, dresses in the new set of garments and then once again sanctifies his hands and feet.

⁸⁴ And if you say that the verses, including this one, are written in order, you find only three immersions and six sanctifications. Read in order, the verses indicate only three changes of garments, which involve three immersions and six sanctifications. In order to arrive at the requisite numbers of five immersions and ten sanctifications one must assume that the High Priest's reentry into the Holy of Holies takes place at a later time, after he has already changed into the golden garments. This would require him to change into the white garments and then back into the golden garments, providing an additional two immersions and four sanctifications.

⁸⁵ Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this: But perhaps the order of the verses in Leviticus can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications still achieved, if he interrupts the service performed in the white garments with the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, and are performed in the golden garments. The sacrifice of the goat is not mentioned in Leviticus but only in Numbers. Therefore, it could be inserted into the service of the day without compromising the order of the verses in Leviticus. The change into the golden garments and then back into the white garments would contribute an additional two immersions and four sanctifications, thus arriving at the requisite numbers.

⁸⁶ Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the reentry must be out of order, since the verse states: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people" (Leviticus 16:24). This is the first exit stated in the verses and implies that immediately following his first exit from the Holy of Holies, he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people without any other interruption. If so, the reentry must occur only afterward.

⁸⁷ Rava said a different proof. The verse states: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments which he wore when he went into the Sanctuary" (Leviticus 16:23). Now, the verse does not need to state "which he wore," as this is obvious; can one remove anything other than what he is wearing? Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states "which he wore"? It is referring to those garments which he had already worn previously, removed, and then worn again. It is therefore apparent that this verse occurs at a point when he had already changed out of the white garments and into the golden garments. Perforce, then, it must be out of order.

⁸⁸ Rabba bar Rav Sheila strongly objects to this: Say that the order of the verses can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications achieved, if he interrupts the services performed in the white garments with the goat whose services are performed outside and are performed in the golden garments. This would provide the additional two immersions and four sanctifications required. The Gemara answers: Isn't it written: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people" (Leviticus 16:24), which implies that immediately

following his first exit he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people and the reentry to the Holy of Holies occurs only later.

⁸⁹ The Gemara questions the premise of the baraita: Is the entire passage really written in order? But among the verses it is written: “And he shall burn the fat of the sin-offering upon the altar”(Leviticus 16:25), and then in a later verse it is written: “And the bull of the sin-offering, and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the Sanctuary, shall be carried outside the camp; and they shall burn...” (Leviticus 16:27). Yet we learned in the mishna: One who sees the High Priest reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned, which are referred to in verse 27, while according to all opinions concerning the order of the day, the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, which are mentioned in verse 25, are burned only afterward. Therefore, it is apparent that these verses are also not in order.

⁹⁰ The Gemara answers: Say that the intent of the baraita is that the verses are in order except for this verse and onward.

⁹¹ The Gemara asks: And what did you see that you preferred to rearrange the order of the verses? Instead, rearrange the order in the mishna.

⁹² Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the burning of the remains of the bull is out of order, since the verse states: “And the one who sends the goat to Azazel” (Leviticus 16:26), and then states: “And the one who burns them” (Leviticus 16:28). The repeated use of the phrase “And the one who...” indicates that just as the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so earlier, before the portions of the sin-offering are placed on the altar to be consumed, so too, the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so earlier, even though the verse detailing this burning is written after the verse detailing the burning of the portions of the sin-offering.

⁹³ The Gemara rejects this: On the contrary, one could make the opposite claim: Just as the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so now, so too, the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so only now, after the other sacrifices.

⁹⁴ The Gemara explains a difficulty with this: The phrasing of: “And the one who sends” implies that it was performed earlier. Alternatively, Rava said: Sending the goat away definitely took place earlier, as the verse states: “But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him” (Leviticus 16:10). This teaches: How long must it stand alive? It must do so until the moment of atonement. And when is the moment of atonement? It is at the moment of the presenting of the blood, but no later. At that point it is already sent away.

⁹⁵ § The Gemara describes the eventual meeting between the High Priest and the one who sends the goat to Azazel: When the one who sends the goat comes on the day following Yom Kippur, if he finds the High Priest in the market, which is a public place, he says to him: My Master, High Priest, we performed your mission, i.e., we fulfilled the mitzva of sending the goat to Azazel. He refers to the sending as the High Priest’s mission as a public display of respect. But if he finds him in his house, he says to him: The One Who grants life to the living, God, we performed His mission.

⁹⁶ Apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, Rabba said: When the Sages take leave from one another in Pumbedita, they say as follows: May the One Who grants life to the living grant you a long, good, and established life.

⁹⁷ Further apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, the Gemara explains a verse using a similar phrase and then additional verses. With regard to the verse: “I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living” (Psalms 116:9), Rav Yehuda said: This is the place of markets, where food and needs can be readily obtained. King David, who wandered from place to place, prayed to always find ready sustenance.

⁹⁸ The verse states: “For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they add to you” (Proverbs 3:2). The Gemara asks: Are there years of life and years that are not of life? The Gemara explains: Rabbi Elazar said: “Years of life” refers to good years. As such, these additional years of life referred to in the verse are the years of a person’s life which are transformed for him from bad to good.

⁹⁹ The verse states: “To you men [ishim] do I call, and my voice is to the sons of men” (Proverbs 8:4). Rabbi Berekhya said: The word ishim, although it means men, is similar to the term isha, woman. It may therefore be taken to refer to these Torah scholars, who are similar to women in that they are physically weak and are not engaged in many activities that other men are, but nevertheless, they act mightily like men when engaged in Torah study. And Rabbi Berekhya said further about that same verse: Nowadays one who wishes to pour libations of wine over the altar should fill the throats of Torah scholars with wine, as it is stated: “To you men [ishim] do I call.” The use of the phrase ishim, which is similar to isheh, used for the altar’s fire, suggests that scholars may be compared to the fire of the altar.

¹⁰⁰ And Rabbi Berekhya said: If a person sees that Torah is ceasing from his children, and they are not becoming Torah scholars like himself, he should marry the daughter of a Torah scholar. This will ensure that his children from her will be raised with Torah, as it is stated: “Though its root will grow old in the earth, and its trunk will die in the ground,

¹⁰¹ from the scent of water it will blossom and put forth branches like a plant” (Job 14:8–9). If the figurative trunk of one’s family is drying up through lack of Torah, he should plant himself in a place of water, i.e., a family of scholars, water being a metaphor for Torah. This will ensure that his children will blossom into Torah scholars.

¹⁰² § It was taught in the mishna: The people escort the High Priest to his house. And he would make a feast for his loved ones. The Sages taught in a baraita: There was an incident involving one High Priest who exited the Holy Temple and everyone followed him. When they saw Shemaya and Avtalyon, the heads of the Sanhedrin, walking along, in deference to them they left the High Priest by himself and walked after Shemaya and Avtalyon.

¹⁰³ Eventually, Shemaya and Avtalyon came to take leave of the High Priest before returning to their homes. Envious of the attention they received, he angrily said to them: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace. Shemaya and Avtalyon descended from converts, and he scornfully drew attention to that fact. They said to him: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace, who perform the acts of Aaron, who loved and pursued peace; and let not a descendant of Aaron come in peace, who does not perform the acts of Aaron and who speaks condescendingly to descendants of converts.

¹⁰⁴ MISHNA: Throughout the year the High Priest serves in eight garments, and the common priest serves in four: In a tunic and trousers and a mitre and a belt. The High Priest adds another four garments beyond those worn by the common priest: A breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a frontplate. When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision

of the Urim VeTummim. And he may be consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim only on behalf of the king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. Individual inquiries are not posed to the Urim VeTummim.

¹⁰⁵ GEMARA: The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to those items of the priestly vestments about which it is stated they must be made with linen [shesh], their threads are spun six-fold, as suggested by the use of the term shesh, which also means six. When the Torah states that certain items are twined, it means their threads are spun eight-fold. Threads used to weave the robe were spun from twelve strands. The threads of the curtain were spun from twenty-four strands. The threads used to weave the breastplate and ephod were spun from twenty-eight strands.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara asks: That the threads made from shesh are spun six-fold, from where do we derive this? The verse states: “And they made the tunics of linen [shesh] of woven work for Aaron and for his sons. And the mitre of linen, and the adorning mitres of linen, and the linen [bad] trousers of twined linen” (Exodus 39:27–28). Five mentions of the word linen are written; four times as “shesh” and an additional instance of “bad,” both meaning linen. One mention is stated for that halakha itself, to teach that they should be made of linen. And one mention is written to teach that the threads should be spun six-fold, shesh being interpreted as six. And one mention teaches that the six strands should be spun together into one. And one mention teaches that this also applies to the other garments, even though the term shesh is not stated with regard to them. And one mention teaches that this requirement is indispensable and that garments not made this way are invalid.

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that this term shesh means linen? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: As the verse also states: “Bad,” and uses it interchangeably with shesh. And bad refers to something which sprouts from the ground stalk by stalk [bad bad], each one by itself. This is a fitting description of flax, the plant used to produce linen, as opposed to other plants, such as cotton, whose fibers grow meshed together. The Gemara asks: And say that it refers to wool, since when it grows from the animal, each hair grows separately. The Gemara answers: Wool splits, with each hair dividing into several hairs, so it does not fully fit the description of sprouting stalk by stalk. The Gemara asks: But flax also splits into individual hairs. The Gemara answers: Flax, unlike wool, splits only when beaten.

¹⁰⁸ Ravina said: We have a proof for the matter from here: The verse states: “They shall have linen [pishtim] mitres upon their heads, and linen trousers upon their loins” (Ezekiel 44:18). The term pishtim used in Ezekiel certainly refers to linen; therefore, it is clear that the terms shesh and bad, used in the Torah for the same garments, also refer to linen.

¹⁰⁹ Rav Ashi said to him: But before Ezekiel came, who said this halakha? How was it known? Ravina retorted: And according to your reasoning, the same question could be asked with regard to that which Rav Ḥisda said concerning the disqualification of an uncircumcised priest from serving in the Temple: This matter we did not learn from the Torah of Moses our teacher, as it is not written explicitly in the Torah; rather, we learned it from the words of Ezekiel ben Buzi, as the verse states: “No foreigner, uncircumcised of heart or uncircumcised of flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary” (Ezekiel 44:9). One could ask here as well: Before Ezekiel came, who said this halakha? Rather, perforce, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse. Here, too, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse.

¹¹⁰ The Gemara continues to explain the baraita. That the use of the term twined implies that the thread should be spun from eight strands, from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And they made upon the skirts of the robe pomegranates of sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, twined” (Exodus 39:24); and derive a verbal analogy from the term “twined” used in this verse and the term “twined” from the verse about the curtain: Just as there, with regard to the curtain, there are twenty-four strands, as will be explained, so too here, there are twenty-four strands in total. And since each pomegranate is made of three colors, sky-blue, purple, and scarlet, it must be that each one of them was spun from eight strands.

¹¹¹ The Gemara challenges this derivation: Let us derive the number of strands instead from the breastplate and ephod and say: Just as there, with regard to the breastplate and ephod, there are twenty-eight strands, so too, here there are twenty-eight strands. The Gemara answers: It is preferable to derive the halakhot of an item, i.e., the pomegranates, with regard to which the use of gold threads is not stated, from the halakhot of an item, i.e., the curtain, with regard to which the use of gold threads is also not stated. This would come to exclude the possibility of deriving them from the breastplate and ephod, with regard to which the use of gold threads is stated. The Gemara asks: On the contrary, it should be preferable to derive the halakhot of one garment from another garment, i.e., the halakhot of the robe from the halakhot of the breastplate and ephod. This would come to exclude the possibility of deriving them from the curtain, which is a tent, i.e., part of the Temple building, and not a garment. The Gemara accepts that the derivation is flawed.

¹¹² Rather, the need for thread of eight strands is derived from the belt, which had twenty-four threads in total, and a garment and an item with regard to which the use of gold thread is not stated, i.e., the pomegranates, are derived from a garment and an item with regard to which the use of gold thread is not stated. And an item with no gold, such as the pomegranates and robe, is not derived from an item that has gold in it, such as the breastplate and ephod.

¹¹³ Rav Mari said another reason not to derive the number of strands in a pomegranate from the breastplate and ephod: “Like the work of the ephod you shall make it” (Exodus 28:15) is written with regard to the breastplate to indicate that you shall make it, i.e., the breastplate, like the ephod, which indicates that for this, i.e., the breastplate, you shall use thread of twenty-eight strands, and not for anything else.

¹¹⁴ Rav Ashi said another reason that there could not be twenty-eight strands in a pomegranate: “And you shall make pomegranates of sky-blue, and of purple, and of scarlet” (Exodus 28:33) is written to indicate that all the makings of it must be equal, i.e., that each color thread should be made from the same number of strands. However, if there are twenty-eight strands in total, the three threads, each of a different color, cannot be made with an equal number of strands, as how should we do it? Let us make three colored threads of ten strands each; then they are thirty strands in total, which is too many. Let us make two colored threads of nine strands and one of ten; but the verse states: “And you shall make,” to indicate that all the makings of it must be equal. Perforce, the threads used for the pomegranates and the robe must be derived from an item woven from threads of a number of strands divisible by three, such as the curtain.

¹¹⁵ The Gemara continues to explain the baraita: That the robe must be woven from threads spun from twelve strands, from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And you shall make the robe of the ephod

¹¹⁶ spun of sky-blue” (Exodus 28:31). And derive a verbal analogy from the term “sky-blue” used here and the same term “sky-blue” from the verse about the curtain: Just as there, with regard to the curtain, there are six strands, so too here, there are six strands. Then, since the Torah also says the threads are spun, i.e., each strand is made of two thinner strands spun together, each thread must contain twelve strands.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara suggests: Let us derive the number of strands in the robe from its hem and pomegranates: Just as there, each thread is spun from eight strands, so too here, the threads should be spun from eight strands. The Gemara rejects this: It is preferable to derive the halakhot of a utensil, i.e., the robe, from the halakhot of another utensil, i.e., the curtain, and one should not derive the halakhot of a utensil from the halakhot of something that is merely an ornament of a utensil, i.e., the pomegranates of the robe.

¹¹⁸ The Gemara asks: On the contrary, it is preferable to derive the halakhot of an object from that object itself, i.e., to assume that the halakhot of the robe and its pomegranates are similar; and one should not derive the halakhot of an object from elsewhere. The Gemara explains: This is precisely what we said in the baraita: One of the five mentions of shesh in the verse is to teach that the requirement that threads be made from six strands applies also to other garments about which shesh is not explicitly stated, such as the robe.

¹¹⁹ The baraita further states: Each thread of the curtain was made of twenty-four strands. The Gemara explains: With regard to each thread being composed of four colored threads: White, purple, scarlet, and sky-blue, and each one of them being composed of six strands, there is neither judgment nor judge, i.e., it is absolutely clear that this is how the threads of the curtain are produced.

¹²⁰ The baraita further states: Each thread of the breastplate and ephod was made of twenty-eight strands. From where do we derive this? As it is written: “And you shall make a breastplate of judgment, the work of the skilled craftsman; like the work of the ephod you shall make it: Of gold, sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen” (Exodus 28:15). There are four colored threads, each composed of six strands, which makes twenty-four. In addition, gold is spun together with each of the four colors, giving the total of twenty-eight.

¹²¹ But couldn’t one say the gold should be made as a thread of six strands, like the other colors? Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov said that the verse states: “And they beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into cords, to work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple, and into the scarlet, and into the fine linen, the work of a skilled craftsman” (Exodus 39:3). “Cord” implies a strand that is doubled over and can be twisted into a cord; “cords” is in the plural, meaning at least two of these. Accordingly, there are four strands here.

¹²² Rav Ashi said: This can be seen from that fact that the verse states with regard to the gold strands: “To work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple” (Exodus 39:3), indicating that the gold strands should be combined with the other colors. What should we do? If we make four gold threads of two strands each and combine each one with each of the colors, then there would be eight. If we make two gold threads of two strands each, and two gold threads of one strand each, it says: “And you shall make,” indicating that all its makings should be the same. Perforce, one strand of gold should be combined with each of the colors, producing a total of twenty-eight strands.

¹²³ § The Gemara discusses various halakhot concerning the priestly vestments and other sacred vessels: Raḥava said that Rav Yehuda said: One who intentionally tears any of the priestly vestments

transgresses a prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated concerning the robe: “It shall have a hem of woven work around the opening of it, like the opening of a coat of mail, and it shall not be torn” (Exodus 28:32). Just as it is prohibited to tear the opening of the robe, so too, it is prohibited to tear any of the priestly vestments. Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps this is what the Merciful One is saying in the Torah: An opening should be made in order that it not tear. In other words, the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: In order that it not be torn? Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

¹²⁴ Rabbi Elazar said: One who detaches the breastplate from upon the ephod or one who removes the staves of the Ark from their rings transgresses a Torah prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated: “And the breastplate shall not be detached from the ephod” (Exodus 28:28), and it is also stated: “The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15). Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps when the Merciful One said this in the Torah, the intention was to strengthen them and make them fast so that the breastplate not become detached from the ephod and the staves not be removed. He suggests that the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: In order that it not become detached, and: In order that they not be removed? Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

¹²⁵ Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, raised a contradiction. In one verse it is written: “The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15), implying the staves should remain there permanently. But in another verse it is written: “And its staves shall be put into the rings” (Exodus 27:7), implying that when the Ark is used the staves are inserted, which suggests that they do not remain there permanently. How is this contradiction resolved? The staves could be removed from their position, i.e., they were loosened, but did not come out. The staves were wider at their ends and thinner in the middle. Therefore, once they had been forced into the rings, although they could be shifted, they would not be removed entirely.

¹²⁶ That was also taught in a baraita. The verse states: “The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15). One might have thought that they should not move from their place at all; therefore, the verse states: “And its staves shall be put into the rings” (Exodus 27:7). If it had stated: And its staves shall be put, one might have thought that they are inserted and removed entirely; therefore, the verse states: “The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15). How is this? They could be removed from their position, but did not come out.

¹²⁷ The Gemara cites other statements concerning the ark. Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And you shall make the boards for the Tabernacle of acacia wood, standing” (Exodus 26:15)? This verse teaches that the boards of wood used for the Tabernacle should stand in the same direction in which they grew from the ground as a tree. Alternatively, “standing” means that they supported their gold plating and prevented it from falling. Alternatively, “standing” is written to hint at the following: Perhaps you will say that now that the Tabernacle is no longer in use, their hope is lost and their chance is abandoned, and after being stored away the boards will no longer return to use. Therefore, the verse states “standing” to indicate that they stand forever and ever.

¹²⁸ § The Gemara returns to its discussion of the priestly vestments: Rabbi Ḥama bar Ḥanina said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “The plaited [serad] garments, for serving in the Sanctuary” (Exodus 35:19)? Why does the verse refer to the priestly vestments as “serad garments”?

¹²⁹ He offers a homiletic interpretation: Were it not for the priestly vestments, which provide atonement for the Jewish people, there would not remain a remnant [sarid] or survivor from the haters of the Jewish people, a euphemism used to refer to the Jewish people themselves. Due to the atonement provided by the priestly vestments, a remnant [sarid] of the Jewish people does survive.

¹³⁰ Another interpretation: Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that the school of Rabbi Shimon taught: The priestly vestments are referred to as “serad garments” because they are garments that are woven in their completed form upon the loom, as opposed to weaving the material and then cutting and sewing pieces of the material together to create the required form, and then just a small part of them remains [masridin] which is not completed upon the loom. What is the remnant, the part that was not woven? Reish Lakish said: This is the needle-work required to complete the garment.

¹³¹ The Gemara raises an objection to this from a baraita: Priestly vestments should not be made through needle-work but through woven work, as it is stated: “Woven work” (Exodus 28:32). The Gemara answers that Abaye said: Reish Lakish’s statement is necessary only for, i.e., refers only to, the sleeves. As it was taught in a baraita: A sleeve made for the priestly vestments is woven separately and then attached to the garment by sewing, and the sleeve is made to reach as far as the palm of the hand. However, the main body of the garment must indeed be made exclusively through weaving.

¹³² § The Gemara cites statements concerning other Temple vessels: Raḥava said that Rav Yehuda said: The Torah states that the Ark should be made of wood with gold plating inside and out (Exodus 25:10–11). In order to achieve this Bezalel made three arks: A middle one made of wood, whose height was nine handbreadths; an inner one made of gold, whose height was eight handbreadths; and an outer one of gold, whose height was ten handbreadths and a bit. These arks were nested.

¹³³ The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita that the outer ark was eleven handbreadths and a bit? The Gemara explains: This is not difficult: This statement in the baraita is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was one handbreadth. According to this opinion, the outer ark’s base took up one handbreadth of its height, ten handbreadths were then needed to contain the middle ark within it, and then a bit more was needed so it could also contain the Ark’s cover. That statement of Rav Yehuda is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was not one handbreadth but was a plate of gold of negligible thickness. According to this opinion, the outer ark needed to be only ten handbreadths and a bit and could still contain the outer ark and have room for the cover. And what is this additional bit? It is the ornamental crown on the edge of the outer ark.

¹³⁴ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There were three crowns on the sacred vessels in the Temple: The crown of the altar, and of the Ark, and of the table. The regal appearance they provided symbolized power and authority: The crown of the altar symbolized the crown of priesthood; Aaron was deserving and took it, and the priesthood continues exclusively through his descendants. The crown of the table symbolized the abundance and blessing associated with the crown of kingship; David was deserving and took it for himself and his descendants after him. The crown of the Ark symbolized the crown of Torah; it is still sitting and waiting to be acquired, and anyone who wishes to take it may come and

take it and be crowned with the crown of Torah. Perhaps you will say it is inferior to the other two crowns and that is why nobody has taken it; therefore, the verse states about the wisdom of Torah: “Through me kings will reign” (Proverbs 8:15), indicating that the strength of the other crowns is derived from the crown of Torah, which is greater than them all.

¹³⁵ § The Gemara presents a number of statements based on the idea that the Ark symbolizes the Torah: Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction: According to the way the word crown is written in the Torah (Exodus 25:11), without vowels, it should be pronounced zar, meaning strange, but according to the traditional vocalization we read it as zeir, meaning crown. These two ways of understanding the word appear to contradict each other. Rabbi Yoḥanan explains: The two understandings apply to two different situations: If one is deserving by performing mitzvot, it becomes a crown [zeir] for him; but if one is not deserving, the Torah will be a stranger [zara] to him and he will forget his studies.

¹³⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction: It is written: “And you shall make for yourself a wooden Ark” (Deuteronomy 10:1), implying that Moses alone was commanded to construct the Ark; and it is written: “And they shall make an Ark of acacia wood” (Exodus 25:10), implying that the Jewish people were all commanded to be involved in its construction. The apparent resolution to this contradiction is that although only Moses actually constructed the Ark, everyone was required to support the endeavor. So too, from here it is derived with regard to a Torah scholar that the members of his town should perform his work for him to support him and allow him to focus on his studies, since it is also the town’s responsibility to enable him to study.

¹³⁷ The verse states concerning the Ark: “From within and from without you shall cover it” (Exodus 25:11). Rava said: This alludes to the idea that any Torah scholar whose inside is not like his outside, i.e., whose outward expression of righteousness is insincere, is not to be considered a Torah scholar.

¹³⁸ Abaye said, and some say it was Rabba bar Ulla who said: Not only is such a person not to be considered a Torah scholar, but he is called loathsome, as it is stated: “What then of one loathsome and foul, man who drinks iniquity like water” (Job 15:16). Although he drinks the Torah like water, since he sins, his Torah is considered iniquitous and this makes him loathsome and foul.

¹³⁹ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Why is there a price in the hand of a fool to buy wisdom, as he has no heart?” (Proverbs 17:16)? This expresses the following sentiment: Woe to them, haters of Torah scholars, a euphemism for the Torah scholars themselves, who immerse themselves in Torah and have no fear of Heaven. They are fools; they try to acquire the wisdom of Torah, but since they have no fear of Heaven in their hearts they lack the ability to do so.

¹⁴⁰ Rabbi Yannai declared that the situation may be expressed by the following sentiment: Pity him who has no courtyard but senselessly makes a gate for his courtyard. Fear of Heaven is like the courtyard, and the study of Torah is the gate that provides entrance to the courtyard. The study of Torah is purposeful only if it leads to fear of Heaven.

¹⁴¹ Rava said to the Sages in the study hall: I beg of you, do not inherit Gehenna twice. By studying Torah without the accompanying fear of Heaven, not only are you undeserving of the World-to-Come, but even in this world you experience Gehenna, as you spend all your time in study and fail to benefit from worldly pleasure.

¹⁴² Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And this is the Torah which Moses put [sam] before the children of Israel” (Deuteronomy 4:44)? The word sam is written with the letter sin and means put; it is phonetically similar to the word sam written with the letter samekh, meaning a drug. This use of this word therefore alludes to the following: If one is deserving, the Torah becomes a potion [sam] of life for him. If one is not deserving, the Torah becomes a potion of death for him. And this idea is what Rava said: For one who is skillful in his study of Torah and immerses himself in it with love, it is a potion of life; but for one who is not skillful in his studies, it is a potion of death.

¹⁴³ Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan raised a contradiction: It was written: “The precepts of the Lord are upright, gladdening the heart” (Psalms 19:9), but it is also written: “The word of the Lord is refining” (Psalms 18:31), which implies that the study of Torah can be a distressing process by which a person is refined like metal smelted in a smith’s fire. He reconciles these verses as follows: For one who is deserving, the Torah gladdens him; for one who is not deserving, it refines him. Reish Lakish said: This lesson emerges from that second verse itself: For one who is deserving, the Torah refines him for life; for one who is not deserving, it refines him for death.

¹⁴⁴ The verse states: “Fear of the Lord is pure, it stands forever” (Psalms 19:10). Rabbi Ḥanina said: This is referring to one who studies Torah in purity; for such a person the Torah will remain with him forever. What is this; what does it mean to study in purity? One first marries a woman and afterward studies Torah. Since he is married, his heart will not be occupied with thoughts of sin, which could lead him to become impure.

¹⁴⁵ In the same Psalm the verse states: “The testimony of God is faithful” (Psalms 19:8). Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said: This alludes to the fact that the Torah is faithful to testify about those who study it and those who do not.

¹⁴⁶ The Gemara returns to its discussion concerning the sacred vessels: The verse states with regard to the covers for the Tabernacle that they are “work of an embroiderer” (Exodus 26:36), and it also states they are “work of a designer” (Exodus 26:31). How can both descriptions be reconciled? Rabbi Elazar said: They embroidered the place where they had designed. They first marked a design on the material in paint, and then they embroidered it.

¹⁴⁷ A Sage taught in the name of Rabbi Neḥemya: “Work of an embroiderer” refers to needlework, which therefore produces only one face. The design is made with a needle passing back and forth from both sides of the curtain, and consequently an identical parallel image, or one face, is formed on both sides. “Work of a designer” refers to woven work, which therefore produces two faces. Although formed together, the two sides of the material were not identical; for example, sometimes an eagle appeared on one side while a lion was on the other side.

¹⁴⁸ § It was taught in the mishna: When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the priest anointed for war serves. This priest is appointed to recite words of encouragement to the nation before it goes out to war (see Deuteronomy 20:2). As it is stated: “And the sacred garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him” (Exodus 29:29), which is taken to refer to the one who comes after

him in greatness, meaning the priest whose rank is one lower than the High Priest, i.e., the priest anointed for war.

¹⁴⁹ Rav Adda bar Ahava raised an objection, and some say it unattributed: It is taught in a baraita: One might have thought that the son of the priest anointed for war serves in his place, i.e., he inherits the position, in the same way that the son of a High Priest serves in his place if he is fit for the job;

¹⁵⁰ therefore, the verse states: “Seven days shall he wear them, the one who serves in his stead from among his sons, who comes into the Tent of Meeting to serve in the Sanctuary” (Exodus 29:30). The verse describes a son serving in the place of his father, indicating that the position is inherited. The conclusion of the verse implies that the rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies only to a High Priest who is fit to enter the Tent of Meeting, but not to the priest anointed for war. Based on this baraita, the following challenge is posed: And if it is so, since the priest anointed for war also serves wearing the same garments as the High Priest, he is also fit to enter the Tent of Meeting and should bequeath his position to his son.

¹⁵¹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said that this is what the baraita is saying: The rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies to anyone for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is to come and serve in the Tent of Meeting. That excludes this priest for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is for war.

¹⁵² The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Dimi’s claim: It was taught in a baraita that the priest anointed for war serves neither in four garments, like a common priest, nor in eight garments, like a High Priest.

¹⁵³ Abaye said to him: Would you make him like a non-priest? If he dresses like neither a High Priest nor a common priest, then effectively he is like a non-priest, but that is certainly not true. Rather, the meaning of the baraita is that the priest anointed for war does not dress like a High Priest due to the animosity that could be caused between him and the High Priest if they both wore similar garments. Therefore, although according to Torah law the priest anointed for war should dress like a High Priest, the Sages decreed that he should not, out of concern that animosity might result. And he does not dress like a common priest, due to the principle: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade. Since the priest anointed for war attained the level of sanctity of a High Priest, he may not now be demoted to serve as an ordinary priest and dress accordingly.

¹⁵⁴ Rav Adda bar Abba said to Rava: But there is this tanna of the following baraita who does not accept the concern of animosity as a reason to prevent one from wearing similar garments, and yet even according to him the priest anointed for war does not serve wearing the eight garments. Clearly, there must be a different reason.

¹⁵⁵ As it was taught in a baraita: The matters in which there are differences between a High Priest and a common priest are as follows: The bull of the anointed priest, also called the bull brought for all the mitzvot, which is brought for unwittingly deciding and following an erroneous halakhic ruling in a case for which one would be liable to receive the penalty of karet had he committed it intentionally; And the bull of Yom Kippur; And the tenth of an ephah that the High Priest offers each day. Only the High Priest brings the above offerings.

¹⁵⁶ In addition, when in mourning, a High Priest does not let his hair grow wild, nor does he rend his clothing in the way other mourners do. But he does rend his clothing from below, in a place that is

not noticeable, while the common priest rends from above in the normal manner. And he may not become ritually impure in the event of the death of his close relatives, but a common priest may. And he is commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow, in contrast to a common priest who is prohibited to marry only a divorcee. And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge.

¹⁵⁷ And he sacrifices offerings even when he is an acute mourner, i.e., on the first day of his mourning, but he may not eat from the offerings on that day and he may not take a portion from them. And he takes his portion first from any offering of his choice. And he has the first right to sacrifice any offering he wants. And he serves wearing eight garments. And he is exempt from bringing an offering for unwittingly causing ritual impurity to the Temple and its sacred objects. And all parts of the Yom Kippur service are valid only when performed by him.

¹⁵⁸ And all these halakhot unique to the High Priest are not limited to one who was consecrated with anointing oil, but apply also to a High Priest of many garments. During the Second Temple period, when the oil used for anointing was no longer available for anointing High Priests, the High Priests were consecrated by virtue of wearing the eight garments. This is true except with regard to the bull brought for all the mitzvot, which is brought only by a High Priest consecrated with anointing oil.

¹⁵⁹ And all these halakhot apply to a former High Priest who had been consecrated to substitute for a High Priest who had become disqualified. If the disqualification of the original High Priest is removed, he may return to his position. Although the substitute no longer serves as a High Priest, he retains the sanctity of a High Priest and the halakhot of the High Priest continue to apply to him. This is true except with regard to the sacrifice of the bull on Yom Kippur and the sacrifice of the tenth of an ephah each day.

¹⁶⁰ And none of them applies to the priest anointed for war, except for the five items stated explicitly in the passage about the High Priest (Leviticus 21:10–15): When in mourning, he does not let his hair grow wild nor does he rend his clothing in the way regular mourners do. And he may not become ritually impure in the event of the death of his close relatives. And he is commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow. And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehuda in tractate Makkot (11a). And the Rabbis say: His death does not allow the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge. The baraita teaches that a former High Priest also wears the eight garments of the High Priest. It is therefore apparent that the tanna of the baraita is not concerned about animosity which could be caused if the High Priest and the former High Priest wear similar garments. Despite this, the baraita agrees that the priest anointed for war does not wear the eight garments. This suggests that the reason for this is not out of concern that animosity might result.

¹⁶¹ The Gemara rejects this proof: When the High Priest has no animosity toward someone else wearing the same garments, it is only where that person is similar to him, such as a former High Priest who held the same rank. But toward someone inferior to him who wears the same garments, such as the priest anointed for war, he does feel animosity.

¹⁶² The Gemara relates: Rabbi Abbahu was sitting before the Sages and saying this halakha of Rav Dimi, that the priest anointed for war serves in the same garments as the High Priest, in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan. Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces away to show that they disagreed. Some

say it was not Rabbi Abbahu but Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba who said it, and it was away from him that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces.

¹⁶³ Rav Pappa strongly objects to the alternative account: Granted, if you say that Rabbi Abbahu reported the halakha, it is understandable that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi did not state outright that they disagreed with him due to the honor of the house of the caesar, as Rabbi Abbahu was close to the government (see Ḥagiga 14a). But if the alternative account were true, then they should have said outright to Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba that they held that Rabbi Yoḥanan did not say this, since there would have been no reason not to have done so. Therefore, Rav Pappa claimed this account must be incorrect.

¹⁶⁴ The Gemara cites an opinion that conflicts with that of Rav Dimi: When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: The teaching that the priest anointed for war wears the eight garments of the High Priest was stated only with regard to being consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim. To be consulted he must wear all eight garments; however, he never serves in them. That was also taught in a baraita: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the priest anointed for war is consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim.

¹⁶⁵ § The Sages taught: How does one consult the Urim VeTummim? The one asking stands with his face toward the one who is asked, i.e., the High Priest or the priest anointed for war. And the one who is asked, the High Priest, turns his face toward the Divine Presence, i.e., the Urim VeTummim, in which the explicit name of God is found, by tilting his head downward toward it.

¹⁶⁶ The one who asks says his question, e.g.: “Shall I pursue after this troop?” (I Samuel 30:8). And the one who is asked answers him according to the response he receives and says, for example: Thus says God: Go up and succeed. Rabbi Yehuda says: He need not say the words: Thus says God; rather, it is sufficient to relay the content of the response and say: Go up and succeed, since he is obviously only repeating what he was told.

¹⁶⁷ One does not ask in a loud voice, as it is stated: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim” (Numbers 27:21), which implies that the inquiry is to be audible only to the person asking. And he should not think his question in his heart but should enunciate it, as it is stated: “And...who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before God” (Numbers 27:21), and immediately afterward it states: “By his mouth” (Numbers 27:21). Rather, how shall he inquire? He should do so akin to the way that Hannah spoke in her prayer, as it is stated: “Now Hannah spoke in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice could not be heard” (I Samuel 1:13), which indicates she did enunciate the words but spoke so quietly that no one else could hear.

¹⁶⁸ One does not ask about two matters simultaneously; rather, one asks one question, and after he is answered he asks a second question. And even if he asks about two matters simultaneously, he is answered only with regard to one of them, and he is answered only with regard to the first question. As it is stated with regard to King David that he asked two questions simultaneously: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand? Will Saul come down?” (I Samuel 23:11). And he was answered with regard to only one: “And God said: He will come down.” (I Samuel 23:11). The Gemara asks: But didn’t you say that if one asks two questions, he is answered only with regard to the first question? Yet the verse states that David received an answer for his second question, not the first. The Gemara answers: David asked the questions

¹⁶⁹ out of order and he was answered in order. He should have asked first whether Saul would come down, and afterward what the people of Keilah would do. And once he realized that he had asked out of order he went back and asked in order, as it is stated immediately afterward: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And God said: They will deliver you” (I Samuel 23:12).

¹⁷⁰ But if the matter is urgent and requires asking two questions simultaneously, there being no time to follow the standard protocol, one may ask both questions simultaneously and he is answered with regard to the two questions together, as it is stated: “And David asked of God, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Will I overtake them? And He answered him: Pursue, for you will surely overtake them, and will surely rescue” (I Samuel 30:8).

¹⁷¹ The Gemara notes the reliability of the Urim VeTummim: Even though a decree of a prophet can be retracted, as sometimes a dire prophecy is stated as a warning and does not come true, a decree of the Urim VeTummim cannot be retracted. As it is stated: “By the judgment of the Urim” (Numbers 27:21). The use of the term judgment suggests that the decree is as final as a judicial decision.

¹⁷² Why is it called Urim VeTummim? Urim, which is based on the word or, light, is so called because it illuminates and explains its words. Tummim, which is based on the word tam, completed, is because it fulfills its words, which always come true.

¹⁷³ And if you say: In the battles following the incidents in Gibeah of Benjamin (Judges 19–20), why did the Urim VeTummim not fulfill its words? The Jewish People consulted the Urim VeTummim three times with regard to their decision to attack the tribe of Benjamin, and each time they were instructed to go to battle. However, the first two times they were defeated and only on the third attempt were they successful. Is this not proof that the UrimVeTummim does not always fulfill its words?

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara answers: The first two times they did not check with the Urim VeTummim whether they would be victorious or be defeated but only inquired how and whether they should go to battle. Had they asked, they indeed would have been told that they would not succeed. But on the last time, when they did check and inquire whether they would be successful, the UrimVeTummim agreed with them that they should go to battle and that they would succeed, as it is stated: “And Pinehas, the son of Elazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I cease? And God said: Go up, for tomorrow I will deliver him into your hand” (Judges 20:28).

¹⁷⁵ How is it done? How does the Urim VeTummim provide an answer? The names of the twelve tribes were engraved upon the stones of the breastplate. These letters allowed for the answer to be received. Rabbi Yoḥanan says: The letters of the answer protrude, and the priest then combines those letters to form words in order to ascertain the message. Reish Lakish says: The letters rearrange themselves and join together to form words.

¹⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: How was it possible to receive an answer to every question? But the letter tzadi is not written within the names of the twelve tribes engraved on the breastplate’s stones. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said: The names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were also written there. The name Yitzḥak, Isaac, contains the letter tzadi. The Gemara asks again: But surely the letter tet was not written on the breastplate, since it is not found in the names of the Patriarchs nor in the names of the

twelve tribes. Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Shivtei Yeshurun, the tribes of Yeshurun, was also written there. The word shivtei, tribes, contains the letter tet. In this way the entire alphabet was represented.

¹⁷⁷ The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spirit and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest is not consulted to inquire of the Urim VeTummim. As Zadok inquired of the Urim VeTummim and it was effective for him, and he received an answer; but Ebiathar inquired and it was not effective for him, and he did not receive an answer. As it is stated: “But Ebiathar went up until all the people had finished” (II Samuel 15:24), which is taken to mean that he was removed from the High Priesthood since the Divine Spirit had departed from him.

¹⁷⁸ The Gemara asks: If it is true that the letters of the breastplate protrude or even join together to form the answer, why does the High Priest need the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence to be with him? And if he has the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence with him, why does he need the Urim VeTummim? The Gemara answers: The Divine Spirit assisted the Urim VeTummim. In other words, the letters formed the answer only if the High Priest himself was worthy, but his divine inspiration was not great enough to provide an answer without them.

¹⁷⁹ § It was taught in the mishna: And the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim only on behalf of the king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Abbahu said that the verse states: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before God; by his mouth they shall go out, and by his mouth they shall come in, both he and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation” (Numbers 27:21). Each phrase describes a different circumstance in which the Urim VeTummim may be consulted: “He”; this is a reference to a king, as “he” refers to Joshua, who had the status of a king. “All the children of Israel with him”; this is a reference to the priest anointed for war, as all of the Jewish people follow him to war according to his instruction. “Even all the congregation”; this is a reference to the Sanhedrin, who are the heads of the Jewish people.

Chapter 8

¹ MISHNA: On Yom Kippur, the day on which there is a mitzva by Torah law to afflict oneself, it is prohibited to engage in eating and in drinking, and in bathing, and in smearing oil on one's body, and in wearing shoes, and in conjugal relations. However, the king, in deference to his eminence, and a new bride within thirty days of her marriage, who wishes to look especially attractive at the beginning of her relationship with her husband, may wash their faces on Yom Kippur. A woman after childbirth, who is suffering, may wear shoes because going barefoot causes her pain. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. The Rabbis prohibit these activities for a king, a new bride, and a woman after childbirth.

² The mishna elaborates: One who eats a large date-bulk of food, equivalent to a date and its pit, or who drinks a cheekful of liquid on Yom Kippur is liable to receive the punishment of karet for failing to fulfill the mitzva to afflict oneself on Yom Kippur. All foods that one eats join together to constitute a date-bulk; and all liquids that one drinks join together to constitute a cheekful. However,

if one eats and drinks, the food and beverage do not join together to constitute a measure that determines liability, as each is measured separately.

³ GEMARA: The Gemara expresses surprise at the mishna's terminology, which states that it is prohibited to eat and drink on Yom Kippur. Why does the mishna use the word prohibited, which indicates that these activities are only sinful? It is, after all, punishable by karet if he eats, and the mishna should have used the more accurate word liable. Rabbi Ila said, and some say that Rabbi Yirmeya said: This term is needed only for a half-measure, meaning that if one eats less than the amount that incurs the punishment of karet, he still violates a prohibition.

⁴ The Gemara asks: This explanation works out well according to the one who said that a half-measure is prohibited by Torah law even though it does not incur a punishment. But according to the one who says that a half-measure is permitted by Torah law, and that it is the Sages who prohibit eating less than a full measure, what is there to say about the terminology?

⁵ The Gemara explains: as it was stated that amora'im debated the nature of a half-measure of a forbidden substance: Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is prohibited by Torah law, and the Torah prohibits even a minute amount of forbidden substance. Reish Lakish said: It is permitted by Torah law. This explanation works out well according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan. However, according to the opinion of Reish Lakish, what can be said? The Gemara answers: Reish Lakish concedes that a half-measure is prohibited by rabbinic law. If so, Reish Lakish, too, will say that eating or drinking a half-measure is prohibited on Yom Kippur, by rabbinic law.

⁶ The Gemara asks: If so, if according to Reish Lakish there is a rabbinic prohibition to eat a half-measure, one should not be liable to bring an offering for breaking an oath to eat a half-measure of forbidden foods. Why, then, did we learn in a mishna otherwise: He who swore the following oath, an oath that I will not eat, and then ate unslaughtered animal carcasses, tereifot, reptiles, or creeping animals, he is liable to bring an offering for violating his oath. Rabbi Shimon exempts him.

⁷ And we discussed it: Why should he be liable for breaking an oath? He was already sworn and obligated at Mount Sinai, along with the rest of the Jewish people, not to eat these things. According to halakha, an oath does not take effect if it contradicts a previously existing oath. The second oath to not eat has no effect in terms of eating forbidden foods, so why should one be liable for breaking it? Rav, and Shmuel, and Rabbi Yoḥanan say with regard to this: Here we are dealing with a case where one includes permitted foods with forbidden foods. This means that had one sworn only not to eat unslaughtered animal carcasses or tereifot and then ate them, he would not be liable for breaking the oath because he was already sworn not to eat those foods. However, if one swore not to eat at all, his oath takes effect on permitted foods. Consequently, if he eats any food he is liable.

⁸ And Reish Lakish said: The only application of this mishna you will find is in a case where one explicitly says that he will not eat a half-measure, and this is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. They say that when one swears that he will not eat, he prohibits himself only from eating a whole measure of food. If he eats a half-measure, he has not violated a prohibition. Therefore, in order for a half-measure to be prohibited, he needs to specify this in his oath. Or, you find it in the case of one who makes no specification at all of a half-measure,

⁹ and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: A man prohibits himself from any amount. If a man swears that he will not eat, he thereby prohibits himself from

eating even the smallest amount of food. Therefore, Reish Lakish himself maintains that eating a half-measure does not constitute a prohibition.

¹⁰ And if you say: Perhaps Reish Lakish maintains that since a half-measure is permitted by Torah law, despite the fact that it is prohibited by rabbinic law, one is liable to bring an offering for violating an oath, then there is the following problem: Didn't we learn in a mishna: An oath of testimony where one is sworn to give testimony on something that he saw or knew, applies only to those who are eligible to give testimony. If one who is ineligible to testify swears an oath to give testimony, the oath is invalid even if he does not testify. And we discussed it: The statement: Those who are eligible to give testimony, comes to exclude what? After all, it was already said that the oath does not apply to women, relatives, and other disqualified people. Rav Pappa said: It comes to exclude a king. A king is not disqualified from giving testimony, but he does not testify before a court, due to the requirement to give respect to a king.

¹¹ Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: It comes to exclude one who plays with dice, whom the Sages disqualified from giving testimony. But surely one who plays with dice is eligible by Torah law to give testimony, and it is the Sages who disqualified him. Despite this, an oath of testimony does not apply to him by Torah law, even though the prohibition on his testifying is rabbinic.

¹² The Gemara rejects this by distinguishing between the two cases: It is different there, in the case of testimony, where the verse states: "If he does not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity" (Leviticus 5:1), i.e., a man who can testify but doesn't do so should be punished. But this person cannot ever give testimony since the court will not accept his testimony. The Torah makes liability for an oath of testimony contingent on one's ability to testify. Therefore, an oath of testimony would not apply to someone unable to testify. However, one who takes an oath not to eat is liable if he breaks that oath, notwithstanding the rabbinic prohibition against eating less than a measure of forbidden food. Consequently, this rejection does not stand, and the first explanation remains.

¹³ § The Gemara's initial assumption is that the mishna's use of the word prohibited is referring to a transgression not punishable by karet. The Gemara asks: And anywhere that it teaches that transgressing is punishable by karet, does it never teach using the word prohibited? Was it not taught in a baraita: Although they said the word prohibited with all of the five Yom Kippur afflictions, they said that the punishment of karet applies only to one who eats, or drinks, or performs prohibited labor. This means that the word prohibit is used with transgressions punishable by karet as well. The Gemara rejects this. This is what the baraita is saying: When they said that those five activities are prohibited, they said that only with regard to a half-measure; but a full measure is punishable by karet. And although a violation is punishable by karet, it is punishable by karet only if one eats, or drinks, or performs prohibited labor; these alone are the cases where karet is incurred.

¹⁴ And if you wish, say instead that when it is taught in the mishna using the language of prohibited, it is referring to the other transgressions, which do not incur karet. As Rabba and Rav Yosef taught this in other books of Rav's school, i.e., the Sifrei, the halakhic midrash on Numbers and Deuteronomy: From where is it derived that it is prohibited to engage in bathing, and in smearing oil on one's body, and in wearing shoes, and in having relations on Yom Kippur? The verse states: "Shabbaton" (Leviticus 16:31), meaning resting and refraining from certain activities. Therefore, the word prohibit is used with these activities, but they are not punishable by karet.

¹⁵ § Apropos the dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish, the Gemara deals with the matter itself: What is the law with regard to a half-measure? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is prohibited by Torah law. Reish Lakish said: It is permitted by Torah law. The Gemara elaborates: Rabbi Yoḥanan said it is prohibited by Torah law because it is fit to combine with another half-measure. If one continues to eat more, he will eat a whole measure, which is punishable by Torah law. Therefore, even when he eats the first half-measure he is eating forbidden food. Reish Lakish said it is permitted by Torah law. His reason is as follows: With regard to all forbidden foods, the Merciful One states in the Torah: “Eat,” for example in the verse: “You shall eat neither fat nor blood” (Leviticus 3:17). Eating is defined as consuming a minimum of an olive-bulk, and there is no prohibition if one eats less than an olive-bulk.

¹⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan raised an objection to the opinion of Reish Lakish from what was taught in a baraita with regard to the prohibition of forbidden fat: I have derived only that anything that is included in the punishment of karet is included in the prohibition. However, one might have thought that there is no prohibition to eat fat of a koy, or a half-measure of forbidden fat, since there is no punishment for those. Therefore, the verse states: “All fat” (Leviticus 7:23), indicating that there is a prohibition to eat any kind of fat, including fat of uncertain status and a half-measure of fat. Therefore, a half-measure of fat is prohibited by Torah law. Reish Lakish rejects this argument: This prohibition is rabbinic, and the verse brought as a proof is a mere support. It cannot be claimed that there is such a prohibition by Torah law.

¹⁷ The Gemara comments: So too, it is reasonable to say that the baraita cites only the verse as a support and not as a source to prove the prohibition. For if it could enter your mind that this teaching constitutes a prohibition by Torah law, there is uncertainty whether a koy is a wild beast or a domestic animal. Is a verse necessary to include an uncertainty? There is no doubt before God and therefore no purpose in writing a case of doubt in the Torah. Consequently, the baraita cites the verse only as a support. The Gemara answers: If that is the reason, there is no conclusive argument. The Sages of the baraita might have thought

¹⁸ that a koy is its own species, and the uncertainty pertains not only to whether it is a wild or domestic animal, but also to whether it even can fit into one of those two categories. For if you do not say so and maintain that it might be its own species, how can we understand that which Rav Idi bar Avin said, that also the word “all” stated in the verse: “All blood you may not eat, whether of birds or of beasts” (Leviticus 7:26), comes to include the koy. Now, if you say that the koy is a case of uncertainty, is a verse necessary to include an uncertainty? Rather, the koy is obviously its own species, and therefore it is different and needs a special verse to include it. Here too, in the case of the forbidden fat, we could say that the koy is its own species, and therefore it is different. Consequently, Reish Lakish’s opinion cannot be proven by this baraita.

¹⁹ § After clarifying the wording of the mishna, the Gemara brings a halakhic midrash to analyze the mishna’s laws. The Sages taught: The verse states: “And this shall be a statute to you forever: In the seventh month on the tenth day of the month you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 16:29). I might have thought that one should sit in the sun or in the cold to suffer and afflict his soul; therefore the continuation of the verse states: “And you shall not do any labor, the home-born, or the stranger that lives among you” (Leviticus 16:29). This teaches that just as prohibited labor is a mitzva that requires one to sit and do nothing, as one is commanded to refrain from action, so too, affliction of

one's soul is also a mitzva requiring one to sit and do nothing. One is not commanded to be proactive in order to afflict his soul. Rather, one must refrain from specified actions such as eating and drinking.

²⁰ The Gemara asks: And say that it means that when one sits in the sun and it is too hot for him, we do not say to him: Get up and sit in the shade. Or, if one sits in the shade and it is too cold for him, we do not say to him: Get up and sit in the sun. These are also cases of affliction involving sitting and doing nothing. The Gemara rejects this: It must be similar to the prohibition of labor. Just as with regard to prohibited labor you did not distinguish between situations, since the prohibition is independent of one's personal circumstance, so too, you do not distinguish with regard to affliction, which is not affected by one's circumstance.

²¹ It was taught in another baraita that as the verse states: "You shall afflict your souls" (Leviticus 16:29), I might have thought that one must sit in the sun or the cold and be uncomfortable; therefore, the continuation of the verse states: "And you shall not do any labor" (Leviticus 16:29). Just as prohibited labor is something that incurs karet in other circumstances, like Shabbat, so too, affliction relates to acts that in other circumstances incur karet. And what is that circumstance? That is referring to piggul and notar, which lead to karet if eaten, and which therefore may not be eaten on Yom Kippur.

²² The baraita continues: I will include the categories of piggul and notar, for which one is punished with karet if eaten during the year, but I will not include untithed produce, which does not cause one to incur the punishment of karet if eaten. Therefore, the verse states: "You shall afflict" (Leviticus 16:29), and it also states: "And you shall afflict your souls" (Leviticus 16:31). The Torah comes to include another affliction of a serious eating prohibition, i.e. untithed produce.

²³ The baraita continues: I will include untithed produce, for which one receives death at the hand of Heaven; but I will not include an unslaughtered animal carcass, which, although it is prohibited for consumption, one who eats it is not punishable by death at the hands of Heaven. Therefore, the verse states "you shall afflict" and also "and you shall afflict your souls." The Torah includes foods that are associated with a prohibition even if one who eats them is not punishable by death.

²⁴ The baraita continues: I will include an unslaughtered animal carcass, which is prohibited by a negative mitzva, but I will not include non-sacred, regular food, which is not prohibited by a negative mitzva. Therefore, the verse states both "you shall afflict" and "and you shall afflict your souls." Although non-sacred food is not prohibited in general, the Torah includes it in the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur.

²⁵ The baraita continues: I will include non-sacred food, which is not associated with any positive mitzva to arise and eat, i.e., there is no obligation to eat non-sacred food; but I will not include teruma, which one is required to arise and eat, as priests are commanded to eat teruma. Therefore, the verse states "you shall afflict" and "and you shall afflict your souls." The Torah includes teruma as well in the foods one is prohibited to eat on Yom Kippur. I will include teruma, which is not subject to the command: "You shall not leave over" (Leviticus 22:30), since teruma need not be consumed within a specific time, but I will not include sacred food, which is subject to the command "you shall not leave over"; it is prohibited to leave the meat uneaten after a certain amount of time. Therefore, the verse states "you shall afflict" and "and you shall afflict your souls," to include the category of

sacred food in the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur. Consequently, the Gemara has demonstrated that it is prohibited to eat any type of food on Yom Kippur.

²⁶ And if it is your wish to say something to challenge this reasoning, the Gemara brings an additional proof: Surely, the verse states with regard to one who violates Yom Kippur: “I will destroy that soul from among his people” (Leviticus 23:30). Therefore, affliction is something that destroys a soul. And what is that? That is refraining from eating and drinking, since someone who does not eat and drink at all will die. The Torah is not referring to other afflictions that do not lead to death. These are the words of the baraita.

²⁷ The Gemara explains: What is meant by: And if it is your wish to say? What flaw did the first proof have? The Gemara explains: And if you say the verse is discussing relations with those with whom relations are forbidden, avoidance of which is also called affliction, and it is not discussing eating and drinking, the verse states: I will destroy that soul, meaning an affliction that can cause death. And what is that? That is refraining from eating and drinking.

²⁸ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught the following concerning the nature of Yom Kippur: The word affliction is stated here with regard to Yom Kippur, and the word affliction is stated further on in a different place, concerning the Jews in the desert: “And He afflicted you and caused you to hunger” (Deuteronomy 8:3). Just as further on the meaning of affliction is hunger, so too, here, the meaning of the word affliction is hunger.

²⁹ The Gemara asks: And let us derive it not from the verse that indicates affliction of hunger but from the verse where Laban warns Jacob: “If you shall afflict my daughters” (Genesis 31:50), which is referring not to hunger but to marital relations. The Gemara answers: We derive affliction commanded to the public on Yom Kippur from affliction relating to the public, i.e., the Jewish people in the desert, and we do not derive affliction of the public from affliction of an individual, as in the case of Jacob’s wives.

³⁰ The Gemara continues to challenge the view of Rabbi Yishmael: And let us derive it from affliction stated with regard to Egypt, as it is written: “And He saw our affliction” (Deuteronomy 26:7). We say that this verse is referring to abstinence from conjugal relations. The Egyptians prevented the Jewish people from having relations. This affliction is an example of public affliction that is not abstention from eating or drinking. Rather, the prohibition to eat or drink on Yom Kippur should not be learned as stated previously, but as follows: We derive affliction by the hand of God from affliction by the hand of God, i.e., affliction caused directly by God or through His mitzvot; and we do not derive affliction by the hand of God from affliction by the hand of man.

³¹ § Apropos the verse: “And he afflicted you and caused you to hunger, and fed you with manna” (Deuteronomy 8:3), the Gemara expounds related verses. The Torah states: “Who feeds you manna in the desert which your fathers did not know, in order to afflict you” (Deuteronomy 8:16). What affliction was there in eating the manna? Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi disagreed on the matter. One said: There is no comparison between one who has bread in his basket and one who does not have bread in his basket. The affliction in eating the manna lay in there being no leftover food for the next day. Each day the people worried that they might not have any food to eat the next day. And one said: There is no comparison between one who sees the food and eats it and one who does not see the food and eats it. Though the manna could taste like anything, it always looked the same and did not look as it tasted. Being unable to see the food that they tasted was an affliction.

³² Rav Yosef said: From here there is an allusion to the idea that blind people eat but are not fully satisfied when they eat because they cannot see their food. Seeing the food contributes to the enjoyment of eating. Abaye said: Therefore, from what we have just learned, one who has a meal should eat it only during daytime, when there is light to see the food that is being eaten. Rabbi Zeira said: What is the verse that alludes to this? “Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire” (Ecclesiastes 6:9). On the same verse, Reish Lakish said: The sight of a woman is better than the actual act of relations, as it is stated: “Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire.”

³³ § Apropos the dispute between Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi, the Gemara continues with another dispute they had with regard to the correct interpretation of a verse. It is stated: “Do not look upon the wine when it is red, when it gives its color in the cup, when it glides down smoothly [bemeisharim]” (Proverbs 23:31). Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi disagreed. One said: Whoever casts

³⁴ his eye on his cup, i.e., is habitually drunk, all the prohibitions of those with whom relations are forbidden seem to him like level [mishor] ground. He is unaware of the pitfalls of sin and continues walking along a twisted and dangerous path. And one said: Whoever casts his eye on his cup, the whole world seems to him like level [mishor] ground. Not only is such a person unconcerned by forbidden sexual relations, but all other prohibitions, e.g., monetary prohibitions, also seem permitted in his eyes.

³⁵ § The Gemara explains another verse in Proverbs: “If there is care in a man’s heart, let him quash it [yashḥena]” (Proverbs 12:25). Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi dispute the verse’s meaning. One said: He should forcefully push it [yashḥena] out of his mind. One who worries should banish his concerns from his thoughts. And one said: It means he should tell [yeshiḥena] others his concerns, which will lower his anxiety.

³⁶ § Another verse states: “And dust shall be the serpent’s food” (Isaiah 65:25). Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi dispute the verse’s meaning. One said: Even if the serpent eats all the delicacies in the world, they will still taste like dust. And one said: Even if it eats all the delicacies in the world, its mind is unsettled until it also eats some dust.

³⁷ With regard to the same topic, it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yosei said: Come and see that the attribute of the Holy One, Blessed be He, is different than the attribute of flesh and blood. The attribute of flesh and blood is that one who seeks to provoke another harasses him in all aspects of his life, but the Holy One, Blessed be He, does not act in this way. He cursed the serpent and what happened? When the serpent goes up to the roof its food is with it, and when it comes down its food is with it. Consequently, the curse that it suffers does not ruin its life but rather benefits it.

³⁸ Similarly, He cursed Canaan that he should be the servant of servants, but he benefits somewhat from this. He eats what his master eats, and drinks what his master drinks, and does not worry like a free man does. He cursed the woman and everyone pursues her to marry her. He cursed the land after the sin of Adam and Eve, yet everyone is sustained from it. Even when God is angry, He does not punish His creations severely.

³⁹ The Gemara cites more verses that pertain to the same issue. Rav and Shmuel disagree with regard to the following verse: “We remember the fish which we ate in Egypt for nothing” (Numbers 11:5). One said: The verse is referring literally to fish. And one said: The verse is referring to incestuous relations that the Torah had not yet forbidden. The people cried once the Torah prohibited certain

relatives to them. The Gemara explains: The one who said that the verse is referring to fish bases his explanation on the verse, as it is written “which we ate.” This means what they actually ate. And the one who said that the verse is referring to forbidden sexual relations also bases his explanation on the verse, as it is written “for nothing.” Certainly, the people did not actually eat fish for free.

⁴⁰ The Gemara asks: And according to the one who said that it is referring to forbidden relations, but isn’t it written “which we ate”? The Gemara answers: The Torah employed a euphemistic expression. Eating is used as a euphemism for sexual relations, as it is written: “So is the way of an adulterous woman; she eats, and wipes her mouth, and says I have done no wickedness” (Proverbs 30:20). And according to the one who said it is referring to fish, what is the meaning of the phrase “for nothing”? The people brought the fish from the river, which was ownerless property, since the Egyptians obviously would not have given them free food. The Master said: When the Jews drew water from the river, the Holy One, Blessed be He, prepared little fish for them in the water. They swam into their jugs.

⁴¹ The Gemara comments: Granted, according to the one who said that they cried over actual fish but were not promiscuous in having forbidden relations in Egypt, this is what is written to praise the Jewish people: “A garden enclosed is my sister the bride; a locked fountain, a sealed spring” (Song of Songs 4:12). This figurative language teaches that Jewish women are chaste. However, according to the one who said the Jewish people cried over forbidden sexual relations, what does the phrase “a sealed spring” mean? The Gemara answers: It means that they were not promiscuous with those relatives who were already forbidden to them. In Egypt, the Jewish people observed the laws of forbidden sexual relations that are included in the seven Noahide commandments. In the desert, they cried over the additional prohibitions imposed when the Torah was given.

⁴² The Gemara asks further: Granted, according to the one who said that they cried over the new prohibitions of forbidden sexual relations, this is as it is written: “And Moses heard the people weeping for their families” (Numbers 11:10). They cried with regard to the issue of their families, because now it became prohibited for them to cohabit with them. But according to the one who says that they cried over fish what does “weeping for their families” mean? The Gemara answers: Both this and that happened. They cried about the laws of forbidden sexual relations, and they also cried because they no longer had the fish of Egypt.

⁴³ The Gemara returns to the same verse: It states: “We remember...the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic” (Numbers 11:5). Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi debate the verse’s meaning. One said: They tasted the flavor of all types of food in the manna, but they cried because they could not taste the tastes of these five foods that they mentioned. And one said: They tasted the flavor of all types of food, as well as their textures. The sensation was so strong that it seemed to them like they were eating those very foods. However, with the foods they listed, the people tasted only their flavor but not their texture.

⁴⁴ With regard to the manna, the Torah further states: “And it was white [lavan] like coriander seed; and its flavor was like wafers made of honey” (Exodus 16:31). The Gemara questions this, since coriander is brown, not white. Rabbi Asi said: The manna was round like coriander seed but white like a pearl. This was also taught in a baraita: Coriander [gad] is so named because it is similar to flax seeds on their stalks, which are bound [agud] in a bundle.

⁴⁵ Others say: It was called coriander [gad] because it is similar to a tale [haggada], which draws a person's heart toward it, just like water, which is essential for life, draws one. It was taught in another baraita: Why is it called gad? Because it told [maggid] the Jewish people the answer to issues of uncertainty, such as the paternity of a baby. If a woman remarries within two months after her divorce or the death of her husband and gives birth seven months after her remarriage, it is unclear if the baby gestated for seven months and is the son of the second husband or for nine months and is the son of the first husband. The manna would tell them if the baby was born after nine months and belongs to the first husband, or if the baby was born after seven months and belongs to the second husband. Since the manna was collected by each family based on the number of its biological members, the manna established the baby's paternity.

⁴⁶ The manna was called white because it whitened Israel's sins. The people feared that if they sinned the manna would not continue to fall. Consequently, they devoted themselves to introspection and repentance.

⁴⁷ Similarly, it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yosei says: Just like the prophet would tell the Jewish people what was in the holes and what was in the cracks of their souls, highlighting the sins of the people, so too, the manna clarified for Israel what was in the holes and what was in the cracks. How so? If two people came before Moses for a judgment, one saying: You stole my slave, and the other one saying: I did not steal him, rather you sold him to me, Moses would say to them: In the morning there will be a judgment. How was the matter resolved? If on the following day the slave found his omer of manna in his first master's house, it would be clear that he was stolen, because the manna still came to the first owner. And if on the following day he found his omer of manna in his second master's house, it would be clear that he had been sold.

⁴⁸ Similarly, if a man and a woman came to Moses for a judgment, he saying: She sinned against me, and therefore I may divorce her and am not obligated to pay her divorce settlement, and she saying: He sinned against me and therefore I am entitled to the full settlement from the marriage contract, Moses would say to them: In the morning there will be a judgment. The following day, if her omer of manna was found in her husband's house, it would be clear that she sinned against him. The fact that her nourishment was given to his household signifies the fact that he has respected her appropriately and is worthy of nourishing her. If her omer of manna was found in her father's house, it would be clear that he sinned against her. Her nourishment has not been given to his household, signifying that he has been disrespectful to her and is not worthy of nourishing her.

⁴⁹ § The Gemara continues to discuss the manna: It is written: "And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, the manna fell upon it" (Numbers 11:9). And it is written: "And the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day" (Exodus 16:4). And it is written: "The people went about and gathered it" (Numbers 11:8). How can these texts be reconciled? For the righteous, the manna fell at the opening of their homes. They expended no effort at all. The average people went out of the camp and gathered what fell there. The wicked had to go about farther to gather.

⁵⁰ With regard to the manna, it is written "bread" (Exodus 16:4); and it is written "cakes" (Numbers 11:8); and it is also written "and ground it in mills," (Numbers 11:8), implying that it was neither bread nor a cake. How can these texts be reconciled? For the righteous, it fell as baked bread; for average people, it fell as unbaked cakes; for the wicked it came in an unprocessed form and consequently they ground it in a mill.

⁵¹ The verse states: “Or beat it in a mortar” (Numbers 11:8). Rabbi Yehuda said that Rav said, and some say it was Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina: This teaches that women’s perfumes fell for the Jewish people with the manna because they are an item that is beaten in a mortar. The verse continues: “And cooked it in a pot” (Numbers 11:8). Rabbi Ḥama said: This teaches that cooking spices fell for the Jewish people with the manna.

⁵² § With regard to donations for the Tabernacle, the verse states: “And they brought yet to him free-will offerings every morning” (Exodus 36:3). The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of “every morning”? Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: They brought donations from that which fell every morning with the manna. This teaches that pearls and precious stones fell for the Israelites with the manna. It states: “And the rulers [nesi’im] brought the onyx [shoham] stones” (Exodus 35:27). A tanna taught that the word nesi’im means actual clouds brought them. As it states: “As clouds [nesi’im] and wind without rain so is he that boasts himself of a false gift” (Proverbs 25:14). We learn from this that the precious stones fell from the clouds with the manna.

⁵³ It was also said with regard to the manna: “And its taste was as the taste of a cake [shad] baked with oil [hashamen]” (Numbers 11:8). Rabbi Abbahu said: Shad means breast. Just as a baby tastes different flavors from the breast, since the taste of the milk changes somewhat depending on what foods his mother eats, so too with the manna, every time that the Jewish people ate the manna, they found in it many different flavors, based on their preferences. There are those who say that the word is written as shed and means literally a demon. How so? Just as a demon changes into different forms and colors, so too, the manna changed into different flavors.

⁵⁴ The verse states: “And Moses said: This shall be, when the Lord will give you in the evening meat to eat, and in the morning bread to the full” (Exodus 16:8). A tanna taught in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa: The meat that the Jewish people asked for inappropriately, since they had the manna and did not need meat, was given to them inappropriately, in a way that was unpleasant; they were punished afterward (Rabbeinu Elyakim).

⁵⁵ However, bread, which is essential, they asked for appropriately. Therefore, it was given to them appropriately, in the morning, when there was time to prepare it. The Gemara comments: From here, the Torah teaches etiquette, that it is proper to eat meat only at night, as Moses said to the children of Israel: “This shall be, when the Lord will give you in the evening meat to eat” (Exodus 16:8). The Gemara asks: But didn’t Abaye say that someone who has a meal should eat it only in the day? The Gemara answers: We mean to say: Like day. It is not necessary to eat the food in the daytime, as long as one can see what he eats. Rabbi Aḥa bar Ya’akov said: At the beginning, the Jewish people were like chickens pecking at the garbage; any time there was food they grabbed it and ate it, until Moses came and set specific times to eat, as the verse implies. He set mealtimes for them in the morning and in the evening.

⁵⁶ It was stated with regard to the quail: “While the meat was yet between their teeth, before it was chewed, the anger of the Lord was kindled against the people” (Numbers 11:33), which means that they died immediately. However, it also states: “You shall not eat it for only one day...but for an entire month until it comes out of your nostrils and becomes loathsome to you” (Numbers 11:19–20). How can these texts be reconciled? The average people died immediately, but the wicked continued to suffer in pain for a month and then died.

⁵⁷ The verse states: “And they spread them [vayishteḥu] out for themselves round about the camp” (Numbers 11:32). Reish Lakish said: Do not read it as vayishteḥu. Rather, read it as vayishḥatu. This teaches that the enemies of the Jewish people, a euphemism for the Jewish people themselves, were liable to receive the punishment of slaughter due to their demand. The verse states: “Spread out [shato’aḥ]” (Numbers 11:32). A tanna taught in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa: Do not read it as shato’aḥ but as shaḥot. This teaches that other food fell for the Jewish people along with the manna. The food was something that requires ritual slaughtering [sheḥita], referring to birds. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: And do you learn this from here? Do we need to alter the word for this purpose? Isn’t it already stated explicitly: “And he rained meat upon them like dust, and winged birds like the sand of the seas” (Psalms 78:27)?

⁵⁸ And it was taught in a related baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The verse states: “Then you shall slaughter of your herd and of your flock which the Lord has given you, as I have commanded you” (Deuteronomy 12:21). This teaches that Moses was commanded in the laws of ritual slaughter to cut the gullet and the windpipe in the neck. And with a bird one must cut through the majority of one pipe, and with an animal one must cut through the majority of both pipes. Moses was commanded these laws along with the other details of slaughtering. According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the word shatoaḥ does not teach us about ritual slaughter. Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states: Shatoaḥ? It teaches that the manna fell in layers [mashtiḥin] in a straight row.

⁵⁹ With regard to the manna, it is written “bread” (Exodus 16:4), and it is written “oil” (Numbers 11:8), and it is written “honey” (Exodus 16:31). How can we reconcile these verses? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: For the youth it was like bread, for the elderly it was like oil, and for the children it was like honey. Each received what was appropriate.

⁶⁰ The Gemara comments further: The word quail is written shlav, with the letter shin, but we read it as slav, with the letter samekh. What does this teach us? Rabbi Ḥanina said: The righteous eat it in peace [shalva], based on the written form of the word; whereas the wicked eat it, and it seems to them like thorns [silvin], based on the way the word is read.

⁶¹ Furthermore, with regard to the quail: Rav Ḥanan bar Rava said: There are four types of quail and these are they: Sikhli, and kivli, and pasyoni, and slav. The best tasting of all is the sikhli. The worst of all is the slav. The Gemara relates how tasty even the quail was that the Jews ate in the desert: It was as small as a sparrow, and they would place it in the oven to roast, and it expanded until it filled the entire oven. They would place it upon thirteen loaves of bread, and even the last loaf on the bottom could be eaten only when mixed with other food, due to all the fat it had absorbed from the quail.

⁶² It is told that Rav Yehuda found quail among his barrels of wine, and Rav Ḥisda found quail among logs of wood in his storeroom. Every day Rava’s sharecropper brought him a quail that he found in his fields. One day, he did not bring him one because he failed to find any. Rava said to himself: What is this, why is today different? He went up to the roof to think about it. He heard a child say the verse: “When I heard, my innards trembled, my lips quivered at the voice, rottenness enters into my bones, and I tremble where I stand; that I should wait for the day of trouble when he comes up against the people that he invades” (Habakkuk 3:16). Rava said: Learn from this that Rav Ḥisda has died. I am therefore not worthy to receive the quail anymore, since it is on account of the

teacher that the student eats. When Rav Ḥisda was alive, Rava received the quail due to Rav Ḥisda's merit; now that he had died, Rava was not worthy to receive the quail.

⁶³ § Furthermore, with regard to the manna it is written: "And when the layer of dew lifted, behold, upon the face of the wilderness there lay a fine flaky substance, as fine as frost on the ground" (Exodus 16:14), indicating that the dew covered the manna. And it is written: "And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, the manna fell upon it" (Numbers 11:9), meaning that the manna fell on top of the dew. How can these verses be reconciled? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: There was dew above and dew below, with the manna in between, and the manna appeared as if it were placed in a box [kufsa] of dew.

⁶⁴ The verse describes the manna as "a fine flaky [meḥuspas] substance" (Exodus 16:14). Reish Lakish said: Meḥuspas means it was a substance that dissolved [maḥ] on the palm [pas] of the hand. Since it was so fine, it dissolved upon contact. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It was a substance that was absorbed in all 248 limbs, the numerical equivalent of the word meḥuspas. The Gemara expresses surprise at this: If one calculates the value of the letters in the word meḥuspas, it is more, totaling 254. Rabbi Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Meḥuspas is written in the Torah without the letter vav. Therefore, the total is exactly 248.

⁶⁵ The Sages taught: The Torah states: "And He caused manna to rain upon them for food, and He gave them of the grain of heaven. Man did eat the bread of the mighty [abirim]" (Psalms 78:24–25). "Bread of the mighty" is bread that the ministering angels eat; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. When these words were said before Rabbi Yishmael, he said to them to go and tell Akiva: Akiva you have erred. Do the ministering angels eat bread? It is already stated about Moses, when he ascended on high: "Bread I did not eat and water I did not drink" (Deuteronomy 9:9). If even a man who ascends on high does not need to eat, certainly the ministering angels do not need to eat. Rather, how do I establish the meaning of the word abirim? It can be explained as bread that was absorbed into all 248 limbs [eivarim], so that there was no waste.

⁶⁶ The Gemara asks: But if so, how do I establish the verses: "And you shall have a spade among your weapons, and it shall be that when you relieve yourself outside, you shall dig with it, and shall turn back and cover your excrement" (Deuteronomy 23:14) and "You shall have a place also outside the camp where you can relieve yourself" (Deuteronomy 23:13). From here we learn that there was waste in their bowels, as they had to leave the camp to relieve themselves. The Gemara explains: This waste was not a byproduct of the manna; it was from food items that the gentile merchants sold them.

⁶⁷ Rabbi Elazar ben Perata disagrees and says: The manna caused even items that the gentile merchants sold them to be completely digested, so that even other food that they ate produced no waste. But then how do I establish the verse: "And you shall have a spade among your weapons"? After they sinned, the manna was not as effective. The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: I initially said that they would be like ministering angels who do not produce waste; now I will trouble them to walk three parasangs to leave the camp in order to relieve themselves.

⁶⁸ How do we know that the Israelite camp was three parasangs? As it is written: "And they camped by the Jordan from Beth-Jeshimoth to Abel-shittim" (Numbers 33:49), and Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: I saw that site and it was three parasangs in length. And a baraita taught: When the Jews relieved themselves in the desert, they did not relieve themselves ahead of themselves, i.e., in the direction of

their travel, nor to the side of the camp, but behind the camp, in a place that they had already traveled. Consequently, those near the front of the camp had to walk a distance of three parasangs from their homes to leave the camp.

⁶⁹ Furthermore, with regard to the manna, the verse states Israel's complaint: "But now our soul is dry, there is nothing at all; we have nothing beside this manna to look to" (Numbers 11:6). They said: This manna will eventually swell in our stomachs and kill us; is there anyone born of a woman who ingests food but does not expel waste? This supports the Gemara's claim that the manna did not create waste.

⁷⁰ When these words were said before Rabbi Yishmael, he said to them: Do not read it as abirim. Rather, read it as eivarim, limbs. The manna was something that was absorbed by 248 limbs. But, how do I establish "And you shall have a spade among your weapons"? From the food items that came to them from overseas lands. Rabbi Yishmael disagrees with Rabbi Elazar ben Perata with regard to the effect the manna had on the digestion of other foods.

⁷¹ Alternatively, "Man [ish] did eat the bread of the mighty" (Psalms 78:25);

⁷² the verse is referring to Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people, when he waited for Moses at Mount Sinai during the forty days Moses was on the mountain. The verses allude to this: "Man" is written here, and "man" is written there: "Take to you Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom there is spirit, and lay your hand upon him" (Numbers 27:18). From here, the Gemara learns that the "man" is Joshua. The Gemara asks: Say that the verse is referring to Moses, about whom it is written: "Now the man Moses was very humble" (Numbers 12:3). The Gemara answers: We can learn a verbal analogy to the word "man" from the word "man," but we cannot learn a verbal analogy to the word "man" from the phrase "the man," which is used to refer to Moses.

⁷³ Furthermore, with regard to the manna: The students of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai asked him: Why didn't the manna fall for the Jewish people just once a year to take care of all their needs, instead of coming down every day? He said to them: I will give you a parable: To what does this matter compare? To a king of flesh and blood who has only one son. He granted him an allowance for food once a year and the son greeted his father only once a year, when it was time for him to receive his allowance. So he arose and granted him his food every day, and his son visited him every day.

⁷⁴ So too, in the case of the Jewish people, someone who had four or five children would be worried and say: Perhaps the manna will not fall tomorrow and we will all die of starvation. Consequently, everyone directed their hearts to their Father in heaven every day. The manna that fell each day was sufficient only for that day, so that all of the Jewish people would pray to God for food for the next day.

⁷⁵ Alternatively, they received manna daily so that they would be able to eat it while it was hot and fresh. Alternatively, they received manna daily due to the hardship of carrying on the journey. They did not stay in the same place all those years, and it would have been difficult for them to carry the manna from one place to another. Therefore, the manna fell wherever they went.

⁷⁶ § It is told: Rabbi Tarfon, and Rabbi Yishmael, and the Elders were sitting and discussing the passage about the manna and Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i was sitting among them. Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i responded and said: The manna that fell for the Jewish people was sixty cubits high.

Rabbi Tarfon said to him: Moda'i, how long will you collect words and bring upon us teachings that have no basis?

⁷⁷ He said to him: Rabbi, I am interpreting a verse. How so? It states about the Flood: "Fifteen cubits above did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered" (Genesis 7:20). Is it possible that it would be fifteen cubits high from a valley, fifteen cubits from the plain, and fifteen cubits from the mountains? Did the water stand as though in layers, conforming to the height of the land below it? Furthermore, how could the Ark travel over water that was at different levels? Rather: "On the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up" (Genesis 7:11), until the water rose and was level with the mountains. Afterward, the verse states that "fifteen cubits above did the waters prevail."

⁷⁸ Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i continues: But which attribute is greater, the attribute of goodness or the attribute of retribution? One must say the attribute of goodness is greater than the attribute of retribution. With regard to the attribute of retribution, in the case of the Flood, the verse states: "And the windows of heaven were opened" (Genesis 7:11), which indicates that there were only windows. Whereas, with regard to the attribute of goodness, in the case of the manna, the verse states: "He commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven, and rained down manna upon them to eat and gave them heavenly grain" (Psalms 78:23–24).

⁷⁹ Based on this, the Gemara calculates: The area of how many windows are in a door? Four. A door is equivalent to four windows in size. One adds another four for the second door, as the verse uses the plural "doors," which implies that there were two doors. This equals the area of eight windows. If the depth of water in the Flood is based on the phrase "windows of heaven," implying two windows, then the manna fell at a rate four times that of the water of the Flood. Since the water of the Flood reached a depth of fifteen cubits, it turns out that the manna that fell for the Jewish people was sixty cubits high, i.e., four times as high.

⁸⁰ Similarly, it was taught in a baraita that Isi ben Yehuda said: The manna that fell for the Jewish people would accumulate and ascend until all the kings of the East and West could see it, as it is stated: "You prepared a table before me in the presence of my enemies; you anointed my head with oil; my cup runs over" (Psalms 23:5). God prepared food for the Jewish people, so that their enemies would see their greatness over the world. "My cup runs over [revaya]"; Abaye said: We learn from this that the cup of David in the next world holds 221 log, since it is stated: "My cup runs over," and the word revaya has that numerical value.

⁸¹ The Gemara asks how Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i can compare the depth of the Flood waters with the amount of manna that fell in the desert: This is not similar, and the calculation is inaccurate. There, in the case of the Flood, the water rose fifteen cubits in forty days; but here, in the case of the manna, it took only one hour every day to fall. Conversely, there the Flood was for everyone and covered the whole world; whereas here the manna was for the Jewish people alone. And there would be much more manna for them than sixty cubits, which is the measurement put forth by Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i derived "opening" in the verse: "He commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven" (Psalms 78:23), from "opening" in the verse: "And the windows of heaven were opened" (Genesis 7:11). He used a verbal analogy that teaches that the skies opened in both instances in the same way.

⁸² § The mishna taught that as per the five prohibited activities on Yom Kippur it is prohibited to engage in eating and in drinking, and in bathing, and in smearing the body with oil, and in wearing shoes, and in conjugal relations. The Gemara asks: These five afflictions of Yom Kippur, to what do they correspond? Where is the Torah source or allusion to them? Rav H̥isda said: They are based on the five times that the afflictions of Yom Kippur are mentioned in the Torah. It is stated: (1) “And on the tenth of this seventh month you shall have a holy convocation, and you shall afflict your souls” (Numbers 29:7); (2) “But on the tenth of this seventh month is the day of atonement, it shall be a holy convocation for you and you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 23:27); (3) “It shall be for you a Shabbat of solemn rest, and you shall afflict your souls (Leviticus 23:32); (4) “It is a Shabbat of solemn rest [shabbaton] for you, and you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 16:31); (5) “And it shall be a statute for you forever, in the seventh month on the tenth of the month, you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 16:29).

⁸³ The Gemara asks: Are these five the only afflictions? We learn in the mishna that there are six: Eating, drinking, bathing, smearing oil, conjugal relations, and wearing shoes. The Gemara answers: Drinking is included in the prohibition of eating; both together are considered a single affliction. As Reish Lakish said: From where do we derive that drinking is included in the concept of eating? As it is stated: “And you shall eat before the Lord your God, in the place where He shall choose to cause His name to dwell there, the tithe of your grain, of your wine [tirosh], and of your oil” (Deuteronomy 14:23). Tirosh is wine, yet the verse calls the drinking of wine eating with the phrase “and you shall eat,” meaning that eating also refers to drinking.

⁸⁴ The Gemara rejects this answer: From where do you draw this conclusion? Perhaps the wine was eaten as anigron, a sauce made of oil, beet juice, and garum mixed with wine. As Rabba bar Shmuel said: Anigron is beet juice and wine mixed together. Akhsigron is water that comes from boiled vegetables that have wine mixed into them. The vegetables are mixed with the wine and eaten. It is possible for wine to literally be eaten. Therefore, the verse does not prove that drinking is included in eating.

⁸⁵ Rather, Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov said: From here there is a proof as the verse states: “And you shall spend that money on all that your soul desires, on oxen, or on sheep, or on wine, or on strong drink [sheikhar] or whatever your soul desires, and you shall eat” (Deuteronomy 14:26). Strong drink is a drink, but the Merciful One calls its consumption eating, in the phrase “and you shall eat.”

⁸⁶ The Gemara rejects this proof: From where do you draw this conclusion? Perhaps here too it was eaten as anigron? The Gemara rejects this: Here that answer is insufficient because the verse writes “strong drink [sheikhar],” meaning something that intoxicates. Beverages that generally intoxicate do not do so when they are in a mixture. The Gemara asks: Perhaps sheikhar does not refer to wine but to a food that causes intoxication, such as a sweet dried fig from Keilah. As it was taught in a baraita: A priest who ate a sweet dried fig from Keilah or drank honey or milk, thereby becoming intoxicated, and entered the Temple to serve

⁸⁷ is liable for violating the prohibition: “Drink no wine nor strong drink [sheikhar]” (Leviticus 10:9). Consequently, the term sheikhar in the text can be understood here as the sweet dried fig.

⁸⁸ Rather, the Gemara rejects this and states: It is derived through a verbal analogy of “sheikhar” and “sheikhar” stated in the verses of the nazirite (Numbers 6:3). Just as there, in the case of the nazirite, sheikhar means strong wine, so too, here, it means strong wine and not sweet dried figs.

⁸⁹ The Gemara returns to the meaning of the word tirosh: Is tirosh wine? Isn't it taught in a baraita: One who vows not to benefit from tirosh is not allowed sweet foods, e.g., sweet fruits, but is allowed wine. Therefore, tirosh is not wine but sweet food. The Gemara rejects this: And is tirosh not wine? But isn't it written: "Tirosh shall make the young women flourish [yenovev]" (Zechariah 9:17). The word yenovev comes from the word niv, speech. Consequently, tirosh is a food that tempts the heart and mouth of the drinker, even of virgins, who are modest and reticent. Since sweet foods do not have this effect, tirosh must be wine. The Gemara replies: This is not a proof, since we could explain it otherwise: Something that comes from tirosh, such as wine, causes virgins to come forth; tirosh itself means sweet grapes. Perhaps wine is called tirosh only by extension because it is made from tirosh.

⁹⁰ The Gemara challenges this: But isn't it written: "And your vats shall overflow with tirosh" (Proverbs 3:10). This description implies that tirosh is wine rather than sweet grapes. The Gemara answers: This too is not a proof that tirosh means wine. We could say that the vats shall overflow with something that comes from tirosh, i.e., wine; yet tirosh itself means sweet fruits.

⁹¹ The Gemara objects: But it is written: "Harlotry, and wine, and tirosh take away the heart" (Hosea 4:11). Since tirosh leads the heart astray, it is clear that it is wine. Therefore, the Gemara accepts that tirosh means wine. Rather, according to everyone, the word tirosh in the Bible refers to wine, but vows follow colloquial language. During the time of the Mishna, tirosh meant sweet fruits; the term included grapes but not wine. When dealing with vows, the intention of the speaker is what must be determined, but no inference can be drawn from colloquial language to the biblical definition of the word.

⁹² The Gemara asks: And if so, why does the Bible call it wine and why does it call it tirosh? The Gemara explains: "Wine" suggests that it brings lament to the world because drunkenness causes most sins. There is a phonetic resemblance between the yayin, wine, and ta'aniya va'aniya, sorrow and howling, which Rashi (on Job 2:5) explains as lament. "Tirosh" shows that those who indulge in it become poor [rash].

⁹³ Rav Kahana raised a contradiction: It is written as tirash but we read it tirosh. This should be understood as follows: If one merits and drinks appropriately, he is made a head [rosh]; if one does not merit and does not drink appropriately, he is made poor [rash]. The Gemara comments: This is the same as what Rava said, as Rava raised a contradiction: It is written: "And wine that makes glad [yishamah] the heart of man" (Psalms 104:15) with a shin, but we read it yisamah with a sin. This teaches: If one merits, wine makes him happy [same'ah]; if one does not merit, it makes him confounded [shamem]. This is the same as what Rava said: Wine and good scents make me wise, meaning that wine benefits one who deserves it.

⁹⁴ § The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that abstaining from bathing and smearing oil on oneself is called affliction? The Gemara answers: As it is written "I ate no pleasant bread, neither did meat nor wine enter my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all" (Daniel 10:3). The Gemara explains the verse: What is the meaning of "I ate no pleasant bread"? Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said: He did not eat even bread made from refined wheat; he ate only wheat mixed with bran.

⁹⁵ The Gemara continues to show that abstaining from smearing oil on oneself is considered an affliction: And from where do we derive that abstaining from the activities that Daniel describes is

considered affliction? As it is written: “Then he said to me: Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that you set your heart to understand and to afflict yourself before your God, your words were heard, and I have come due to your words” (Daniel 10:12). “For you are greatly loved” (Daniel 9:23).

⁹⁶ We have found proof that abstaining from smearing oil on oneself is considered affliction; from where do we derive that abstaining from bathing is also called affliction? Rav Zutra, son of Rabbi Toviya, said: The verse states: “And it came into his innards like water, and like oil into his bones” (Psalms 109:18). This means that the water with which one bathes and the oil with which one smears himself are absorbed into the body. Just as abstaining from smearing oil is considered an affliction, so too, abstaining from bathing is considered an affliction. The Gemara objects: But say that “came into his innards like water” is referring to drinking rather than smearing oil. The Gemara rejects this: It is similar to oil. Just as the oil described in the verse is smeared from outside the body and not drunk, so too, the water mentioned in the verse is used for bathing from the outside. It is not drunk.

⁹⁷ The Gemara asks: But the tanna took the opposite meaning, as we learned in a mishna: From where do we derive that smearing oil is like drinking on Yom Kippur? Although there is no explicit proof of the matter from the Bible, there is an allusion to the matter from the verse, as it is stated: “And it came into his innards like water, and like oil into his bones” (Psalms 109:18), meaning that oil on the body is like water within it. Therefore, the phrase “and it came into his innards like water” is referring to the act of drinking water. Rather, Rav Ashi said: Bathing is derived from the same verse cited above, as it is written: “Neither did I anoint myself at all” (Daniel 10:3). This teaches that Daniel did not do any anointing, including bathing. Consequently, the same source prohibits both of these activities.

⁹⁸ Apropos the verses from Daniel, the Gemara asks: What did the angel mean when he said to Daniel: “And I have come due to your words” (Daniel 10:12)? From this, it seems that the angel was able to come only because of Daniel. The Gemara answers: This is as it is written: “And there stood before them seventy men of the Elders of the house of Israel, and Jaazaniah, son of Shaphan, standing in the midst of them, each man with his censer in his hand, and a thick cloud of incense went up” (Ezekiel 8:11). Ezekiel saw the Elders of the house of Israel worshipping foreign gods. “And the form of a hand was put forth, and I was taken by a lock of my head; and a spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the gate of the inner court that faces northward where

⁹⁹ there was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provokes jealousy” (Ezekiel 8:3). “And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord’s House, and behold at the opening of the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary of God, between the porch and the altar were about twenty-five men with their backs toward the Temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshipped the sun toward the east” (Ezekiel 8:16). The Gemara explains: From the fact that it is stated “and their faces toward the east,” is it not clear that their backs were to the Sanctuary, which is in the west? Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states “their backs toward the Temple of the Lord”? This teaches that they would uncover themselves and defecate downward, toward the Divine Presence. The verse used a euphemism to refrain from vulgar language.

¹⁰⁰ The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Michael, the ministering angel of the Jewish people: Michael, your nation has sinned (see Daniel 10:21). He replied: Master of the Universe, may it be enough for the good people among them to save them from destruction. He said to him: I will burn

them and the good among them because the good do not rebuke the wicked. Immediately, God spoke to Gabriel: “He spoke to the man clothed in linen and said: Go in between the wheelwork and beneath the cherub, and fill your hands with coals of fire from between the cherubs, and scatter them over the city; and he came before my eyes” (Ezekiel 10:2). Immediately: “And the cherub stretched out his hand from between the cherubs into the fire that was between the cherubs, and took and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen, who took it and went out” (Ezekiel 10:7).

¹⁰¹ Rav Ḥana bar Bizna said that Rabbi Shimon Ḥasida said: If it were not for the fact that the embers cooled as they were passed from the hand of the cherub to the hand of Gabriel, instead of Gabriel taking the embers directly himself as he had been told, not a remnant or a refugee of the enemies of the Jewish people, a euphemism for the Jewish people themselves, would have survived. The cooling of the embers limited the punishment.

¹⁰² The Gemara continues. And it is written: “And behold, the man clothed in linen with the slate by his side, reported the matter saying: I have done as You have commanded me” (Ezekiel 9:11). Rabbi Yoḥanan said: At that moment, they cast out Gabriel from behind the curtain [pargod], where the inner angels reside, and they struck him with sixty blows [pulsei] of fire. They said to him: If you did not do it, you did not do it; if you did do it, why did you not do it according to what you were commanded but deviated from what you were instructed to do? Moreover, after you already did it, do you not have knowledge of the principle: One should not deliver a report about destruction? If one is sent on a mission of destruction, he should not deliver a detailed report of its success but should only hint at it.

¹⁰³ They then brought Dubiel, the ministering angel of the Persians and put him in the place of [baḥarikei] Gabriel and he served for twenty-one days. As it is written: “But the prince of the kingdom of Persia stood opposed to me for twenty-one days, but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me and I remained there beside the kings of Persia” (Daniel 10:13). Corresponding to those twenty-one days, they gave him, the ministering angel of Persia, twenty-one kings who ruled and the seaport of Mashhig.

¹⁰⁴ The ministering angel of the Persians said: Write for me that the Jews must pay taxes [akarga] to the Persians. They wrote it for him as he asked. He said: Write for me that the Sages must pay taxes. They wrote this for him. When they wanted to sign the documents, Gabriel stood from behind the curtain and said: “It is vain for you who rise early who sit up late to eat the bread of sorrow, for He gives His beloved sleep” (Psalms 127:2). What does “for He gives His beloved sleep” mean? Rav Yitzḥak said: These are the wives of Torah scholars who disturb their sleep in this world by staying up waiting for their husbands, who rise early and return late from learning Torah, and they thereby merit the World-to-Come. Gabriel asked: Is this the reward they deserve, to pay more taxes? They did not listen to Gabriel.

¹⁰⁵ He said before Him: Master of the Universe, if all the wise men of other nations were placed on one side of the scale, and Daniel the beloved man were on the other side, would he not outweigh them? The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: Who is the one who teaches the virtue of My children? They said to Him: Master of the Universe, it is Gabriel. He said to them: Let him come from behind the partition, as it is stated: “And I have come due to your words” (Daniel 10:12), meaning that Gabriel was permitted to enter from behind the partition because he mentioned Daniel’s name. God then said to the other angels: Let him ascend. They brought him up.

¹⁰⁶ He came and found Dubiel the ministering angel of the Persians holding the letter in his hand. Gabriel wanted to take the letter from him, but Dubiel swallowed it. Some say the letter was written, but it was not signed. Some say it was also signed, but when he swallowed it, the signature was erased. The Gemara comments: This is why, in the kingdom of Persia, there are those who pay taxes and there are those who do not pay taxes, as the decree was not finalized. It also states there: “And when I depart from him, the prince of Greece comes” (Daniel 10:20). Gabriel screamed and screamed that the kings of Greece should not rule over the Jews, but no one listened to him.

¹⁰⁷ § The Gemara returns to the issue of whether refraining from bathing is considered affliction. If you wish, say instead: The fact that bathing is considered affliction, from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And to Ebiathar the priest the king said: Get to Anathoth to your fields, for you are deserving of death. But I will not put you to death today, because you carried the Ark of the Lord God before David my father, and because you have been afflicted in all that my father was afflicted” (I Kings 2:26). And it is written with regard to David: “For they said the people is hungry, and weary, and thirsty in the wilderness” (II Samuel 17:29). Hunger means from lack of bread to eat, and thirst means from lack of water to drink. The word weary means lack from what? Is it not from bathing? The comparison of the verses suggests that that too is affliction. The Gemara challenges: And perhaps “weary” means from lack of wearing shoes? Therefore, this does not teach us that refraining from bathing is considered an affliction.

¹⁰⁸ Rather, another source needs to be found. Rav Yitzḥak said: It can be derived from here: “As cold water on a weary soul, so is good news from a far country” (Proverbs 25:25). This implies that the word weary is used to describe someone who has not bathed. The Gemara asks: But perhaps the verse is referring to weariness from not drinking? The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: As cold water in a weary soul? That would mean that it entered one like a drink. Rather, “on a weary soul” is written, which implies bathing.

¹⁰⁹ § The Gemara clarifies the next point in the mishna: The fact that not wearing shoes is considered an affliction, from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And David went up by the ascent of the Mount of Olives, and wept as he went up, and he had his head covered, and was walking barefoot” (II Samuel 15:30). Barefoot implies a lack of what? Is it not a lack of wearing shoes? All these deprivations are described as affliction. The Gemara rejects this: No, perhaps he was barefoot from a horse and whip. Even if he was wearing shoes, a king without a horse and whip was considered as if he were going barefoot.

¹¹⁰ Rather, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We learn it from here, as it states: “Go and loose the sackcloth from your loins, and remove your shoe from your foot” (Isaiah 20:2). And it is written: “And he did so, walking naked and barefoot” (Isaiah 20:2). Barefoot implies a lack of what? Is it not a lack of wearing shoes? The Gemara challenges: And say that perhaps the meaning of barefoot is that Isaiah walked with patched shoes. Because if you do not say this, but you claim that the verse is to be understood literally, does “naked” mean actually naked? Rather, the meaning is that Isaiah walked in ragged garments. Here too, the meaning is that he walked in patched shoes.

¹¹¹ Rather, a different source must be found. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said that we derive it from here: It states: “Withhold your foot from being barefoot, and your throat from thirst” (Jeremiah 2:25), meaning: Keep yourself from sin, so that your feet will not come to be barefoot; keep your tongue

from idle talk, so that your throat will not come to be thirsty. Consequently, we learn that being barefoot is considered an affliction.

¹¹² § The Gemara continues to clarify another of the afflictions of Yom Kippur: From where do we derive the halakha that refraining from conjugal relations is called affliction? As it is written, Laban said to Jacob: “If you shall afflict my daughters, and if you shall take other wives beside my daughters” (Genesis 31:50).

¹¹³ This can be explained as: “If you shall afflict my daughters” by refraining from conjugal relations, “and if you shall take other wives” causing them to suffer from additional rival wives. The Gemara objects: And say that this phrase and that phrase are both referring to taking rival wives. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: If you take? “And if you shall take” is written. Therefore, the clauses must be referring to two different kinds of affliction.

¹¹⁴ The Gemara challenges further: And say that this phrase and that phrase are referring to taking rival wives. One phrase is referring to his wives’ current rivals. “If you shall afflict” means that Jacob should not elevate the position of the two maidservants, Bilhah and Zilpah, to the status of wife, which would make them co-wives with Laban’s daughters. And one phrase is referring to rivals who might come to him from the world at large, which would be similar in meaning to “if you shall take.” The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: If you take and if you afflict? It is logical to first state the more severe warning and then the less severe one. But according to this proposed reading that “take” refers to rivals from the world at large and “afflict” refers to elevating the status of maidservants, the text would have first mentioned the less painful affliction of elevating the maidservants and then followed it with a warning about taking new rival wives, as “if you shall afflict and if you shall take” is written.

¹¹⁵ Rav Pappa said to Abaye: But conjugal relations themselves are called affliction, as it is written: “And Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land, saw her; and he took her, and he lay with her and afflicted her” (Genesis 34:2). If so, how can it be said that the affliction is in withholding conjugal relations? He said to him: There, Shechem afflicted her from different relations, meaning he slept with her in an unnatural way. That type of relations is clearly an affliction.

¹¹⁶ § The Gemara clarifies some of the prohibitions relating to Yom Kippur. The Sages taught: It is prohibited to bathe part of the body just as it is prohibited to bathe the whole body. But if one is dirty from mud or excrement, he may bathe in his usual manner, and he need not be concerned about transgressing, since his goal is not pleasure. Similarly, it is prohibited to smear oil on part of the body just as it is prohibited to smear oil on the whole body. But if one was sick and needed to smear oil on his body for medicinal purposes, or if one had scabs on his head that would hurt if he did not smear oil on himself, he may smear oil in his usual manner, and he need not be concerned about transgressing.

¹¹⁷ The school of Menashe taught that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: A woman may rinse one hand in water, so that she does not touch food before she has washed her hands in the morning, and give bread to her child, and she need not be concerned about violating the prohibition of bathing on Yom Kippur.

¹¹⁸ They said about Shammai the Elder that he did not want to feed his children with one hand, to avoid having to wash it. This prevented the children from eating during all of Yom Kippur. Due to

concerns about the health and the suffering of his children, they decreed that he must feed them with two hands, forcing him to wash both hands. What is the reason that they also said in general that one must wash his hands before touching food? Abaye said: Due to an evil spirit named Shivta, who resides on hands that have not been washed in the morning.

¹¹⁹ § The Sages taught: One who goes to greet his father or his teacher, or to greet one who is greater than him in wisdom, and has to cross a river on the way, may cross the water until his neck is in the water, and he need not be concerned that he is violating the prohibition against bathing on Yom Kippur.

¹²⁰ A dilemma was raised before them, i.e., the students discussing this question: What is the law concerning a teacher going to visit his student? May he enter the water in order to teach his student? The Gemara tries to bring a proof: Come and hear from what Rav Yitzḥak bar bar Ḥana said: I saw Ze'iri, who went through a river on his way to Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi, his student. Rav Ashi said: This was not the case. Rather, in that case, it was the student Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi who went to Ze'iri, his teacher. Therefore, this incident does not answer the question.

¹²¹ Rava permitted those who lived on the right side of the Euphrates to pass through the water to guard the fruit in their fields on Yom Kippur. Abaye said to Rava: A baraita was taught that supports your opinion. We learned: Guards of fruit may cross the river until their necks are in the water, and they need not be concerned that they are violating the prohibition against bathing on Yom Kippur.

¹²² Rav Yosef permitted the people of the village of Bei Tarbu to cross in the water to come to the lecture he delivered on Yom Kippur. He did not, however, permit them to go back home through the water. Abaye said to him: If so, you are obstructing them from coming in the future. They will not come to the lecture knowing they will be prohibited from returning home. Some say the incident happened differently: Rav Yosef permitted them to come and permitted them to go back through the water. Abaye said to him: Granted, you allow them to come, that is well. But what is the reason you allow them to go back? He said to him: So as not to obstruct them from coming in the future.

¹²³ It is told: Rav Yehuda and Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yehuda were standing on the bank of the Pappa River next to the Ḥatzdad crossing, and Rami bar Pappa was standing on the other side of the river. He raised his voice to them and asked: What is the ruling with regard to crossing over to come to you to ask a halakha? Rav Yehuda said to him: It is Rav and Shmuel who both say: One may cross in the water, provided that he does not remove his hand from under the hem of his cloak. One may not raise the hems of his cloak to his shoulders to keep them dry, since this form of carrying renders one liable to bring a sin-offering. Rather, one should walk normally and get his clothes wet in the water. Some say this is not how the incident happened. Rather, Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yehuda said to him: We learned in a baraita: One may cross over, provided that he does not remove his hand from the hem of his cloak.

¹²⁴ Rav Yosef strongly objects to this: And on a weekday is it permitted to walk in such deep water that it presents a danger of drowning? But isn't it written with regard to the river that, in the future, will issue forth from the Holy of Holies: "He measured a thousand cubits, and he led me through the water; the water was ankle deep" (Ezekiel 47:3); from here it is derived that one is permitted to pass through water that reaches up to the ankles.

¹²⁵ Rav Yosef continues explaining the verse: "Again he measured a thousand and he led me through the water, the water was knee deep" (Ezekiel 47:4); from here it is derived that one is permitted to

pass through water that reaches up to the knees. “He measured a thousand and led me through the water up to the waist” (Ezekiel 47:4); from here it is derived that one is permitted to pass through water that reaches up to the waist. From this point forward: “And he measured a thousand, a river that I could not pass through” (Ezekiel 47:5). This implies that one is never permitted to pass through water that is more than waist high, because it is dangerous.

¹²⁶ Abaye said: That is not a proof, because a river with fast flowing water is different. If it is higher than one’s waist, he could drown. However, one is permitted to cross still water even if it is deeper than that.

¹²⁷ § Apropos the river that will flow in the future, the Gemara explains additional verses in Ezekiel. One might think that Ezekiel could cross the river by swimming. The verse states: “For the water had swollen into saḥu waters” (Ezekiel 47:5). What does “saḥu waters” mean? Water that can be traversed only with a boat [shiyuta], as sailing [shayta] is sometimes called swimming [sayḥa]. I might have thought Ezekiel could pass across in a small boat [burni]. Therefore, the verse states: “No galley with oars shall go” (Isaiah 33:21). I might have thought he could pass through in a large boat. Therefore, the verse states: “Neither shall a fishing boat [tzi adir] be able to cross it” (Isaiah 33:21). The Gemara asks: From where can it be inferred that the words tzi adir mean fishing boat? The Gemara explains: This is how Rav Yosef translated this verse: A fishing boat [sfinat tzayyadin] will not travel on it and a large ship will not cross it.

¹²⁸ The Gemara continues its discussion of the river that will in the future come out of the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Yehuda ben Pazi said: Even the Angel of Death does not have permission to pass through it to the other side of this river, and proof of this is in the verse, as it is written here: “No galley with oars [ani shayt] can travel” and as it was written there: “Then Satan answered the Lord and said: From going to and fro [mishut] the earth and from walking up and down in it” (Job 1:7). Even Satan, who is also the Angel of Death, cannot cross through this river.

¹²⁹ The Gemara cites more midrashim about the river that will flow from the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Pineḥas said in the name of Rav Huna of Tzipori: The spring that comes forth from inside the Holy of Holies is at first very narrow and resembles grasshoppers’ antennae in width. Once it reaches the opening of the Sanctuary it becomes as thick as the thread of the warp; once it reaches the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary, it becomes as thick as the thread of the woof, which is wider than the warp thread. Once it reaches the opening of the Temple courtyard it becomes like the mouth of a small jug. This is as we learned in a mishna: Rav Eliezer ben Ya’akov says: Water,

¹³⁰ in the future, will bubble from under the threshold of the Temple. From this point forward, the spring will grow in strength and rise until it reaches the opening of David’s house, i.e., his grave, which is outside of Jerusalem. When it reaches the opening of David’s house, it will become a flowing river in which zavim and zavot, menstruating women, and women after childbirth will bathe to purify themselves. As it is stated: “On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for purification and for sprinkling” (Zechariah 13:1).

¹³¹ Rav Yosef said: From here, there is an allusion that a menstruating woman must be able to sit up to her neck in water, i.e., that this is the appropriate depth for waters of a ritual bath to purify. The Gemara comments: But the halakha is not in accordance with his opinion. Rather, the depth of the water is irrelevant. As long as the water can cover an entire adult body, the ritual bath is kosher.

¹³² § The Gemara investigates the permissibility of crossing water in order to fulfill a mitzva: It works out well that on Yom Kippur it is permitted because there are no shoes, and there is no problem going through water barefoot. However, on Shabbat, when there are shoes, what is the halakha? Is one permitted to cross water wearing shoes? Is there a concern that his shoe might come off and he may pick it up, thereby violating the prohibition of carrying out? Neḥemya, the son-in-law of the Nasi, said: I saw Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi come to a pool of water that they had to cross on Shabbat, and they crossed it while wearing their shoes without removing them first.

¹³³ The Gemara asks: It works out well that shoes are permitted, since one can tie them tightly, but what is there to say about sandals? Since they do not fit tightly on the foot, they might come off in the water. Rav Riḥumi said: I saw Ravina cross a river while wearing sandals on his feet. Rav Ashi said: If he is wearing sandals, he should not cross the water *ab initio*, lest the sandal fall off his foot and he violate the prohibition of carrying on Shabbat by picking it up.

¹³⁴ Incidental to this, the Gemara reports: The Exilarch came to deliver a lecture in Rav Natan's study hall in Hagronya. Rafram and all the Sages came to the lecture, but Ravina did not come. The next day, when he came, Rafram wanted to remove any anger towards Ravina from the mind of the Exilarch, for missing the lecture. Rafram therefore asked Ravina: What is the reason that the Master did not come to the lecture? He said to him: My foot hurt. He said to him: You should have put shoes on. Ravina answered him: It was the back of the foot that hurt, so wearing shoes would have been hard for me.

¹³⁵ Rafram said to Ravina: You should have worn sandals, which leave the heel exposed. He said to him: There was a pool of water on the way that I would have had to cross. He said to him: You should have crossed it wearing the sandals. He said to him: Does the Master not hold with that which Rav Ashi said: One should not wear sandals when crossing a river on Shabbat, *ab initio*? From this conversation, the Exilarch understood that Ravina meant no disrespect in not attending the lecture.

¹³⁶ § The Gemara continues to discuss the laws of Yom Kippur: Yehuda bar Gerogarot taught: It is prohibited to sit on damp clay on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This prohibition applies only when the clay is dripping wet, when one feels its wetness when touching it. Abaye said in clarification: It must be dripping wet enough to make something else wet. Rav Yehuda said: One is permitted to cool off with fruit on Yom Kippur, and it is not considered bathing. Similarly, when Rav Yehuda suffered from the heat on Yom Kippur he cooled off by putting a squash on himself.

¹³⁷ Rabba cooled off by placing a baby [yanuka] next to him, because a baby's body is cold. Rava cooled off with a silver cup. Rav Pappa said: If the silver cup is full, it is prohibited; however, if it is not full, it is permitted. With regard to a ceramic cup, both this and that are prohibited, since the water seeps through the cup, causing a violation of the prohibition of bathing. Rav Ashi said: A silver cup that is not full is also prohibited because it can slip [mizderiv] from his hand and spill.

¹³⁸ Ze'eira bar Ḥama, the host of the home where Rabbi Ami, and Rabbi Asi, and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, and all the Sages of Caesarea stayed, said to Rav Yosef, son of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: Son of a lion, come, I will tell you about a wonderful custom that your father used to perform. He had a cloth that he would prepare on the day before Yom Kippur by soaking it in water and wringing it out, making it almost like a dried cloth. And the next day he wiped his face, hands, and feet with it. On the day before the Ninth of Av, on which the prohibition of bathing is by rabbinic law and not Torah law, he would soak the cloth in water and the next day pass it over his eyes.

¹³⁹ Similarly, when Rabba bar Mari came from Eretz Yisrael he said: The day before the Ninth of Av they bring one a cloth, and he may soak it in water and place it under his head. The next day, when only some moisture remains, he may wipe his face, hands, and feet with it. On the day before Yom Kippur, they bring one a cloth, and he may soak it in water and wring it out to make it like a dried cloth. The next day, he may pass it over his eyes. Rabbi Ya'akov said to Rabbi Yirmeya bar Taḥlisa: You told us the opposite. What you told us about Yom Kippur was really what he did on the Ninth of Av, and we objected to you with regard to the prohibition of wringing, since Yom Kippur has the same prohibition of wringing that Shabbat has.

¹⁴⁰ § Rav Menashya bar Taḥalisa said that Rav Amram said that Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: They asked Rabbi Elazar ben Pedat: Must an Elder who sits and studies Torah in a yeshiva receive permission from the Nasi to permit him to render firstborn animals permitted, like others who must get permission from the Nasi to render firstborn animals permitted, or not? A firstborn animal may not be eaten until it has a blemish. Knowing which blemishes are permanent and permit the animal to be eaten and which are temporary is specialized knowledge.

¹⁴¹ The Gemara asks: What are they asking? What is the basis of the question? The Gemara explains: This is what they are asking, like this statement of Rav Idi bar Avin, who said: This matter, the authority of the Nasi to grant permission, was given to the house of the Nasi to raise its stature. Therefore, must permission be received, since the request itself honors the Nasi? Or, perhaps because the individual in question is an Elder who sits and studies Torah in a yeshiva, there is no need. Rav Tzadok ben Ḥaluka rose to his feet and said: I saw Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra, who was an Elder who sat in the yeshiva and who stood before the grandfather of this current Nasi, ask permission from him to permit firstborn animals.

¹⁴² Rabbi Abba said to him: The way you described it was not how the incident was. Rather this was the incident: Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra was a priest, and he raised the following dilemma: Is the halakha in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said: One who is suspect in a certain area may not judge it and may not testify about it? Priests are suspected of inflicting blemishes on firstborn animals because after the destruction of the Temple, even priests may not benefit from a firstborn animal until it becomes blemished. The question was not one of seeking permission from the Nasi, but it was a question of halakha. Are priests who are Torah scholars also suspected of inflicting blemishes? Or perhaps the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said: One who is suspect is believed about his fellow but is not believed about himself. He resolved the question for him: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.

¹⁴³ § They raised another dilemma before them, the same Sages mentioned: What is the halakha with regard to going out in sandals made of

¹⁴⁴ cork on Yom Kippur? Is it considered a shoe, and therefore it may not be worn on Yom Kippur, or not? Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Naḥmani stood on his feet to testify and said: I saw that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi went out on Yom Kippur in cork sandals, and I said to him: What is the law on a communal fast that is decreed in a time of drought, when shoes are similarly prohibited? Are reed sandals permitted? He said to me: It is no different, and such sandals are permitted even on a communal fast day. Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: I saw Rabbi Elazar from Nineveh go out in cork sandals on a communal fast day, and I said to him: What is the law on Yom Kippur? He said to me: It is no

different, and it is permitted. The Gemara reports: Rav Yehuda went out on Yom Kippur in reed sandals. Abaye went out in sandals made of palm fiber. Rava went out in sandals braided with reeds. None of these sandals are considered to be shoes. Rabba bar Rav Huna wrapped a scarf around his feet and went out.

¹⁴⁵ Rami bar Hama raised an objection: We learned that an amputee may go out with his wooden prosthetic leg on Shabbat, since it is like a shoe; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. But Rabbi Yosei prohibits it. And a baraita was taught in that regard as an addendum to that mishna: And they agree that it is prohibited to go out wearing it on Yom Kippur. As this indicates that even wooden shoes are prohibited, the materials worn by the aforementioned amora'im should also be prohibited. Abaye said: There, in the case of Yom Kippur, it is prohibited because there are rags in the prosthesis. The prohibition is not due to the shoes but due to the pleasure of the comfort, which is prohibited on Yom Kippur.

¹⁴⁶ Rava said to him: And if the prosthetic leg is not a garment, meaning that it is not a shoe, do the rags make it into a garment? Only shoes are forbidden, not other garments. And furthermore, any other kind of pleasure that is not the pleasure of wearing shoes, is it prohibited on Yom Kippur? Only certain afflictions are mandated on Yom Kippur; activities that are not specifically restricted by those afflictions are permitted. And Rabba bar Rav Huna would wrap a scarf on his feet and go out, demonstrating that the comfort provided by rags is permitted on Yom Kippur. Furthermore, the continuation of the baraita contradicts your explanation that the prohibition is due to the comfort provided by the rags. From the fact that it teaches in the latter clause: If the prosthetic leg has a receptacle designed for rags it is susceptible to ritual impurity like all wooden utensils which have receptacles, it may be inferred that in the first clause we are not dealing with a prosthetic leg that has a hollow space designed for rags. Abaye's position is thereby rejected.

¹⁴⁷ Rather, Rava said: Actually, according to everyone, a prosthetic leg is considered to be a shoe, and with regard to Shabbat this is what they disagree about: One Sage, Rabbi Yosei holds that we decree a prohibition of wearing a prosthetic leg on Shabbat lest the leg slip off and one come to carry it four cubits in the public domain; and one Sage, Rabbi Meir, holds that we do not decree such a rule.

¹⁴⁸ § The Sages taught: Young children are permitted to perform all of the prohibited activities on Yom Kippur, except for wearing shoes. The Gemara asks: What is different about wearing shoes? It is because observers who see a child wearing shoes will say that adults did this for him, i.e., put them on for him, since he cannot do it for himself. But if that is the reason, with regard to those other prohibitions also, like bathing and smearing oil, they will say that adults did this for him, and children should be prohibited from those activities as well. The Gemara explains: With regard to bathing and smearing oil, they could say that they did this for him yesterday, since one cannot be certain when the child was bathed.

¹⁴⁹ The Gemara asks: If so, we could say this with regard to shoes as well. They could say that they did this for him yesterday. The Gemara answers: In the case of shoes, it is impossible to say an adult did it for him yesterday, since the child would not have worn shoes at night. As Shmuel said: He who desires a taste of death should put on shoes and go to sleep.

¹⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: But the mishna is teaching that they are permitted to wear shoes ab initio. If so, it is permitted for an adult to perform these acts for a child even on the day of Yom Kippur, and the

observer will not think that the adult has done anything wrong. Rather, we must explain the mishna as follows: The Sages decreed against performing those actions that are not necessary for the child's growth, but the Sages did not decree against performing those actions that are necessary for the child's growth. As Abaye said: My mother told me: A child's growth requires hot water and oil for smearing. When he grows a little, he must eat egg with kutaḥa, a pickled dip made with milk. When he grows a little more, he must have vessels to break, since he will enjoy breaking them. This is like Rabba who bought cracked ceramic vessels for his children, and they broke them for their enjoyment.

¹⁵¹ § We learned in the mishna that according to Rabbi Eliezer, the king and the bride may wash their faces on Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna of the mishna? The Gemara answers: It is the opinion of Rabbi Ḥananya ben Teradyon, as it was taught in a baraita: The king and the bride may not wash their faces on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Ḥananya ben Teradyon says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: A king and a bride may wash their faces. The Rabbis said: A new mother may not wear shoes on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Ḥananya ben Teradyon says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: A new mother may wear shoes.

¹⁵² The Gemara asks: According to Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, what is the reason that the king may wash his face? Because it is written: "Your eyes shall see the king in his beauty" (Isaiah 33:17). A king should always look regal before his nation. What is the reason that a bride may wash her face? So that she should not appear repulsive to her husband. Since it is only the beginning of their marriage, her husband may be disgusted at seeing her otherwise. Rav said to Rabbi Ḥiyya: For how long after her wedding is a woman considered a bride? He said to him: As it was taught in a baraita: If she becomes a mourner, we do not prevent the bride from wearing perfumes during the entire first thirty days of her marriage. This shows that for the first thirty days, her appearance is most critical.

¹⁵³ A new mother may wear shoes. What is the reason for this? Due to the cold there is concern that she will become ill, as she is weak from the birth.

¹⁵⁴ Shmuel said: If a man is worried about walking barefoot on Yom Kippur due to the danger of scorpions, he is permitted to wear shoes, since one need not put himself in danger.

¹⁵⁵ § We learned in the mishna: On Yom Kippur, one who eats food the volume of a large date is liable. Rav Pappa asked:

¹⁵⁶ The large date-bulk that they said is the measure that determines liability for eating on Yom Kippur, does this refer to the volume of a large date with its pit or without its pit? Rav Ashi asked a similar question: The mishna that states that a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk imparts ritual impurity, does this refer to the volume of a barley grain with its husk or without its husk? And is that referring to a wet kernel or a dry one? The Gemara clarifies: Rav Ashi did not ask the question that Rav Pappa asked, regarding the size of the date-bulk on Yom Kippur because the answer was clear to him. Since it is stated in the mishna: Large, it means as large as possible, which must include the pit. Conversely, Rav Pappa did not ask the question that Rav Ashi asked regarding the size of the barley-grain-bulk because the answer was clear to him. Wet barley is called shibbolet and not barley; without its shell it is no longer called barley but is called ushla. Therefore, the mishna must be referring to dry barley within its shell.

¹⁵⁷ Rava said that Rav Yehuda said: The volume of a large date that they said is larger than an egg-bulk. The Sages have an accepted tradition that with this amount of food, the mind of the one who

eats is settled, and he is not afflicted. Less than this amount, the mind is not settled. The Gemara raises an objection from what we have learned: An incident happened on the festival of Sukkot. They brought a cooked dish to Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai to taste, and they brought to Rabban Gamliel two dates and a tankard of water. Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai and Rabban Gamliel said to them: Bring them up to the sukka, and we will eat there. And a baraita was taught in that regard: They did not act this way because that is the halakha, that such food must be eaten in the sukka. Rather, they wished to be stringent upon themselves and not eat anything outside of the sukka.

¹⁵⁸ On the other hand, the Gemara reports: And when they gave Rabbi Tzadok food that was less than an egg-bulk to eat, he held it in a cloth and did not wash his hands. And he ate it outside of the sukka and did not recite Grace after Meals afterward.

¹⁵⁹ The Gemara clarifies: Food that has the volume of an egg-bulk is required to be eaten in a sukka. If it should enter your mind to say that the volume of the large date that they spoke of is larger than the volume of an egg-bulk, there is a contradiction. Now, comparing the two episodes, it seems that two dates without their pits are not the volume of an egg. If so, can the volume of a large date and its pit be greater than that of an egg-bulk? Rav Yirmeya said: Yes, although two dates without their pits are not equal to an egg-bulk, the volume of a large date and its pit are larger than an egg-bulk, since date pits are very large. Rav Pappa said: This explains the folk saying that people say: In two kav of dates there is one kav and more of pits, meaning that the volume of the pit is larger than that of the fruit itself.

¹⁶⁰ Rava said: This entire line of questioning has no basis: There, in the incident of the sukka, this is the reasoning that the halakha permits eating the dates outside of the sukka, due to the fact that dates are fruit, and fruit need not be eaten in a sukka but may be eaten outside of a sukka. The Gemara raises an objection. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: When we would learn Torah with Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua, they brought before us figs and grapes, and we ate them as a casual meal outside of the sukka. The Gemara analyzes this: This implies that in the case of a casual meal, yes, it may be eaten outside of a sukka; but a fixed meal may not be eaten outside of a sukka. Therefore, a meal consisting of fruit must be eaten in a sukka. The Gemara rejects this: That is the wrong inference. Instead, say we ate them as if they were a casual meal, which may be eaten outside of the sukka, meaning that eating fruit is always considered a snack.

¹⁶¹ If you wish, say instead that it can be understood in this way: We ate that fruit as a fixed meal, and we ate bread as a casual meal with the fruit, to temper their sweetness, outside of the sukka.

¹⁶² The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this baraita supports Rava. It teaches: Therefore, if one completed consuming the amount that one is required to eat in the sukka with types of sweets, he has fulfilled his obligation of sitting in the sukka. If it should enter your mind to say that fruit is required to be eaten in a sukka, then it should not say sweets; let it teach fruit. The Gemara rejects this proof: What do the words types of sweets mean? It means fruit. Therefore, this baraita is not a support for Rava's opinion. And if you wish, say that this baraita is referring to a place where fruits are uncommon, and therefore other sweet foods are eaten, but fruit can similarly complete the requirement. Consequently, no support can be brought from here.

¹⁶³ Until now, the Gemara has assumed that the volume of a large date is more than that of an egg. Rav Zevid disagreed with what was mentioned earlier and said: This is not so. Rather, the volume of a large date that they spoke of is less than an egg-bulk, as we learned in a mishna: Beit Shammai say:

With regard to leaven, the sourdough used to make dough rise, ownership of the volume of an olive-bulk violates the prohibitions in the following verses stated regarding Passover: “And no leavened bread shall be seen with you” (Exodus 13:7) and “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses” (Exodus 12:19). However, the amount of leavened bread that must be owned to violate the prohibition is the volume of a large date.

¹⁶⁴ The Gemara continues. And we discussed it: What is the reason for the opinion of Beit Shammai? If both leaven and leavened bread had the same measure that determines liability, let the Merciful One write only: “Leavened bread,” and He would not need to write: “Leaven.” I would say, based on logic: If leavened bread, whose leavening ability is not as strong, is prohibited at an olive-bulk, all the more so should not leaven, whose leavening ability is strong because it causes dough to rise, be also prohibited at an olive-bulk? Since the Merciful One distinguishes between them and states both “leaven” and “leavened bread,” this taught you that the measure for one is not the same as the measure for the other. The measure that determines liability for leaven is an olive-bulk, like in the case of most prohibitions from the Torah, and the measure that determines liability for leavened bread, whose leavening ability is weaker, is the volume of a large date.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara clarifies: And if it should enter your mind to say: The volume of the large date that they spoke of is greater than an egg-bulk, since Beit Shammai are searching for the measure one size larger than an olive-bulk, as they proved that leavened bread must have a larger measure than an olive-bulk, and if the measure one size larger than an olive-bulk is an egg-bulk, then let them teach an egg-bulk and not a date. Alternatively, if they are exactly the same volume, and the volume of a large date has the same volume as an egg-bulk, they should have taught an egg-bulk, which is the more commonly used measure. Rather, must one not conclude from here that the volume of a large date is less than an egg-bulk?

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara rejects this: From where is your proof? Perhaps I could actually say to you that the measure of the volume of a large date that they said is larger than an egg-bulk; however, the volume of a date of normal size is the same as an egg-bulk, and Beit Shammai were referring to a normal-sized date. Alternatively, say that the volume of a large date and an egg-bulk are equal, and the mishna chose to use one of them. Either way, there is no proof from here that the volume of a large date is greater than an egg-bulk.

¹⁶⁷ Rather, it cannot be proven from here. Proof can be found from here: How much must one eat to obligate those with whom he ate in an invitation [zimmin] for Grace After Meals? An olive-bulk of food suffices to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmin; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk is the minimum measure to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmin. The Gemara clarifies: With regard to what do they disagree? Rabbi Meir holds that the verse “And you shall eat and be satisfied and bless the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 8:10) should be understood as follows: “And you shall eat”; this is referring to eating. “And be satisfied”; this is referring to drinking. The definition of eating throughout the Torah is consuming an olive-bulk. Rabbi Yehuda holds: “And you shall eat and be satisfied” is referring to eating that causes satisfaction, and what is that? The volume of an egg-bulk. Less than that amount of food is not satisfying.

¹⁶⁸ And if it should enter your mind to say that the volume of the large date that they spoke of is larger than an egg-bulk, the following question can be asked: Now that we have said that the volume

of an egg-bulk satisfies, can we say that it does not settle the mind, and thereby remove the affliction of Yom Kippur? Rather, must one not conclude from this that the volume of a large date that they said is less than the size of an egg-bulk? Eating the larger amount of an egg-bulk satisfies a person, but eating the volume of a large date only settles his mind.

¹⁶⁹ It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:

¹⁷⁰ All the measures in the Torah connected to eating are the volume of an olive-bulk, except for the amount of food that renders objects impure, because the verse changed its expression in this case, and the Sages altered the measure accordingly. The proof of this, that the Sages gave it a different measure because the verse used different language for it, is from Yom Kippur. Also in the case of Yom Kippur the Sages assigned a different measure because the verse used a different phrase. The Gemara asks: How did the Sages learn that the verse changed its expression? They learned from: “Any soul which shall not be afflicted” (Leviticus 23:29). The verse does not state: Any soul that shall eat, but rather: “Any soul which shall not be afflicted.” How did the Sages change its measure? One does not violate the prohibition unless he has eaten the volume of a large date-bulk, as opposed to the usual olive-bulk.

¹⁷¹ The Gemara asks: And what does the baraita mean when it says: A proof for this is from Yom Kippur? Why is the verse pertaining to ritual impurity not sufficient to show that the Sages changed the measure based on the different words in the verse? The Gemara answers: If we learned it only from there, the case of impurity, I would have said that that is the style of the verse, and no halakha can be derived from it. Therefore, the verse pertaining to Yom Kippur teaches that whenever a verse deviates from the usual language, it implies a change in the halakha as well.

¹⁷² § The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the measure for impure foods is the volume of an egg-bulk? Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Elazar said that the verse states: “Of all food [okhel] which may be eaten [ye’akhel], on which water comes shall be ritually impure” (Leviticus 11:34). The double usage of the root akhal teaches that the ritual impurity of food applies even to the amount which can be described as food that comes on account of food, i.e., food that comes from another food. And which food is that? A chicken egg. The Gemara asks: And say it is referring to a kid, which comes from a mother goat, and is therefore also food that comes from another food. The Gemara answers: It lacks ritual slaughter. The young goat is not yet food, since it is not edible until it has been slaughtered. The Gemara asks further: And say it is referring to a ben pekua. Since the slaughter of its mother made it fit to eat, the fetus itself need not be slaughtered, even if it survives and continues to live independently of its mother. The Gemara answers: The calf still requires cutting, since it cannot be eaten live, but it does not require ritual slaughter.

¹⁷³ The Gemara asks: Even if we claim that the measure for impure foods is an egg-bulk, one could say it is referring to the giant egg-bulk of the bird called bar yokhani. The Gemara answers: If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something. This means that in a case of doubt, take the smaller number, as it is included in the larger number. Therefore, the correct measure is the volume of a chicken egg. The Gemara questions this: If so, say it is referring to a very small bird’s egg. Consequently, no proof can be brought from the verse that the volume of a chicken egg is the measure for ritual impurity.

¹⁷⁴ Rabbi Abbahu himself said: The verse states: “Of all food which may be eaten.” This is referring to food that you can eat at one time. The Sages estimated: The esophagus cannot hold more than the volume of a chicken’s egg, and therefore this is the measure used for the ritual impurity of foods.

¹⁷⁵ Incidental to the discussion on Torah measures, Rabbi Elazar said: One who unwittingly eats forbidden fat even today must write down the exact measure that he ate, lest another court come in the future and increase the measure.

¹⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: What does it mean to increase the measure? If we say that a future court will obligate him to bring an offering even for the bulk of a small olive, which is less than what is considered an olive-bulk today, he would not be liable to bring a guilt-offering. Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: It was said with regard to guilt-offerings: “And if any one of the common people sin through error, in doing any of the things which the Lord has commanded not to be done, and be guilty” (Leviticus 4:27)? This teaches that one who repents due to his awareness, i.e., one who repents following becoming aware that he performed a transgression, brings an offering for his unwitting transgression.

¹⁷⁷ However, one who does not repent due to his awareness that he sinned does not bring an offering for his unwitting action. Similarly, if one eats less than an olive-bulk, based on the current measures, he will not be obligated to bring a guilt-offering in the future if the measures change, even if the amount that he ate equals the volume of a revised olive-bulk. This is because the individual would not be bringing his offering because he became aware he had sinned, but because the Torah measures had been changed.

¹⁷⁸ Rather, it should be explained as follows: It is possible that in the future a court will not obligate one to bring an offering until he has eaten the bulk of a large olive, which is more than today’s amount. One should write down how much he ate, since in the future a court might rule that the amount he ate is less than the size of an olive, and therefore he will not be obligated to bring an offering.

¹⁷⁹ The Gemara returns to its first suggestion: According to what entered his mind initially, that in the future a court might obligate him to bring an offering for the bulk of a small olive, what is the meaning of increase the measure? Rabbi Elazar should have said decrease the measure. The Gemara answers: The statement may have meant that perhaps there will be an increase in offerings that are brought due to the smaller measure for liability.

¹⁸⁰ With regard to this topic, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Measures and punishments are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. The Gemara expresses surprise at this: The punishments for all transgressions are written explicitly in the Torah, and therefore are not part of an oral transmission from Moses. Rather, this is what was said: Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Measures that determine liability for punishments are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara comments: This was also taught in a baraita: Measures of punishments are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. Others say: These measures were instituted by the court of Jabez. The Gemara questions this: How can this be? Isn’t it written: “These are the mitzvot which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel at Mount Sinai” (Leviticus 27:34). The word “these” underscores that a prophet is not permitted to introduce any new element related to the Torah and its mitzvot from here on. Rather, over the course of time, the people forgot the measures; subsequently the prophets reestablished the measures and taught them to the masses.

¹⁸² § We learned in the mishna that one who drinks a cheekful on Yom Kippur is liable. Rabbi Yehuda said that Shmuel said: This does not mean two cheeks actually full. Rather, the measure that determines liability is the volume of liquid if one pushes the drink to one side of his mouth, and it appears as though his cheek were full. The Gemara questions this: Didn't we learn in the mishna: A cheekful, in the plural form, meaning two cheeks full? The Gemara answers: Say: Like two cheeks full in appearance. If viewed from only one side, one whose cheek is full appears as if his entire mouth is full.

¹⁸³ The Gemara raises an objection to this from a baraita: How much does one need to drink on Yom Kippur to be liable? Beit Shammai say: A quarter-log, and Beit Hillel say: Two cheeks full. Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: Like two cheeks full in appearance from the side, i.e. a single cheekful. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: The amount that one can swallow in one gulp. In this baraita, Beit Hillel's opinion is that the measure for drinking on Yom Kippur is a cheekful. This implies that a cheekful means an actual cheekful.

¹⁸⁴ The Gemara expresses surprise: Is the baraita preferable to the mishna? Since it was established that the measure in the mishna is so that it appears like a cheekful, so too, the baraita can be explained as meaning an amount that looks like two cheeks full. The Gemara questions further: If so, Beit Hillel require an amount that appears like two cheeks full; this is identical with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who says: Like two cheeks full. The Gemara answers: We could say that the practical difference between them is evident in the case of a paltry cheekful, which is not a complete mouthful but slightly less. According to Beit Hillel, one is not liable unless he drinks a full cheekful; but according to Rabbi Eliezer, one is liable even for a paltry mouthful.

¹⁸⁵ Rav Hoshaya strongly objects to this understanding: If so, if Beit Hillel's measure is a single cheekful, then this is an instance of Beit Shammai's leniencies and Beit Hillel's stringencies, since the measure of a quarter-log is larger than a single cheekful. If so, why isn't this debate listed in tractate Eduyyot, which lists all the cases where Beit Shammai are more lenient than Beit Hillel? He said to him:

¹⁸⁶ When this question with regard to the measure of liquid was asked, it was not asked about an average-sized person, for whom a mouthful is smaller than a quarter-log. Rather, the question was asked even about Og, king of Bashan, in which case, it is Beit Shammai who are stringent, for Og's cheekful is much more than a quarter-log.

¹⁸⁷ Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this halakha with regard to the measure for liability for drinking: What is different with regard to eating, in that all people have the same measure, the volume of a large date; and what is different with regard to drinking, where each and every person is liable according to his own measure, i.e., every individual's measure depends on the size of his own mouth? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition with regard to the volume of the large date, that eating this amount settles his mind, but less than this amount does not settle his mind. However, with regard to drinking, his mind is settled with the amount of his own cheekful, but his mind is not settled with the cheekful of his fellow who is smaller than him.

¹⁸⁸ Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this for a different reason: Is everyone of average size satisfied with eating the volume of a large date, and even Og, king of Bashan, is also satisfied with the volume of a large date? If not, there should also be relative measures for eating. Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that this amount settles his mind, but less than this amount does not

settle his mind. However, everyone of average size has his mind greatly settled, whereas Og, king of Bashan, has his mind only a little settled. But even so, this measure settles the mind of any person and relieves his affliction.

¹⁸⁹ Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this further: If it is on account of settling one's mind, the following question can be raised: If one ate fatty meat, his mind would be settled with the volume of a large date, but if he ate edible grapevine shoots, would his mind similarly be settled with the volume of a large date? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that with this measure one's mind is settled, but with less than this measure his mind is not settled. However, with fatty meat, his mind is greatly settled; if one ate the same measure of grapevine shoots, his mind is only a little settled.

¹⁹⁰ Rava strongly objects to this: For all prohibitions of eating, the measure that determines liability is the volume of an olive-bulk consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread. All forbidden food eaten within that period combines to the measure of an olive-bulk. However, one who eats an olive-bulk over a longer period is exempt. Yet, on Yom Kippur one who eats the volume of a large date, which is a larger measure, is culpable if this amount is eaten within the time it would take to eat a half-loaf of bread. This appears to be a leniency, since one must eat a larger measure in the same time period of time. Why is there not a longer period of time for liability on Yom Kippur, to reflect the larger measure? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that one who eats within this duration of time, his mind is settled; but one who eats within a longer duration of time, his mind is not settled, and he remains in a state of affliction.

¹⁹¹ Rava strongly objects to this: The measure for liability for eating on Yom Kippur is the volume of a large date consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread; but the measure for eating impure foods that render one ritually impure is half of a half-loaf, which is two egg-bulks, a much larger volume, and this must also be consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread. Rav Pappa said to him: Do not raise a challenge from here. Leave aside ritual impurity of the body contracted through consuming impure foods because that is not by Torah law but by rabbinic law. The Sages were lenient in this matter. If one does not consume that amount of impure food within this time period, he is not rendered impure.

¹⁹² The Gemara challenges this: But did Rav Pappa actually say that the rendering of ritual impurity of the body through the consumption of impure foods is by rabbinic law? But he appears to say the opposite in another statement: Isn't it written: "You shall not make yourselves detestable with any creeping thing that creeps, neither shall you make yourselves impure with them, that you should be impure thereby" (Leviticus 11:43). And Rav Pappa said: From here, from the Torah's usage of the word "impure" with regard to the prohibition of eating, we learn that ritual impurity of the body is by Torah law. The Gemara answers: Rav Pappa did not mean that the law is actually Torah law. The law is indeed rabbinic law, and the verse brought as proof is a mere support.

¹⁹³ § We learned in the mishna: All types of foods combine to form a measure of liability with regard to eating on Yom Kippur. Rav Pappa said: If one ate meat and the salt that was on it, these combine to make the volume of a large date. Although consuming salt alone is not considered eating, since people do eat meat with salt together, they combine into one measure. Similarly, Reish Lakish said: Brine on a vegetable combines with the vegetable to make the volume of a large date with regard to the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur. The Gemara expresses surprise at this: It is obvious. Why

should the brine not combine with the vegetable, considering that it is itself food? The Gemara answers: Lest you say that brine is a beverage, and food and drinks do not combine, it teaches us that any item that prepares food for eating is considered a food.

¹⁹⁴ § Reish Lakish said: One who eats in an excessive manner on Yom Kippur, to the degree that he forces himself to continue eating even when full is exempt, e.g., one who ate beyond being satiated on Yom Kippur eve and then ate something else as soon as the fast began. What is the reason for that? Because the Torah does not mention the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur, but it was written “any soul which shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from his people” (Leviticus 23:29), excluding one who harms himself, e.g., one who does not enjoy his food at all.

¹⁹⁵ Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Reish Lakish said: A non-priest who ate teruma in an excessive manner pays the principal, that which he took, and does not pay the additional fifth, which one who illegally eats teruma pays to the priest as a penalty. This is because it states about one who eats teruma: “And if a man eat of the sacred thing in error, then he shall add a fifth to it, and give the priest the sacred thing” (Leviticus 22:14). The word “eat” excludes one who is not eating but harming himself. He does, however, pay the principal, since he caused a loss to the priest. The fifth is only paid by one who eats normally, not excessively. Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest

¹⁹⁶ who chews on barley of teruma that has not been ground or baked pays the principal and not an extra fifth. The reason is that it states “eats” (Leviticus 22:14), which excludes one who harms himself. Consuming raw barley is considered self-harm, not eating.

¹⁹⁷ Rav Sheizvi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: In the case of a non-priest who swallowed plums of teruma whole and vomited them out, whereupon another person ate them, the first one pays the principal plus a fifth. When the first one benefited from the plums, he acquired them and must therefore pay for them, and the second one must pay their worth to the first one. Since they are only fit for fuel after the first one vomited them out, the second person is considered to have damaged their value as fuel. Therefore, he pays only the price of wood, i.e., fuel, to the first person.

¹⁹⁸ § It was taught in the mishna that food and drink do not combine. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who taught this? Rav Ḥisda said: This halakha is taught as a dispute, and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua. As we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua stated a general principle: Any item that is identical to another item in its type of ritual impurity, e.g., impurity that lasts only until evening, and its measure for impurity, e.g., an olive-bulk, combines with the other item to reach one measure to render other items impure. Therefore, two half olive-bulk pieces of two corpses or of two animal carcasses, or two half lentil-bulk pieces from two creeping animals all combine to render other items impure.

¹⁹⁹ However, if one item is identical to another in its ritual impurity but not its measure, e.g., half a lentil-bulk of a creeping animal and half an olive-bulk of an animal carcass, which both impart impurity until nightfall; or if its measure is identical but not its type of ritual impurity, e.g., half an olive-bulk from a corpse, which imparts impurity for seven days, and half an olive-bulk from an animal carcass, which imparts impurity until nightfall; and all the more so, when neither its ritual impurity nor its measure are identical, then the items do not combine. Here, too, although both eating and drinking are prohibited on their own, they do not combine because they do not have the same measure that imparts impurity.

²⁰⁰ Rav Naḥman said: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, until now we have heard the Rabbis say there that items with different measures combine only with respect to ritual impurity. Since the phenomenon of ritual impurity is one concept, different types combine. But here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the measure that determines liability is set due to settling the mind, and this combination of eating and drinking together does not settle the mind.

²⁰¹ And similarly, Reish Lakish said: This question of whether food and drink combine to reach a measure that determines liability on Yom Kippur is taught as a dispute. The approach brought in the mishna that states that they do not combine is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, as we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua stated a general principle with regard to whether items with different types of impurity and measures combine, as Rav Ḥisda explained above. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in accordance with the opinion of Rav Naḥman: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, until now we have heard the Rabbis say there that items with different measures combine only with regard to ritual impurity. But here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the measure that determines liability is set due to settling the mind, and this combination of eating and drinking together does not settle the mind.

²⁰² MISHNA: If one ate and drank unwittingly within one lapse of awareness, e.g., he forgot that it is Yom Kippur, he is liable to bring only one sin-offering. However, if he ate and performed labor unwittingly, he is liable to bring two sin-offerings, as by doing so he violated two separate prohibitions. If he ate foods that are not fit for eating, or drank liquids that are not fit for drinking, or drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled, he is exempt, as that is not the typical manner of eating or drinking.

²⁰³ GEMARA: Reish Lakish said: Why is there no warning stated about affliction; why did the Torah not state explicitly that it is prohibited to eat and drink on Yom Kippur? It is because it was not possible to write it that way. The Gemara explains: How could the Merciful One write it? Let the Merciful One write: One shall not eat on Yom Kippur. The term eat prohibits eating the amount of an olive-bulk, whereas on Yom Kippur the actual prohibited measure is a large date-bulk. Let the Merciful One write: Do not be afflicted. That indicates the opposite of affliction, and would mean: Get up and eat. Therefore, it is written: “For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted on that same day, he shall be cut off from his people” (Leviticus 23:29).

²⁰⁴ Rav Hoshaya strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write it in this manner: Guard yourself lest you not be afflicted. The Gemara answers: If so, there would be too many negative mitzvot, as the following are all expressions of prohibition: Guard, lest, and not. One would then say that there are three prohibitions against eating.

²⁰⁵ Rav Beivai bar Abaye strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write: Guard yourself in the mitzva of affliction. The Gemara rejects this: If so, there is a principle: If the words guard yourself are written about a prohibition, it is considered to be a prohibition; if the words guard yourself are written about a positive mitzva, it is considered to be a positive mitzva. Had the Torah written it that way, one would understand that there is a positive mitzva of affliction, but there is no element of prohibition. Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write: Do not stray from afflicting yourself, which would imply a negative mitzva. The Gemara says: Indeed, this is difficult. The Gemara concedes that it could have been written in this manner.

²⁰⁶ § With regard to the prohibitions against eating and labor, the Gemara says: And a tanna cites the prohibitions relating to affliction on Yom Kippur from here: It is stated: “And you shall afflict your souls, you shall do no manner of labor” (Numbers 29:7). The Gemara considers: One might have thought that performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor, added before Yom Kippur actually begins, is punishable by karet. Therefore, the verse states: “And whatsoever soul it be that does any manner of labor on that same day” (Leviticus 23:30), which teaches that performing labor on that very day is punishable by karet, but labor performed during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor is not punishable by karet.

²⁰⁷ The baraita continues: One might have thought that performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor is not punishable by karet, but not afflicting oneself during the extension of the period of affliction is punishable by karet. Therefore, the verse states: “For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted on that same day, he shall be cut off from his people” (Leviticus 23:29), which teaches that not afflicting oneself on that very day is punishable by karet, but not afflicting oneself during the extension of the period of affliction is not punishable by karet.

²⁰⁸ The baraita continues: One might have thought that one who performs labor during the extension would not be included in the punishment of karet, but he would be warned against performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor with a prohibition incurring the punishment of lashes; therefore, the verse states: “And you shall do no manner of labor on that same day” (Leviticus 23:28). That teaches that he is warned not to perform labor on that very day, but he is not warned against performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor, and therefore he is not liable to receive lashes for doing so.

²⁰⁹ The baraita continues: One might have thought: He would not be warned with regard to performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor that it is a prohibition that incurs lashes; but he would be warned with regard to not being in a state of affliction during the extension of the period of affliction that it is a prohibition that incurs lashes. However, that is incorrect, and it is learned from a logical derivation that it is not so: Just as with regard to labor, whose prohibition is observed on both Shabbatot and Festivals, one is not warned about the extension added to the day, is it not logical that with regard to affliction, which is not observed on Shabbatot and Festivals, he should not be warned about or liable to receive lashes for the extension?

²¹⁰ The baraita comments: But the warning about lashes during the very day itself we have not learned. From where is it derived? The Torah need not state the punishment of karet for performing labor, since one can learn it by logical derivation from the punishment of not being in a state of affliction, as follows: Just as the requirement of affliction, which is not observed on Shabbatot and Festivals, is punishable by karet on Yom Kippur, with regard to the prohibition of labor, which is observed on all Shabbatot and Festivals, is it not all the more so? If so, why is the punishment for labor stated explicitly? It is available to compare and learn a verbal analogy from it: A punishment with regard to affliction is stated, and a punishment with regard to labor is stated. Just as with regard to labor one is punished only if he was warned first with a negative mitzva, so too, with regard to affliction, one is punished only if he was warned.

²¹¹ The Gemara rejects this: This comparison can be refuted. How so? Whereas affliction has no permitted exceptions from its general prohibition, as the mitzva to afflict oneself applies to all the Jewish people, what can you say with regard to labor, which has permitted exceptions from its

general prohibition? It is permitted to perform the Temple services on Yom Kippur, which include prohibited labors, e.g., slaughtering animals and offering incense. Consequently, there is no proof that the mitzva of affliction is more lenient than the prohibition of labor.

²¹² Rather, say as follows: The Torah need not say the punishment for not being in a state of affliction, since one can learn it from the punishment for performing labor through an a fortiori inference. How so? Just as labor, for which exceptions from the general prohibition are permitted, e.g., performing the Temple service on Yom Kippur, and yet labor is punishable by karet, with regard to not being in a state of affliction, which has no permitted exceptions from its general prohibition, is it not all the more so that one who does not afflict himself should be liable to receive karet? If so, why is it nevertheless stated? It is available to compare and learn a verbal analogy: Punishment is stated with regard to affliction, and punishment is stated with regard to labor. Just as for labor the Torah punished and warned, so too, for affliction the Torah punished and warned.

²¹³ The Gemara rejects this: This comparison can be refuted, and one might say the opposite: Whereas the prohibition of labor is observed on Shabbatot and Festivals, can you say the same about affliction, which is not observed on Shabbatot and Festivals?

²¹⁴ Ravina said: We did not properly understand the teaching of this baraita, as this tanna derived a verbal analogy from the words “on that same day” (Leviticus 23:29) stated with regard to affliction, and “on that same day” (Leviticus 23:28) stated with regard to labor. The Gemara comments: We must say that it is available, meaning that in both places, the phrase “on that same day” is unnecessary within its own context and comes only to teach this verbal analogy; as, if it were not available, it could be refuted, as we refuted it above.

²¹⁵ The Gemara responds: No, it is certainly available, and we may learn from it, as five verses are written with regard to the prohibition of labor on Yom Kippur. One to teach a warning with regard to the prohibition of labor on the day of Yom Kippur itself; and one for a warning with regard to labor on the night of Yom Kippur; and one for the punishment of karet for performing labor on the day; and one for the punishment for performing labor at night; and one verse to be available to derive the requirement of affliction from the prohibition of labor, both during the day and night, using a verbal analogy.

²¹⁶ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught an alternative verbal analogy for the derivation: “Affliction” is stated here, with regard to Yom Kippur, and “affliction” is stated later, with regard to a man who rapes a woman: “Because he has afflicted his neighbor’s wife” (Deuteronomy 22:24). Just as there, in the case of rape, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning, so too here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning. Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov said a different proof: Derive a verbal analogy from the words “Shabbat of solemn rest” (Leviticus 16:31) written with regard to Yom Kippur from the words “Shabbat of solemn rest” (Exodus 31:15, 32:5; Leviticus 23:3) written with regard to the weekly Shabbat, which commemorates the Shabbat of Creation. Just as there, in the case of Shabbat, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning, so too here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning.

²¹⁷ Rav Pappa said:

²¹⁸ Yom Kippur itself is called “Shabbat,” as it is written: “From evening until evening, you shall rest on your Shabbat” (Leviticus 23:32). The Gemara compares the various opinions. Granted, Rav Pappa

did not say as Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov did because a verse that is written about the matter itself is preferable to a verbal analogy. But what is the reason that Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov did not state his opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa?

²¹⁹ The Gemara answers: He requires this verse of “keep your Shabbat” for that which was taught in a baraita: The verse states: “And you shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month at evening, from evening until evening, you shall rest on your Shabbat” (Leviticus 23:32). One might have thought that one should start to afflict oneself on the ninth of Tishrei; therefore, the verse states “at evening.” If the Torah had stated only “at evening,” one might have thought that the fast starts only when darkness falls; therefore, the verse states “on the ninth,” implying that one begins to fast on the ninth of Tishrei. How can these verses be reconciled? One begins to fast while it is still daytime; from here it is derived that one sanctifies and extends from the non-sacred weekday to the sacred day of Yom Kippur.

²²⁰ I have derived only that one must add time at the beginning of Yom Kippur. From where do I derive that one adds time at the conclusion of Yom Kippur? The verse states: “From evening until evening” (Leviticus 23:32), implying that one adds at the end as well, just as he does at the beginning. And I have derived only the mitzva of adding to Yom Kippur; from where is it derived that one must also sanctify and append time before and after Festivals? The verse states: “You shall rest” (Leviticus 23:32), to teach that this rule applies even to Festivals, on which one is commanded to rest. I have derived only that one adds an extension to Festivals; from where do I derive that one must also sanctify and append to Shabbatot? The verse states: “Your Shabbat” (Leviticus 23:32). How so? Every place the term: Rest [shevut] is stated, it teaches from here that one sanctifies and appends from the non-sacred weekday to the sacred.

²²¹ The Gemara asks: And the tanna who learns a verbal analogy from the words “that same day,” “that same day,” what does he do with the phrase: “On the ninth day of the month”? The Gemara answers: He requires it, in accordance with that which Ḥiyya bar Rav of Difti taught. As Ḥiyya bar Rav of Difti taught: It states: “And you shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month” (Leviticus 23:32). But does one afflict oneself on the ninth of Tishrei? Doesn't one in fact afflict oneself on the tenth of Tishrei? Rather, the verse comes to tell you: Anyone who eats and drinks on the ninth of Tishrei and then fasts on the tenth, the verse ascribes him credit as though he fasted on both the ninth and the tenth. The verse alludes to this when it states that the fast is on the ninth.

²²² § It was taught in the mishna: If one ate food that is not fit for eating, he is exempt. Rava said: If one chews raw pepper on Yom Kippur, he is exempt, since this is not considered eating. Similarly, if one chews ginger [zangvila] on Yom Kippur, he is exempt.

²²³ The Gemara raises an objection to this. Rabbi Meir would say about the verse: “And when you shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of trees for food, then you shall count the fruit of it as forbidden [orla]; three years it shall be forbidden to you, it shall not be eaten” (Leviticus 19:23). From the implication of what is stated: “Then you shall count the fruit of it as forbidden,” do I not know that the verse is referring to “trees for food,” since it uses the word “fruit”? Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states “trees for food”? It includes a tree whose wood and fruit taste the same, i.e., a tree that is itself eaten in addition to its fruit. One must say that this is referring to pepper that grows on a tree, to teach you that even pepper is subject to the halakha of orla. And this also teaches that Eretz Yisrael lacks nothing, as even pepper can grow there, as it is stated among the

listed praises of Eretz Yisrael: “You will not lack anything in it” (Deuteronomy 8:9). In any event, it has been derived that pepper is called food, which contradicts Rava’s statement.

²²⁴ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This statement about edible pepper is referring to fresh pepper, which is moist; and that halakha pertaining to Yom Kippur is referring to dry pepper, which is not considered food.

²²⁵ Ravina said to Mareimar: But didn’t Rav Naḥman say that it is permitted to eat this cooked ginger [himalta] that comes from India, and there is no concern that gentiles may have cooked it. And we recite the blessing: Who creates the fruit of the ground, over it. Apparently, ginger is edible. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: This statement is referring to wet ginger, which is considered food; and that earlier statement pertaining to Yom Kippur, which maintained that ginger is not food, is referring to dry ginger.

²²⁶ The Sages taught in a baraita: If one ate leaves of reeds on Yom Kippur, he is exempt, but if one ate grapevine shoots he is liable. The Gemara clarifies: What are these grapevine shoots? Rabbi Yitzḥak from the city of Migdal said: All shoots that sprouted between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur and are still very soft are considered food. And Rav Kahana said: All shoots that sprouted up to thirty days before Yom Kippur are considered food. The Gemara comments: It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak from Migdal: If one ate leaves of reeds he is exempt, but if one ate grapevine shoots he is liable. What are these grapevine shoots? They are all those that sprouted between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur.

²²⁷ It was taught in the mishna that if on Yom Kippur one drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled, he is exempt. The Gemara comments: From the language of the mishna it may be inferred that if one drank vinegar, he is liable. Who is the tanna of the mishna? It is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Vinegar revives the spirit and is therefore considered a beverage.

²²⁸ The Gemara relates: Rav Giddel bar Menashe from the town of Birei DeNeresh taught in a public lecture that the halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and vinegar is not considered a beverage. The next year everyone went out and mixed vinegar with water and drank vinegar on Yom Kippur. Rav Giddel heard this and became angry with them for their actions. He said: Say that I said one is not liable for drinking vinegar only after the fact; however, did I say it is permitted to drink it ab initio? Furthermore: Say that I said my statement with regard to one who drinks a little, but did I say it is permitted to drink a lot? Furthermore: Say that I said my statement in reference to pure vinegar, which is very strong, but did I say anything about diluted vinegar? That is certainly prohibited.

²²⁹ MISHNA: With regard to the children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them one year before or two years before they reach majority, by means of a partial fast lasting several hours, so that they will be accustomed to fulfill mitzvot.

²³⁰ GEMARA: The Gemara asks about the wording of the mishna: Since it is stated that one trains children two years before their maturity, is it necessary to say that one trains them one year before? This expression in the mishna is superfluous. Rav Ḥisda said: This is not difficult. This statement that one trains children one year before their maturity is referring to a feeble child; that statement that one trains children two years before their maturity is referring to a healthy child.

²³¹ Rav Huna said: One trains a healthy child of eight years and nine years to fast for several hours; at ten years and eleven years, they complete the fast by rabbinic law; at twelve years they complete the fast by Torah law. This applies to girls who reach maturity and become obligated in mitzvot at age twelve. And Rav Nahman said: At nine years and ten years one trains them to fast for several hours; at eleven and twelve years they complete the fast by rabbinic law; at thirteen years they complete the fast by Torah law. This applies to boys. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There is no obligation with regard to children completing the fast by rabbinic law. Rather, at ten and eleven years, one trains them to fast for several hours; and at twelve years girls are obligated to complete their fast by Torah law.

²³² § We learned in the mishna: With regard to the children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them for one year before or two years before they reach maturity. Granted, this makes sense according to the opinion of Rav Huna and Rav Nahman, who hold that for one or two years before reaching maturity there is a rabbinic law requiring children to complete the fast. The mishna that states one year before or two years before should be understood as follows: A feeble child is obligated to complete the fast on Yom Kippur in the year before reaching maturity by rabbinic law, and a healthy child is obligated to complete the fast on Yom Kippur in the two years before reaching maturity by rabbinic law (Vilna Gaon).

²³³ But according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that there is no rabbinic law to complete the fast, this is difficult. In his opinion, what is the difference between one year before and two years before? Rabbi Yoḥanan could have said to you: What is the meaning of one year or two years? One year is referring not to the year before the year preceding their maturity, i.e. the two years preceding it, but actually to the year preceding their maturity. The phrase: One or two years, indicates that there is a difference between those who are required for one year and those who required for two, which depends on their health: The healthy child is required to fast two years, but one year is sufficient for a feeble child.

²³⁴ Come and hear that which Rabba bar Shmuel taught in a baraita: With regard to children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them one year for a feeble child or two years for a healthy child preceding their maturity. Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, this works out well; but according to Rav Huna and Rav Nahman, who say that there is an additional year that one is required to complete the fast according to rabbinic law, this is difficult. The Rabbis could say to you: What is this training that is also taught there? It is referring to fasting a complete day, which is required by rabbinic law. By rabbinic law, the time of completing the fast for a healthy child is two years before he reaches maturity.

²³⁵ The Gemara asks: And is training called completion? Doesn't training mean that the child performs only part of the mitzva? Wasn't it taught explicitly in a baraita: What is training? If the child was accustomed to eat every day at the second hour of the day, one feeds him at the third hour, so he will begin to understand the concept of affliction. If he was accustomed to eat at the third hour, one feeds him at the fourth hour. Rava bar Ulla said: This is not difficult; these are two different types of training. There is training of small children to wait slightly longer before eating, and training of older children, in which one habituates them to fasting a full day.

²³⁶ MISHNA: With regard to a pregnant woman who smelled food and was overcome by a craving to eat it, one feeds her until she recovers, as failure to do so could lead to a life-threatening situation.

If a person is ill and requires food due to potential danger, one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts who determine that he indeed requires food. And if there are no experts there, one feeds him according to his own instructions, until he says that he has eaten enough and needs no more.

²³⁷ GEMARA: The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to a pregnant woman who smelled consecrated meat or pig meat and craved those specific foods, one inserts a thin reed into the juice of that item and places it on her mouth. If her mind become settled with that, it is well. And if not, one feeds her the gravy itself of that forbidden food. If her mind becomes settled with that, it is well. And if not, one feeds her the fat of the forbidden food itself, as there is no halakha that stands in the way of saving a life except for the prohibitions against idol worship, and forbidden sexual relationships, and bloodshed.

²³⁸ The Gemara clarifies: With regard to the halakha that the prohibition against idol worship takes precedence over saving one's life, from where do we derive this? As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: If it is stated: "And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul" (Deuteronomy 6:5), why is it stated in the continuation of the verse: "And with all your might" (Deuteronomy 6:5)? And if it is stated: "With all your might," why is it stated: "With all your soul"? One of these statements appears to be superfluous.

²³⁹ Rather, it is to teach that if there is a person whose body is more beloved to him than his property, therefore it is stated: "With all your soul." The verse teaches that one must be willing to sacrifice his life to sanctify God's name. And if there is a person whose property is more beloved to him than his body, therefore it is stated: "With all your might." Rabbi Eliezer understands the phrase "with all your might" to mean: With all your possessions. Therefore, one must be prepared to forfeit his life rather than be saved through idol worship.

²⁴⁰ § With regard to the concept that one must surrender his life rather than have forbidden sexual relations or shed blood through murder, from where do we derive this? As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It is stated about the rape of a betrothed woman: "For as when a man rises against his fellow and slays him, even so is this matter" (Deuteronomy 22:26). One might ask: What idea did we learn about a betrothed woman from a murderer? The halakha of a betrothed woman is clear; what new point is learned by comparing it to the halakha of a murderer?

²⁴¹ Rather, this halakha about the murderer, which appears to come to teach about the betrothed woman, is found to actually be the subject of teaching. The inference is as follows: Just as with regard to the betrothed woman, permission is given to save her at the cost of the life of her attacker, so too, the murderer may be saved from committing the crime at the cost of his life, i.e., one may save the victim by killing the attacker. Another teaching is derived in the opposite direction, from the case of murder to the case of rape. Just as the murderer is subject to the halakha of let him be killed, and let him not transgress, i.e., one must even allow himself to be killed rather than take the life of another, so too, a man must surrender his life rather than engage in forbidden sexual relations with a betrothed young woman. By inference, the halakha of let him be killed, and let him not transgress, applies to all forbidden sexual relations.

²⁴² The Gemara asks: And with regard to the murderer himself, from where do we derive this halakha that he should be killed rather than transgress the prohibition against murder? The Gemara answers: It is derived through reason, as it was told: A certain person came before Rava. He said to

Rava: The master of the village where I live said to me: Kill so-and-so, and if you do not do so, I will kill you. What should I do? Rava said to him: Let yourself be killed, and you should not kill. Rava reasoned: What did you see to make you think that your blood is redder and more important than his? Perhaps the blood of that man is redder, and he is more important than you. If so, it is logical that one must not kill another person to save himself.

²⁴³ § With respect to a pregnant woman who smells food, it is told: A certain pregnant woman smelled a food and craved it. Those involved came before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi to ask how to proceed. He said to those who were inquiring: Go and whisper to her that today is Yom Kippur. They whispered to her, and this whispering helped; she stopped craving the food. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi read this verse about the baby she was carrying: “Before I formed you in the belly I knew you, and before you came forth out of the womb I sanctified you” (Jeremiah 1:5), and indeed, the baby who came out of that woman was Rabbi Yoḥanan.

²⁴⁴ The Gemara relates another story: A certain pregnant woman smelled food and had a craving to eat it on Yom Kippur. Those involved came before Rabbi Ḥanina to ask how to proceed. He said to them: Whisper to her that today is Yom Kippur. They whispered to her, but she did not accept the whisper and continued to crave the food. Rabbi Ḥanina read this verse about the baby:

²⁴⁵ “The wicked are estranged from the womb” (Psalms 58:4), i.e., it is clear they are estranged already in their mother’s womb. Indeed, Shabbetai the hoarder of fruits came out of her. He hoarded fruit during years of famine in order to inflate its price and profit at the expense of poor people.

²⁴⁶ § It was taught in the mishna: If a person is ill and requires food due to potential danger, one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts. Rabbi Yannai said: If an ill person says he needs to eat, and a doctor says he does not need to eat, one listens to the ill person. What is the reason for this halakha? It is because the verse states: “The heart knows the bitterness of its soul” (Proverbs 14:10), meaning an ill person knows the intensity of his pain and weakness, and doctors cannot say otherwise. The Gemara asks: It is obvious that a person knows himself better than anyone else does. Why does this need to be stated explicitly? The Gemara answers: It is lest you say that the doctor is more certain because he has had more experience with this condition. Therefore, the verse teaches us that even so, it is the ill person who knows his own suffering better than anyone else.

²⁴⁷ However, in the opposite case, if a doctor says that the ill person needs food, but the ill person himself says he does not need to eat, one listens to the doctor. What is the reason for this halakha? It is because confusion [tunba] has taken hold of the ill person on account of his illness, and his judgment is impaired. Consequently, he himself does not know how much he needs food.

²⁴⁸ § We learned in the mishna: If a person is ill, one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts. This implies that if there are experts present, then according to the advice of experts, yes, one feeds the ill person; but at his own instructions, no, one does not feed him, contrary to Rabbi Yannai’s opinion. It further implies that according to the advice of several experts, yes, one feeds an ill person; however, according to the advice of only one expert, no, one does not feed him. There appears to be a requirement for at least two doctors, which also contradicts Rabbi Yannai’s opinion that the opinion of one expert is sufficient to override the opinion of the ill person.

²⁴⁹ The Gemara rejects this: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a unique circumstance: The ill person says I do not need food, and the consultation of experts is required. The Gemara suggests: But let them feed him according to the advice of one expert, as Rabbi Yannai said

that in such a circumstance one feeds the ill person based on the advice of one doctor. The Gemara answers: No, the requirement of two experts is necessary in a case where there is another, third expert with him who says that the ill person does not need to eat. In such a case, one feeds the ill person according to the advice of two experts who agree that he requires it.

²⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: If so, this is obvious, since it is a case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation, and in all cases of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation, the halakha is lenient. The Gemara answers: No, this halakha is necessary in a case where there are two other doctors who, along with the ill person, say that he does not need food. And although Rav Safra said that two witnesses are like one hundred witnesses, and one hundred witnesses are like two witnesses, that rule applies specifically to the matter of testimony; however, in the matter of assessing a situation, we follow the majority of opinions. Therefore, one might think in this case that the ill person should not be fed because the opinion of two doctors plus the ill person should override the opposing opinion of two other doctors.

²⁵¹ Generally speaking, two or more witnesses constitute complete testimony, and there is no difference between the testimony of two and the testimony of a large number of people. However, this principle of following the majority applies specifically to assessing monetary issues, but here it is a case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation. Therefore, although it is the opinion of two doctors against the opinion of two doctors and the ill person, the ill person must eat.

²⁵² The Gemara asks: But from the fact that it is taught in the latter clause of the mishna that if there are no experts present one feeds him according to his own opinion, by inference, the first clause of the mishna is referring to a case where the ill person said he needs to eat. In that case, the mishna states that one follows the experts' opinion, not his own, and feeds him. The Gemara answers: The mishna is incomplete and is teaching the following: In what case is this statement that he may eat only based on the advice of experts said? It is when the ill person said: I do not need to eat. But if he said: I do need to eat, and instead of two experts there is only one who says that he does not need to eat, one feeds him according to his own opinion.

²⁵³ Mar bar Rav Ashi said: Any instance where an ill person says: I need to eat, even if there are one hundred expert doctors who say that he does not need to eat, we listen to his own opinion and feed him, as it is stated: "The heart knows the bitterness of its soul" (Proverbs 14:10).

²⁵⁴ We learned in the mishna: If an ill person himself says he needs to eat and there are no experts present, one feeds him according to his own opinion. This implies that the reason one feeds him is because there are no experts present. One may infer from this that if there were experts present, no, one would not feed the ill person based on his own opinion but would instead listen to the advice of the experts. The Gemara rejects this: This is what the mishna is saying: In what case is this statement that one follows the opinion of the experts said? It is when the ill person said: I do not need to eat. However, if he said: I do need to eat, it is considered as if there were no experts there at all; we feed him based on his opinion, as it is stated: "The heart knows the bitterness of its soul" (Proverbs 14:10). All the experts are ignored in the face of the ill person's own sensitivities.

²⁵⁵ MISHNA: In the case of one who is seized with the life-threatening illness bulmos, causing him unbearable hunger pangs and impaired vision, one may feed him even impure foods on Yom Kippur or any other day until his eyes recover, as the return of his sight indicates that he is recovering. In the case of one whom a mad dog bit, one may not feed him from the lobe of the dog's liver. This was

thought to be a remedy for the bite, but the Rabbis deem it ineffective. And Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash permits feeding it to him, as he deems it effective.

²⁵⁶ And furthermore, Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash said: With regard to one who suffers pain in his throat, one may place medicine inside his mouth on Shabbat, although administering a remedy is prohibited on Shabbat. This is because there is uncertainty whether or not it is a life-threatening situation for him, as it is difficult to ascertain the severity of internal pain. And a case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation overrides Shabbat.

²⁵⁷ Similarly, with regard to one upon whom a rockslide fell, and there is uncertainty whether he is there under the debris or whether he is not there; and there is uncertainty whether he is still alive or whether he is dead; and there is uncertainty whether the person under the debris is a gentile or whether he is a Jew, one clears the pile from atop him. One may perform any action necessary to rescue him from beneath the debris. If they found him alive after beginning to clear the debris, they continue to clear the pile until they can extricate him. And if they found him dead, they should leave him, since one may not desecrate Shabbat to preserve the dignity of the dead.

²⁵⁸ GEMARA: The Sages taught: From where would they know that his eyes had recovered their sight? It is from when he can discern between good and bad food, since under the influence of bulmos one eats food indiscriminately. Abaye said: It is with tasting. When he can distinguish the tastes of different foods his eyesight must have also recovered. For example, at night, although it is dark, the sign that his eyesight has been restored is that he is able to detect difference in tastes (Me'iri).

²⁵⁹ § The Sages taught: In the case of one who is seized with bulmos and must be fed until his vision is restored, one feeds him the items whose prohibition is least severe first. If he must be fed forbidden foods, he should first be fed those whose level of prohibition is least severe. For instance, if there is untithed produce and an unslaughtered animal carcass [neveila] or any other non-kosher meat, one feeds him the neveila, as the prohibition of untithed produce warrants death at the hand of Heaven, but eating non-kosher meat is a transgression punishable only by lashes. If there is untithed produce and produce from the Sabbatical Year, he is fed the produce from the Sabbatical Year. Untithed produce warrants death at the hand of Heaven, whereas the produce of a Sabbatical Year is prohibited by a positive mitzva and there is no punishment associated with it.

²⁶⁰ If they have untithed produce and teruma, there is a dispute between tanna'im as to which food they should feed him, as it was taught in a baraita: One feeds him untithed produce and does not feed him teruma. Ben Teima says: It is better to feed him teruma and not feed him untithed produce. Rabba said: Where it is possible to feed him non-sacred food by separating tithes from untithed produce and thereby rendering the remainder permitted, everyone agrees that one should make the produce fit for consumption by separating tithes and then feed it to him, even on Shabbat, when it is otherwise prohibited to separate tithes.

²⁶¹ Where they disagree, it is in a case where it is impossible to feed him non-sacred food because there is no way to separate tithes. One Sage holds that the prohibition of untithed produce is more severe; and one Sage holds that the prohibition of teruma is more severe. The two sides reason as follows. One Sage holds that the prohibition of untithed produce is more severe because it is prohibited to everyone; but teruma is fit for a priest, and therefore one could say that its prohibition is less severe. And one Sage holds that teruma is more severe because non-priests may never eat it,

while untithed produce can be made fit to eat, and therefore, even while it is still untithed, the prohibition against eating it is less severe.

²⁶² It was stated that, according to Rabba, if it is possible to make the untithed produce fit and then feed him with non-sacred food, one should do so. The Gemara is surprised at this: It is obvious that if it is possible to tithe the produce and feed him that, one should do so. Why must it be stated? The Gemara explains: No, it is necessary to state this with regard to a case on Shabbat, when it is generally prohibited to separate terumot and tithes. Even so, the Sages said that it is better to separate terumot and tithes on Shabbat rather than feed the ill person untithed produce.

²⁶³ The Gemara asks: With regard to Shabbat it is also obvious, since the prohibition against separating terumot and tithes is merely a prohibition against moving, which is prohibited by rabbinic law. That is certainly less severe than the prohibition against eating untithed produce. The Gemara answers: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with fruits grown in an imperforate container, which are not subject to teruma by Torah law but by rabbinic law. The Gemara teaches that it is preferable to transgress the rabbinic prohibition of tithing the fruit on Shabbat rather than feed the ill person untithed produce, although in this case the prohibition is rabbinic.

²⁶⁴ § The Gemara now discusses the aforementioned two opinions: One Sage, ben Teima, holds that untithed produce is more severe, and therefore one must tithe the fruit although it is prohibited to separate teruma on Shabbat; and one Sage, the first tanna, holds that teruma is more severe.

²⁶⁵ Let us say that Rabba's view is one side of a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: In the case of one whom a snake bit on Shabbat and who is in danger, one calls a doctor for him to come from one place to another; and one tears a chicken apart for him if he needs its meat for healing; and one harvests leeks from the ground and feeds them to him for healing purposes, and one need not separate tithes; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: He should not eat it unless it has been tithed.

²⁶⁶ Let us say that Rabba's statement that one must separate teruma and tithes from the fruit for the ill person on Shabbat, even from untithed produce prohibited by rabbinic law, corresponds to the view of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon. He says that one must tithe the leeks for the ill person even on Shabbat, although leeks, like all other vegetables, are considered untithed produce only by rabbinic law. And Rabba's opinion does not follow the view of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

²⁶⁷ The Gemara rejects this: Even if you say that Rabba holds in accordance with the view of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is saying that one should not separate tithes only there, with regard to the requirement to take the tithe from vegetables, like leeks, which is rabbinic in origin. This requirement was decreed lest one come to confuse vegetables with produce that is untithed by Torah law. However, with regard to the tithe of grains, which have the status of untithed produce by Torah law, although in this particular circumstance their untithed status is rabbinic because the grains grew in an imperforate container, even Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi concedes that the produce must be tithed. Because if it is permitted for him to eat without separating tithes from produce grown in an imperforate container, he may err and come to eat from grain grown in a perforated pot, which is considered untithed produce by Torah law. Consequently, one must separate tithes on Shabbat before feeding an ill person, even according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

²⁶⁸ The Sages taught in a baraita: In the case of one who is seized with bulmos, one feeds him honey and all types of sweet foods, as the honey and all types of sweet foods restore the sight of his eyes.

And although there is no clear proof for the matter, there is an allusion to the matter. Jonathan said: “See, I pray you, how my eyes are brightened because I tasted a little of this honey” (I Samuel 14:29).

²⁶⁹ The Gemara asks: And why does the baraita say: Although there is no clear proof for the matter, when that verse is a strong proof? The Gemara answers: There, Jonathan was not seized with bulmos, he was merely very hungry. Therefore, the episode provides no evidence that honey or sweet foods are the remedy for bulmos.

²⁷⁰ Abaye said: They taught that honey restores one’s eyesight only after eating other food, but before eating other food it whets one’s appetite, as it is written: “And they found an Egyptian man in the field, and brought him to David, and they gave him bread and he ate, and they gave him water to drink; and they gave him a piece of a cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins, and he ate, and his spirit was restored; for he had eaten no bread nor drunk any water for three days and three nights” (I Samuel 30:11–12). This indicates that sweets are given after the main course and not before it.

²⁷¹ Rav Naḥman said that Shmuel said: In the case of one who is seized with bulmos, one feeds him a sheep’s tail with honey, since the combination of the fatty meat and the honey helps greatly. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: Also, fine wheat flour with honey is a remedy. Rav Pappa said: Even barley flour with honey is good for curing bulmos. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Once I was seized with bulmos and I ran to the east side of a fig tree and found ripe figs there, which I ate. Figs on a tree do not all ripen at once but ripen first on the side where the sun rises, so Rabbi Yoḥanan searched first for figs on the east side of the tree. And I thereby fulfilled the verse: “Wisdom preserves the lives of those who have it” (Ecclesiastes 7:12). As Rav Yosef taught: One who wishes to taste the flavor of the fig should turn to the east, as it is stated: “And for the precious things of the sun’s fruits” (Deuteronomy 33:14), implying that the sun ripens fruit and makes them sweet.

²⁷² The Gemara relates that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei were walking on the road when Rabbi Yehuda was seized with bulmos. He overpowered a nearby shepherd and ate the bread that the shepherd had in his hand, since his life was in danger. Rabbi Yosei said to him: You have robbed that shepherd. When they reached the city, Rabbi Yosei was seized with bulmos, and all the people of the city surrounded him with jugs [lagei] and plates with all sorts of sweets. Rabbi Yehuda said to him in jest: I robbed only the shepherd, but you have robbed the entire city.

²⁷³ § And furthermore, it is told: Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei were walking on the road together. Rabbi Meir would analyze names and discern one’s nature from his name, while Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei were not apt to analyze names. When they came to a certain place, they looked for lodging and were given it. They said to the innkeeper: What is your name? He said to them: My name is Kidor. Rabbi Meir said to himself: Perhaps one can learn from this that he is a wicked person, as it is stated: “For they are a generation [ki dor] of upheavals” (Deuteronomy 32:20). Since it was Friday afternoon, Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei entrusted their purses to him. Rabbi Meir did not entrust his purse to him but went and placed it at the grave of the innkeeper’s father.

²⁷⁴ The innkeeper’s father appeared to the innkeeper in a dream and said to him: Go take the purse placed at the head of that man, i.e., the innkeeper’s father. The following day, he said to the Sages: This is what appeared to me in my dream. They said to him: Dreams during twilight on Shabbat evening have no substance and should not be trusted. Even so, Rabbi Meir went and guarded his money all that day and then took it.

²⁷⁵ The next day, the rabbis said to the innkeeper: Give us our purses. He said to them: These matters never occurred; you never gave me any purses. Rabbi Meir said to them: Why didn't you analyze his name to learn that he is a wicked man? They said to him: Why didn't the Master tell us? He said to them: I said one should be suspicious, but have I said a person should be established as wicked? Could I say to you with certainty that he is wicked based on his name alone?

²⁷⁶ What did they do? They dragged the innkeeper and brought him to a store and gave him wine to drink. After he drank the wine, they saw lentils on his mustache, showing that he had eaten lentils that day. They went and gave this sign to his wife. They said that the innkeeper had ordered that their money be returned to them upon the sign that he ate lentils at his last meal. And they took their purses and went. He went and killed his wife out of anger that she did this.

²⁷⁷ This is as we learned in a baraita: Due to a person's laxity in the first washing, they fed him pork. There was an innkeeper who was accustomed to feed pork to gentiles and kosher meat to Jews. He distinguished between Jews and gentiles by watching to see whether they performed the ritual hand-washing before eating. One time, a Jew came and ate without washing his hands before the meal, and the innkeeper gave him pork to eat. Laxity in the final washing, the washing of one's hands and mouth after a meal, caused the innkeeper to kill the person. This is similar to that story, as had the wicked innkeeper washed his mouth, the rabbis would not have known that he had eaten lentils.

²⁷⁸ And in the end, they too, Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, would analyze names. When they came to a house of a landlord named Bala, they did not enter. They said: Conclude from here that he is certainly wicked, as it is written: "I said of her who was worn out [bala] by adulteries" (Ezekiel 23:43), as it states: "After I am grown old [beloti] shall I have pleasure?" (Genesis 18:12). "Worn out by adulteries" means aged through adulteries.

²⁷⁹ § It was taught that in the case of one whom a mad dog bit, one does not feed him the lobe of its liver. The Gemara clarifies the concept of the mad dog. The Sages taught in a baraita: Five signs were said about a mad dog: Its mouth is always open; and its saliva drips; and its ears are floppy and do not stand up; and its tail rests on its legs; and it walks on the edges of roads. And some say it also barks and its voice is not heard. The Gemara asks: From where did the dog become mad? Rav said: Witches play with it and practice their magic on it, causing it to become mad. And Shmuel said: An evil spirit rests upon it.

²⁸⁰ The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two opinions? The Gemara answers: There is a practical difference between them with regard to

²⁸¹ killing it with an object that is thrown from a distance like an arrow rather than with one's hands. If the dog is possessed by an evil spirit, one should avoid direct contact with it.

²⁸² The Gemara comments: This was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel: When one kills a mad dog, he should kill it only with a thrown object. Furthermore, one who is rubbed by a mad dog will become dangerously ill, while one bitten by the dog will die. The Gemara asks: What is the remedy for one who is rubbed by mad dog and becomes dangerously ill? The Gemara answers: Let him take off his clothing and run. The Gemara relates: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, was rubbed by one of these mad dogs in the market, whereupon he took off his clothing and ran. He said: I have fulfilled the verse: "Wisdom preserves the lives of those who have it" (Ecclesiastes 7:12).

²⁸³ The Gemara continues to discuss the baraita: One bitten by a mad dog will die. The Gemara asks: What is the remedy? Abaye said: Let him bring the skin of a male hyena and write on it: I, so-and-so, son of so-and-so, am writing this spell about you upon the skin of a male hyena: Kanti kanti kelirus. And some say he should write: Kandi kandi keloros. He then writes names of God, Yah, Yah, Lord of Hosts, amen amen Selah. And let him take off his clothes and bury them in a cemetery for twelve months of the year, after which he should take them out, and burn them in an oven, and scatter the ashes at a crossroads. And during those twelve months of the year, when his clothes are buried, when he drinks water, let him drink only from a copper tube and not from a spring, lest he see the image of the demon in the water and be endangered, like the case of Abba bar Marta, who is also called Abba bar Manyumi, whose mother made him a gold tube for this purpose.

²⁸⁴ § The mishna said: And furthermore, Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash said: With regard to one who suffers pain in his throat, one may place medicine inside his mouth on Shabbat, although administering a remedy is prohibited on Shabbat. The Gemara discusses a related incident: Rabbi Yoḥanan suffered from the illness tzefidna, which first affects the teeth and gums and then the intestines. He went to a certain gentile matron [matronita] who was a well-known healer. She prepared a medicine for him on Thursday and Friday. He said to her: What shall I do on Shabbat, when I cannot come to collect the medicine from you? She said to him: You will not need it. He asked her: If I do need it, what shall I do? She said to him: Swear to me that you will not reveal the remedy; then I will tell you, and you can prepare it yourself should you need it. He swore: To the God of the Jews, I will not reveal it. She told him the remedy. Rabbi Yoḥanan then went out and taught it publicly, revealing the secret of the remedy.

²⁸⁵ The Gemara is surprised at this: But he swore to her that he would not reveal it. The Gemara answers that in his vow he declared: I will not reveal it to the God of the Jews. However, his words imply: I will reveal it to His people, the Jews. The Gemara asks: Still, there is a desecration of God's name, as the matron now thinks that a great man of Rabbi Yoḥanan's stature broke his vow. The Gemara answers: He revealed it to her at the outset. As soon as she revealed the remedy to him, he told her that his vow would not prevent him from publicizing the remedy.

²⁸⁶ The Gemara asks: What was the medicine that she prepared for him? Rav Aḥa, son of Rav Ami, said: It was water in which leaven was steeped, olive oil, and salt. Rav Yeimar said: It was leaven itself, olive oil, and salt. Rav Ashi said: The remedy was fat from the bone marrow of a goose's wing. Abaye said: I made all of these medicines and was not cured from this ailment, until a certain Arab told me the remedy for it: Take olive seeds that are less than one-third ripe, and burn them in a fire on top of a new hoe, and stick them along the row of gums. I did this and was cured.

²⁸⁷ § The Gemara asks: From where does this disease tzefidna come? It is from eating wheat bread that is too hot and fish remains fried in oil. What is the sign of this sickness? When one puts something between his teeth, blood comes out from his gums. When Rabbi Yoḥanan suffered from tzefidna, he prepared this medicine described above on Shabbat and was cured. The Gemara asks: And how did Rabbi Yoḥanan prepare this medicine on Shabbat for an ailment which affects only the gums but is not life-threatening? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Tzefidna is different, since it does indeed begin in the mouth and appears to be an illness of the teeth, but it ends up in the intestines and is dangerous.

²⁸⁸ Rav Ḥiyya bar Abba said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: In accordance with whose opinion did you do this? Was it not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash, who said: In the case of one who suffers pain in his mouth, one puts medicine in his mouth on Shabbat, which is a minority opinion? Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: It is so, but I say the Sages agreed with him about taking medicine in this case alone, but no other. If so, with regard to medicine on Shabbat, the view of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash is not a minority opinion.

²⁸⁹ Let us say that this baraita supports him: With regard to one who is seized with yerakon, one feeds him donkey meat as medicine; with regard to one whom a mad dog bit, one feeds him the lobe of its liver; in the case of one who has pain in his mouth, one puts medicine in his mouth on Shabbat; this is the statement of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash. And the Rabbis say: These have no value as a remedy. The Rabbis used the term these, to exclude what? What, is it not to exclude this medicine for tzeḥidna, which the Rabbis agree is permitted on Shabbat?

²⁹⁰ The Gemara rejects this: No, it excludes a different remedy, which Rabbi Matya suggests: Bloodletting to heal the ailment serunkhi is permitted on Shabbat. The Gemara comments: So too, this is reasonable to say, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, said three things that he heard in the name of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash: One may let blood for serunkhi on Shabbat; and in the case of one whom a mad dog bit, one feeds him the lobe of its liver; and in the case of one who has pain in his mouth, one puts medicine in his mouth on Shabbat.

²⁹¹ And the Rabbis say: These have no value as a remedy. The Rabbis used the term these to exclude what? What, is it not to limit their argument only to the latter two items, which do not cure anything, and to exclude the first item, bloodletting for serunkhi, which everyone agrees is an effective remedy? The Gemara rejects this: No, there is no proof from here, since it is possible to say that it is referring to the first two items of the first baraita and excludes the latter clause with regard to medicine on Shabbat, which they agree with.

²⁹² Come and hear a proof for the matter, as Rabba bar Shmuel taught in the following baraita: With regard to a pregnant woman who smells and craves food, one feeds her until she is satisfied, even on Yom Kippur; and in the case of one whom a mad dog bit, one feeds him from the lobe of its liver; and in the case of one who has pain in his mouth, one places medicine in his mouth on Shabbat; this is the statement of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, who said it in the name of Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash. And the Rabbis say: In this case and no other. The Gemara clarifies: To which case is this one referring? If we say they said this about a pregnant woman, it is obvious; is there anyone who says one should not give a pregnant woman food? Rather, is it not referring to the halakha pertaining to medicine on Shabbat, which they agree is permitted? Learn from this that the Rabbis did not disagree about this.

²⁹³ Rav Ashi said: The wording of the mishna is also precise in accordance with this approach, as it was taught in the mishna: And furthermore, Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash said: In the case of one who suffers pain in his mouth, one places medicine in his mouth on Shabbat, and the Rabbis do not disagree with him and say otherwise. And if it is so that the Rabbis disagree with him, then let the mishna combine the two halakhot and teach them together, and let the Rabbis disagree with both points in the latter clause. Since the mishna was not written this way, but instead the dispute of the Rabbis appears after Rabbi Matya's statement about the mad dog, learn from here that the Rabbis did not disagree with him about the halakha with regard to medicine.

²⁹⁴ § The mishna states that one with pain in his throat should be given medicine on Shabbat because it is a case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation. The Gemara asks: Why do I need to say furthermore: And any case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation overrides Shabbat? Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: They stated this not only in a case where there is uncertainty with regard to this Shabbat, but even if the uncertainty is with regard to a different future Shabbat.

²⁹⁵ What are the circumstances in which uncertainty would arise as to whether or not his life will be in danger in the future? They are a case where doctors assess that an ill person needs a certain treatment for eight days, and the first day of his illness is Shabbat. Lest you say: He should wait until evening and begin his treatment after Shabbat so they will not need to desecrate two Shabbatot for his sake, therefore it teaches us that one must immediately desecrate Shabbat for his sake. This is the halakha, despite the fact that an additional Shabbat will be desecrated as a result, because there is uncertainty about whether his life is in danger.

²⁹⁶ That was also taught in a baraita: One heats water for an ill person on Shabbat, whether to give him to drink or to wash him, since it might help him recover. And they did not say it is permitted to desecrate only the current Shabbat for him, but even a different, future Shabbat. And one must not say: Let us wait and perform this labor for him after Shabbat, perhaps he will get well in the meantime. Rather, one heats it for him immediately because any case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation overrides Shabbat. And this is so not only with regard to uncertainty whether his life is in danger on the current Shabbat, but even in a case of uncertainty with regard to danger on a different Shabbat.

²⁹⁷ And these acts should not be performed by gentiles or Samaritans but should be done by the greatest of the Jewish people, i.e., their scholars, who know how to act properly. And one does not say: These actions may be performed based on the advice of women or Samaritans, since they are not considered experts able to declare a person ill enough to override Shabbat. However, the opinions of these people do combine with an additional opinion, meaning that if there is a dispute, their opinions may be considered when coming to a decision.

²⁹⁸ § The Sages taught in a baraita: One engages in saving a life on Shabbat, and one who is vigilant to do so is praiseworthy. And one need not take permission from a court but hurries to act on his own. How so? If one sees a child who fell into the sea, he spreads a fisherman's net and raises him from the water. And one who is vigilant and acts quickly is praiseworthy, and one need not seek permission from a court, although in doing so he catches fish in the net as well. Similarly, if one sees a child fall into a pit and the child cannot get out, he digs part of the ground out around the edge of the pit to create a makeshift step and raises him out. And one who is vigilant and acts quickly is praiseworthy, and one need not seek permission from a court, although in doing so he fashions a step.

²⁹⁹ Similarly, if one sees that a door is locked before a child and the child is scared and crying, he breaks the door and takes the child out. And one who is vigilant and acts quickly is praiseworthy, and one need not seek permission from a court, although he intends to break it into boards to be used later. Similarly, one may extinguish a fire by placing a barrier of metal or clay vessels filled with water in front of it on Shabbat when life is endangered. And one who is vigilant and acts quickly is praiseworthy, and one need not seek permission from a court, although he leaves the coals, which can be used for cooking after Shabbat.

³⁰⁰ The Gemara comments: And it is necessary to teach these examples, since each one suggests an original idea. As, had it taught us the halakha of the child who fell into the sea, we would have said: He must act quickly in that case because in the meantime, if he delays, the child will be swept away by the waves and disappear, and therefore the rescuer need not seek permission; but in the case of a child who fell into a pit, who remains there and is in no further danger, one might say the rescuer need not hurry but should request permission from the court first. Therefore, the baraita explains: No, it is necessary to tell us that case, too.

³⁰¹ And if it had taught us the case of the pit, one might have thought it is because the child is scared at being trapped; but when a door is locked before a child, it is possible to sit on the other side of the door and amuse him with the sound of nuts until Shabbat is over. Therefore, it is necessary to teach that in this case, too, one does not delay but acts immediately because a life is possibly in danger.

³⁰² It was taught in a baraita that one may extinguish a fire by placing a barrier in front of it on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: Why do I need this? What new point is taught by this additional case of a life-endangering situation? The Gemara answers: This halakha applies even if the fire is spreading toward another courtyard. Not only may this be done to save the lives of people in the courtyard on fire; it may also be done to prevent the fire from spreading to an adjacent courtyard.

³⁰³ § Rav Yosef said that Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: With regard to saving a life, the Sages did not follow the majority as they do in other areas of halakha. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? When does one not follow the majority? If we say that one does not follow the majority in a case where there are nine Jews and one gentile among them and a building collapses on one of them, then in that case the majority of people are Jews and yet one desecrates Shabbat to save the trapped person. In such a case one is in fact following the majority. Alternatively, if the group is half Jews and half gentiles, the ruling is lenient with regard to a case of uncertainty concerning a life-threatening situation. But this, too, is not a case where one follows the minority, as there is an even chance that the victim is a Jew.

³⁰⁴ Rather, it is referring to a case where there are nine gentiles and one Jew. However, this too is obvious. One saves the trapped individual because the group is in a fixed location, and there is a principle that whenever a group is in a fixed location it is considered as though it were evenly divided. In this case, despite the fact that the group's majority is gentile, it is considered as though it were composed half of Jews and half of gentiles.

³⁰⁵ The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary to teach that one does not follow the majority in a case where one individual did not remain with the group in their courtyard but separated and went to another courtyard, and a building collapses on him. Lest you say: One should follow the principle that whatever is separated from a group is considered to have left from the majority, and since there was a majority of gentiles there the individual who left the group was probably a gentile, and it is not necessary to clear the debris for a gentile on Shabbat, therefore it teaches us that with regard to uncertainty in a situation of saving a life, one does not follow the majority.

³⁰⁶ The Gemara asks: Is that so? But didn't Rav Asi say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If there are nine gentiles and one Jew and a building collapses on one of them, if it is in that same courtyard one removes the debris, but in another courtyard one does not remove the debris? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult; there is no contradiction between the halakhot. This case, where one removes the debris, is when they all left for another courtyard and it is clear that the Jew was among them.

Consequently, the principle of being in a fixed location still applies, and it is considered a case of uncertainty. That other situation is when only a minority of them left for the other courtyard, and it is unknown whether the Jew left with them.

³⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: Did Shmuel actually say this, that one does not follow the majority with regard to saving a life? Didn't we learn in a mishna: If one finds an abandoned child in a city and his parents are unknown, if the majority of the city are gentiles the child is considered a gentile; and if the majority of the city are Jews the child is considered a Jew; if the city is composed of half gentiles and half Jews, the child is considered a Jew? And Rav said: They taught this, that he is a Jew, only with respect to sustaining him but not with respect to attributing a lineage to him. One does not say that he is definitely Jewish based on the majority. Therefore, with regard to the halakhot of marriage, his status remains uncertain. If the abandoned child is a girl, she is not permitted to marry a priest, who may marry only a woman of certain lineage.

³⁰⁸ And Shmuel said: This halakha of the status of a found child is with regard to removing debris from on top of him, implying that if there is a majority of gentiles in the city where he is found, one does not violate Shabbat by removing the debris from the child to save his life. This implies that one does follow the majority in the case of saving a life. The Gemara answers: When this statement of Shmuel was stated, it was stated with regard to the first halakha. Shmuel's intent was to be lenient, and his statement should be understood as follows: If the majority are gentiles, he is a gentile. Shmuel said: But with regard to the matter of saving a life it is not so. Rather, one saves him based on the uncertainty.

³⁰⁹ § It was taught that if there is a majority of gentiles in the city, a foundling is considered to have the status of a gentile. The Gemara asks: To what halakha does this statement relate? Rav Pappa said: It relates to feeding him non-kosher food. One need not protect the child from every prohibition and may even feed him non-kosher food, as though he were a gentile. It was further taught: If there is a majority of Jews, he is a Jew. The Gemara asks: To what halakha does this relate? The Gemara answers: It relates to returning a lost object to him. In such a case it is assumed that he is definitely a Jew. Consequently, Jews must return lost objects to him, whereas there is no obligation to return lost objects to gentiles.

³¹⁰ It was further stated: If the city is half gentile and half Jewish, the foundling has the status of a Jew. The Gemara asks: To what halakha does this relate? Reish Lakish said: It is referring to halakhot of damages. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? If we say that our ox, i.e., an ox belonging to another Jew, gored his ox, one could ask: How can he make a claim like a Jew? Let him bring proof that he is Jewish, and only then may he take the money for damages, since the burden of proof rests upon the claimant. Since he cannot prove his Jewish status, he has no claim.

³¹¹ The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary when his innocuous ox, which has gored fewer than three times, gored our ox, i.e., an ox belonging to a Jew, in which case he gives him half, which is what a Jew pays for damages caused by an innocuous ox. However, a gentile must make full restitution for the damage caused. The foundling does not pay the other half, which a gentile gives to a Jew if his ox harms a Jew's ox. Let me say to the one who suffered the damage: Bring proof that I am not a Jew and take the money. In that case, the burden of proof rests upon the one who suffered the damage.

³¹² § It was taught in the mishna: With regard to one upon whom a rockslide fell, and there is uncertainty whether he is there under the debris or whether he is not there; and there is uncertainty whether he is still alive or whether he is dead; and there is uncertainty whether the person under the debris is a gentile or whether he is Jew, one clears the pile from atop him. The Gemara asks: What is the mishna saying? Why does it bring three different uncertainties to illustrate the principle that one violates Shabbat to save a life even in a case of uncertainty?

³¹³ The Gemara explains: It is speaking using the style of: Needless to say, and the mishna should be understood as follows: Needless to say, in a case where it is uncertain whether he is there or not there, one removes the debris, since if he is there and he is alive, one must clear the debris. But even if it is uncertain whether he is alive or dead, one must clear the debris. And needless to say, when there is uncertainty whether he is alive or dead, but it is certain that he is a Jew, one must clear the debris. Rather, one must clear the debris even if there is uncertainty whether he is a gentile or a Jew.

³¹⁴ § The mishna taught: If they found him alive, they continue to remove the debris. The Gemara is surprised at this: If they find him alive, it is obvious that they remove the debris, since that is saving a life. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary to teach that one must desecrate Shabbat for his sake even if it is clear that he will live only a short while and will die soon after.

³¹⁵ § The mishna taught: If they found him dead, they should leave him. The Gemara is surprised at this: Isn't this also obvious? What allowance might there be to desecrate Shabbat for the sake of a corpse? The Gemara answers: No, this ruling is necessary according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Lakish, as it was taught in a baraita: One may not save a corpse from a fire, since one may not violate Shabbat for the sake of the dead. Rabbi Yehuda ben Lakish said: I heard that one may save a corpse from a fire. The Gemara challenges: Even Rabbi Yehuda ben Lakish said this only with regard to a fire because a person is agitated over his dead relative, whose body might burn in the fire. If you do not permit him to remove the corpse he may come to extinguish the fire and transgress a severe Torah prohibition. However, here, in the case of a rockslide or building collapse, if you do not permit him to remove the debris, what might he do? In this case, there is no concern of Shabbat desecration, and preserving the dignity of the dead does not override Shabbat.

³¹⁶ The Rabbis taught: If a person is buried under a collapsed building, until what point does one check to clarify whether the victim is still alive? Until what point is he allowed to continue clearing the debris? They said: One clears until the victim's nose. If there is no sign of life, i.e., if he is not breathing, he is certainly dead. And some say: One clears until the victim's heart to check for a heartbeat. If several people are buried and one checked and found the upper ones under the debris dead, he should not say: The lower ones are likely also already dead, and there is no point in continuing to search. There was an incident where they found the upper ones dead and the lower ones alive.

³¹⁷ The Gemara comments: Let us say that the dispute between these tanna'im who disagree about checking for signs of life is like the dispute between these tanna'im who disagree about the formation of the fetus. As it was taught in a baraita: From what point is the fetus created? It is from its head, as it is stated: "You are He Who took me [gozi] out of my mother's womb" (Psalms 71:6), and it says: "Cut off [gozi] your hair, and cast it away" (Jeremiah 7:29). These verses suggest that one is created from the head, the place of the hair. Abba Shaul says: A person is created from his navel, and he sends his roots in every direction until he attains the image of a person. The tanna who says that the

presence of life is determined based on the nose holds in accordance with the opinion of the tanna who maintains that the formation of a fetus begins with its head. Likewise, the tanna who says the presence of life is determined based on the heart holds in accordance with the opinion of the one who thinks the formation of a fetus begins with its navel.

³¹⁸ The Gemara rejects this: Even if you say that the formation of a fetus from the navel is the opinion of Abba Shaul, he may nevertheless require one to check the nose for signs of life. Until now, Abba Shaul spoke there only about formation, saying that everything is created from its middle; however, as for saving a life, even Abba Shaul admits that the main sign of life is in the nose, as it is written: “All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life” (Genesis 7:22).

³¹⁹ Rav Pappa said: The dispute with regard to how far to check for signs of life applies when the digger begins removing the rubble from below, starting with the feet, to above. In such a case it is insufficient to check until his heart; rather, one must continue removing rubble until he is able to check his nose for breath. But if one cleared the rubble from above to below, once he checked as far as the victim’s nose he is not required to check further, as it is written: “All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life” (Genesis 7:22).

³²⁰ § The Gemara relates: It once happened that Rabbi Yishmael, and Rabbi Akiva, and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya were walking on the road, and Levi HaSadar and Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, were walking respectfully behind them, since they were younger and did not walk alongside their teachers. This question was asked before them: From where is it derived that saving a life overrides Shabbat?

³²¹ Rabbi Yishmael answered and said that it is stated: “If a thief be found breaking in and be struck so that he dies, there shall be no blood-guiltiness for him” (Exodus 22:1). Now, if this is true for the thief, where there is uncertainty whether he comes to take money or to take lives, and it is known that bloodshed renders the land impure, since it is stated about a murderer: “And you shall not defile the land” (Numbers 35:34), and it causes the Divine Presence to depart from the Jewish people, as the verse continues: “In the midst of which I dwell, for I the Lord dwell in the midst of the children of Israel” (Numbers 35:34), and even so the home owner is permitted to save himself at the cost of the thief’s life, then a fortiori saving a life overrides Shabbat.

³²² Rabbi Akiva answered and said that it is stated: “And if a man comes purposefully upon his neighbor to slay him with guile, you shall take him from My altar, that he may die” (Exodus 21:14). The phrase “take him from My altar” implies that if the murderer is a priest and comes to perform the service, one does not wait for him to do so but takes him to his execution immediately. But one should not take him from on top of My altar. If he already began the service and is in the midst of it, one does not take him down from the altar immediately but instead allows him to finish his service. And Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They taught only that a priest is not removed from the altar in order to execute him for murder,

³²³ but to preserve a life, e.g., if the priest can testify to the innocence of one who is sentenced to death, one removes him even from on top of My altar, even while he is sacrificing an offering. Just as this priest, about whom there is uncertainty whether there is substance to his words of testimony or whether there is no substance to his words, is taken from the Temple service in order to save a life, and Temple service overrides Shabbat, so too, a fortiori, saving a life overrides Shabbat. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya answered and said: Just as the mitzva of circumcision, which rectifies only one of the 248

limbs of the body, overrides Shabbat, so too, a fortiori, saving one's whole body, which is entirely involved in mitzvot, overrides Shabbat.

³²⁴ Other tanna'im debated this same issue. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says that it is stated: "But keep my Shabbatot" (Exodus 31:13). One might have thought that this applies to everyone in all circumstances; therefore, the verse states "but," a term that restricts and qualifies. It implies that there are circumstances where one must keep Shabbat and circumstances where one must desecrate it, i.e., to save a life. Rabbi Yonatan ben Yosef says that it is stated: "For it is sacred to you" (Exodus 31:14). This implies that Shabbat is given into your hands, and you are not given to it to die on account of Shabbat.

³²⁵ Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya said: It is stated: "And the children of Israel shall keep Shabbat, to observe Shabbat" (Exodus 31:16). The Torah said: Desecrate one Shabbat on his behalf so he will observe many Shabbatot. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: If I would have been there among those Sages who debated this question, I would have said that my proof is preferable to theirs, as it states: "You shall keep My statutes and My ordinances, which a person shall do and live by them" (Leviticus 18:5), and not that he should die by them. In all circumstances, one must take care not to die as a result of fulfilling the mitzvot.

³²⁶ Rava commented on this: All of these arguments have refutations except for that of Shmuel, which has no refutation. The Gemara explains Rava's claim: The proof brought by Rabbi Yishmael from the thief who breaks in could perhaps be refuted based on the principle of Rava, as Rava said: What is the reason for the halakha about the thief who breaks in? There is a presumption that while a person is being robbed he does not restrain himself with respect to his money. And this thief knows that the homeowner will rise to oppose him and said to himself from the start: If he rises against me, I will kill him. And the Torah states: If a person comes to kill you, rise to kill him first. We found a source for saving a life that is in certain danger, but from where do we derive that even in a case where there is uncertainty as to whether a life is in danger one may desecrate Shabbat? Consequently, Rabbi Yishmael's argument is refuted.

³²⁷ The proof of Rabbi Akiva can also be refuted. He brought the case of removing a priest from altar service in order to have him testify on another's behalf, since his testimony might acquit the accused and save him from execution. But perhaps that halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abaye, as Abaye said: If the accused says he has a witness in his favor, we send a pair of rabbis on his behalf to determine if his words of testimony have substance. These rabbis would first check that the testimony of the priest is substantive before removing him from the altar. If so, we have found that one interrupts the Temple service to save a life from certain danger, but from where do we derive that one interrupts the Temple service when the likelihood of saving life is uncertain?

³²⁸ And for all the other arguments as well, we have found proofs for saving a life from certain danger. But for cases of uncertainty, from where do we derive this? For this reason, all the arguments are refuted. However, the proof that Shmuel brought from the verse: "And live by them," which teaches that one should not even put a life in possible danger to observe mitzvot, there is certainly no refutation. Ravina said, and some say it was Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak who said with regard to this superior proof of Shmuel: One spicy pepper is better than a whole basket of squash, since its flavor is more powerful than all the others.

³²⁹ MISHNA: A sin-offering, which atones for unwitting performance of transgressions punishable by karet, and a definite guilt-offering, which is brought for robbery and misuse of consecrated items, atone for those sins. Death and Yom Kippur atone for sins when accompanied by repentance. Repentance itself atones for minor transgressions, for both positive mitzvot and negative mitzvot. And repentance places punishment for severe transgressions in abeyance until Yom Kippur comes and completely atones for the transgression. With regard to one who says: I will sin and then I will repent, I will sin and I will repent, Heaven does not provide him the opportunity to repent, and he will remain a sinner all his days. With regard to one who says: I will sin and Yom Kippur will atone for my sins, Yom Kippur does not atone for his sins. Furthermore, for transgressions between a person and God, Yom Kippur atones; however, for transgressions between a person and another, Yom Kippur does not atone until he appeases the other person.

³³⁰ Similarly, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya taught that point from the verse: “From all your sins you shall be cleansed before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:30). For transgressions between a person and God, Yom Kippur atones; however, for transgressions between a person and another, Yom Kippur does not atone until he appeases the other person. In conclusion, Rabbi Akiva said: How fortunate are you, Israel; before Whom are you purified, and Who purifies you? It is your Father in Heaven, as it is stated: “And I will sprinkle purifying water upon you, and you shall be purified” (Ezekiel 36:25). And it says: “The ritual bath of Israel is God” (Jeremiah 17:13). Just as a ritual bath purifies the impure, so too, the Holy One, Blessed be He, purifies Israel.

³³¹ GEMARA: The mishna says that a definite guilt-offering atones for sins. The Gemara analyzes this: With regard to a definite guilt-offering, yes, it does atone for sins. This implies that an uncertain guilt-offering does not. The Gemara asks: But isn’t atonement written with regard to it? Why, then, doesn’t it atone? The Gemara answers: Those, the sin-offerings and definite guilt-offerings, facilitate complete atonement, but an uncertain guilt-offering does not facilitate complete atonement. Instead, this offering provides temporary atonement for an individual, to protect him from punishment until he becomes aware of his sin and brings the appropriate offering.

³³² Alternatively, there is this distinction: Nothing else facilitates the atonement of those sin-offerings and definite guilt-offerings, whereas something else does facilitate the atonement of the uncertain guilt-offering, as we learned in a mishna: If Yom Kippur passed, those who are obligated to bring sin-offerings and definite guilt-offerings are still obligated to bring their offerings; however, those obligated to bring uncertain guilt-offerings are exempt because Yom Kippur atoned for them.

³³³ § It was taught in the mishna that death and Yom Kippur atone for sins when accompanied by repentance. The Gemara analyzes this: With repentance, yes, they do atone for sins; but by themselves, without repentance, they do not. Let us say that the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says that for all transgressions in the Torah, whether one repented or did not repent, Yom Kippur atones, with the exception of rejecting the yoke of Torah and mitzvot; and denying the Holy One, Blessed be He; and interpreting the Torah falsely; and violating the covenant of the flesh, i.e., circumcision. In these cases, if one repents Yom Kippur atones for his sin, and if one does not repent Yom Kippur does not atone for his sin.

³³⁴ The Gemara rejects this: This is no proof; even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the mishna can be understood as follows: Repentance still

requires Yom Kippur in order to complete the atonement, whereas Yom Kippur does not require repentance but atones even without it.

³³⁵ § It was taught in the mishna: Repentance itself atones for minor transgressions, for both a positive mitzva and for a negative mitzva. The Gemara is surprised at this: Now that it was stated that repentance atones for a negative mitzva, which is severe and warrants lashes, is it necessary to also teach that it atones for a positive mitzva, which is more lenient? Rav Yehuda said: This is what it said, i.e., the mishna should be understood as follows: Repentance atones for a positive mitzva and for a negative mitzva whose violation can be rectified by a positive mitzva. One is not punished by a court for violating a prohibition for which the Torah prescribes a positive act as a corrective measure and which thereby has the same halakha as a positive mitzva.

³³⁶ The Gemara asks: But does repentance not atone for a full-fledged negative mitzva? The Gemara raises a contradiction from a separate source: It was taught that these are minor transgressions: A positive mitzva and a negative mitzva,

³³⁷ except for: “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” (Exodus 20:7), about which the Torah states: “For God will not absolve him who takes His name in vain” (Exodus 20:7). The Gemara answers: It is not that this is the only negative mitzva that is not a minor transgression; rather, it is: “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” and any prohibition similar to it, meaning all severe prohibitions that carry punishment by a court.

³³⁸ The Gemara proposes: Come and hear from that which was taught: Rabbi Yehuda says: For any sin from “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” and below, i.e., prohibitions less severe than that, repentance atones. For any sin from “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” and above, repentance suspends punishment and Yom Kippur atones. The Gemara rejects this: This does not constitute proof either, since one could say that it is referring to: “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” and anything similar to it.

³³⁹ Come and hear from a different source that was taught: Since it was stated at Horeb with regard to repentance: “Absolve,” one might have thought that even the transgression of: “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain” is included among them; therefore, the verses states: “Will not absolve” (Exodus 20:6). One might have thought this is also true for those who are liable for violating all other prohibitions; therefore, the verse states: “His name.” God does not absolve the one who disrespects His name, but He absolves those who are liable for violating all other prohibitions and repent. This is proof that those who violate all other prohibitions are not comparable to one who violates: “You shall not take the name of the Lord, your God, in vain.”

³⁴⁰ The Gemara answers: This is a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: For what does repentance atone? It atones for a positive mitzva and for a negative mitzva that can be rectified through a positive mitzva. And for what does repentance suspend punishment and Yom Kippur atone? It is for sins punishable by karet, and for sins punishable by the death penalty from the earthly court, and for full-fledged negative mitzvot. This indicates that there is a tanna who distinguishes between prohibitions that warrant lashes and those that do not. Therefore, there is a tannaitic dispute as to whether or not prohibitions that warrant punishment by the courts can be rectified by repentance alone.

³⁴¹ § Since the Gemara cited this baraita, it now clarifies part of it. The Master said: Since it was stated at Horeb with regard to repentance: “Absolve.” The Gemara asks: From where do we derive

this concept that repentance was mentioned there? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Elazar says: It is not possible to say “absolve” (Exodus 34:7) about all transgressions, since “will not absolve” is already stated (Exodus 34:7). And it is not possible to say “will not absolve,” since “absolve” is already stated. How so? The Holy One, Blessed be He, absolves those who repent and does not absolve those who do not repent. Therefore, both “repentance” and “absolve” were mentioned at Horeb.

³⁴² Furthermore, with regard to the topic of repentance, Rabbi Matya ben Ḥarash asked Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya when Rabbi Elazar was in Rome: Have you heard the teaching that there are four distinctions in the process of atonement that Rabbi Yishmael would derive? He said to him: They are not four but three distinctions, and repentance is necessary with each one.

³⁴³ These are the categories: If one violates a positive mitzva and repents, he is forgiven even before he moves from his place, i.e. immediately, as it is stated: “Return, you backsliding children, I will heal your backsliding” (Jeremiah 3:22), implying that when one repents he is immediately forgiven. If one violates a prohibition and repents, repentance suspends his punishment and Yom Kippur atones for his sin, as it is stated: “For on this day shall atonement be made for you, to purify you from all your sins” (Leviticus 16:30). If one commits a transgression that warrants karet or a sin punishable by death from the earthly court and then repents, repentance and Yom Kippur suspend his punishment, and suffering absolves and completes the atonement, as it is stated: “Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with strokes” (Psalms 89:33).

³⁴⁴ But in the case of one who has caused desecration of God’s name, his repentance has no power to suspend punishment, nor does Yom Kippur have power to atone for his sin, nor does suffering alone have power to absolve him. Rather, all these suspend punishment, and death absolves him, as it is stated: “And the Lord of Hosts revealed Himself to my ears: This iniquity shall not be atoned for until you die” (Isaiah 22:14).

³⁴⁵ § The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances that cause desecration of God’s name? Rav said: For example, in the case of someone like me, since I am an important public figure, if I take meat from a butcher and do not give him money immediately, people are likely to think that I did not mean to pay at all. They would consider me a thief and learn from my behavior that one is permitted to steal. Abaye said: They taught this statement of Rav only in a place where they do not ask for the money, where it is not customary for the butcher himself to come and collect payment from the customer. When the customer does not pay immediately, people may suspect him of theft. But in a place where they ask for the money from the customer some time later, we have no problem with doing this. Since everyone understands he is buying on credit, he is not desecrating God’s name.

³⁴⁶ Ravina said: My native city of Meḥasya is a place where they ask for and collect the money. The Gemara relates that when Abaye bought meat from two partners, he would give the money to this one and the money to this one, so that each would know that he had paid. And afterward he would bring them together and perform the calculation to see whether he received his change.

³⁴⁷ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: What is an example of desecration of God’s name? For example, someone like me, if I would walk four cubits without Torah and without phylacteries, and the onlookers did not know that it is only on account of my body’s weakness, that would be a desecration of God’s name. Yitzḥak from the school of Rabbi Yannai said: Any case when one’s friends are embarrassed on account of his reputation, meaning his friends are embarrassed due to things they hear about him,

this is a desecration of God's name. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: One creates a profanation of God's name, for example, when people say about him: May his Master forgive so-and-so for the sins he has done.

³⁴⁸ Abaye said: As it was taught in a baraita that it is stated: "And you shall love the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 6:5), which means that you shall make the name of Heaven beloved. How should one do so? One should do so in that he should read Torah, and learn Mishna, and serve Torah scholars, and he should be pleasant with people in his business transactions. What do people say about such a person? Fortunate is his father who taught him Torah, fortunate is his teacher who taught him Torah, woe to the people who have not studied Torah. So-and-so, who taught him Torah, see how pleasant are his ways, how proper are his deeds. The verse states about him and others like him: "You are My servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified" (Isaiah 49:3).

³⁴⁹ But one who reads Torah, and learns Mishna, and serves Torah scholars, but his business practices are not done faithfully, and he does not speak pleasantly with other people, what do people say about him? Woe to so-and-so who studied Torah, woe to his father who taught him Torah, woe to his teacher who taught him Torah. So-and-so who studied Torah, see how destructive are his deeds, and how ugly are his ways. About him and others like him the verse states that the gentiles will say: "Men said of them: These are the people of the Lord, yet they had to leave His land" (Ezekiel 36:20). Through their sins and subsequent exile, such people have desecrated the name of God.

³⁵⁰ § Further on the topic of repentance, Rabbi Ḥama bar Ḥanina said: Great is repentance, as it brings healing to the world, as it is stated: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely" (Hosea 14:5), which teaches that repentance from sin brings healing.

³⁵¹ Rabbi Ḥama bar Ḥanina raised a contradiction between two verses. It is written in one verse: "Return, you backsliding children" (Jeremiah 3:14), implying that initially when you sinned, it was only because you were backsliding, i.e., rebelling. It was merely an act of immaturity and foolishness and could be ignored as if it had never happened. But it is written: "I will heal your backsliding" (Jeremiah 3:22), implying that He will heal the sin from this point onward, and that they are still sinners. He resolved this contradiction, explaining that this is not difficult: Here, where everything is forgiven as if the Jewish people never sinned, it is referring to repentance out of love; there, where the sin is still remembered despite the forgiveness and repentance, it is referring to repentance out of fear.

³⁵² Similarly, Rabbi Yehuda raised a contradiction between two verses. It is written: "Return, you backsliding children I will heal your backsliding" (Jeremiah 3:22), implying that anyone can achieve healing, which is dependent only on repentance. But it also states: "Return, O backsliding children, says the Lord, for I am a lord to you, and I will take you one from a city, and two from a family" (Jeremiah 3:14), implying that repentance is available only to certain individuals. He resolved the contradiction and explained that this is not difficult: Here, it is referring to repentance out of love or fear, which few people achieve; there, it referring is repentance through suffering, as everyone has thoughts of repentance when they suffer. Rabbi Levi said: Great is repentance, as it reaches the heavenly throne, as it is stated: "Return, Israel, to the Lord your God" (Hosea 14:2). This implies that repentance literally reaches to God.

³⁵³ § Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Great is repentance, as it overrides even a prohibition of the Torah. How so? As it is stated that God said: "...Saying: If a man sends away his wife and she goes from him and

becomes another man's, may he return to her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted? But you have committed adultery with many lovers; and would you yet return to Me, said the Lord" (Jeremiah 3:1). Indeed, the Torah states: "Her former husband, who sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife after she has been made impure" (Deuteronomy 24:4). The relationship between the Jewish people and the Holy One, Blessed be He, is compared to that between a husband and wife. Just as it is prohibited for an adulterous wife to return to her husband, it should be prohibited for the Jewish people to return to God from their sins, yet repentance overrides this prohibition.

³⁵⁴ Rabbi Yonatan said: Great is repentance, which hastens the redemption, as it is stated: "And a redeemer will come to Zion, and to those who repent from transgression in Jacob" (Isaiah 59:20). What is the reason that a redeemer will come to Zion? It is because there are those who repent from transgression in Jacob.

³⁵⁵ Reish Lakish said: Great is repentance, as the penitent's intentional sins are counted for him as unwitting transgressions, as it is stated: "Return, Israel, to the Lord your God, for you have stumbled in your iniquity" (Hosea 14:2). The Gemara analyzes this: Doesn't "iniquity" mean an intentional sin? Yet the prophet calls it stumbling, implying that one who repents is considered as though he only stumbled accidentally in his transgression. The Gemara asks: Is that so? Didn't Reish Lakish himself say: Great is repentance, as one's intentional sins are counted for him as merits, as it is stated: "And when the wicked turns from his wickedness, and does that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby" (Ezekiel 33:19), and all his deeds, even his transgressions, will become praiseworthy? The Gemara reconciles: This is not difficult: Here, when one repents out of love, his sins become like merits; there, when one repents out of fear, his sins are counted as unwitting transgressions.

³⁵⁶ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: Great is repentance, which lengthens the years of a person's life, as it is stated: "When the wicked man turns from his wickedness that he has committed, and does that which is lawful and right, he will preserve his life" (Ezekiel 18:27).

³⁵⁷ § Rabbi Yitzḥak said: They say in the West, Eretz Yisrael, in the name of Rabba bar Mari: Come and see that the attribute of flesh and blood is unlike the attribute of the Holy One, Blessed be He. With flesh and blood people, if one insults his friend with words, it is uncertain whether the victim will be appeased by him or will not be appeased by him. And if you say he will be appeased, it is still uncertain whether he will be appeased by words alone or will not be appeased by words alone, and one must try to appease him in other ways.

³⁵⁸ But with regard to the Holy One, Blessed be He, if a person commits a transgression in private, God is appeased by words, as it is stated: "Take with you words and return to God" (Hosea 14:3). And not only that, but God considers it as though he has done a favor for God by repenting, as it is stated: "Accept that which is good" (Hosea 14:3). And not only that, but the verse ascribes him credit as though he had sacrificed bulls, as it is stated: "So we will render for bulls the offering of our lips" (Hosea 14:3). Lest you say he is considered only like one who offers obligatory bulls, therefore the verse states: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely" (Hosea 14:5). Repentance is considered as though it were the sacrifice of a free-will offering.

³⁵⁹ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Meir would say: Great is repentance because the entire world is forgiven on account of one individual who repents, as it is stated: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely; for My anger has turned away from him" (Hosea 14:5). It does not say: From

them, i.e., from the sinners, but “from him,” i.e., from that individual. Because he repented, everyone will be healed.

³⁶⁰ § With regard to repentance, the Gemara asks: What are the circumstances that demonstrate that one has completely repented? Rav Yehuda said: For example, the prohibited matter came to his hand a first time and a second time, and he was saved from it, thereby proving that he has completely repented. Rav Yehuda demonstrated what he meant: If one has the opportunity to sin with the same woman he sinned with previously, at the same time and the same place, and everything is aligned as it was that first time when he sinned, but this time he overcomes his inclination, it proves his repentance is complete, and he is forgiven.

³⁶¹ Rav Yehuda said that Rav raised a contradiction: It is written: “Fortunate is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is hidden” (Psalms 32:1), implying that it is inappropriate for one to reveal his sins, and it is written: “He who hides his transgressions shall not prosper” (Proverbs 28:13). He resolved the contradiction as follows: This is not difficult. Here it is referring to a publicized sin; since his sin is public knowledge it is fitting for him to also publicize his repentance. There, it is referring to a sin that is not publicized, in which case it is inappropriate to publicize one’s repentance. Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav Nahman said: Here, it is referring to sins a person commits against another; he must publicize his repentance so that those who hear him may persuade the other to forgive him. There, it is referring to sins a person commits against God, in which case he need not repent publicly.

³⁶² § It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: When a person commits a transgression the first time, he is forgiven; a second time, he is forgiven; a third time, he is forgiven; but the fourth time, he is not forgiven, as it is stated: “Thus said the Lord: For three transgressions of Israel, but for four I will not reverse it” (Amos 2:6). And it says: “All these things does God do twice or three times with a man” (Job 33:29).

³⁶³ The Gemara asks: What is: And it says? Why did he need to bring an additional biblical proof when the first verse seems to suffice? The Gemara explains: Lest you say that this statement that the Holy One, Blessed be He, forgives easily the first three times applies to a community but not to an individual, come and hear proof from another verse that states: “All these things does God do twice or three times with a man,” implying that this is so even for an individual. From this point onward, he is not forgiven, as it is stated: “For three transgressions of Israel, but for four I will not reverse it.”

³⁶⁴ § The Sages taught in the Tosefta: With regard to transgressions that one confessed on this Yom Kippur, he should not confess them on another Yom Kippur, since he has already been forgiven. But if he repeated those same transgressions during the year, he must confess them again on another Yom Kippur. And if he did not repeat them but did confess them again, about him the verse states: “As a dog that returns to its vomit, so is a fool who repeats his folly” (Proverbs 26:11), since it is inappropriate to go back and mention one’s earlier sins.

³⁶⁵ Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov says: If one confesses in subsequent years, all the more so is he praiseworthy, as he remembers his earlier sins and is thereby humbled, as it is stated: “For I know my transgressions; and my sin is ever before me” (Psalms 51:5). But how do I establish the meaning of the verse: “Like a dog that returns to its vomit”? It may be established in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, as Rav Huna said: When a person commits a transgression and repeats it, it is permitted

to him. The Gemara is surprised at this: Can it enter your mind that it is permitted to him because he has sinned twice? Rather, say it becomes to him as if it were permitted.

³⁶⁶ Furthermore, during confession, one must detail the sin he committed and not suffice with a general admission of sin, as it is stated: “And Moses returned to the Lord and said: Please, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made themselves a god of gold” (Exodus 32:31); this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava. Rabbi Akiva says that the verse states: “Fortunate is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is hidden” (Psalms 32:1), which teaches that one need not detail his sins. But what is the meaning of that which Moses said: “And have made themselves a god of gold” (Exodus 32:31)? It should be understood in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yannai, as Rabbi Yannai said: Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the universe, it is the silver and gold that you gave to the Jewish people in abundance, until they said: Enough, which caused them to make a god of gold. Consequently, the phrase: “And have made themselves a god of gold,” is not a description of the sin but an explanation and justification of it.

³⁶⁷ It is said that two good leaders arose for the Jewish people: Moses and David. Moses said: Let my disgrace be written, i.e., may the sin I committed be written explicitly, as it is stated: “Because you did not believe in Me, to sanctify Me” (Numbers 20:12). In contrast, David said: Let my disgrace not be written, as it is stated: “Fortunate is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is hidden” (Psalms 32:1).

³⁶⁸ The Gemara explains: A parable with regard to Moses and David shows to what this may be compared. It may be compared to two women who were flogged in court for their sins. One of them sinned by engaging in forbidden relations, and one ate unripe figs of the Sabbatical Year although they are forbidden. The woman who ate the unripe figs of the Sabbatical Year said to the court: Please publicize the sin for which I am being flogged, so that people will not say that what that woman is being flogged for is also what this woman is being flogged for. They brought unripe figs of the Sabbatical Year, and hung them around her neck, and announced before her, saying: She is receiving lashes on account of the Sabbatical Year. Moses requested that his sin be publicized so that people would not think that he committed the same sins as the members of his generation, i.e., the Golden Calf and the report of the spies.

³⁶⁹ Furthermore, they said: One exposes the hypocrites due to the desecration of God’s name, so others will not think that they are truly righteous and that their deeds bear imitating, as it is stated: “When a righteous man turns from his righteousness and commits iniquity, I will lay a stumbling block before him” (Ezekiel 3:20). That is, when people do not know that someone is wicked to the core, he causes other people to err and this desecrates the name of God when it is revealed. The repentance of utterly wicked people prevents suffering from coming upon them. And although the sentence of judgment has already been signed against them for suffering, their repentance prevents them from being punished.

³⁷⁰ The tranquility of the wicked is ultimately their destruction, as in their contentment they sit and think about forbidden matters. And authority buries one who owns it. He was naked when he entered into power, and he will be naked when he leaves it, and if only his exit would be like his entrance, without sin and added iniquity. The Gemara relates: When Rav would leave his home to go to court to judge cases, he would say this of himself: Of his own will, he goes to die, because a judge who misjudges a case is liable to death at the hand of Heaven; and he does not fulfill the will of his

household and he goes empty-handed to his household, because a judge does not receive a salary; and if only his entrance would be like his exit, without sin or transgression.

³⁷¹ When Rava would go to judge, he would say this of himself:

³⁷² Of his own will, he goes to die; and he does not fulfill the will of his household, and he goes empty-handed to his household; and if only his entrance would be like his exit. And when he saw a line of people [ambuha] following after him out of respect for him, he said: "Though his excellency ascends to the heavens, and his head reaches to the clouds, yet he shall perish forever like his own dung; they who have seen him will say: Where is he?" (Job 20:6–7). This teaches that when one achieves power, it can lead to his downfall. When they would carry Rav Zutra on their shoulders during the Shabbat of the Festival when he taught, he would recite the following to avoid becoming arrogant: "For power is not forever, and does the crown endure for all generations?" (Proverbs 27:24).

³⁷³ § It was further taught: "It is not good to respect the person of the wicked" (Proverbs 18:5), meaning, it is not good for wicked people when they are respected in this world and are not punished for their sins. For example, it was not good for Ahab to be respected in this world, as it is stated: "Because he humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the evil in his days" (I Kings 21:29), and Ahab thereby lost his share in the World-to-Come.

³⁷⁴ The opposite is also true. The complete verse states: "It is not good to respect the person of the wicked, to turn aside the righteous in judgment" (Proverbs 18:5), meaning: It is good for the righteous when they are not respected in this world and are punished in this world for their sins. For example, it was good for Moses that he was not respected in this world, as it is stated: "Because you did not believe in Me, to sanctify Me" (Numbers 20:12). The Gemara analyzes this: Had you believed in Me, your time still would not have come to depart the world.

³⁷⁵ They said: Fortunate are the righteous because not only do they accumulate merit for themselves, but they accumulate merit for their children and their children's children until the end of all generations; as there were several sons of Aaron who essentially deserved to be burned like Nadav and Avihu, as it is stated: "The sons of Aaron who were left" (Leviticus 10:16), implying that others were left as well although they deserved to be burned with their brothers. But the merit of their father protected them, and they and their descendants were priests for all time.

³⁷⁶ On the other hand: Woe to the wicked, as not only do they render themselves liable, but they also render their children and children's children liable until the end of all generations. For example, Canaan had many children who deserved to be ordained as rabbis and instructors of the public due to their great stature in Torah study, like Tavi, the servant of Rabban Gamliel, who was famous for his wisdom; but their father's liability caused them to remain as slaves.

³⁷⁷ Furthermore: Whoever accumulates merit for the public will not have sin come to his hand, and God protects him from failing; but whoever causes the public to sin has almost no ability to repent. The Gemara explains: What is the reason that whoever accumulates merit for the public will not have sin come to his hand? It is so that he will not be in Gehenna while his students are in the Garden of Eden, as it is stated: "For You will not abandon my soul to the nether-world; neither will You suffer Your godly one to see the pit" (Psalms 16:10). On the other hand, whoever causes the public to sin has almost no ability to repent, so that he will not be in the Garden of Eden while his students are in Gehenna, as it is stated: "A man who is laden with the blood of any person shall hasten his steps to

the pit; none will support him” (Proverbs 28:17). Since he oppressed others and caused them to sin, he shall have no escape.

³⁷⁸ § The Gemara returns to interpreting the mishna. It states there that one who says: I will sin and I will repent, I will sin and I will repent, is not given the opportunity to repent. The Gemara asks: Why do I need the mishna to say twice: I will sin and I will repent, I will sin and repent? The Gemara explains that this is in accordance with that which Rav Huna said that Rav said, as Rav Huna said that Rav said: Once a person commits a transgression and repeats it, it becomes permitted to him. The Gemara is surprised at this: Can it enter your mind that it becomes permitted to him? Rather, say that it becomes to him as though it were permitted. Consequently, the sinner who repeats his sin has difficulty abandoning his sin, and the repetition of his sin is reflected in the repetition of the phrase.

³⁷⁹ It is stated in the mishna that if one says: I will sin and Yom Kippur will atone for my sins, Yom Kippur does not atone for his sins. The Gemara comments: Let us say that the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Yom Kippur atones for all transgressions of the Torah, whether one repented or did not repent. The Gemara answers: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, it is different when it is on the basis of being permitted to sin. Even Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi agrees that Yom Kippur does not atone for the transgressions one commits only because he knows that Yom Kippur will atone for them.

³⁸⁰ § It was taught in the mishna: Yom Kippur atones for sins committed against God but does not atone for sins committed against another person. Rav Yosef bar Ḥavu raised a contradiction before Rabbi Abbahu: The mishna states that Yom Kippur does not atone for sins committed against a fellow person, but isn't it written: “If one man sin against another, God [Elohim] shall judge him [ufilelo]” (I Samuel 2:25). The word *ufilelo*, which may also refer to prayer, implies that if he prays, God will grant the sinner forgiveness. He answered him: Who is Elohim mentioned in the verse? It is referring to a judge [*elohim*] and not to God, and the word *ufilelo* in the verse indicates judgment. Atonement occurs only after justice has been done toward the injured party by means of a court ruling.

³⁸¹ Rav Yosef bar Ḥavu said to him: If so, say the following with regard to the latter clause of the verse: “But if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat [yitpalle] for him?” (I Samuel 2:25). This is difficult, since it has been established that the root *pll* is interpreted in this verse as indicating judgment, and therefore the latter clause of the verse implies that if one sins toward God there is no one to judge him. Rabbi Abbahu answered him: This is what the verse is saying: If one man sins against another, God [Elohim] shall forgive him [ufilelo]; if the sinner appeases the person against whom he has sinned, he will be forgiven. But if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat [yitpalle] for him? Repentance and good deeds. The root *pll* is to be interpreted as indicating forgiveness rather than judgment.

³⁸² § Rabbi Yitzḥak said: One who angers his friend, even only verbally, must appease him, as it is stated: “My son, if you have become a guarantor for your neighbor, if you have struck your hands for a stranger, you are snared by the words of your mouth... Do this now, my son, and deliver yourself, seeing you have come into the hand of your neighbor. Go, humble yourself [hitrapes] and urge [rehav] your neighbor” (Proverbs 6:1–3). This should be understood as follows: If you have money that you owe him, open the palm of [hater pisat] your hand to your neighbor and pay the money that

you owe; and if not, if you have sinned against him verbally, increase [harbe] friends for him, i.e., send many people as your messengers to ask him for forgiveness.

³⁸³ Rav Ḥisda said: And one must appease the one he has insulted with three rows of three people, as it is stated: “He comes [yashor] before men, and says: I have sinned, and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not” (Job 33:27). Rav Ḥisda interprets the word yashor as related to the word shura, row. The verse mentions sin three times: I have sinned, and perverted, and it profited me not. This implies that one should make three rows before the person from whom he is asking forgiveness.

³⁸⁴ Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina said: Anyone who asks forgiveness of his friend should not ask more than three times, as it is stated: “Please, please forgive the transgression of your brothers and their sin, for they did evil to you. And now, please forgive” (Genesis 50:17). The verse uses the word please three times, which shows that one need not ask more than three times, after which the insulted friend must be appeased and forgive. And if the insulted friend dies before he can be appeased, one brings ten people, and stands them at the grave of the insulted friend, and says in front of them: I have sinned against the Lord, the God of Israel, and against so-and-so whom I wounded.

³⁸⁵ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Yirmeya insulted Rabbi Abba, causing the latter to have a complaint against him. Rabbi Yirmeya went and sat at the threshold of Rabbi Abba’s house to beg him for forgiveness. When Rabbi Abba’s maid poured out the dirty water from the house, the stream of water landed on Rabbi Yirmeya’s head. He said about himself: They have made me into a trash heap, as they are pouring dirty water on me. He recited this verse about himself: “Who lifts up the needy out of the trash heap” (Psalms 113:7). Rabbi Abba heard what happened and went out to greet him. Rabbi Abba said to him: Now I must go out to appease you for this insult, as it is written: “Go, humble yourself [hitrapes] and urge your neighbor” (Proverbs 6:3).

³⁸⁶ It is related that when Rabbi Zeira had a complaint against a person who insulted him, he would pace back and forth before him and present himself, so that the person could come and appease him. Rabbi Zeira made himself available so that it would be easy for the other person to apologize to him.

³⁸⁷ It is further related that Rav had a complaint against a certain butcher who insulted him. The butcher did not come before him to apologize. On Yom Kippur eve, Rav said: I will go and appease him. He met his student Rav Huna, who said to him: Where is my Master going? He said to him: I am going to appease so-and-so. Rav Huna called Rav by his name and said: Abba is going to kill a person, for surely that person’s end will not be good. Rav went and stood by him. He found the butcher sitting and splitting the head of an animal. The butcher raised his eyes and saw him. He said to him: Are you Abba? Go, I have nothing to say to you. While he was splitting the head, one of the bones of the head flew out and struck him in the throat and killed him, thereby fulfilling Rav Huna’s prediction.

³⁸⁸ The Gemara further relates: Rav was reciting the Torah portion before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

³⁸⁹ Rabbi Ḥiyya, Rav’s uncle and teacher, came in, whereupon Rav returned to the beginning of the portion and began to read it again. Afterward, bar Kappara came in, and Rav returned to the beginning of the portion out of respect for bar Kappara. Then Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, came in, and he returned again to the beginning of the portion. Then, Rabbi Ḥanina bar Ḥama came in, and Rav said to himself: Shall I go back and read so many times? He did not return but continued from where he was. Rabbi Ḥanina was offended because Rav showed that he was less

important than the others. Rav went before Rabbi Ḥanina on Yom Kippur eve every year for thirteen years to appease him, but he would not be appeased.

³⁹⁰ The Gemara asks: How could Rav act this way? Didn't Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina say: Anyone who requests forgiveness from another should not ask more than three times? The Gemara answers: Rav is different, since he was very pious and forced himself to act beyond the letter of the law. The Gemara asks: And how could Rabbi Ḥanina act this way and refuse to forgive Rav, though he asked many times? Didn't Rava say: With regard to anyone who suppresses his honor and forgives someone for hurting him, God pardons all his sins?

³⁹¹ The Gemara explains: Rather, this is what happened: Rabbi Ḥanina saw in a dream that Rav was being hung on a palm tree, and he learned as a tradition that anyone about whom there is a dream in which he was being hung on a palm tree will become the head of a yeshiva. He said: Learn from this that providence has decreed that he must eventually become the head of the yeshiva. Therefore, I will not be appeased, so that he will have to go and study Torah in Babylonia. He was conscious of the principle that one kingdom cannot overlap with another, and he knew that once Rav was appointed leader, he, Rabbi Ḥanina, would have to abdicate his own position or die. Therefore, he delayed being appeased, so that Rav would go to Babylonia and be appointed there as head of the yeshiva. In this way, the dream would be fulfilled, as Rav would indeed be appointed as head of a yeshiva, but since he would be in Babylonia, Rabbi Ḥanina would not lose his own position.

³⁹² § The Sages taught: The main mitzva of confession is on Yom Kippur eve when darkness falls. But the Sages said: One should also confess on Yom Kippur eve before he eats and drinks at his last meal before the fast lest he become confused at the meal, due to the abundance of food and drink, and be unable to confess afterward. And although one confessed before he ate and drank, he confesses again after he eats and drinks, as perhaps he committed some sin during the meal itself. And although one confessed during the evening prayer on the night of Yom Kippur, he should confess again during the morning prayer. Likewise, although one confessed during the morning prayer, he should still confess during the additional prayer. Similarly, although one confessed during the additional prayer, he should also confess during the afternoon prayer; and although one confessed during the afternoon prayer, he should confess again during the closing prayer [ne'ila].

³⁹³ And where in the Yom Kippur prayers does one say the confession? An individual says it after his Amida prayer, and the prayer leader says it in the middle of the Amida prayer. The Gemara asks: What does one say; what is the liturgy of the confession? Rav said: One says the prayer that begins: You know the mysteries of the universe, in accordance with the standard liturgy. And Shmuel said that the prayer begins with: From the depths of the heart. And Levi said that it begins: And in your Torah it is written, saying, and one then recites the forgiveness achieved by Yom Kippur as stated in the Torah. Rabbi Yoḥanan said that it begins: Master of the Universe.

³⁹⁴ Rabbi Yehuda said that one says: For our iniquities are too many to count and our sins are too great to number. Rav Hamnuna said: This is the liturgy of the confession: My God, before I was formed I was unworthy. Now that I have been formed, it is as if I had not been formed. I am dust while alive, how much more so when I am dead. See, I am before You like a vessel filled with shame and disgrace. May it be Your will that I may sin no more, and as for the sins I have committed before You, erase them in Your compassion, but not by suffering. The Gemara comments: This is the

confession that Rava used all year long; and it was the confession that Rav Hamnuna Zuta used on Yom Kippur.

³⁹⁵ Mar Zutra said: We said only that one must follow all these versions when he did not say the words: But we have sinned. However, if he said the words: But we have sinned, he need not say anything further because that is the essential part of the confession. As bar Hamdudei said: I was standing before Shmuel and he was sitting; and when the prayer leader reached the words: But we have sinned, Shmuel stood. Bar Hamdudei said: Learn from here that this is the main part of the confession, and Shmuel stood up to emphasize the significance of these words.

³⁹⁶ § We learned in a mishna there, in tractate Ta'anit: At three times in the year, priests raise their hands to recite the priestly benediction four times in a single day: In the morning prayer, in the additional prayer, in the afternoon prayer, and at the closing [ne'ila] of the gates. And these are the three times in the year: During communal fasts for lack of rain, on which the ne'ila prayer is recited; and during non-priestly watches [ma'amadot], when the Israelite members of the guard parallel to the priestly watch come and read the account of Creation (see Ta'anit 26a); and on Yom Kippur.

³⁹⁷ The Gemara asks: What is the closing of the gates, i.e., the ne'ila prayer? Rav said: It is an added prayer of Amida. And Shmuel said: It is not a full prayer but only a confession that begins with the words: What are we, what are our lives? The Gemara raises an objection to this from a baraita, as it was taught: On the night of Yom Kippur, one prays seven blessings in the Amida prayer and confesses; during the morning prayer, one prays seven blessings and confesses; during the additional prayer, one prays seven blessings and confesses; during the afternoon prayer, one prays seven blessings and confesses; and during the ne'ila prayer, one prays seven blessings and confesses. This concurs with Rav's opinion that ne'ila is an added prayer.

³⁹⁸ This is a dispute between tanna'im. They all agree that ne'ila is an added prayer but disagree about the obligation to confess at the ne'ila prayer, as it was taught in a baraita: At the end of Yom Kippur, as darkness falls, one prays seven blessings of the Amida and confesses and ends with the confession; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: He prays seven blessings of the Amida, and if he wishes to end his prayer with a confession, he ends it in this way. The Gemara says: If so, this is a refutation of the opinion of Shmuel, since all agree that ne'ila is a complete prayer. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is a conclusive refutation.

³⁹⁹ The Gemara relates: Ulla bar Rav went down to lead the ne'ila prayer before Rava, who was in the synagogue. He opened the prayer with: You have chosen us, and he concluded with: What are we, what are our lives? And Rava praised him. Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan, said: And an individual says it after his Amida prayer. The individual says the confession after his Amida prayer, not within the Amida prayer as the prayer leader does.

⁴⁰⁰ Rav said: The ne'ila prayer exempts one from the evening prayer. Since one recited an added prayer after the afternoon prayer, when darkness fell, it serves as the evening prayer. The Gemara comments that Rav conforms to his line of reasoning above, as he said: It is an added prayer, and since he has prayed it he needs no further prayer in the evening.

⁴⁰¹ The Gemara is surprised at this: And did Rav actually say this? Didn't Rav say: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the one who says that the evening prayer is optional? If it is optional, why would Rav use the term exempt? One is exempt even if he does not pray the closing prayer. The Gemara answers: He said this in accordance with the statement of the one who says that

the evening prayer is mandatory. Even according to the opinion that maintains that the evening prayer is mandatory, if one recites ne'ila, he has fulfilled his obligation to recite the evening prayer.

⁴⁰² The Gemara raises an objection from that which we learned in a baraita: During the evening after Yom Kippur, one prays seven blessings in the Amida and confesses; during the morning prayer, one prays seven blessings in the Amida and confesses; during the additional prayer, one prays seven blessings in the Amida and confesses; during ne'ila one prays seven blessings in the Amida and confesses; and during the evening prayer, one prays seven blessings in an abridged version of the eighteen blessings of the weekday Amida prayer. One recites the first three blessings, the final three, and a middle blessing that includes an abbreviated form of the other weekday blessings. Rabbi Ḥanina ben Gamliel says in the name of his ancestors: One prays the full eighteen blessings of the weekday Amida prayer as usual,

⁴⁰³ because he must recite havdala in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge, and there is nowhere to insert this prayer in the abridged Amida. This indicates that these tanna'im maintained that ne'ila does not exempt one from the evening prayer. The Gemara answers: It is a dispute between tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: Anyone who requires immersion immerses in his usual manner on Yom Kippur, as this act does not violate the prohibition against washing. A menstruating woman and a new mother, who immerse at night, immerse in their usual manner on the night of Yom Kippur.

⁴⁰⁴ The baraita continues: One who had a seminal emission during Yom Kippur before the afternoon prayer may immerse at any point in the day until the afternoon prayer, in order to be able to recite it. Ezra decreed that a man who has had a seminal emission must immerse in order to pray and study Torah. If the emission occurred after the afternoon prayer, he should not immerse then but should wait until darkness falls. Since the time for ne'ila is at night, this individual should wait and immerse after the fast has concluded, so as to avoid violation of the prohibition of washing on Yom Kippur, and then pray afterward. This indicates that ne'ila is a nighttime prayer, and therefore its recitation exempts one from the weekday evening prayer. Rabbi Yosei says: He may immerse at any point in the day. According to his opinion, the ne'ila prayer is recited while it is still daytime, and therefore the individual must immerse in the daytime in order to be able to recite it. Consequently, Rabbi Yosei holds that ne'ila does not exempt one from the evening prayer.

⁴⁰⁵ The Gemara raises a contradiction with regard to this baraita from that which was taught: In the case of the zav, and the zava, the male and female leper, and one who had relations with a menstruating woman, and one who is ritually impure through contact with a corpse, if their time has come for purification, they immerse in their usual manner on Yom Kippur. A menstruating woman and a woman after childbirth immerse in their usual manner on the night of Yom Kippur. One who had a seminal emission immerses at any point in the day. Rabbi Yosei says: From the time of the afternoon prayer onward he is not able to immerse. This contradicts Rabbi Yosei's statement in the previous baraita.

⁴⁰⁶ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This statement, in which Rabbi Yosei says that one may not immerse during the day, is referring to a case where he had already prayed the ne'ila prayer before he noticed his seminal emission. That statement, in which Rabbi Yosei says that one may immerse during the day, is referring to a case where he had not yet prayed the ne'ila prayer when he noticed his seminal emission, and he therefore immerses in order to pray ne'ila.

⁴⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: If he had already prayed ne'ila before he noticed his seminal emission, what is the reasoning of the Rabbis, who permit him to immerse on Yom Kippur? The immersion seems to have no purpose. The Gemara answers: The Rabbis hold that immersion at its proper time is a mitzva, even when one does not need to immerse to pray. Therefore, if the time for immersion falls on Yom Kippur, the individual should immerse as usual.

⁴⁰⁸ The Gemara asks: By inference, Rabbi Yosei holds that immersion at its proper time is not a mitzva. But wasn't it taught in a baraita: If God's name is written in ink on one's flesh, he may not wash and he may not smear it with oil lest he erase the name, and he may not stand in a filthy place out of respect for the name. If his time came for an immersion that is a mitzva, he must try to ensure that the name not be erased. He therefore wraps a reed around it and descends and immerses. Rabbi Yosei says: He descends and immerses in his usual manner and need not worry about erasing the name, provided he does not rub the place where the name is written.

⁴⁰⁹ And we maintain that they disagree as to whether or not immersion at its proper time is a mitzva. According to the Rabbis, immersion at its proper time is not a mitzva. Therefore, if the individual has no reed, he should wait even until the following day rather than immerse without it. However, Rabbi Yosei maintains that immersion at its proper time is a mitzva. Therefore, it must be done at its proper time, even if that requires immersion without covering God's name.

⁴¹⁰ The Gemara answers: This Rabbi Yosei mentioned in the baraita is actually Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda, and this resolves the contradiction, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: It is sufficient for the immersion to be at the end. According to one opinion, if a menstruating woman is uncertain on which day to immerse, she immerses multiple times to ensure that the required immersion is at its proper time. However, according to Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda, it is sufficient for her to immerse once at a point when she is certainly pure. Consequently, according to his opinion, there is no mitzva to immerse at the proper time.

⁴¹¹ The Sages taught: One who sees an emission of semen on Yom Kippur descends and immerses. And in the evening, he should rub his skin to remove anything that might obstruct the immersion. The Gemara is surprised at this: Why should he do that in the evening? What was, was. Since he has already immersed, how will removing interpositions afterward benefit the immersion? Rather, say that he should rub his skin from the evening before Yom Kippur to remove any obstructions, in case it becomes necessary to immerse on Yom Kippur. The Gemara comments: This Master holds that it is a mitzva to rub.

⁴¹² § Apropos the halakhot of immersion for one who has had a seminal emission on Yom Kippur, the Gemara relates: A tanna taught a baraita before Rav Nahman: With regard to one who sees an emission of semen on Yom Kippur, his sins are forgiven. The Gemara asks: But wasn't it taught in a baraita: His sins are arranged before him? The Gemara answers: What is the meaning of arranged? They are arranged to be forgiven.

⁴¹³ The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: One who sees an emission of semen on Yom Kippur should worry the whole year that perhaps he was given a sign that he and his fast were rejected. But if he survives the year, he can be assured that his good deeds protected him and ensured for him a share in the World-to-Come. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Know that it is so, as the whole world is hungry due to refraining from conjugal relations, and he is satiated since he emitted semen and his lust was subdued. Since the issue was involuntary and not intentional, it is a sign that he has merited

divine compassion. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: Seeing semen on Yom Kippur is a sign that one will live a long life, grow, and raise others. An allusion to that is the verse: “That he might see his seed and prolong his days” (Isaiah 53:10).