

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud



YOMA

Book II

Folios 28a-61b

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

WITH NOTES

CHAPTERS III – V

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771

www.613etc.com

YOMA - 28a-61b

Yoma 28a

Surely there is [the smoking of] the limbs and fat-pieces?¹ — That is the end of the service of the day.² But what of the removal of the ashes?³ — It is the beginning of the service of the day,⁴ for R. Johanan said: If he sanctified his hands by washing for the removal of the ashes, in the morning he need not sanctify [his hands] since he had already sanctified them at the beginning of the service. If so the difficulty⁵ remains? —

Rather if this statement was made it was made thus: R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: If a non-priest arranged in order two logs of wood [on the altar] he incurs the penalty of death, because it is a complete service.⁶

To this Raba demurred: If this is so let it require a count. But it requires no count? Surely it was taught, He who secures the privilege in respect of the removal of the ashes, secures also the privilege in respect of the arranging of the two logs of wood? This is what he means. It should have a separate count for itself? The [reason is] as we have already stated. Are we to say that for a service which is complete, and for the performance of which a non-priest incurs the penalty of death, a count is required, but for one, for performance of which a non-priest does not incur such penalty, no count is required — but there is the killing [of the sacrificial animal]? — It is different with that killing, because it is the beginning of the service of the day. Shall we say that only a complete service requires the count, but a service followed by another does not require it — but there is the smoking of the members and the fat-pieces? — That is the end of the service of the day. — But there is the removal of the ashes? — Here [the count is due] because of what happened.

Mar Zutra or R. Ashi said: We too have learnt thus:⁷ The officer said to them: GO

FORTH AND SET WHETHER THE TIME FOR THE KILLING OF THE MORNING SACRIFICE HAS ARRIVED. But he does not teach anything about the time for the laying in order of the two logs of wood?⁸ — He teaches only concerning such things as cannot be remedied again, but not concerning such for which there is a remedy.⁹

CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. THE¹⁰ OFFICER SAID TO THEM: GO FORTH AND SEE WHETHER THE TIME FOR KILLING [OF THE MORNING SACRIFICE] HAS ARRIVED. IF IT HAD ARRIVED THEN HE WHO SAW IT SAID: IT IS DAYLIGHT!¹¹ MATHIA B. SAMUEL SAID: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT.¹² EVEN UNTO HEBRON?¹³ AND HE ANSWERED 'YES'. AND WHY WAS THAT [CONSIDERED] NECESSARY? BECAUSE ONCE WHEN THE LIGHT OF THE MOON¹⁴ ROSE THEY THOUGHT THAT THE EAST WAS ALIGHT¹⁵ AND SLAUGHTERED THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, WHICH AFTERWARDS THEY HAD TO TAKE AWAY INTO THE PLACE OF BURNING.¹⁶ THE HIGH PRIEST¹⁷ WAS LED DOWN TO THE PLACE OF IMMERSION. THIS WAS THE RULE IN THE TEMPLE: WHOSOEVER CROSSED HIS FEET¹⁸ REQUIRED AN IMMERSION, AND WHOSOEVER MADE WATER REQUIRED SANCTIFICATION BY WASHING¹⁹ HIS HANDS AND FEET.

- (1) [This service, it is now assumed, receives its completion only with the removal of the ashes, and yet must not be performed by a non-priest under the penalty of death (Tosaf.).]
- (2) [The original assumption n. 3. is rejected. The smoking of the limbs is in itself regarded as the completion of the day service (Tosaf.).]
- (3) [Which must be followed by the taking of the ashes outside the camp, v. Lev. VI, 4' and yet is considered a complete service, v. supra 24a (Tosaf.).]
- (4) [Whereas the taking of the ashes outside the camp is not performed daily (v. Tamid II, 2) and consequently it cannot be regarded as completing the removal of the ashes (Tosaf.).]
- (5) Of R. Ze'ira.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(6) [V. supra 22a. For the reason that no special count has been arranged for the two logs of wood. R. Hananel.]

(7) That the laying of the two logs of wood is a complete service.

(8) [Because it is considered a night service completing the arranging of the wood pile on the altar (Rashi), v. also Tosaf.]

(9) V. supra, p. 128, nn. 8, 9.

(10) The Mishnah continues the account of the procedure, where it had been interrupted, 26a. This Mishnah refers not only to the Day of Atonement, but to the continual sacrifice on every morning of the year.

(11) The Mishnaic 'ברקאי' may be a contraction of 'Barka hi', i.e. there is a shining. Or: the shining one, i.e., the morning star.

(12) [Rashi (Men. 100a) regards these words not as reporting the view of Mathia b. Samuel, but as a historical narrative. The passage is consequently to be translated: Mathia b. Samuel (who was a Temple officer v. infra), used to say (in announcing the time in question) The whole east is alight, יְמִין וְמִזְמַנָּה a.l.

(13) V. Gemara. For the choice of Hebron, which is too far from Jerusalem to permit one in Jerusalem to see its towers, the Yerushalmi has a plausible suggestion, viz., that that city was mentioned for its historical importance; because of the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs and matriarchs of Israel are buried.

(14) This could not have happened on a Day of Atonement, because on that day the moon has gone down long before dawn, but on one of the last days of a month, in which the moon, to the west of the sun, rises before dawn.

(15) When the sky is clouded the light coming from the moon may be confused with that of the sun. But it never reaches as far as the latter, hence the question of the officer whether the horizon is alight even unto Hebron. The officer may have been Mathia. V. Shek. V, 1.

(16) Possibly a room in the Temple, V. Baneth, Pes. IX, note 49.

(17) The account of the service on the Day of Atonement is here continued, immediately interrupted again, and re-continued on 30a.

(18) A euphemism for: to ease oneself, to relieve nature.

(19) In the water of the holy laver. Ex. XXX, 18.

Yoma 28b

GEMARA. It was taught: R. Ishmael said: The morning [star] shines. R. Akiba said the morning [star] rose.¹ Nahuma b. Afkashion said: The morning [star] is already in Hebron. Mathia b. Samuel, the officer in

charge of the counts, said: The whole east even unto Hebron is alight. R. Judah b. Bathyra said: The whole east even unto Hebron is alight and all the people have gone forth, each to his work. If that were the case, it would be [too much of the day] too late! — Rather: each to hire working men.²

R. Safra said: The [afternoon] prayer of Abraham³ is due when the walls begin to grow dark.⁴ R. Joseph said: Shall we indeed learn [our laws] from Abraham?⁵ — Raba answered: A Tanna learned from Abraham and we should not learn from him! For it has been taught: And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised,⁶ this passage teaches that the whole of the [eighth] day is proper for the circumcision, but the zealots perform their religious duty as early as possible as it is said: And Abraham rose early in the morning and saddled his ass.⁷ —

Rather, said Raba, is it this that appeared difficult to R. Joseph: For we have learnt: If the eve of Passover falls on the eve of Sabbath, the Paschal lamb is to be slaughtered at one half after the sixth hour,⁸ and offered up at one half after the seventh hour.⁹ — But let it be slaughtered when the walls begin to grow dark!¹⁰ —

What is the difficulty? Perhaps the walls of the Sanctuary begin to grow dark half an hour after the sixth hour because they were not exactly straight.¹¹ Or [one might say]: It was different with Abraham whose heart [mind] knew great astronomical speculation.¹² Or: Because he was an elder [Zaken] who had a seat at the scholar's council,¹² for R. Hama b. Hanina said: Our ancestors were never left without the scholars' council. In Egypt they had the scholars' council, as it is said: Go and gather the elders of Israel together;¹³ in the wilderness they had the scholars' council, as it is said: Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel;¹⁴ our father Abraham was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And Abraham was [Zaken] an

YOMA - 28a-61b

elder well stricken in age;¹⁵ our father Isaac was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And it came to pass when Isaac was an elder [Zaken];¹⁶ our father Jacob was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: Now the eyes of Israel were dim with age [Zoken];¹⁷ [even] Eliezer, the servant of Abraham was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And Abraham said unto his servant, the elder of his house, that ruled over all he had,¹⁸ which R. Eleazar explained to mean that he ruled over [knew, controlled] the Torah of his master.¹⁹ Eliezer of Damascus': R. Eleazar said, He was so called because he drew²⁰ and gave drink to others of his master's teachings.

Rab said: Our father Abraham kept the whole Torah, as it is said: Because that Abraham hearkened to My voice [kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws].²¹

R. Shimi b. Hiyya said to Rab: Say, perhaps, that this refers to the seven laws?²² — Surely there was also that of circumcision!²³ Then say that it refers to the seven laws and circumcision [and not to the whole Torah]? — If that were so, why does Scripture say: 'My commandments and My laws'?

Raba or R. Ashi said: Abraham, our father, kept even the law concerning the 'Erub of the dishes,'²⁴ as it is said: 'My Torahs':²⁵ one being the written Torah, the other the oral Torah.²⁶

MATHIA B. SAMUEL SAID, etc.... AND HE ANSWERED 'YES'. Who was it that said 'yes'? the man standing on the roof! Is he the dreamer and the interpreter?²⁷ Should it, then, be he who is standing on the ground, whence would he know?²⁸ — If you like say it is he who stands on the roof, and if you like say it is he who stands on the ground. If you want to say it is he who stands on the roof; he says: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT, the one standing on the ground answering:

EVEN UNTO HEBRON? whereupon the former says: 'YES'. If you like say that it is he who stands on the ground: He says: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT? whereupon the other responds: EVEN UNTO HEBRON?²⁹ and the former answers: 'YES'.³⁰ AND WHY WAS THAT CONSIDERED NECESSARY, etc. But can it be confused?³¹ Has it not been taught: Rabbi says: The rising column of the moon is different from that of the sun. The light column of the moon rises straight like a stick, the light column of the sun [the dawn] irradiates in all directions? — The school of Ishmael taught: It was a cloudy day and the light was scattered in all directions.³²

R. Papa said: We can infer therefrom that on a cloudy day the sun is felt all over. What is the practical difference?³³ — In the spreading³⁴ of skins, or, as Raba expounded: A woman should not knead³⁵ either in the sun or in the heat of the sun. R. Nahman said: The sultry air of the sun³⁶ is more intense than that of direct sunlight, your analogy³⁷ being: a jar of vinegar;³⁸ the dazzling sunlight³⁹ is worse than the uncovered sun, your analogy being drippings [from the roof].⁴⁰

(1) A later time.

(2) All the people have gone forth, each to his work, refers not to the workingmen who leave for work at a later hour, but to the contractors, who early in the morning hire their men for the day's work.

(3) The afternoon prayer is by tradition ascribed to Isaac, but since he learned it from his father, Abraham receives here the credit for it. Or, as Tosaf. Ber. 26b s.v. קפז has it, after Isaac had instituted the prayer, Abraham fixed the time for it.

(4) Are no longer shone upon by the sun, that is after the middle of the day.

(5) For Abraham lived before the Torah was given and Israelites should follow the conduct of the prophets, who knew and practiced the Torah rather than that of Abraham who, whilst living in its spirit, could not have known all the laws thereof. There are, of course, also views according to which Abraham practiced the oral and the written law, v. below. v. Tosaf. Moed Katon, 20a, s.v. גן נס.

(6) Lev. XII, 3.

(7) Gen. XXII, 3, the reference may also be ibid. XIX, 27, v. Meg. 20a.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(8) The day was divided into twelve hours of varying duration, in winter an hour may be as short as forty minutes, in summer as long as ninety.

(9) Pes. 58a.

(10) I.e., after the beginning of the seventh hour-after midday.

(11) It was narrower above than below and thus did not cast a shadow till later in the afternoon.

(12) And could hence foretell the exact hour; V. B.B., Sonc. ed., p. 83, n. II.

(13) Ex. III, 16.

(14) Num. XI, 16.

(15) Gen. XXIV, I. E.V. ‘was old’.

(16) Ibid. XXVII, 1.

(17) Ibid. XLVIII, 10.

(18) Ibid. XXIV, 2.

(19) Ibid. XV, 2. In all these cases the word Zaken (elder) is interpreted in accord with Sifra, Kedoshim. III, 7: (זקן חכם) זקן זה a Zaken is he who has acquired wisdom (through study).

(20) This is a play on קשׁמָה, as if it were a compositum of דָוִלָה (one who draws) and קשׁמָה, (one who gives drink).

(21) Gen. XXVI, 5.

(22) Obligatory upon ‘The sons of Noah’, i.e., upon all civilized nations and individuals. They include the commandment to promote justice, and the prohibitions of idolatry, immorality, blasphemy, murder, cruelty to animals, and theft.

(23) Which Abraham observed.

(24) Lit., ‘mixing of dishes’. One may not prepare food on a holy day, which falls on Friday, for the Sabbath immediately following it. But one may start on the eve of the holy day to prepare such food for the Sabbath, the cooking on the holy day being but a continuation of this weekday work. This provision is not Biblical.

(25) Taking the word Torah in its sense as the sum-total of Jewish Law.

(26) The written Law, i.e., the Five Books of Moses; the Oral Law, which Moses received on Sinai, handing it down to Joshua, the latter handing it down to the elders, the latter to the prophets, these to the Men of the Great Synod (Aboth I, 1).

(27) It seems strange that one man should both ask the question and answer it.

(28) He could not observe it from where he stood.

(29) [‘Is this what you want to know’.]

(30) [‘Indeed this is just what I ask’. The mention of Hebron is to recall the memory of the patriarchs who lie buried there. T. J. Yoma III, 1. V. Rashi. Var. lec.: He (who stands on the roof) says THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT AS EAR AS HEBRON, and the other (who stands on the ground) says ‘YES?’ i.e., ‘Indeed? are you sure it is so?’ V. R. Hananel and D.S. a.l.]

(31) Can the light of the moon be confused with that of the sun?

(32) On a cloudy day the rising column of the sun is invisible because of the heavy clouds and it is only where the clouds are somewhat scattered that it is visible, hence the confusion is possible.

(33) That this inference is mentioned here.

(34) To be dried.

(35) The dough on the Passover to prepare unleavened cakes. R. Papa's maxim would make the rule more stringent.

(36) Produced by the passage of the sun-rays through a cloudy atmosphere.

(37) Lit., ‘your sign’.

(38) Which emits a stronger smell through a small opening than when quite open.

(39) Coming through cracks or breaks in the clouds.

(40) It is more agreeable to enter completely (a bath or rainy place) than to get continual drippings on one's body.

Yoma 29a

Unchaste imagination is more injurious¹ than the sin itself, your analogy being the odor of meat.² The end of the summer is more trying than the summer itself, your analogy being a hot oven.³ A fever in winter is severer than in summer, your analogy being a cold oven.⁴ It is harder to remember well something old than to commit to memory a fresh thing, your analogy being a cement made out of old cement.⁵

R. Abbahu said: What is the reason of Rabbi's opinion?⁶ — It is written:⁷ For the Leader, upon Aijeleth ha-Shahar — just as the antlers of the hind branch off this way and that way, so the light of the dawn is scattered in all directions. —

R. Zera said: Why was Esther compared to a hind?⁹ To tell you that just as a hind has a narrow womb and is desirable to her mate at all times as at the first time, so was Esther precious to King Ahasuerus at all times as at the first time.

R. Assi said: Why was Esther compared to the dawn?¹⁰ To tell you that just as the dawn is the end of the whole night, so is the story of Esther the end of all the miracles. But there is

YOMA - 28a-61b

Hanukkah? — We refer to those included in Scripture. That will be right according to the opinion that Esther was meant to be written,¹¹ but what can be said according to him who held that it was not meant to be written? — He could bring it in accord with what R. Benjamin b. Japheth said, for R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Benjamin b. Japheth: Why is the prayer of the righteous compared to a hind? To tell you that just as with the hind, as long as it grows, its antlers form additional branches every year, so with the righteous, the longer they abide in prayer, the more will their prayer be heard.

THEY SLAUGHTERED THE CONTINUAL OFFERING: When?¹² Would you say on one of the remaining days of the year? Had it then to be offered up? Hence [you will say that it happened] on the Day of Atonement, but is there any moon-light visible then?¹³ — This is what it means: On the Day of Atonement, when the observer said: It is daylight, they would take the high priest down to the place of immersion.¹⁴

The father of R. Abin learnt:¹⁵ Not only concerning this¹⁶ was it said,¹⁷ but also concerning the pinching of a bird's head and the taking of a fistful of the meal-offering, [was it said] that if it was done during the night, it had to be burnt. That is quite right with regard to the bird designated for a burnt-offering, since the fact can no more be undone, but touching the fistful of the meal offering,

(1) To health, physical and moral.

(2) The odor of roast meat is more injurious to the digestive apparatus even than the eating thereof.

(3) It is easy to kindle a fresh fire in a hot oven, the ground being dry. By the end of summer the atmosphere is very hot so that any additional hot weather makes it well nigh intolerable.

(4) It requires a great deal of wood and effort to warm up the cold oven in the cold days of winter. Thus must a fever be very severe to afflict one on a cold day.

(5) That has been used before. It is hard to dissolve it and re-make it.

(6) Who says that the light column of the sun (dawn) is scattered.

(7) Ps. XXII, 1.

(8) Lit., 'The Hind of the Dawn. That may have been a well-known melody, according to which the psalm was to be sung, the direction being meant for the choir-leader. V. the comm. of Delitzsch, Cheyne and Koenig.

(9) In Meg. 15b, Queen Esther is reported to have sung this psalm as she came before Ahasuerus, hence the comparison.

(10) 'Er. 54b.

(11) Meg. 7a. To protect the books of the Bible, they were declared unclean, so that after touching them, one had to wash one's hands. The question hence, as to whether any book defiled the hands, implies the question as to whether it was included in the Canon and has inspiration ascribed to its contents. About the Book of Esther there is a dispute in Meg. 7a, one of the Rabbis ascribing inspiration to it, whence it was to be written and included in the Canon, the other denying it inspiration, hence declaring its touch did not defile the hands. V. Yadaim III, 5.

(12) Did this error happen, on the basis of which the high priest was taken down to the place of immersion. The questioner takes the second incident reported in the Mishnah as a sequel to the first.

(13) At dawn.

(14) The answer indicates that these two incidents are not to be connected. The error happened on an ordinary day. The second passage refers to the Day of Atonement and states that when the observer had said 'It is daylight', then, on a Day of Atonement, the high priest would be taken down, etc.

(15) Men. 100a.

(16) Not only a sacrifice that was offered up during the night (instead of in its proper time, after day-break).

(17) That it is to be burnt.

Yoma 29b

let him put it back and take it again when it is day? — He learnt and explained it: The vessels of ministration render what is in them sacred even outside of the proper time.¹

An objection was raised: This is the rule: Whatsoever is offered² up during the day, becomes sanctified by day and whatsoever is offered up during the night becomes sanctified both by day and by night.³ At any rate it is taught that whatsoever is offered up during the day becomes sanctified by day only, and not by night.⁴ — It may not

YOMA - 28a-61b

become sanctified [enough] to be offered up, but it may become sanctified enough to be invalidated.⁵

R. Zera raised an objection: If he put in order the showbread and the [frankincense] clip after the Sabbath and smokes the [contents of] the cups on the [following] Sabbath it is invalid.⁶ What should he do? He should leave it for the coming Sabbath, for even if it stayed for many days on the table, that does not matter. But why? It should be sanctified and invalidated?⁷ —

Raba said: He who raised the objection, raised a valid one, and the father of R. Abin is also quoting a Baraita,⁸ but it is of the opinion that the night is not considered a wanting⁹ time, the day however is so considered. But when the night of Sabbath approaches, let it then become at once sanctified and invalidated?¹⁰ —

Rabina said: We assume that he removed it before then. Mar Zutra, or as some say, R. Ashi said: You may set the case even if he had not removed it before [Sabbath eve], since, however, he had put it in order at variance with the regulation¹¹ it is as if a monkey had laid it there.¹²

THIS WAS THE RULE IN THE TEMPLE, etc.: It is quite right that the feet must be washed because of squirtings,¹³ but why must the hands be washed? — R. Abba said: This teaches us that it is

(1) Hence it can no more be put back. Since the vessel has sanctified it for the altar, it must not be put back among the remaining part of the meal-offering.

(2) E.g., the meal-offerings, the incense.

(3) The text here corrected in accord with Bah. V. Tem. 14a. [Cur. ed. inserts ‘and whatsoever is offered up during the night becomes sanctified by night, and whatsoever is offered up both during the day and during the night becomes sanctified both by day and by night.’ As the former can refer only to drink-offerings (V. Ta'an. 2b) which however are offered up also during the day, this passage is omitted and the text corrected accordingly.]

(4) Which means that there is no sanctification but in the proper time.

(5) [If it tarries overnight without having been offered (V. Zeb. 87a). The fistful accordingly having been placed in the vessel of ministration at night becomes invalidated with daybreak, and can no longer be put back among the remaining part of the meal-offering.]

(6) [Because it had not been left on the table for seven days as prescribed, v. Lev. XXIV, 5ff. Var. lec. rightly omit: it is invalid, V. Rashi.]

(7) Through having been set on the table in its proper time.

(8) It is not the case of all Amoraic opinion, which can be refuted by argument. It is an authoritative Tannaitic teaching and a way must be found to bring the present argument in accord with it.

(9) The day goes after the night, hence it is part of the night, hence the fistful put into the vessel at night is regarded as having been put therein in the proper time and consequently is sanctified properly. Since, however, it is a day-offering it must be burned with the showbread; however, where there is a whole day wanting, the bread does not become sanctified.

(10) Since the night is not considered as ‘wanting time’, whereas everything that is due during the day and was placed into the sacred vessels in the preceding night, becomes sanctified and invalidated, then, when the eve of second Sabbath comes, let the table sanctify the bread and invalidate it?

(11) When it was wanting time.

(12) Without any intention, hence the table does not sanctify it, for we consider that since it was placed there without intention, it was technically not placed there at all, hence it becomes neither sanctified nor invalidated.

(13) Of urine.

Yoma 30a

the right thing to wipe off [squirtings]. This supports the view of R. Ammi who says: A man must not go out with squirtings on his feet, because he may appear as one that has his privy member cut off and he may thus cause evil talk against his children that they are bastards.¹

R. Papa said: If there be excrement in its place,² he must not read the Shema'.³ How shall we imagine this case? If to say that it is invisible, that is self-evident; if to say that it is not seen surely⁴ ‘The Torah was not given to the ministering angels!’ This has but

YOMA - 28a-61b

reference to a situation in which it is obvious when he sits and invisible when he stands. But what is the difference between this and one who has filth on his body, for it has been stated: Where one who has filth on his body, or whose hands are in a privy,⁵ R. Hunu permits the reading of the Shema' and R. Hisda forbids it?⁶ — In its place filth is most execrable, away from it, it is less so.

Our Rabbis taught: This is the Halachah with regard to meal-time:⁷ If a man goes forth to make water, he washes his one⁸ hand and re-enters. If he conversed with his neighbor and waited [diverting himself], he washes both his hands [again] and re-enters. When he washes his hands, he should not wash them outside and enter, because of the suspicion,⁹ but he should enter, sit at his accustomed place and wash his two hands there, then pass the pitcher¹⁰ around the guests.¹¹ —

R. Hisda said: What we said refers to drinking,¹² but as to eating he may wash his hands outside and re-enter, people know that he is fastidious of taste.¹³ R. Nahman b. Isaac said: I would do the same¹⁴ before drinking as people know me to be fastidious.

MISHNAH. NO MAN EVEN IF HE WERE CLEAN COULD ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WITHOUT HAVING IMMERSED HIMSELF. FIVE IMMERSIONS AND TEN SANCTIFICATIONS DID THE HIGH PRIEST UNDERGO ON THAT DAY. AND ALL ON HOLY GROUND IN THE PARWAH¹⁵ CELL WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THIS ONE¹⁶ ALONE. — A LINEN SHEET WAS SPREAD BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE.

GEMARA. Ben Zoma was asked: What is the purpose of this immersion?¹⁷ He answered: If one¹⁸ who moves from one holy place to another and from one place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves Kareth¹⁹ to another place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves Kareth, requires immersion, how much more shall he require

immersion who moves from profane ground into holy ground, and from a place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] does not involve Kareth, to a place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves Kareth!

R. Judah said: It is only an immersion required for the sake of uniformity,²⁰ so that he may remember if there is any uncleanness on him and abstain.²¹ In what principle do they differ?

- (1) Men afflicted with such blemish are incapable of reproduction, hence people, mistaking him for a man thus afflicted and hearing that he has children, will spread the rumor that they are begotten in adultery.
- (2) In the anus.
- (3) V. Glos.
- (4) Ber. 25b.
- (5) He happens to have his hands still in the space of the privy, between its door and the wall which separates it from the next room.
- (6) Because the whole body ought to be attuned to prayer, as the psalmist has it: All my bones shall say: Lord, who is like unto Thee, Ps. XXXV, 10.
- (7) Hands have to be washed before taking a meal.
- (8) The one which may have been touched by the squirtings of urine.
- (9) That he failed to wash his hands outside.
- (10) Which he had used for washing his hands.
- (11) V. Tosef. Ber. IV.
- (12) [That he does not intend eating any more, but drinking, in which case the washing of the hands a second time is but a matter of precaution in case he does partake of some bread (Rashi).]
- (13) The average man is assumed to be fastidious enough not to eat without his fingers having been washed before, esp. since eating with the fingers (rather than with fork and knife) was the general custom. V.T.A. III, p. 43.
- (14) And wash my hands outside.
- (15) In the southern part of the Temple Court, v. Mid. V, 3.
- (16) The first one (mentioned in preceding Mishnah 28a) which he performed on profane ground at the Water-Gate.
- (17) For every man who wishes to enter the Temple Court.
- (18) The high priest, in the course of his five services on the Day of Atonement, moved from the inner to the outer court, both being sacred and having the special restriction attached, viz., that one who entered them in uncleanness incurred divine penalty of death.
- (19) V. Glos.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(20) Lit., ‘an attached immersion’. There is no Biblical obligation, but a Rabbinic ‘fence’ to assure a consciousness of any uncleanness attaching to him who entered the Temple Court.

(21) From entering the Temple Court.

Yoma 30b

As to whether the service is profaned.¹ According to Ben Zoma² he profanes the service, according to R. Judah he does not. But does he, in accordance with Ben Zoma's view, profane the service? Has it not been taught: If a high priest did not immerse or sanctify himself between garment and garment or between service and service, his service remains valid.³ But if either a high priest or a common priest has not washed his hands and feet in the morning and then had officiated at a service, that service is invalidated? —

Rather does the dispute concern the question as to whether he transgresses a positive command or not,⁴ Ben Zoma holding he transgresses a positive command, R. Judah that he does not. But does R. Judah hold this view? Has it not been taught: A leper⁴ immerses himself and stands in the Nicanor Gate.

R. Judah said: He does not need to immerse himself, for he has done so already on the evening before! This has its own reason, as it was taught: ‘Because he had immersed himself on the eve before’.⁵ What does he ask who asks this?⁶ — Because he wants to raise another objection, viz., [why was it called] the cell of the lepers, because lepers immerse themselves therein.⁷

R. Judah says: Not only of the lepers did they say [this] but of every man [who enters the Temple Court]⁸ — That is no difficulty. One statement refers to the case that he immersed himself, the other to the case that he did not. But, if he did not immerse himself, he must await the setting of the sun? —

Rather: In both cases he is presumed to have immersed himself, but in the one case he is presumed to have ceased to have his mind [on the necessity of preventing defilement],⁹ in the other he is presumed to have had his mind thereon all the time. But if he ceased to have his mind on it, he would need to be sprinkled on the third and the seventh day, for R. Dosthai b. Mattun said in the name of R. Johanan: Wherever attention¹⁰ [from the need to prevent uncleanness] is diverted, sprinkling on the third and the seventh day is required?¹¹ —

Rather: In both cases he is presumed not to have diverted the attention, yet there is no contradiction, for in the one case he is presumed to have immersed himself for the purpose of entering the Sanctuary, in the other he is assumed to have done so without that purpose in mind.¹² Or, if you like, say: Read not of lepers did they say [this]¹³ but of every man.

Rabina said: R. Judah makes his statement only on behalf [of the view] of the Rabbis: As far as my view is concerned, no leper needs [another] immersion. But according to your opinion, admit at least that this was said not of lepers alone but of all people. And the Rabbis?¹⁴ — The leper is accustomed to [his] impurity, all others are unaccustomed to it.¹⁵

Shall we say that the Rabbis who dispute with R. Judah¹⁶ are of the opinion of Ben Zoma,¹⁷ notwithstanding which they make reference to the leper,¹⁸ to inform you of the far-reaching consequences of R. Judah's opinion; or perhaps the difference in the case of the leper lies in the fact that he is accustomed to the uncleanness?¹⁹ — He answered: It is different with the leper, because he is accustomed to his uncleanness.

Said Abaye to R. Joseph:²⁰ Would an intervening object

(1) By officiating without immersing first.

(2) Who infers it from an argument a minori which has the force of Biblical law.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(3) Zeb. 19b. [Since a high priest does not profane the service by failing to take the intermediary immersions, there could be no profanation of the service in the absence of the first immersion, since on the view of Ben Zoma the latter is inferred from the former.]

(4) On the eighth day of his affliction, although he had immersed himself on the seventh, Lev. XIV, 9: And it shall be on the seventh...he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall be clean. Yet, when he offers up the prescribed sacrifices on the eighth day, he shall immerse himself again.

(5) R. Judah holds the purpose of the immersion of those who enter the Sanctuary in the morning is just to remind them of their former uncleanness, whereas the leper, who by reason of last night's immersion got rid of his uncleanness, is not in need of another reminder, in form of a second immersion.

(6) I.e., why ask an apparently unnecessary question? The answer is obvious. Mielziner (Introduction p. 238) cites Frankel MGWJ 1861 for a tradition according to which all passages in the Talmud introduced by this phrase belong to the additions made by the Saboraim.

(7) [Before they entered the Temple Court on the eighth day in the morning; when standing at the Nicanor Gate they thrust their thumb and toe into the Temple Court, there to receive an application of the blood of the guilt-offering and of oil; v. Lev. XIV, 14ff and supra 16a and infra p. 143, n. 10.]

(8) 'Not only of the lepers' implies the lepers at any rate, hence he would consider a re-immersion necessary, which contradicts his earlier statement.

(9) By consistent guarding of his body against touch by agents of ritual uncleanness.

(10) For he may have entered the tent in which a corpse lay.

(11) For entering the Temple.

(12) He therefore requires a second immersion in the morning.

(13) Requiring immersion on entering the Sanctuary.

(14) How would they meet R. Judah's argument?

(15) Hence he will no more pay attention to the dangers of defilement, whereas all others, unaccustomed to uncleanness and not reconciled to it, will be anxious to avoid such risk.

(16) And hold that a leper needs re-immersion on the eighth day.

(17) Who requires no morning immersion even in the case of a leper who is accustomed to uncleanness.

(18) Although they hold with Ben Zoma that every one entering the Sanctuary is by the law of the Torah obliged to immerse himself.

(19) That of leprosy, hence is accustomed to touch things unclean, whence the assumption that even after his immersion he may have done so; but

other men require no morning immersion Biblically before entering the Sanctuary.

(20) Text in accord with Maharsha.

Yoma 31a

render this immersion invalid or not? — He replied: 'Whatever the Rabbis ordained, they endowed with the authority of a law of the Torah'.²

Said Abaye to R. Joseph: Is a partial entrance of the Sanctuary considered an entrance or not? — He answered: The thumb³ and toe will prove that, for there but a partial entrance is involved, and it was taught: A leper immerses himself and stands in the Nicanor Gate! — The question was asked: What about making for himself a long knife for slaughtering?⁴ This question is asked in accord with the view of both Ben Zoma and the Rabbis who oppose R. Judah. This question is asked on the view of Ben Zoma: Perhaps Ben Zoma does not consider the immersion obligatory except in the case of one who actually enters, but not for one who stands outside; or perhaps even for the latter, because he might gradually enter. The question is also asked according to the view of the Rabbis who oppose R. Judah: Perhaps the Rabbis hold their view only theres because he does not perform a service,⁵ but where he officiates at a service they would agree,⁶ or do they make no difference? — The question remains unanswered.

FIVE IMMERSIONS AND TEN SANCTIFICATIONS: Our Rabbis taught: The high priest underwent five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day, all of them on holy ground, in the Parwah Cell, with the exception of the first, which took place on profane ground, on top of the Water Gate, lying at the side of his [private] cell.⁸

Abaye said: We infer therefrom that the Etam well was [at least] twenty-three cubits above the ground of the Temple Court.⁹ For we have learnt: All the doorways there were twenty cubits in height, ten cubits in breadth,

YOMA - 28a-61b

with the exception of that of the Hall¹⁰ and it was taught: And he shall bathe all his flesh in water,¹¹ i.e., in the waters of a mikweh,¹² in water which covers his whole body. What ‘is its quantity? One cubit square, three cubits high, and the Sages have calculated that the required quantity for [the contents of] a mikweh is forty se'ah.¹³

(1) An immersion, to be valid, requires utterly undisturbed touch of the water on the body of the person immersing himself, any intervening object rendering the immersion invalid. This, however, in the questioner's mind applies only to such immersion as is commanded by the Torah. R. Judah, who considers it only an immersion for the sake of uniformity, might hence hold that in this case an intervening object might not be considered sufficiently disturbing to render the immersion invalid.

(2) Pes. 30b.

(3) Lev. XIV, 14: And the priest shall take the blood of the guilt-offering and... shall put it upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot. Ibid. 17: And of the rest of the oil... the priest shall put... upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right foot. It is to receive of the blood and the oil that the leper stands at the Nicanor Gate and puts his hands and feet inside, v. 11 indicating that: And the priest that cleaneth him shall set the man that is to be cleansed... at the door of the tent of meeting.

(4) To escape the obligation of an immersion, which is due on entering. With a knife long enough he might slay the sacrificial animal from without.

(5) In the case of an ordinary man entering the Sanctuary.

(6) Hence they free him from the obligations of an immersion.

(7) That such is necessary.

(8) V. supra.

(9) From the Etam well was the water supply for the pool on top of the Water Gate, v. Zeb. 55b.

(10) V. supra 15a.

(11) [The reference is to Lev. XV, 16 and the text is to be corrected accordingly. The verse in cur. edd. is from Lev. XV, 13.]

(12) Lit., ‘gathering (of water)’ then the term, techn. for the pool for ritual immersion. The water therein must not be drawn, i.e., through a vessel, but must come directly from spring, river, sea or rain.

(13) ‘Er. 4b. Forty se'ah correspond roughly to two hundred and sixty-four quarts of water. [The water in the pool on top of the Water Gate had thus to rise to a height of twenty-three cubits

above the level of the Temple Court twenty cubits for the height of the doorway and three cubits for the height of the pool, which would have been impossible unless the Etam well was situated on at least a corresponding height.]

Yoma 31b

But there is also one cubit of the ceiling and one cubit of the flooring?¹ — Since the gates of the Sanctuary are made of marble these were made of a small [thickness]. But there is some [additional thickness] however small? — Since it is not even as much as a cubit, he does not count it.

A LINEN SHEET WAS SPREAD BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE. Why of linen? — As R. Kahana said [elsewhere]:² So that he may perceive that the service of the day is to be performed in garments of linen. Thus here too it is that he might perceive that the service of the day is to be performed in garments of linen.

MISHNAH. HE STRIPPED OFF [HIS GARMENTS],³ WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF.⁴ THEY BROUGHT HIM THE GOLDEN⁵ GARMENTS, HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET. THEY BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT AND SOME ONE ELSE FINISHED IT FOR HIM.⁶ HE RECEIVED THE BLOOD AND SPRINKLED IT. HE WENT INSIDE⁷ TO SMOKE THE INCENSE OF THE MORNING⁸ AND TO TRIM THE LAMPS;⁹ [AFTERWARDS] TO OFFER UP THE HEAD AND THE LIMBS AND THE PANCAKES AND THE WINE-OFFERING. THE MORNING INCENSE WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE BLOOD AND THE LIMBS, THE AFTERNOON [INCENSE] BETWEEN THE LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. IF THE HIGH PRIEST WAS EITHER OLD OR OF DELICATE HEALTH WARM WATER WOULD BE PREPARED FOR HIM AND POURED INTO THE COLD, TO MITIGATE ITS COLDNESS.

YOMA - 28a-61b

GEMARA. The scholars said in the presence of R. Papa:¹⁰ This [Mishnah]¹¹ is not in accord with R. Meir, for if it were in accord with him,¹² behold he said: There must be two sanctifications for the putting on of the garments, hence there ought to be here, too,¹³ two sanctifications for the putting on of the garments!¹⁴

R. Papa said unto them: Whether on the view of the Sages or of R. Meir, one sanctification is for the stripping off of the holy garments,¹⁵ and one for the putting on¹⁵ and the reason of their dispute is [the interpretation of these words]: He shall put off, he shall bathe and he shall put on.¹⁶ R. Meir holds that Scripture compares the stripping to the putting on [of the garments], i.e., just as in the case of the putting on of the garments he first puts them on and only afterwards sanctifies himself, so also with the stripping off of the garments, he first strips off and then sanctifies himself; whereas the Rabbis hold that [Scripture] compares the stripping off to the putting on, i.e., just as with the putting on he sanctifies himself whilst dressed in the garments, so with the stripping off, he sanctifies himself whilst the garments are yet on him.

Said the scholars to R. Papa: How can you say so, has it not been taught: A sheet of linen was spread between him and the people, he stripped off [his garments], went down, immersed himself, came up and dried himself. One brought the golden garments before him, he put them on, and sanctified his hands and his feet.

R. Meir said: He stripped off [his garments] and sanctified his hands and his feet, went down and immersed himself, came up and dried himself. One brought the golden garments before him, he put them on and sanctified his hands and feet!¹⁷ — He answered them: If there is such teaching, it is a teaching [to be recognized]. According to R. Meir it is right, because we thus account for the

(1) [I.e., there must have been an additional cubit for the ceiling of the doorway and one for the flooring of the pool on top?] (2) Infra 35a.

(3) His non-holy garments.

(4) Lit., ‘sponged himself’.

(5) The eight garments, which the high priest puts on for service. They are: tunic, breeches, miter, girdle, breast-plate, ephod, robe and plate. V. Ex. XXVIII, 2ff.

(6) To enable the high priest to put the knife aside and to take hold of the holy bowl in which he receives the blood. On other days one priest would slaughter, and another receive the blood. Both functions were to be performed by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

(7) **בָּנֵה** Lit., ‘entered’. The word ‘entered’, however, does not fit the whole of what follows, as Baneth remarks. For whereas ‘he entered the Sanctuary (Hekal) to smoke the incense and trim the lamps, he cannot be said to have ‘entered’ to offer up the head, etc. which took place outside. Baneth therefore suggests with considerable justification that, as elsewhere, ‘בָּנֵה’ be translated ‘prepared to’, ‘went on to’. But this change is unnecessary as one could translate: He went in to... trim the lamps, (afterwards) to offer up the head .’.

(8) Ex. XXX, 7.

(9) I.e., clean them, provide them with wick and oil, according to Maimonides, also light them.

(10) V. Rashi.

(11) [Which prescribes only one sanctification in connection with the first immersion when he changes from his non-holy garments into the garments of gold.]

(12) [Who teaches infra 34b that in connection with the second immersion, when he changes from the garments of gold into linen garments, he disrobes himself first and then sanctifies himself, in contradistinction to the Rabbis who place the sanctification before the disrobing.]

(13) [It is assumed that the reason of R. Meir for prescribing the disrobing before the sanctification is that he holds that the two sanctifications required on the change of garments are for the putting on of holy vestments. Whereas the Rabbis ascribe one for the stripping of holy garments and the other for the putting on of holy garments.]

(14) [On the other hand, in the view of the Rabbis, there would be no need for more than one sanctification, since the garments of which he strips himself at the first immersion are non-holy.]

(15) So that our Mishnah can be also in accord with R. Meir.

(16) Lev. XVI, 23, 24.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(17) [This shows that R. Meir requires two sanctifications also in connection with the first immersion.]

Yoma 32a

ten sanctifications, but according to the Rabbis, they are only nine? — The Rabbis will answer you: The last sanctification is made when he strips off the holy garments and puts on the profane¹ ones.

Our Rabbis taught: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting² For what purpose does he enter? For no other purpose than that of taking out the censer and the coal-pan, the whole portion being reported in right order with the exception of this passage.³ For what reason?⁴ —

R. Hisda said: There is a tradition: Five immersions and ten sanctifications did the high priest undergo on that day. If he had performed them in the order mentioned in the scriptures there could have been no more than three immersions and six sanctifications.⁵

It was taught: R. Judah said: Whence do we know of the five immersions and ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that day? To teach us that it is said: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments... and he shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place and put on his other vestments and come forth and offer [his burnt-offering].⁶ Thus you infer that whenever one changes from one service to another,⁷ an immersion is required.

Rabbi said: Whence do we know that the high priest had to undergo five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day? Because it is said: He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with the linen girdle, and with the linen Miter shall he be attired; they are the holy garments; and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and put them

on.⁸ Hence you learn that whosoever changes from service to service requires an immersion. Moreover, it says, 'They are the holy garments', thus putting all the garments on the same level. Now there are five services;⁹ The continual offering of dawn, [performed] in the golden garments: the service of the day [the Day of Atonement], in linen garments; of his [the high priest's] and the people's ram, in the golden garments; [the taking out] of the censer and coal-pan, in white garments; the continual evening offering in the golden garments — Whence do we know that every immersion required two sanctifications? For it is written: And he shall put off... and he shall wash; and he shall wash and he shall put on.¹⁰ —

R. Eliezer b. Simeon said: This can be inferred a minori ad majus: If in a case where no immersion is required,¹¹ sanctification is yet required,¹² how much more, in a place in which immersion is required,¹³ is sanctification also required — But [perhaps let us also infer] that as there only one sanctification is required, here, too, one only would be necessary? Therefore Scripture says: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments which he put on — what is the meaning of 'which he put on'? Does not a man put off but that which he did put on?

Rather [are these superfluous words written] to put the putting off on the same level with the putting on of the garments; just as the putting on of the garments requires sanctification,¹⁴ so does the putting off of the garments require it.

[The master said]:¹⁵ 'R. Judah said: Whence do we know of the five immersions and ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that Day? To teach us that Scripture says: "And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting... and shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place." Thus you infer that whenever one changes from one service to another, an immersion is required.' We

YOMA - 28a-61b

found [this rule] for the change from the white garments to the golden ones.¹⁶ Whence do we know [that it also applies] for the change from the golden to the linen ones?

(1) At the end of the service of the Day of Atonement, as he strips off" the holy garments to don profane ones.

(2) Lev. XVI, 23.

(3) Infra 70b.

(4) Did Aaron, have to interrupt the service, interpolating the offering up of his and the people's ram, between the incense and the bringing out of censer and coal-pan?

(5) One immersion each for the continual offering of the morning, for the service of the day, which includes censer — and coal-pan — function, and one between that and the offering up of the rams, which includes the additional, and the continual afternoon offering. Thus there would be three immersions only as against the five traditionally reported. Hence the necessity of a change in the program, hence the interpolation of the offering of the rams between the service within (the day's service) and the bringing out of censer and coal-pan. So that the censer — and coal-pan — function now interrupts between the offerings of the rams and the continual afternoon-offering, with the result that there are now five immersions necessary; one for the morning's continual offering, in the golden garments; one for the service of the day in white garments; one for the offering of the two rams on the outer altar in the golden garments; one for the taking out of censer and coal-pan in white garments; and the fifth for the additional, and the continual afternoon offering in the golden garments. Thus tradition and text are harmonized, the five immersions implying ten sanctifications, one each, before each putting off, and before each putting on, of the garments required for each service.

(6) Lev. XVI, 23, 24.

(7) I.e., from a service performed within the Tent of Meeting to one performed outside and vice versa.

(8) Ibid. 4.

(9) Whether on the view of Rabbi or of R. Judah.

(10) [This is the continuation of Rabbi's statement and the reference is to Lev. XVI, 23, 24. The words 'he shall wash', being placed between 'he shall put off' and 'he shall put on', are taken by Rabbi as referring both to stripping and the robing, each requiring a separate washing (sanctification), this in contradistinction to R. Judah who derives from it supra the need of all immersion between every change of service v. infra 32b.]

(11) During the rest of the days of the year (as against the Day of Atonement) the law of the Torah does not require immersion before each service, only by Rabbinic ordinance, the purpose of which is to keep the priest conscious of risks to his cleanliness, is such immersion necessary. (V. supra 30a.)

(12) V. Ex. XL, 32.

(13) On the Day of Atonement, at every change of garment.

(14) As is inferred a minori.

(15) [To be inserted with some MSS. V. D.S.]

(16) The verses in question (Lev. XVI, 23, 24) occurring in connection with the stripping of the white garments.

Yoma 32b

The school of R. Ishmael taught: That can be inferred a minori: If the golden garments in which the high priest does not enter the Holy of Holies require immersion, how much more do the linen garments, in which he enters the Holy of Holies, require it? But this argument can be demolished: The case of the golden garments is different, because much atonement is obtained in them.¹ Rather, he infers it from what Rabbi said.²

[The Master said]:³ 'Rabbi said, Whence do we know of the five immersions and the ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that day? To teach us that it is said: "He shall put on the holy linen tunic..."' Hence you learn that whosoever changes from service to service requires an immersion.' We have found that [required for a change] from the golden,⁴ to the white garments. Whence do we know that [the same rule obtains for a change] from the white to the golden garments?

The school of R. Ishmael taught: That can be inferred a minori: If the white garments, in which but little atonement is obtained, require an immersion, how much more will the golden garments, in which much atonement is obtained, require it? This argument can be demolished: The case of the white garments is different, because the high priest, dressed in them, enters the Holy of Holies? It is for this reason that he [Rabbi, in

YOMA - 28a-61b

his statement] teaches: And it also says: 'They are the holy garments, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and put them on'.⁵

'Now there are five services'. That of the continual afternoon offering [performed] in the golden garments; the service of the day in white garments; [the offering up of] his, and the people's ram in the golden garments; the [taking out of] the censer and coal-pan in white garments; and the continual offering at dusk, In the golden garments — And whence do we know that every immersion requires two sanctifications? To teach us that Scripture says: 'And he shall put off... and he shall wash... and he shall wash... and he shall put on'. But this [passage] refers to the immersions?⁶ —

Since it has no reference to the immersion [the requirement of] which we infer from 'They are the holy garments,⁷ apply it to the sanctifications. Then the Divine Law should have written the term of 'sanctification'?⁸ — [Scripture chooses that term] to let us know that immersion is even as sanctification, i.e., just as immersion must take place on holy ground, so must sanctification take place on holy ground. Whence does R. Judah⁹ infer [that] the sanctification [must take place on holy ground]? — He infers it from the teaching of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon.

R. Hisda said: Rabbi's view excludes that of R. Meir and that of the Rabbis.¹⁰ It excludes that of the Rabbis, for according to them he sanctifies himself [first] while he is still dressed, whereas Rabbi holds that he sanctifies himself after he is stripped; and it also excludes the view of R. Meir, for R. Meir holds that the second sanctification takes place when he is [already] dressed, whereas, according to Rabbi, he sanctifies himself whilst still stripped of the garments.¹¹

R. Aha b. Jacob said: All agree that at the second sanctification he first dons [the garments] and then sanctifies himself. What is the reason? Because Scripture said: Or

when they come near to the altar,¹² i.e., only he who lacks nothing but the approach,¹³ that excludes him who lacks both dressing and approach.

R. Aha, the son of Raba, said to R. Ashi: R. Hisda does not agree with R. Aha, nor does R. Aha agree with R. Hisda, for else there would be fifteen sanctifications required according to Rabbi.¹⁴

ONE BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT, etc. What does 'KERAZO'¹⁵ mean? 'Ulla said: It is a synonym for 'slaying' — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: What is the scriptural evidence? Egypt is a very fair heifer. But the Kerez [gadfly] out of the north is come, it is come.¹⁶ What is the intimation?¹⁷ — As R. Joseph interpreted it: A fair kingdom is Egypt but murderous nations from the north will come upon it.¹⁸ How far shall he cut? —

'Ulla said: The bigger part of both organs.¹⁹ Thus also said R. Johanan: The bigger part of the two organs. Resh Lakish also holds that he cuts through the bigger part of the two organs, for Resh Lakish said:²⁰ Since we have learned that the cutting through of the bigger part of an organ is as good as the cutting through the whole of it, why did we learn that 'the bigger part of one organ [is required to be cut through] in case of a fowl 'and the bigger part of the two organs [are required to be cut through] in case of an animal?

Because we have learned: **ONE BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT AND SOMEONE ELSE FINISHED IT FOR HIM, HE RECEIVED THE BLOOD AND SPRINKLED IT** — one might assume, if another one did not complete the killing for him, it would be invalid. — [You say that] 'one could assume that if the other did not complete the killing for him, it would be invalid,' then it would mean that the service is performed by someone²¹ else and we have

YOMA - 28a-61b

learnt: All the services of the Day of Atonement are valid only if performed by him [the high priest]?²² —

Rather: This is what he says: One might have assumed that it shall be considered invalidated by Rabbinic ordinance,²³

(1) They are used every day for services, whereas the white garments are used only for the service in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement and obtain atonement for the Sanctuary and its sacred things, if defilement had occurred there; v. Shebu. 7b.

(2) From Lev. XVI, 4.

(3) [Inserted by one MS. cf. Rashi.]

(4) The verse in question occurring in connection with the changing from the gold garments into the linen ones.

(5) The additional passage adduced by Rabbi intimates that Scripture makes the fact that they are the holy garments the reason for the need of immersion, so that one shall infer that all changes of holy garments on the Day of Atonement require immersion, thus also the golden garments.

(6) Since it says 'his flesh'.

(7) Cf. n. 1.

(8) [I.e., it should have been written 'he shall wash his hands and feet', R. Hananel.]

(9) Who interprets the above passage differently, who therefore lacks a source for this information.

(10) Mentioned supra p.146, n. 6.

(11) [Rabbi holds that both sanctifications are performed whilst he is stripped, one before the immersion and the other after the immersion.]

(12) Ex. XXX, 20.

(13) May perform the sanctification.

(14) According to R. Hisda, Rabbi requires two sanctifications between stripping and dressing; and according to R. Aha, Rabbi requires the sanctification after being dressed before the service, for if their views were not incompatible, Rabbi would be found to require fifteen sanctifications.

(15) Why a change of the usual wording? 'Shehato' would have been the normal way of putting it.

(16) Jer. XLVI, 20.

(17) The word 'Kerez' here, meaning 'gadfly', does not suggest explanation of the incision.

(18) The question has the Hebrew text in mind, the answer the Aramaic paraphrase. Since 'Kerez' is interpreted as 'murderous', 'Karaz' may fitly be used for 'shahat', to kill.

(19) The windpipe and the gullet.

(20) Hul. 29b.

(21) That would render the service of the other essential, hence would mean someone else's

participation in the service of the Day of Atonement, which is against the law.

(22) Infra 73a.

(23) Making a distinction between profane slaughter, where the bigger part of an organ is on the same level as the whole organ, i.e., the cutting through of the bigger part completes the slaughtering effectively, as against sacred animals, which would have their organ (or organs) completely cut through.

Yoma 33a

therefore we have learnt: The bigger part of an organ with a fowl, the bigger part of two organs with an animal — But since, even by Rabbinic ordinance, it would be considered not invalidated,¹ why does he [the other one] have to finish it? — It is the proper thing [a command] to finish it.²

Abaye related the order of the [daily] priestly functions in the name of tradition and in accordance with Abba Saul:³ The large pile comes before the second pile for the incense; the second pile for the incense comes before the laying in order of the two logs of wood; the laying in order of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner altar; the removing of the ashes from the inner altar precedes the trimming of the five lamps; the trimming of the five lamps precedes the blood⁴ of the continual offering; the blood of the continual offering precedes the trimming of the two lamps; the trimming of the two lamps precedes the incense; the incense precedes the limbs;⁵ the limbs come before the meal-offering; the meal-offering precedes the pancakes; the pancakes come before the drink-offerings; the drink-offerings precede the additional offerings; the additional offerings come before the [frankincense] censers, and the [frankincense] censers precede the continual afternoon-offering, as it is said: And he shall make smoke thereon the fat of the peace-offerings,⁶ i.e., herewith all the offerings are completed —⁷

The Master said: 'The great pile precedes the second pile for the incense.' Whence do we

YOMA - 28a-61b

know that? Because it has been taught:⁸ This is the law of the burnt-offering: it is that which goeth up on its fire-wood upon the altar all night⁹ — this passage refers to the great pile. And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby¹⁰ — this refers to the second pile for the incense.¹¹ But perhaps I should reverse it?¹² —

It seems more logical that the great pile have preference because it brings more¹³ atonement — On the contrary: the second pile is of greater value, for it is introduced within [the Sanctuary].¹⁴ — Nevertheless, the one which causes more atonement is of greater value. And, if you like, say: If there be no wood found for the second pile, would one not bring it into [the Sanctuary] from the great pile?¹⁵ ‘The second pile for the incense precedes the laying in order of the two logs of wood.’ Whence do we know that?—

Because it is written: And the priest shall kindle wood¹⁶ upon it every morning,¹⁷ i.e., ‘upon it’,¹⁸ but not upon the other pile,¹⁹ hence we can infer that the other pile is arranged already. But the word ‘upon it’ has its own text meaning? — ‘Upon it’ is written twice.²⁰ ‘The laying in order of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner altar.’ Although touching the one it is written: ‘In the morning, in the morning’²¹ and touching the other it is also written: ‘In the morning, in the morning’²² nevertheless that which is preparatory [to the incense burning] has preference,²³ What would be preparatory [according to their reply], are the two logs of wood, but surely you said that the two logs of wood belong to the great pile!²⁴ —

R. Jeremiah said: It is the laying in order of the wood.²⁵ — Rabina said:²⁶ Since he started with the laying in order [of the wood], he completes it also. R. Ashi said:²⁶ If he found no wood in the second pile, would he not bring it in from the great pile? ‘And the removal of the ashes from the inner altar

precedes the trimming of the five lamps.’ Why? —

Abaye said: I know it²⁷ by tradition, but I do not know the reason. Raba said: it is in accord with Resh Lakish, for Resh Lakish said: ‘One must not forego the occasion of performing a religious command’²⁸

- (1) If the other priest did not finish the cutting of the organs.
- (2) In order to obtain a proper supply of blood for the services of the day.
- (3) V. supra 14b.
- (4) Actually: the slaying of the animal and the receiving of the blood.
- (5) Smoking of the limbs of the continual morning-offering.
- (6) Lev. VI, 5.
- (7) Connecting ad hoc מים ליל peace-offerings’ with the root ליל meaning to be complete, thus: And he shall make smoke thereon the fat of the peace-offerings is made to mean: And he shall... the complete sacrifice, the conclusion of the sacrifices.
- (8) Infra 45a.
- (9) Lev. VI, 2.
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) A special pile of wood, away from the main great pile, was kindled to provide embers for the daily burning of incense on the golden altar; v. Tam. 29a.
- (12) So that the pile for the incense should come first.
- (13) Because every smoking, with the exception of that of the incense, smoked on the inner altar, is performed thereon.
- (14) For incense burning.
- (15) So that some of the great pile, too, may be introduced within the Sanctuary.
- (16) This is taken to refer to the two logs of wood.
- (17) Lev. VI, 5.
- (18) I.e., the large pile.
- (19) The second pile for incense.
- (20) Ibid. In this very same verse, once it has its text meaning, the surplus word intimates the inference.
- (21) Ex. XXX, 7, E. V., ‘every morning’. [With reference to the smoking of incense, which also includes the removal of the ashes from the inner altar which must precede the incense offering.]
- (22) Lev. VI, 5.
- (23) The embers of the wood are essential, for without them no incense can be smoked.
- (24) And are thus not preparatory to the incense.
- (25) Lit., ‘the name of’ is wood, and wood is essential for the incense, even though not this wood.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(26) The reason why the laying of the two logs precedes the removal of the ashes from the inner altar.

(27) That this was the order according to Abba Saul.

(28) Infra 58b.

Yoma 33b

and as he [the priest] enters the Hekal [Sanctuary], he comes first upon the altar.¹ For it was taught: The table was to the north two and one half cubits away from the wall, the candlestick was to the south, two and one half cubits away from the wall, the altar stood in the exact middle, extending somewhat outward.² But let it stand with them?³ — Since it is written: And the candlestick over against the table,⁴ it is required that they⁵ see each other.

Said Raba: From what Resh Lakish said we infer that it is forbidden to forego the arm in favor of the forehead.⁶ How shall he do it? From the arm [he shall] proceed to the forehead.⁷ ‘And the trimming of the five lamps is to precede the blood of the continual offering, and the blood of the continual offering is to come before the trimming of the two lamps.’ What is the reason? —

Abaye said: [The phrases] ‘In the morning, in the morning’, [written] in connection with the two logs of wood,⁸ which are not necessary [there]:⁹ one¹⁰ applies to the trimming of the five lamps which shall precede the blood of the continual offering; the other applies to the blood of the continual offering which is to come before the trimming of the two lamps.¹¹ ‘One applies to the trimming of the five lamps which should precede the blood of the continual offering’, for here¹² are three¹³ [words], there only two. ‘And the other applies to the blood of the continual offering which should come before the trimming of the two lamps’, for, although in each case there are two,¹⁴ yet, that which obtains atonement¹⁵ has preference.

R. Papa said to Abaye: But say, perhaps, that one is to be applied to the removing of the ashes of the inner altar, which is to precede the blood of the continual offering, for here are three words,¹⁶ there but two; and one applies to the blood of the continual offering that should come before the trimming of the five lamps, for, although in both cases there are but two, the one that obtains atonement is to have preference? — If so, what shall he interrupt it with?¹⁷ It would be quite right according to Resh Lakish who said: The lamps were trimmed and [after interruption] trimmed again.¹⁸ in order to keep the whole Temple Court animated, but according to R. Johanan who interprets ‘In the morning, in the morning’,¹⁹ i.e., divide it into two mornings,²⁰ what could be said?²¹

Said Rabina to R. Ashi: Are the words ‘In the morning, in the morning’ in connection with the wood at all superfluous? Surely they are really necessary for their text meaning, the Divine Law saying that they should precede the second pile for the incense? He replied: Have we not explained: ‘Upon it’ but not upon the other pile, which indicated that the other must have been there already!²² Why does he trim the five lamps first, let him trim the two lamps first! — Having started already, let him do the bigger part. Then let him trim six? —

Scripture says: When he dresseth the lamps, he shall burn it,¹⁹ and ‘lamps’ is no less than two. — ‘And the trimming of the lamps is to come before the incense’, for Scripture says: ‘When he dresseth the lamps’, and afterwards [it says]. ‘He shall burn it’ [the incense].¹⁹ ‘And the incense [shall precede] the limbs’ — For it was taught: Let that, in connection with which it is said ‘In the morning, in the morning’, precede that, in connection with which Scripture said only, ‘In the morning’ [once].²³ ‘And the limbs [come before] the meal-offering’, for it was taught:²⁴ Whence do we know that nothing may precede²⁵ the continual offering of the dawn?

YOMA - 28a-61b

Yoma 34a

- (1) Before he reaches the candlestick.
- (2) Men. 99a. Eastward towards the entrance into the Hekal,
- (3) Between them, i.e., in the exact middle.
- (4) Ex. XXVI, 35.
- (5) The candlestick and table.
- (6) To reverse the order of putting on the Tefillin (v. Glos.).
- (7) In Deut. VI, 8 it reads: And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thy eyes. Tosaf. s.v. עבורי would have Raba's remark apply to the obligation to touch the Tefillin as a preventive of diversion from a prayerful mood.
- (8) Lev. VI, 5, v. supra p. 156, n. 2.
- (9) For as preparatory they have preference and come every morning first; v. supra.
- (10) 'In the morning'.
- (11) On the principle that if a certain expression is superfluous in its own context it is applied for hermeneutical purposes to another (אמ אינו עניין).
- (12) With reference to the trimming of the lamps.
- (13) I.e., three times 'in the morning': twice in Ex. XXX, 7, and one which we apply as above, whereas the continual offering has but once 'in the morning', Ex. XXIX, 39, to which the one applied from the two logs of wood is to be added.
- (14) Twice in Ex. XXX, 7, which apply to the two lamps equally as to the five, and twice in connection with the continual offering as explained in n. 8.
- (15) V. infra 36a.
- (16) The applied and the two in their own passage. Lev. VI, 5.
- (17) The trimming of the lamps, which according to Abba Saul had to take place before the incense-offering. Since the order would be: the blood of the continual offering, the trimming of the lamps, the incense.
- (18) First five lamps were trimmed and two after a break.
- (19) Ex. XXX, 7.
- (20) By interrupting it through the interpolation of another service in the midst of the original order.
- (21) Hence R. Papa's supposition cannot be admitted.
- (22) V. supra p. 154. nn. 13, 14.
- (23) Ex. XXIX, 39. [Although it has been stated supra that one 'in the morning' is applied to the continual offering from elsewhere, this is only as far as the blood rituals are concerned, but does not apply to the smoking of the limbs (Rashi).]
- (24) Tamid 28b.
- (25) I.e., may be burnt on the main pile of the altar.

To teach us that it said: And he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it,¹ and Raba said 'the burnt-offering' [means] this is the first burnt-offering.² 'And the meal-offering [shall precede] the pancakes' — [For Scripture reads]: Burnt-offering and meal-offering.³ 'And the pancakes precede the drink-offerings', they, too, are considered a species of a meal-offering. 'And the drink-offerings [come before] the additional offerings as it is written: A sacrifice and drink-offerings.⁴ 'And the additional sacrifices [come before] the [frankincense] censers' — But has it not been taught: The [frankincense] censers come before the additional sacrifices? —

This is a matter concerning which Tannaim are disputing.⁵ Abaye said: The view that the additional offerings precede the [frankincense] censers seems more logical, for did you not say that the words 'In the morning, in the morning' imply that it is to receive preference before all, thus do the words 'on the day... on the day'⁶ indicate that it is to be [offered up] last [in the day]. What is the reason of him who holds that the [frankincense] censers come before the additional offerings? — He infers it from the identical expression 'statute'⁷ which occurs with the pancakes. If he infers it hence, let him do so complete?⁸ — Here [the words] 'on the day... on the day' come in to intimate that they [the frankincense censers] are offered up last [in the day].

THE INCENSE OF THE MORNING WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. According to whom [is this teaching]? If according to the Rabbis,⁹ it should come between the blood and the lamps;¹⁰ if according to Abba Saul, it should come between the lamps and the limbs?¹¹ — In truth it is in accord with the Rabbis, but he does not treat of the order here.¹²

YOMA - 28a-61b

THE INCENSE OF THE AFTERNOON WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE [SMOKING OF THE] LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. Whence do we know these things? — R. Johanan said: Because Scripture said: As the meal-offering of the morning, and as the drink-offering thereof, thou shalt present it,¹³ i.e., just as with the meal-offering of the morning the incense precedes the drink-offerings, so also here the incense shall come before the drink-offerings. But then, just as there the incense precedes the [smoking] of the limbs, here too the incense should come before the limbs? Is it written: ‘As the limbs of the morning’? It is written: ‘As the meal-offering of the morning’, which means: As the meal-offering of the morning, but not as the [smoking of the] limbs of the morning.

Our Rabbis taught: And the drink-offering thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin:¹⁴ let him infer [the need of a drink-offering] for the morning sacrifice from the evening sacrifice.

(1) Lev. VI, 5.

(2) Cf. Hor. 12a.

(3) Lev. XXIII, 37: These are the appointed seasons of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to bring an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt-offering, and a meal-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings, each on its own day. This is the prescribed order, not to be interfered with.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Pes. 58a.

(6) Ibid. XXIV, 8: on the day of the Sabbath, on the day of the Sabbath, shall he set it in order before the Lord, continually. Just as In the morning, in the morning’ was accepted as an intimation that it shall be early in the morning, so ‘On the day, on the day’ may fitly be assumed to be an indication that it is to be offered last in the day.

(7) Concerning the pancakes, the word ‘statute’ is used in Lev. VI, 15, as in connection with the frankincense censers, ibid. XXIV, 9. Just as pancakes take precedence over additional offerings, so do the frankincense censers.

(8) That the frankincense censers should have precedence over the drink-offerings too.

(9) [That the incense was offered between the trimming of the five lamps and the two lamps, v. supra 15a.]

(10) [I.e., before completing the trimming of the lamps.]

(11) V. supra 33a.

(12) [He was not too particular in regard to the details of the order (Rashi). On this view it could be also in accord with Abba Saul, but it is preferable to make the Mishnah in agreement with the majority of Rabbis (Rashi).]

(13) Num. XXVIII, 8.

(14) Ibid. 7.

Yoma 34b

Rabbi said: For the evening sacrifice from the morning sacrifice!¹ It is quite right according to the Rabbis, for that is written [specifically] in connection with the continual offering of the evening,² but what is the ground of Rabbi's statement? — Rabbah b. Ulla said: Scripture said: ‘For the one lamb’.³ Now which is the lamb in connection with which the word *ehad* [one] is used? Say: It is the lamb of the continual offering of the morning.⁴ And what do the Rabbis [reply]? — ‘Ehad’, i.e., the unique, the best of the flock. And [what is] Rabbi's [answer]? — He infers that from: And all your choice vows.⁶ And the Rabbis? — One speaks of freewill-[offerings], the other of obligatory [offerings] and both need special mention.⁷

IF THE HIGH PRIEST WAS OLD OR OF DELICATE HEALTH, etc. It was taught: R. Judah said: Lumps of wrought iron were heated on the eve of the Day of Atonement and were cast into the cold water to mitigate the coldness. But was [one] not thereby hardening them?⁸ —

R. Bibi said: [The heat] did not reach the hardening point. Abaye said: Even assume it did reach the hardening point, [a forbidden] act⁹ which was produced without intent, is permitted. But did Abaye say that? Has it not been taught:¹⁰ The flesh of his foreskin¹¹ — even though a white spot¹² is there may he cut it off,¹³ these are the words of R. Josiah. And we asked investigatingly concerning it: Why is a Scriptural statement necessary for

YOMA - 28a-61b

that,¹⁴ and Abaye said: This was in accord with R. Judah who said: A forbidden act produced without intent, remains forbidden!¹⁵ That applies only to forbidden things in the whole Torah,¹⁶ but here¹⁷ hardening is [forbidden] only by Rabbinic ordination.

MISHNAH. THEY BROUGHT HIM TO THE PARWAH CELL-WHICH WAS ON HOLY GROUND.¹⁸ THEY SPREAD A SHEET OF BYSSUS [LINEN] BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE. HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET AND STRIPPED. R. MEIR SAID: HE STRIPPED, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. HE WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. AFTERWARDS THEY BROUGHT HIM WHITE GARMENTS.¹⁹ HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON PELUSIUM LINEN WORTH TWELVE MINAS,²⁰ IN THE AFTERNOON INDIAN LINEN WORTH EIGHT HUNDRED ZUZ. THESE ARE THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. THE SAGES SAY: IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON [GARMENTS] WORTH EIGHTEEN MINAS AND IN THE AFTERNOON [GARMENTS] WORTH TWELVE MINAS, ALTOGETHER THIRTY MINAS.²¹ ALL THAT AT THE CHARGE OF THE COMMUNITY²² AND IF HE WANTED TO SPEND MORE OF HIS OWN HE COULD DO SO.

(1) Just as the one requires drink-offering, so does the other. The practical difference: The case of a community who had enough for only one drink-offering. According to the opinion that one must infer the regulation for the afternoon-offering from the morning-offering, the latter is more important and the drink-offering would have to be allotted to the morning-offering. (Tosaf. s.v. זב). The basis of the discussion: To which of the two continual offerings does the phrase 'for the one lamb' (Num. XXVIII, 7) refer? The Sages hold it refers to the last named, the afternoon-offering, whereas Rabbi holds that it recalls the morning-offering, where the same phrase ('one') is used (verse 4).

(2) The last named of the two.

(3) Num. XXVIII, 7.

(4) V. Ibid. 4.

(5) That particular meaning of 'ehad', as applied to the continual offering.

(6) Deut. XII, 11.

(7) As arguments may be advanced in favor of each requiring to be of the best, to the exclusion of the other.

(8) Which is forbidden on any holy day, how much more on the solemn Day of Atonement.

(9) Shab. 41b.

(10) Shab. 133a.

(11) Lev. XII, 3.

(12) Of leprosy, which normally must not be removed by surgery.

(13) The word 'flesh' here is superfluous, hence we infer therefrom that no matter how the flesh be (even leprous) he may circumcise it.

(14) Since it was a forbidden act produced without intent, it seems self-evident that it would be permitted. Why, then, was the Scriptural intimation necessary?

(15) Abaye, who held that this intimation supported the view of R. Judah, evidently agrees with him.

(16) By the Torah proper, the Five Books of Moses, as against the Torah in general, the sum total of the Jewish law and tradition. Prohibitions of the Torah are more serious, hence even unintended transgression remains forbidden.

(17) The prohibition dealt with here.

(18) The first immersion, on top of the Water Gate, took place on profane ground; this, however, had to be performed on holy ground, as part of the service of the Day of Atonement.

(19) The four garments prescribed for the special service of the Day of Atonement: the tunic, the breeches, the girdle and the miter, Lev. XVI, 4.

(20) One mina is worth about £ 3.

(21) As long as one spends more for the morning garments than for the evening garments, there is no regulation to

enforce the exact sum mentioned in the Mishnah. V. infra. The evening garment was put on by the high priest for the

sole purpose of removing spoon and coal-pan from the Holy of Holies, whereas the rest of the special service of the Day

of Atonement was performed by him in the morning garment, hence it has to be the better of the two.

(22) Var. lec.: So much he received from the Temple treasury. V. Bah.

Yoma 35a

GEMARA. What does 'Parwah' mean? — R. Joseph said: Parwah is [the name of] a [Persian] Magus.¹

THEY SPREAD A SHEET OF BYSSUS [LINEN] BETWEEN HIM AND THE

YOMA - 28a-61b

PEOPLE. Why was it of Byssus [linen]? R. Kahana said: That he may perceive that the service of the day was [to be performed] in garments of Byssus [linen].

IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON PELUSIUM LINEN WORTH EIGHTEEN MINAS: Does the Tanna wish to teach us summing up?² — This is what he teaches us: One should spend neither more nor less than the sum total, but it does not matter whether one spends less for the one or more for the other. Now everybody, at any rate, agrees that the garments for the morning are more important, whence do we know that? — R. Huna, the son of R. Elai said: Scripture said: Linen... linen... linen... linen,³ i.e., the choicest linen.

(1) Rabbenu Hananel reported that according to some scholars, Parwah had dug a cave under the ground of the Sanctuary, so that he might be able to watch the high priest at the service of the Day of Atonement. The Sages, noticing the digging, sought and found the cave, and hence called the cell after him.

(2) The summing up seems superfluous, it is too simple to warrant the statement by the Tanna.

(3) Lev. XVI, 4, in connection with the putting on of the garments in the morning. Four times, as if to indicate the best of all possible linen.

Yoma 35b

An objection was raised: And they shall put on other garments and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments.¹ Would you not say that 'other' implies better garments? — No, 'other' implies inferior ones.

R. Huna b. Judah, or, as some say, R. Samuel b. Judah learnt: After the community service is over, a priest for whom his mother made a tunic, may put it on and perform therein private service,² provided he hands it over to the community. Is that not self-evident?³ You might have said: Let us fear he may not hand it over properly,⁴ therefore he teaches us that we have no such fear. They told about R. Ishmael b. Phabis that his mother made him a tunic worth one hundred minas which he

put on to officiate at a 'private' service and then handed it over to the community. They told about R. Eleazar b. Harsom⁶ that his mother made him a tunic worth twenty thousand minas and his brethren, the priests, would not suffer him to put it on because he looked like one naked. But how could it be transparent, did not a Master say the thread [of the priestly garments] was six times twisted? — Abaye said: [It was visible] even as wine shines through a [glass] cup.⁷

Our Rabbis taught: The poor, the rich, the sensuals come before the [heavenly] court — They say to the poor: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he says: I was poor and worried about my sustenance, they would say to him: Were you poorer than Hillel? It was reported about Hillel the Elder that every day he used to work and earn one tropaik,⁹ half of which he would give to the guard at the House of Learning, the other half being spent for his food and for that of his family. One day he found nothing to earn and the guard at the House of Learning would not permit him to enter. He climbed up and sat upon the window,¹⁰ to hear the words of the living God from the mouth of Shemayah and Abtalion — They say, that day was the eve of Sabbath in the winter solstice and snow fell down upon him from heaven.

When the dawn rose,¹¹ Shemayah said to Abtalion: Brother Abtalion, on every day this house is light and to-day it is dark, is it perhaps a cloudy day. They looked up and saw the figure of a man in the window. They went up and found him covered by three cubits of snow. They removed him, bathed and anointed him and placed him opposite the fire and they said: This man deserves that the Sabbath be profaned on his behalf. To the rich man they said: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he said: I was rich and occupied with my possessions, they would say to him: Were you perchance richer than R. Eleazar?

YOMA - 28a-61b

It was reported about R. Eleazar b. Harsom that his father left him a thousand cities on the continent and over against that one thousand boats on the sea. Every day he would take a sack of flour on his shoulder and go from city to city and from province to province to study the Torah. One day his servants found him¹² and seized him for public service. He said to them: I beg of you, let me go to study the Torah. They said: By the life of R. Eleazar b. Harsom, we shall not let you go. [He gave them much money so that they let him go].¹³ He had never seen them, for he was sitting all day and night, occupying himself with the Torah. To the sensual person they would say: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah?

If he said: I was beautiful and upset by sensual passion, they would say to him: Were you perchance more beautiful than Joseph? It was told of Joseph the virtuous that the wife of Potiphar every day endeavored to entice him with words — The garments she put on for him in the morning, she did not wear in the evening, those she had put on in the evening, she did not wear in the morning. She said to him: Yield to me! He said: No. She said: I shall have you imprisoned. He said: The Lord releases the bound.¹⁴ She said: I shall bend thy proud stature.¹⁵ He replied: The Lord raises those who are bowed down.¹⁶ She said: I shall blind your eyes. He replied: The Lord opens the eyes of the blind.¹⁶ She offered him a thousand talents of silver to make him yield to her, to lie with her, to be near her,¹⁷ but he would not listen to her; not to ‘lie with her’ in this world, not ‘to be with her’ in the world to come. —

Thus [the example of] Hillel condemns the poor, [the example of] R. Eleazar b. Harsom condemns the rich, and Joseph the virtuous condemns the sensual.

MISHNAH. HE CAME TO HIS¹⁸ BULLOCK AND HIS BULLOCK WAS STANDING BETWEEN THE HALL¹⁹ AND THE ALTAR,²⁰

ITS HEAD TO THE SOUTH AND ITS FACE TO THE WEST.²¹ AND THE PRIEST STOOD IN THE EAST WITH HIS FACE TO THE WEST.²² AND HE PRESSED BOTH HIS HANDS UPON IT²³ AND MADE CONFESSION. AND THUS HE WOULD SAY: O LORD!²⁴ I HAVE DONE WRONG, I HAVE TRANSGRESSED, I HAVE SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE. O LORD! FORGIVE THE WRONGDOINGS, THE TRANSGRESSIONS, THE SINS WHICH I HAVE COMMITTED AND TRANSGRESSED AND SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES THY SERVANT: FOR ON THIS DAY SHALL ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU [TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD].²⁵ AND THEY²⁶ ANSWERED AFTER HIM: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER!

(1) Ezek. XLIV, 19. [The prohibition of the use of woolen garments in verse 17 shows that the reference is to the Day of Atonement, as on other days some of the priestly garments were made of wool; further, the words ‘and they shall put on other garments’ are taken as applying to their return in the afternoon into the inner court after they had gone forth into the outer court to put off their garments with which they ministered in the morning, and the words ‘they shall not sanctify the people with their garments’ are taken as a separate command forbidding the use by the priests of the garments of ministry when not in actual service (Rashi).]

(2) The removal of the spoon and coal-pan, which may be done even when the community is absent, hence is called ‘individual or private service’.

(3) That he may perform therein a ‘private’ service once he hands it over to the community.

(4) I.e., without reservation.

(5) V. supra p. 37, n. 5.

(6) V. supra p. 37, n. 5.

(7) Be it ever so thick. Thus was the flax of his garments transparent and his body visible.

(8) Lit., ‘wicked’.

(9) Corresponding to ** (Victoriatus) — Quinarius, half a denar, Jast.

(10) An aperture in the roof looking down to the ground floor.

(11) Lit., ‘the pillar of the morning’.

(12) Not knowing who he was.

(13) This is a marginal addition.

(14) Ps. CXLVI, 7.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(15) I.e., humiliate you with a slave's labor.

(16) Ibid. 8.

(17) Gen. XXXIX, 10.

(18) Two bullocks were offered up on that day, one from community funds at the additional sacrifice (Num. XXIX, 8), the other from the high priest's means; the latter, here dealt with, is therefore called 'his' bullock.

(19) The Ulam leading to the interior of the Temple connecting the Hekal with the Temple court.

(20) The outer altar in the Temple court.

(21) The priest turned its head in the direction of the Hekal, so that the horns, between which the priest pressed his hands on its head, faced the Hekal, v. Gemara.

(22) The priest thus stood at the side of his bullock, his back to the altar, his face towards the Holy of Holies.

(23) I.e., upon its head, between the horns.

(24) Lit., 'O, the Name'.

(25) Lev. XVI, 30.

(26) The priests and the people who stood in the Temple court and who, on hearing him pronounce the ineffable Name of God, prostrated themselves.

Yoma 36a

GEMARA. Whom did you hear saying that the place between Hall and altar was [considered] north?¹ R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, for it was taught: What is [considered] north? From the northern wall of the altar up to the [northern] wall of the Temple court and opposite the whole altar on the north,² this is the opinion of R. Jose son of R. Judah. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon adds also the space between the Hall and the altar.³ Rabbi adds also the space for the treading of the priests and the place for the treading of the Israelites within,⁴ and all agree that from the inside of the knives' cells it was illegitimate.⁵ Shall we [then] say that the Mishnah is in accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, but not with Rabbi? —

You can even say that it is in accord with Rabbi, for if he adds even⁷ to what R. Jose son of R. Judah says, will he not add to [the space defined by] R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon!⁸ This is what we mean: If it were in accord with Rabbi, its could be placed anywhere in the whole Temple court! What, then [would you maintain] that [the Mishnah] is in accord

with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon! But then it ought to be placed anywhere between altar and wall!¹⁰ You must consequently say that the reason¹¹ is to avoid the high priest getting tired;¹² thus also, on the view of Rabbi, the reason¹¹ is to avoid the high priest getting tired.

ITS HEAD TO THE SOUTH, AND ITS FACE TO THE WEST. How is that possible?

— Rab answered: The priest turns its head
— But let him place it straight!¹³ — Abaye said: We are afraid it might drop excrements.

Our Rabbis taught:¹⁴ How does one press [the hands on the head of the sacrifice]?¹⁵ The sacrifice stands to the north,¹⁶ with its face to the west, and he who presses¹⁷ [the hands] stands to the east, with his face to the west, and lays his two hands between the two horns of the sacrifice, that nothing may intervene between him and the sacrifice¹⁸ — and he makes confession. With a sin-offering [he makes confession] of the sin [committed]; with a guilt-offering, of the guilt incurred; with a burnt-offering, of the transgressions in connection with gleanings,¹⁹ the forgotten sheaf,²⁰ the corner of the field,¹⁹ and the poor tithe²¹ — these are the words of R. Jose the Galilean.

R. Akiba said: A burnt-offering is offered up exclusively for transgression of a positive command or of a prohibition transformed into a command.²² In what do they differ? R. Jeremiah said:

(1) [For the purposes of slaughtering the sacrifice of the high priest, which, as belonging to the highest grade of sanctity had to be slaughtered on the north side. Such must be the view of the Mishnah which states that the bullock was placed between the Hall and the altar for confession as well as for slaughtering purposes, v. infra 41b: 'At the place where the confession was made there it was slaughtered'.]

(2) Only the thirty-two cubits to the north and facing the altar are considered part of the north, where the slaughtering of sacrifices of the highest grade of sanctity is legitimate, but not the space east and west of the altar, although lying to the north of the Temple court, for the biblical

YOMA - 28a-61b

command states: And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord. (Lev. I, 11), for though these parts are to the north of the Temple court, they are not to the north of the altar.

(3) [He includes the spice on the north side of the Temple court extending westwards, although not exactly facing the northern wall of the altar.]

(4) Eleven cubits each. He includes the whole north of the Temple court, even to the eastern wall.

(5) V. Mid. IV, 7, to the north and south of the Temple court. This cell, fifteen cubits to the north, fifteen to the south, ten from east to west, had twenty-four apertures where the twenty-four divisions of priests kept their knives.

(6) From the knives' cell within it was impossible to see the wall altar, hence it was forbidden to slaughter it there, Zeb. 20a.

(7) Surely when he declares that space which, is further away is legitimate he will not declare forbidden that which is nearer!

(8) [The text is difficult. MS. M. omits 'You can even say it is in accord with Rabbi'.]

(9) The high priest's bullock.

(10) On the north of the Temple court.

(11) For placing it between the Hall and the altar.

(12) To prevent his becoming over-tired by carrying the bowl with the blood a long distance.

(13) With its back to the altar and its face to the Hekal.

(14) Tosef. Men. X, 12.

(15) Of the highest grade of sanctity.

(16) The side on which it is to be slain.

(17) The owner of the sacrifice.

(18) Men. 93b, the text in the Tosef. differs somewhat.

(19) Lev. XIX, 9: Neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest.

(20) Deut. XXIV, 19.

(21) Ibid. XXVI, 12.

(22) I.e., a prohibition the transgression of which must be repaired by a succeeding act, as e.g., Ex. XII, 10: You shall let nothing of it remain until the morning (prohibition); But that which remaineth... you shall burn in fire (remedial action).

Yoma 36b

They differ concerning the prohibition of carrion,¹ R. Akiba holding it to be a proper prohibition,² whilst R. Jose the Galilean does not consider it a proper prohibition.³ Abaye said: Everybody agrees that the prohibition of carrion is a proper prohibition, what they differ in is the laws touching 'Thou shalt

leave',⁴ R. Akiba holding 'Thou shalt leave' means from the very beginning,⁵ whilst R. Jose the Galilean holds it means 'now'.⁶

Our Rabbis taught:⁷ How does he make confession: I have done wrong, I have transgressed I have sinned — Similarly, in connection with the he-goat to be sent away Scripture says: And he shall confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions even in their sins.⁸ Similarly, with Moses, it says: Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin⁹ — these are the words of R. Meir.

The Sages, however, say: 'Wrongs' are deliberate misdeeds, thus also does Scripture say: That soul shall be utterly cut off, his wrong shall be upon him,¹⁰ 'transgressions' are rebellious deeds, as it is said: The King of Moab hath transgressed against me;¹¹ furthermore: Then did Libnah transgress at the same time; 'sins'¹² are inadvertent omissions, as it is said: If any one shall sin through error.¹³ —

Should he then, after having confessed the deliberate misdeeds and the rebellious deeds, turn back and confess inadvertent omissions?¹⁴ Rather, thus did he make confession: I have sinned, I have done wrong, I have transgressed before Thee, I and my house, etc. Thus also does Scripture say in connection with David: We have sinned with our fathers, we have done wrong, we have dealt wickedly.¹⁵ Thus also with Solomon: We have sinned, and have done wrong, we have dealt wickedly.¹⁶ Thus also with Daniel: We have sinned, and have dealt wrong, and have done wickedly.¹⁷ —

What is the meaning, then, of Moses' saying: 'Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin'?¹⁸ Moses said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Lord of the Universe, when Israel sin before Thee and then do penance, account their premeditated sins as errors! Rabbah b. Samuel said in the name of Rab: The Halachah is in accord with the Sages.

YOMA - 28a-61b

But [that is] self-evident, for ‘Where the opinion of one individual is opposed to the opinion of a majority, the law follows the majority’?¹⁹ — You might have said: The reason of R. Meir appears more logical because the scriptural verse of Moses²⁰ supports it, therefore we are taught [as above].

Once a man went down²¹ before Rabbah and arranged his prayer in accord with R. Meir’s view. He said to him: Do you forsake the Sages and act like R. Meir? — He answered: I hold as R. Meir, for thus it is written in the Torah of Moses.

Our Rabbis taught:²² And shall make atonement²³ — Scripture speaks of atonement through words.²⁴ You say it refers to atonement through words. But perhaps it refers to atonement [obtained] through [sacrificial] blood? I infer it thus: Here ‘atonement’ is mentioned and there²⁵ ‘atonement’ is mentioned — Just as the atonement mentioned in connection with the he-goat is one through words, so the atonement mentioned with the bullock is one obtained through words. And if you wish to argue against it, then [learn from]: And Aaron shall present the bullock for the sin-offering, which is for himself and shall make atonement for himself and for his house,²³ yet the bullock has not been slaughtered!²⁶ What does ‘And if you wish to argue against it’ imply? —

This: And if you would say: Let us infer from the he-goat prepared within the Temple, the atonement of which is obtained through blood, behold [against that argument] Scripture says: ‘And he shall make atonement’, and the bullock has not been slaughtered yet! —

(1) Carrion—an animal that has died a natural death; also whatever has become unfit through faulty slaughtering.

(2) [For which lashes are inflicted, and for which a burnt-offering does not atone.]

(3) Because once one has eaten the carrion, it is no more possible to sell it to the stranger or give it to

the sojourner as prescribed in Deut. XIV, 21, R. Akiba holding it a proper prohibition, for the transgression of which one would be punished with the prescribed thirty-nine lashes, the fact that one cannot repair the transgression notwithstanding. According to R. Jose no such punishment would here be inflicted, hence it is not a proper prohibition.

(4) Thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither gather the fallen fruit of thy vineyard. Thou shalt leave them for the poor and for the stranger. (Lev. XIX, 9.)

(5) V. next note.

(6) Here is another instance of a prohibition transformed into a command: Thou shalt not glean... thou shalt leave them. R. Akiba holds the positive commandment is enjoined from the very first, that is, thus: do not glean but leave; hence it is not a prohibition transformed into a command, but a command from the beginning; whilst R. Jose assumes that it is a de facto command: Don’t glean, but having gleaned, undo your transgression by leaving it, etc.

(7) Tosef. Yoma, II, 1.

(8) Lev. XVI, 21.

(9) Ex. XXXIV, 7.

(10) Num. XV, 31.

(11) II Kings III, 7.

(12) Ibid. VIII, 22.

(13) Lev. IV, 2.

(14) It is illogical to ask forgiveness for the gravest offenses first and then for the lighter ones.

(15) Ps. CVI, 6.

(16) I Kings VIII, 47.

(17) Dan. IX, 5. In all these cases the logical order is maintained, forgiveness being asked, first, for the sins due to inadvertence, then for those deliberate misdeeds, at last for rebellious acts.

(18) Where the order appears reversed.

(19) Ber. 9".

(20) Which agrees, as to the order, with R. Meir.

(21) To the prayer desk.

(22) Meg. 20b.

(23) Lev. XVI, 11.

(24) I.e., confession.

(25) In connection with the he-goat that is sent away. Lev. XVI, 10.

(26) How then is atonement possible? It can be obtained through confession.

Yoma 37a

Whence do we know that [the confession] starts with ‘O’? — Here the expression ‘atonement’ is used and there, in connection with Mount Horeb,¹ the expression ‘atonement’ is used, [hence the inference that] just as it started there with ‘O’² so

YOMA - 28a-61b

must it start here with ‘O’ Whence do we know that the Name³ is to be pronounced here? — Here the word ‘atonement’ is used and in connection with the heifer whose neck is to be broken⁴ the word ‘atonement’ is used, [hence the inference that] just as there the Name is pronounced, so is it to be pronounced here.

Abaye said: It is quite right that we cannot make inference for Horeb from the heifer whose neck is to be broken,⁵ because that is a past affair, but why should one not infer for the heifer whose neck is to be broken from what happened at [Mount] Horeb?⁶ — And if you will say ‘indeed so’, but have we not learned:⁷ ‘The priests say: Forgive Thy people Israel’,⁸ but they mention nothing about ‘O!’ — This is a difficulty.

AND THEY ANSWERED AFTER HIM: It was taught: Rabbi said, [commenting on]: For I will proclaim the name of the Lord; Ascribe ye greatness unto our God:⁹ Moses said to Israel: When I mention the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, ascribe greatness [unto Him]; Hananyah, the son of the brother of R. Joshua said [commenting on]: The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing:¹⁰ The prophet said to Israel: When I make reference to the Righteous One of all the Worlds, say a blessing!

MISHNAH. HE THEN WENT BACK TO THE EAST OF THE TEMPLE COURT, TO THE NORTH OF THE ALTAR, THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST¹¹ AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY¹² [MINISTERING THAT WEEK] AT HIS LEFT. THERE WERE TWO HE-GOATS¹³ AND AN URN¹⁴ CONTAINING TWO LOTS. THEY WERE OF BOX-WOOD. BEN GAMALA MADE THEM OF GOLD AND THEREFORE HE WAS PRAISED. BEN KATIN MADE TWELVE SPIGOTS FOR THE LAVER,¹⁵ FOR THERE HAD BEEN BEFORE BUT TWO. HE ALSO MADE A MACHINE FOR THE LAVER, IN ORDER THAT ITS WATER SHOULD NOT BECOME UNFIT BY REMAINING OVERNIGHT.¹⁶ KING

MONOBAZ¹⁷ HAD ALL THE HANDLES OF ALL THE VESSELS USED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT MADE OF GOLD. HIS MOTHER HELENA¹⁸ HAD A GOLDEN CANDLESTICK MADE OVER THE DOOR OF THE HEKAL. SHE ALSO HAD A GOLDEN TABLET MADE, ON WHICH THE PORTION TOUCHING THE SUSPECTED ADULTERESS¹⁹ WAS INSCRIBED. NICANOR²⁰ EXPERIENCED MIRACLES WITH HIS GATES AND HIS MONEY WAS PRAISED.

GEMARA. Since [the Mishnah] reads: TO THE NORTH OF THE ALTAR, one infers that the altar was not standing in the north.²¹ Whose opinion represents our Mishnah? The opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it was taught: Northward before the Lord,²² i.e., the north must be fully unoccupied — this is the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.²³ But the first part of the Mishnah is in accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — The whole of the Mishnah is in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob,²⁴ but read there: In the space between Hall and altar.

THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY AT HIS LEFT: Rab Judah said:²⁵ One who walks at his master's right hand is a boor. [But] we have learnt: THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE [MINISTERING] FAMILY AT HIS LEFT; and furthermore, it was taught:²⁶ Of three walking along, the teacher should walk in the middle, the greater of his disciples to his right, the smaller one at his left, and thus do we find that of the three angels who came to visit Abraham, Michael went in the middle, Gabriel at his right,²⁷ Raphael at his left? —

R. Samuel b. Papa interpreted [the first saying] before R. Adda: [It is wrong only, if] he [the teacher] be hidden by him — But has it not been taught: One who walks in front of his teacher is a boor, one who walks behind him is arrogant? — [It is assumed here] that he turns sideways.

YOMA - 28a-61b

AND THERE WAS A CASKET WHEREIN THERE WERE TWO LOTS: Our Rabbis taught: [with reference to] And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats²⁸ — ‘lots’, i.e., made of any material. One might have assumed that he should cast two lots on the head of each,²⁹ therefore [Scripture repeats]: One lot for the Lord and the other lot for Azazel,²⁸ i.e., there is but one lot ‘for the Lord’, and there is but one lot ‘for Azazel’ — One might have assumed that he shall give upon the head of each²⁹ a lot each ‘for the Lord’ and ‘for Azazel’, therefore Scripture says: ‘One lot for the Lord’, i.e., there is but one lot ‘for the Lord’ and but one lot ‘for Azazel’ —

Why then does Scripture say: [he shall cast] ‘lots’? [That means to say] that they must be alike: he must not make one of gold and the other of silver, one large, the other small; ‘lots’ [means they may be made] of any material. But that is self-evident? — No, it is necessary [to state that], as it was taught: Since we find that the [high priest's] front-plate had the name of the Lord inscribed thereon and was made of gold, I might have assumed that this too must be made of gold, hence it says [twice] ‘lot’... ‘lot’, to include [permission to make it of] olive-wood, nut-wood or box-wood.³⁰

BEN KATIN MADE TWELVE SPIGOTS FOR THE LAVER: A Tanna taught: In order that his twelve brethren, the priests, who were occupied with the continual offering, may be able to sanctify their hands and feet simultaneously.³¹

A Tanna taught:³² In the morning, when the laver was full, he sanctified his hands and feet from the upper spigot; in the evening, when [the water] was low, he sanctified his hands and feet from the lower spigot.

HE ALSO MADE A MACHINE FOR THE LAVER: What machine was that? — Abaye

said: A wheel which let it go down [to the pit].

KING MONOBAZ MADE ALL THE HANDLES FOR THE VESSELS, etc.: He should have made [the vessels] them[selves] of gold? —

(1) Ex. XXXII, 30. The similarity of expression indicates some similarity of procedure, hence the inference is legitimate.

Thus also below.

(2) Ibid. v. 31.

(3) The ineffable name of God. ‘בָּ’ may be ‘B essentiae’.

(4) Deut. XXI, 8.

(5) To pronounce the Name also here.

(6) To start with ‘O’.

(7) Sot. 47b.

(8) Deut. XXI, 8.

(9) Deut. XXXII, 3.

(10) Prov. X, 7.

(11) Segan. V. Glos.

(12) Beth Ab. V. Glos.

(13) Lev. XVI, 5,7.

(14) The Greek **.

(15) The priests washed (sanctified) their hands and feet with the water of that laver, before entering the Sanctuary or preparing a service. They turned the spigots and the water came over their hands and feet.

(16) The sacred vessels sanctify everything that comes in contact with them (Zeb. 86a), and whatever has thus been sanctified becomes invalid by remaining overnight. Ben Katin's machine (**) connected the laver with the well, thus retaining for it the undisturbable freshness of the well, hence, when drawn up in the morning, by means of the wheel, it remained valid for sacred use. The heavy laver, until then, had to be filled every morning afresh, after being emptied of last night's water — a laborious, time-wasting effort.

(17) He was king of Adiabene in the last years before the destruction of the second Temple.

(18) She was queen of Adiabene.

(19) Num. V, 11-31. V. Git. 60a.

(20) V. Tosef. II, 4, and with slight modifications, the account infra 38a.

(21) [I.e., that no part of the altar extended to the north half of the Temple court, so that on retracing his steps from the Temple proper to the Temple court, and reaching the altar, he was on the north of it.]

(22) Lev. I, 11.

(23) Zeb. 59a.

(24) Who said: Part of the altar extended to the north, whence he permitted the bullock to be slaughtered between Hall and altar. V. supra 36a

YOMA - 28a-61b

and note. (10) In the preceding Mishnah: The bullock was standing near the place between Hall and altar, about the northern corner of the latter, not in the north exactly'.

(25) Hul. 91a.

(26) 'Er. 54b.

(27) To the right, somewhat behind him, not next to him, because in the latter case he would cover him and that is unseemly.

(28) Lev. XVI, 8.

(29) Since Scripture says 'lots' instead of 'a lot each'.

(30) [Since the repetition of 'lot' intimates that they can be made of any material, the word 'lots' must likewise mean of any material, Tosef. s.v. 'כָּל']

(31) V. supra 25b.

(32) [What follows gives the reason why formerly there had been, as stated in the Mishnah, two spigots; v. D.S. a.l.]

Yoma 37b

Abaye said: [Reference here is made to] the handles of the knives. The following objection was raised: He also made of gold the base of the vessels, the rims of the vessels, the handles of the vessels and the handles of the knives [used on the Day of Atonement]? — Abaye explained: These are the helms of axes and adzes.

HIS MOTHER HELENA MADE A CANDLESTICK OF GOLD, etc.: A Tanna taught:¹ When the sun was shining, sparkling rays proceeded from it and all knew then that the time had arrived for the reading of the [morning] Shema'.² An objection was raised: One who reads the Shema' in the morning together with the linen of the [priestly] Mishmars or the [laymen] Ma'amad,³ has not fulfilled his duty, because the men of the Mishmar read it early and the men of the Ma'amad read it too late.⁴ — Abaye said: It was for the rest of the people of Jerusalem.

SHE ALSO MADE A TABLET: Do you not conclude from this that one may write a scroll for a child for practicing purposes?⁵ — Resh Lakish said in the name of R. Jannai: Alphabetically.⁶ An objection was raised: Whilst writing he⁷ looks unto the tablet and copies what is written on the tablet?⁸ — Say: He looks and writes as it is written on the

tablet.⁹ He raised this objection: When he writes he looks and copies what is written on the tablet, and what is written thereon? And if some man have lain with thee... if no man have lain with thee; if thou hast gone aside... and if thou hast not gone aside!¹⁰ — There it was written

(1) Tosef. II, 3.

(2) V. Ber. 26a.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) They postponed the reading of the Shema' until their service in connection with the continual offering had been completed. How then did the sparks inform them when this information for practical purposes was useless?

(5) In Git. 60a there is a discussion on this matter, one view permitting the writing of individual portions, the other holding only the whole Torah may be written out. Our Mishnah might settle the dispute there.

(6) What is involved here is not the real copying of a chapter of the Torah, but a kind of mnemotechnic device, with the initial letters only written out, the complete text to be supplied by memory, with the guidance of these hints.

(7) The priest who writes the scroll which the suspected adulteress must drink up.

(8) Indicating that the complete text was contained thereon.

(9) I.e., the initial letters serve him as guide.

(10) Num. V, 19, 20.

Yoma 38a

by sections.¹

NICANOR EXPERIENCED MIRACLES WITH HIS DOORS: Our Rabbis taught: What miracles happened to his doors? It was reported that when Nicanor had gone to fetch doors² from Alexandria of Egypt, on his return a gale arose in the sea to drown him. Thereupon they took one of his doors and cast it into the sea and yet the sea would not stop its rage. When, thereupon, they prepared to cast the other into the sea, he rose and clung to it, saying: 'Cast me in with it!' [They did so, and] the sea stopped. Immediately its raging. He was deeply grieved about the other [door]. As he arrived at the harbor of Acco, it broke through and came up from under the sides of the boat. —

YOMA - 28a-61b

Others say: A monster of the sea swallowed it and spat it out on the dry land Touching this, Solomon said: The beams of our houses are cedars, and our panels are Berothim [cypresses].³ Do not read ‘Berothim [cypresses] but ‘Brith yam’,⁴ i.e., covenant of the sea’. — Therefore all the gates in the Sanctuary were changed for golden ones with the exception of the Nicanor gates because of the miracles wrought with them. But some say: Because the bronze of which they were made had a golden hue.⁵ R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: It was Corinthian bronze,⁶ which shone like gold.

MISHNAH. AND THESE WERE MENTIONED TO THEIR SHAME: THEY OF THE HOUSE OF GARMU WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE SHOWBREAD;⁷ THEY OF THE HOUSE OF ABTINAS WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE INCENSE; HYGROS, SON [OF THE TRIBE] OF LEVI KNEW A CADENCE⁸ IN SONG BUT WOULD NOT TEACH IT; BEN KAMZAR WOULD NOT TEACH ANYONE HIS ART OF WRITING.⁹ CONCERNING THE FORMER IT IS SAID: THE MEMORY OF THE RIGHTEOUS SHALL BE FOR A BLESSING;¹⁰ CONCERNING THE OTHERS IT IS SAID: BUT THE NAME OF THE WICKED SHALL ROT.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: The house of Garmu was expert in preparing the showbread, but would not teach it — The Sages sent for specialists from Alexandria of Egypt, who knew how to bake as well as they, but they did not know how to take [the loaves] down [from the oven] as well as the former, for they were heating the oven from without and baked from within, whereas the latter heated the oven from within and baked from within [with the result] that the bread of the latter became moldy, whereas the bread of the former did not grow moldy. When the Sages heard that, they quoted: Everyone that is called by My name [and whom] I have created for My glory,¹¹ and

said: Let the house of Garmu return to their office. The Sages sent for them, but they would not come. Then they doubled their hire and they came. [Until now] they used to get twelve minas for the day, [from] that day, twenty-four minas. R. Judah said: [Until then] they received twenty-four minas per day, [from] that day they received forty-eight minas.

The Sages said to them: What ground did you see for refusing to teach [your art]? They said to them: In our father's house they knew that this House will be destroyed, and perhaps an unworthy man would learn it and then proceed to serve an idol with it. — For the following was their memory honored: Never was fine bread to be found in their children's hand, lest people say: These feed from the [preparation of]¹² the showbread — Thus [they endeavored] to fulfill [the command]: Ye shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel.¹³

THEY OF THE HOUSE OF ABTINAS WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE INCENSE. Our Rabbis taught: The house of Abtinas were expert in preparing the incense but would not teach [their art]. The Sages sent for specialists from Alexandria of Egypt, who knew how to compound incense as well as they, but did not know how to make the smoke ascend as well as they. The smoke of the former ascended [as straight] as a stick, whereas the smoke of the latter was scattered in every direction.

When the Sages heard thereof, they quoted: ‘Everyone that is called by My name, I have created for My glory’,¹⁴ as it is said: The Lord hath made everything for His own purpose,¹⁵ and [said]: The house of Abtinas may return to their [wonted] place. The Sages sent for them, but they would not come. Then they doubled their hire and they came. Every day [thitherto] they would receive twelve minas, [from] that day twenty-four.

YOMA - 28a-61b

The Sages said to them: What reason did you have for not teaching [your art]? They said: They knew in our father's house that this House is going to be destroyed and they said: Perhaps an unworthy man will learn [this art] and will serve an idol therewith. — And for the following reason was their memory kept in honor: Never did a bride of their house go forth perfumed and when they married a woman from elsewhere they expressly forbade her to do so lest people say: From [the preparation of] the incense they are perfuming themselves. [They did so] to fulfill the command: 'Ye shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel.'¹⁶

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Once I was walking on the way and I came upon one of their children's children and I said to him: Your forefathers sought to increase their glory and to reduce the glory of the Creator, now the glory of the Creator is at its wonted place, and He has reduced their glory.

R. Akiba said: R. Ishmael b. Luga related to me: One day I and one of their descendants went to the field to gather herbs and I saw him crying and laughing. I said to him: 'Why did you cry?' He answered: 'I recalled the glory of my ancestors' — 'And why did you laugh happily?' He replied: 'Because the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore it to us' — 'And what caused you to remember?' He said: 'There is smoke-raiser¹⁷ before me'. 'Show it to me!' He said to me: 'We are bound by oath not to show it to any person'—

R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Once I came upon an old man, who had a scroll [containing prescriptions] for frankincense in his hand. I asked him: 'Whence are you [derived]?' He said: 'I come from the house of Abtinas' — 'What have you in your hand?' He replied: 'A scroll [containing prescriptions] for frankincense.' 'Show it to me!' He said: 'As long as my father's house was alive they would not surrender it to any one, but now

here it is, but be very careful about it — When I came and told thereof to R. Akiba he said: 'Henceforth it is forbidden to speak of them in dispraise' — Referring to this¹⁸ Ben 'Azzai said: By your name you will be called, to your place you will be restored

(1) Not the initial letters of the words, but the initial words of the verses: The headings of sections were written out, the rest intimated by initial letters.

(2) The doors for the great eastern gate of the Temple Court.

(3) Cant. I, 17.

(4) Without any radical change of the text, except the division of the words, which in the original was hardly noticeable. V. Blau, Einleitung in die Schrift, p. 119f. [Aliter: Do not read 'Berothim' (ברותים) but Berithim (בריתים), 'covenants', the doors having made a covenant with each other to be together. V. Rashi and D.S. a.l.]

(5) Mid. II, 3.

(6) Corinthian bronze was refined, hence the light weight, hence the golden hue, as against the duller tone of the heavier bronze.

(7) The twelve showbread loaves, resting in the Hekal on the golden table from Sabbath to Sabbath (Ex. XXV, 30 and Lev. XXIV, 5-9) were very thin and fragile. Made of some four quarts of flour, they were about one half inch in thickness, some twenty-eight inches in length, some twelve inches in breadth. There were some artistic devices at the corners, which made the preparation a highly difficult art. They would be baked on Friday, often on Wednesday, to be eaten on the Sabbath of the following week, and extraordinary skill was required to keep them fresh and well-tasting. The secret of the baking and removing them, from the oven without breaking them was kept by the house of Garmu, for failure to reveal which they are branded here. The Talmud, however, adduces some mitigating reasons for this apparent niggardliness.

(8) A somewhat difficult phrase. Evidently in connection with the Temple songs. It may have been a specially composed finale, allowing for individual margins of musical ingenuity (Baneth).

(9) V. Gemara.

(10) Prov. X, 17.

(11) Isa. XLIII, 7; hence the best should be available for the Sanctuary, even if cost is involved.

(12) Profits, remainders, at any rate not from their own. One must avoid giving the appearance of unrighteous action, even when acting rightly.

(13) Num. XXXII, 22.

(14) V. p. 176, n. 1.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(15) Prov. XVI, 4; thus that skill must not be allowed to remain unused.

(16) Num. XXXII, 22.

(17) The name of a plant whose identity had to be hidden from all but the members of the house of Abtinas.

(18) Their re-instatement into the original office.

Yoma 38b

and from what belongs¹ to you will you be given. No man can touch what is prepared for his fellow and ‘One kingdom does not interfere with the other² even to the extent of one hair’s breadth’.³

HYGROS OF THE TRIBE OF LEVI, etc. It was taught: When he tuned his voice to a trill, he would put his thumb into his mouth and place his finger [on the division line] between the two parts of the moustache, so that his brethren, the priests, staggered backward with a sudden movement.⁴

Our Rabbis taught: Ben Kamzar would not teach anything about [his art of] writing. It was said about him that he would take four pens between his fingers and if there was a word of four letters⁵ he would write it at once. They said to him: ‘What reason have you for refusing to teach it?’ All found an answer for their matter [attitude]. Ben Kamzar could not find one. Concerning [all] former ones it is said: ‘The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing’, with regard to Ben Kamzar and his like it is said: ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot’ — What is the meaning of ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot’? — R. Eleazar said: Rottenness enters their names, none name their children after them.

Rabina raised an objection: The story of Doeg b. Joseph whom his father left to his mother when he was a young child: Every day his mother would measure him by handbreadths⁶ and would give his [extra] weight in gold to the Sanctuary. And when the enemy prevailed, she slaughtered him and ate him, and concerning her Jeremiah lamented: Shall the women eat their fruit,

their children that are handled in the hands?⁷ Whereupon the Holy Spirit replied: Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the Sanctuary of the Lord?⁸ — See what happened to him!⁹

R. Eleazar said: The righteous man is remembered by his own [good deeds], the wicked [also] by those of his fellow. [Proof that] the righteous [is remembered] by his own [good deeds], for it is written: ‘The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing’. The wicked [is remembered also] by his associate[‘s wickedness], for it is written: ‘But the name of the wicked [pl.] shall rot.’ —

Rabina said to one of the Rabbis who expounded Aggadah before him: Whence is this statement, which the Rabbis mention: The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing? — He replied: It is a scriptural verse: ‘The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing.’ Whence, in the Torah, may that teaching be derived? — From what is written: Shall I hide from Abraham that which I am doing?¹⁰ And it is [there] also written: Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation.¹¹ [He asked further]: Whence do we know this matter, which the Rabbis mention: But the name of the wicked shall rot? — He replied: It is a scriptural verse: ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot’. Whence, in the Torah, may this teaching be derived? — From what is written: And he moved his tent as far as Sodom,¹² and it is written: Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly.¹³

R. Eleazar said: A righteous man once lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their deeds, a wicked man lived between two righteous men and did not learn from their ways — The righteous who lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their wicked ways was Obadiah.¹⁴ The wicked man living between two righteous

YOMA - 28a-61b

men and not learning from their ways was Esau.

R. Eleazar [also] said: From the blessing of the righteous you can infer the curse for the wicked and from the curse of the wicked you may infer the blessing for the righteous — From the blessing of the righteous you can infer the curse for the wicked, as it is written: For I have known him, to the end that he may command,¹⁵ and [soon] after that it is written: And the Lord said: Verily the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great.¹⁶ From the curse of the wicked you can infer the blessing for the righteous, for it is written: Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly.¹⁷ And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him... [all the land, which thou seest, to thee will I give...]¹⁸

R. Eleazar further said: Even for the sake of a single righteous man would this world have been created for it is said: And God saw the light that it was [for one who is] good,¹⁹ and 'good' means but the righteous, as it is said: Say ye of the righteous that he is the good one.²⁰

R. Eleazar said also: Whoever forgets [through neglect] any part of his study, causes his children to go into exile, as it is said: Seeing that thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children.²¹

R. Abbahu said: Such a one is deprived of his greatness, as it is said: Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me.²²

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: No righteous man dies out of this world, before another, like himself, is created,²³ as it is said: The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down²⁴, — before the sun of Eli set, the sun of Samuel of Ramathaim rose.

R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in the name of R. Johanan: The Holy One, blessed be He, saw that the righteous are but few, therefore He planted them throughout all generations, as it is said: For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and He hath set the world upon them.²⁵

R. Hiyya b. Abba said also in the name of R. Johanan: Even for the sake of a single righteous man does the world endure, as it is said: But the righteous is the foundation of the world.²⁶

R. Hiyya himself infers this from here: He will keep the feet of His holy ones²⁷ 'Holy ones' means many? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is written: His holy' one.²⁷

R. Hiyya b. Abba said further in the name of R. Johanan: When the majority of a man's years have passed without sin, he will no more sin, as it is said: 'He will keep the feet of His holy ones'. In the school of Shila it was taught that if the opportunity for sin has come to a man the first and the second time and he resisted, he will never sin, as it is said: 'He will keep the feet of His holy ones'.²⁸

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of: If it concerneth the scorners He scorneth them, but unto the humble He giveth grace?²⁹ i.e., if a man comes to defile himself, the doors are opened to him, but if he comes to purify himself, he is helped.

In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: It is as when a man sells naphtha and balm:

- (1) What is predestined as your lawful source of income.
- (2) In either time or place.
- (3) Ber. 48b.
- (4) Enchanted with the beauty of the music, or startled by the power of his voice.
- (5) [The Tetragrammaton. V. Rashi on the Mishnah.]
- (6) With her handbreadth, on her hand, to know how much he had gained since yesterday.
- (7) Lam. II, 20.
- (8) The reference is to the Prophet Zechariah b. Jehoiadah, the priest. The text in Lam. may refer

YOMA - 28a-61b

to that as well; its original meaning, not unknown to the answerer, lamented the destruction by the enemy, of priest and prophet alike. At any rate someone was called Doeg in spite of the first Doeg's bad reputation (I Sam. XXI, 8.)

(9) Normally, none would do that, because of a bad omen, or because one should help the name of the wicked to 'rot' by being forgotten. Look what this deviation from custom brought upon the child.

(10) Gen. XVIII, 17.

(11) Ibid. XVIII, 18.

(12) Ibid. XIII, 12.

(13) Ibid. 13.

(14) Who lived between Ahab and Jezebel. V. Sanh. 12b.

(15) Gen. XVIII, 19.

(16) Ibid. 20.

(17) Ibid. XIII, 13.

(18) Ibid. 15.

(19) Ibid. I, 4.

(20) Isa. III, 10. E.V., 'Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with him.' V. Hag. 12b.

(21) Hosea IV, 6.

(22) Ibid.

(23) Kid. 72b.

(24) Eccl. I, 5.

(25) I Sam. II, 8.

(26) Prov. X, 25. E.V., 'Is an everlasting foundation'.

(27) I Sam. II, 9. Although the Kere (the traditional reading) is in the plural the Kethib (כָּתַדְיוֹ), (the written form) חֲתִידְיוֹ is in the singular.

(28) [Taking לְרַגֵּל in the sense of אֶל, cf. Gen. XXX, 30, 'at the foot of', 'at the guidance of', 'on account of', he renders the verse, He preserves (the world) on account of His holy ones (Rashi).]

(29) Prov. III, 34.

Yoma 39a

If [a purchaser] comes to measure naphtha, he [the shopkeeper] says to him: Measure it out for yourself; but to one who would measure out balm he says: Wait, till I measure together with you, so that both I and you, may become perfumed.

The school of R. Ishmael taught: Sin dulls the heart of man, as it is said: Neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby.¹ Read not we-Nitmethem [that you should be defiled], but u-netamothem [that you should become dull-hearted].²

Our Rabbis taught: 'Neither shall you make yourselves unclean that you should be defiled thereby.' If a man defiles himself a little, he becomes much defiled: [if he defile himself] below, he becomes defiled from above; if he defile himself in this world, he becomes defiled in the world to come.

Our Rabbis taught: Sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy:³ If a man sanctify himself a little, he becomes much sanctified. [If he sanctify himself] below, he becomes sanctified from above; if he sanctify himself in this world, he becomes sanctified in the world to come.

CHAPTER IV

MISHNAH. HE SHOOK⁴ THE URN AND BROUGHT UP THE TWO LOTS. ON ONE WAS INSCRIBED: 'FOR THE LORD', AND ON THE OTHER: 'FOR AZAZEL'. THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST WAS AT HIS RIGHT HAND, THE HEAD OF THE [MINISTERING] FAMILY AT HIS LEFT. IF THE LOT [HAVING] 'FOR THE LORD' [INSCRIBED THEREON] CAME UP IN HIS RIGHT HAND, THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST WOULD SAY TO HIM: SIR HIGH PRIEST, RAISE THY RIGHT HAND! AND IF THE LOT [WITH THE INSCRIPTION] 'FOR THE LORD' CAME UP IN HIS LEFT HAND, THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY WOULD SAY: SIR HIGH PRIEST, RAISE THY LEFT HAND! THEN HE PLACED THEM ON THE TWO HE-GOATS AND SAID: A SIN-OFFERING 'UNTO THE LORD!' R. ISHMAEL SAID: HE DID NOT NEED TO SAY: A SIN-OFFERING, BUT 'UNTO THE LORD'. AND THEY ANSWERED AFTER HIM: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER!⁵

GEMARA. Why was it necessary to shake the urn? — Lest he take one intentionally.⁶ Raba said: The urn was of wood and profane and could hold no more than the two hands [at its mouth]. —

YOMA - 28a-61b

Rabina demurred to this: It is quite right that [its mouth] could contain no more than his two hands, i.e., to prevent his taking one intentionally [through manipulation] but why should it be profane? Let it be sanctified? — That would result in our having a ministering vessel of wood, and we do not make ministering vessels of wood. Then let it be made of silver, or of gold? — ‘The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel’.⁷

Our Mishnah is not in accordance with the following Tanna, for it was taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Eliezer: The deputy high priest and the high priest put their hand into the urn. If the lot [‘For the Lord’] comes up in the hand of the high priest, the deputy high priest said to him: Sir high priest, raise thy hand! And if it came up in the right hand of the deputy high priest, the head of the [ministering] family says to him: Say your word!⁸ -Let the deputy high priest address him? — Since it did not come up in his hand, he might feel discouraged.⁹ In what [principle] do they¹⁰ differ? — One holds, the right hand of the deputy high priest is better than the left hand of the high priest, the other holding, they are of even importance. Who is the Tanna disputing R. Judah? —

It is R. Hanina, deputy high priest. For it was taught: R. Hanina, deputy high priest, says: Why does the deputy high priest stand at the right? In order that if an invalidating accident should happen to the high priest, the deputy high priest may enter [the Sanctuary] and officiate in his stead.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: Throughout the forty years that Simeon the Righteous ministered, the lot [‘For the Lord’] would always come up in the right hand; from that time on, it would come up now in the right hand, now in the left. And [during the same time] the crimson-colored strap¹² would become white. From that time on it would at times become white, at others not. Also: Throughout those forty years the westernmost light¹³ was shining, from that time on, it was now

shining, now failing; also the fire of the pile of wood kept burning strong,¹⁴ so that the priests did not have to bring to the pile any other wood besides the two logs,¹⁵ in order to fulfill the command about providing the wood unintermittently; from that time on, it would occasionally keep burning strongly, at other times not, so that the priests could not do without bringing throughout the day wood for the pile [on the altar]. [During the whole period] a blessing was bestowed upon the ‘omer,¹⁶ the two breads,¹⁷ and the showbread, so that every priest, who obtained a piece thereof as big as an olive, ate it and became satisfied with some eating thereof and even leaving something over. From that time on a curse was sent upon ‘omer, two breads, and showbread, so that every priest received a piece as small as a bean: the well-bred¹⁸ ones withdrew their hands from it, whilst voracious folk took and devoured it.

Once one [of the latter] grabbed his portion as well as that of his fellow, wherefore they would call him ‘ben

(1) Lev. XI, 43.

(2) מִתְמַמָּנָן for מִתְמַמָּנָה MS.M. cur. ed. מִתְמַמָּנָן.

(3) Lev. XVI, 44.

(4) Continuing the account of Mishnah (supra 37a); or ‘shook hastily’ (because of eagerness, anxiety).

(5) The J.T. states that when the high priest pronounced the Ineffable Name those near prostrated themselves, those afar responding with ‘Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever’.

(6) It was considered a happy omen when it came up in the right hand, and the temptation was as great as near to improve upon chance by dexterous manipulation.

(7) V. infra 44b.

(8) Viz., ‘A sin-offering unto the Lord’.

(9) If the deputy high priest, in whose hand it came up, gave him the command, he might easily read into his words the arrogance of the successful.

(10) R. Judah and the Tanna of our Mishnah.

(11) Nazir 47b, which implies that as long as the high priest is fit for service the deputy high priest performs no priestly service whatsoever, in opposition to R. Judah.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(12) Which was tied between the horns of the bullock. If that became white, it signified that the Holy One, blessed be He, had forgiven Israel's sin. Cf. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow (Isa. I, 18, Rashi).

(13) The westernmost light on the candlestick in the Temple, into which as much oil was put as into the others. Although all the other lights were extinguished, that light buried oil, in spite of the fact that it had been kindled first. This miracle was taken as a sign that the Shechinah rested over Israel. V. Shab. 22b and Men. 86b.

(14) On the altar, on which it was kindled in the morning.

(15) V. supra 26b.

(16) V. Glos.

(17) V. Lev. XXIII, 17ff

(18) Lit., 'modest', 'decorous'.

Yoma 39b

Hamzan' [grasper] until his dying day. Rabbah b. R. Shela said: What Scriptural basis [is there for this appellation]? — O my God, rescue me out of the hand of the wicked, out of the grasp of the unrighteous and Homez [ruthless] man.¹ Raba said, From here [is the basis obtained]: Learn to do well, seek justice, strengthen Hamoz [the oppressed]² i.e., strengthen him Hamoz [who is oppressed], but strengthen not Homez [the oppressor].³

Our Rabbis taught: In the year in which Simeon the Righteous died, he foretold them that he would die. They said: Whence do you know that? He replied: On every Day of Atonement an old man, dressed in white, wrapped in white, would join me, entering [the Holy of Holies] and leaving [it] with me, but today I was joined by an old man, dressed in black, wrapped in black, who entered, but did not leave, with me. After the festival [of Sukkoth] he was sick for seven days and [then] died. His brethren [that year] the priests forbore to mention the Ineffable Name in pronouncing the [priestly] blessing.⁴

Our Rabbis taught: During the last forty years before the destruction of the Temple the lot ['For the Lord'] did not come up in the right hand; nor did the crimson-colored strap become white; nor did the westernmost

light shine; and the doors of the Hekal would open by themselves, until R. Johanan b. Zakkai rebuked them, saying: Hekal, Hekal, why wilt thou be the alarmer thyself?⁵ I know about thee that thou wilt be destroyed, for Zechariah ben Ido has already prophesied concerning thee:⁶ Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.⁷

R. Isaac b. Tablai said: Why is its⁸ name called Lebanon? Because it makes white the sins of Israel. R. Zutra b. Tobiah said: Why is it called 'Forest', as it is written: The house of the forest of Lebanon?⁹ To tell you that just as a forest produces sprouts, so does the Temple. For R. Hosea said:¹⁰ When Solomon built the Sanctuary, he planted therein all sorts of precious golden trees, which brought forth fruit in their season. When the wind blew against them, their fruits would fall down, as it is said: May his fruit rustle like Lebanon.¹¹ They were a source of income for the priesthood. But as soon as the idolaters entered the Hekal, they dried up, as it is said: And the flower of Lebanon languisheth.¹² And the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore it to us, as it is said: It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice, even with joy and singing, the glory of Lebanon shall be given to it.¹³

Our Rabbis taught:¹⁴ Ten times did the high priest pronounce the [Ineffable] Name on that day: Three times at the first confession, thrice at the second confession, thrice in connection with the he-goat to be sent away, and once in connection with the lots. And it already happened that when he pronounced the Name, his voice was heard even unto Jericho.¹⁵

Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: From Jerusalem to Jericho it is a distance of ten parasangs. The turning hinges of the Temple doors were heard throughout eight Sabbath limits.¹⁶ The goats in Jericho used to sneeze because of the odor of the incense. The women in Jericho did not have to perfume themselves, because

YOMA - 28a-61b

of the odor of the incense. The bride in Jerusalem did not have to perfume herself because of the odor of the incense.

R. Jose b. Diglai said: My father had goats on the mountains of Mikwar¹⁷ and they used to sneeze because of the odor of the incense. R. Hiyya b. Abin said in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: An old man told me: Once I walked towards Shiloh¹⁸ and I could smell the odor of the incense [coming] from its walls. R. Jannai said: To bring the lot up out of the casket is indispensable,¹⁹ but to place [it on the bullock's head] is not.²⁰

R. Johanan said: Even to bring up the lot is not indispensable.²¹ On the opinion of R. Judah who said that services performed in the white garments outside the Holy of Holies are not indispensable there is no dispute, [all agreeing] that [the bringing up of lots] is not indispensable; they dispute only the opinion of R. Nehemiah:²² He who says it is indispensable, holds even as R. Nehemiah [does]; whereas the other who holds it is dispensable, explains [R. Nehemiah to refer to] an actual service, whereas the casting of the lots is no service. —

Others say: On the opinion of R. Nehemiah, who says it is indispensable, there is no dispute, [all agreeing that] it is indispensable; the dispute touches only the opinion of R. Judah: he who holds it is dispensable, agrees with R. Judah; whereas he who holds it is indispensable [explains] that it is different here because Scripture repeats twice: On which [the lot] fell.²³ —

An objection: was raised 'It is a command to cast the lots but if he has failed to do so, [the service] is, nevertheless, valid. Now that will be quite right according to the version that none disputes that on R. Judah's view it is dispensable, so that this [teaching]²⁴ is in accordance with R. Judah.

(1) Ps. LXXI, 4.

(2) Isa. 1, 17.

(3) V. Sanh. 35a.

(4) Men. 109b. Tosaf Sotah 38a suggests that the Ineffable Name could be pronounced only when there was some indication that the Shechinah rested on the Sanctuary. When Simeon the Righteous died, with many indications that such glory was no more enjoyed, his brethren no more dared utter the Ineffable Name.

(5) Predict thy own destruction.

(6) I.e., concerning this significant omen of the destruction of the Temple.

(7) Zech. XI, 1. Ido was his grandfather, but it occurs occasionally that a man is called 'the son after a distinguished ancestor.'

(8) The Sanctuary. A play on לְבָנָן, connected with נֶבֶל.

(9) I Kings X, 21.

(10) V. supra 21b.

(11) Ps. LXXII, 16.

(12) Nahum I, 4.

(13) Isa. XXXV, 2.

(14) Tosef. Yoma II, 2.

(15) V. supra 20b.

(16) The marked-off area around a town or place within which it is permitted to move on the Sabbath. Sabbath limits i.e., two thousand cubits in every direction. The turning hinges, then, created a sound, according to this scholar, audible beyond sixteen thousand cubits.

(17) The name varies: Mikmar, Mikwar, Makvar (a district of Peraea). One version omits reference to a place, and reads 'on the mountains', which may have appropriated the מ from the next word and omitted it for want of clarity. It should be reasonably near Jerusalem to suit the context. See D.S., p. 110.

(18) The place of the tent of meeting. In the mind of the narrator the odor of incense must have been well-nigh imperishable.

(19) Without the casting of the lots no choice could be made as to the destination of the two he-goats, i.e., the service could not go on.

(20) This view considers the service of the high priest dependent on the decision of the lots, the decisive factor being the lots and not the formal putting of the lot on the animal's head.

(21) R. Johanan considers the action of the high priest the determining factor, independent of his having either had lots or having placed them on the head. His declaration as to which animal is for the Lord and for Azazel resp., validates the service.

(22) Infra 60a contains the dispute between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah as to whether any change in the prescribed order renders the service invalid. It hinges on the question as to whether the word 'Hukkah' (statute) i.e., binding order, applies to the service in the Holy of Holies only, independent as to the garments wherein they are performed (R.

YOMA - 28a-61b

Judah) or whether it applies to any service in the white garments, performed either in the Holy of Holies or elsewhere (R. Nehemiah). A sub-question would be whether anything in connection with the Day of Atonement, or only a service proper is covered by R. Nehemiah's view. If e.g., the casting of the lots is not considered a service, though an action in connection with it, it may not be indispensable since it is performed outside the Holy of Holies, although in white garments.

(23) Lev. XVI, 9,10 which repetition emphasizes the indispensable nature of this service.

(24) That it is a command to cast the lots, but that failure to do so does not invalidate the service.

Yoma 40a

But according to the version that they are disputing on R. Judah's view it would again be quite right according to him who holds it is dispensable, for then [the authority for this teaching] would be R. Judah; but according to him who considers it indispensable [the question is asked]: Who [will be the authority] for this [teaching]? Read: It is a command to place [the lots on the bullock's head].¹

Come and hear: It is a command to cast the lots and to make confession. But if he had not cast the lots² or made confession, [the service is] valid.³ And should you reply that here, too' [you would read] 'to place [the lot on the bullock's head]', say then the second part: R. Simeon said: If he has not cast the lots, the service is still valid, but if he has failed to make confession, it is invalidated. Now what does 'If he has not cast the lots' mean? Would you say it means, 'He has not placed the lots',⁴ this would imply [would it not] that R. Simeon holds the casting of the lots is indispensable? But surely it was taught: If one of the two [bullocks] died, he brings the other without [new] casting of lots — these are the words of R. Simeon?⁵—

R. Simeon did not know what the Sages meant [with the Phrase 'lo Higril']⁶ and thus he said to them: If by 'Hagralah' you mean casting of the lots itself, I dispute with you on one matter, but if by 'Hagralah' you mean

the placing of the lots then I disagree with you on two counts.⁷

Come and hear: With regard to the sprinkling of the blood within the veil, [the regular service of] the bullock is indispensable for the service of the he-goat [to be valid]; but the regular service of the he-goat is not indispensable for the service of the bullock to be valid.⁸ Now, it is quite right that the regular service of the bullock is indispensable for the he-goat, e.g., if he performed the rites of the he-goat before those of the bullock, he has done nothing.⁹ But that [the regular service of] the he-goat is not indispensable to the bullock, what does it mean? Would you say [it means] that if he sprinkled the blood of the bullock in the Hekal before the sprinkling of the he-goat within [the veil]?¹⁰ But surely Scripture says 'statute'!¹¹ Rather must you say [it means that] if he sprinkled the blood of the bullock within, before the casting of the lots¹² [it is valid]. Now since the order is not indispensable [is it not to be inferred that] the casting of the lots itself is not indispensable!¹³—

No, [it means that] he made the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the altar before sprinkling the blood of the he-goat in the Hekal¹⁴ and this [teaching] is in accord with R. Judah, who says that anything done in the white garments outside [the Holy of Holies] is dispensable. But does it not state 'with regard to the sprinklings within'?¹⁵ Rather: It is in accord with R. Simeon who holds the casting of the lots is dispensable. Or, if you like, say: Still I say it is in accord with R. Judah,¹⁶ and although the order of the service is not indispensable, the casting of the lots is indispensable. And they follow their own principle.¹⁷ For it was taught:

(1) This ruling is generally accepted: Dejure the placing of the lots is obligatory. De facto failure to do so does not render the ceremony invalid, Scripture repeating twice 'on which the lot fell', thus creating a precedent for the casting of the lots, but it refers only once to the placing of the lots on the bullock's head.

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (2) **לא הגריל** infra n. 6.
- (3) Hence the casting of the lots is dispensable — a refutation of R. Jannai.
- (4) Only the placing of the lots does R. Simeon consider dispensable, but the casting he considers indispensable.
- (5) Infra 63b.
- (6) Lit., ‘He did not perform the Hagralah’ and rendered supra ‘he has not cast lots’ cf. n. 3. ‘Hagralah’, ‘acting with lots’ may mean causing lots ‘to be cast’ or ‘to be placed’, hence grammatically either application is justified: ‘lo Higril’ he did not cause the lots ‘to be cast’ or ‘to be placed’ (on the head, etc.). R. Simeon did not know which interpretation had been offered by the Sages. He knew however that both are possible.
- (7) If you mean by ‘Hagralah’ the casting of the lots, I dispute only your stand touching confession, agreeing with you that the casting of the lots is not indispensable, but if you mean by ‘Hagralah’ the placing of the lots on the head, etc. but the casting itself you consider indispensable, then I disagree with you on two counts: you hold casting indispensable, I do not; you hold confession not indispensable, I consider it indispensable.
- (8) [The order of the service prescribed in Lev. XVI for the bullock and the he-goat which is offered within is as follows: (i) First confession over the bullock; (ii) Casting lots over the he-goats; (iii) second confession over the bullock; (iv) Slaughtering of the bullock; (v) Bringing the spoon and fire pan into the Holy of Holies; (vi) Burning of incense; (vii) Sprinkling of blood of the bullock on the mercy-seat; (viii) Confession over and slaughtering of the he-goat; (ix) Sprinkling of the he-goat’s blood on the mercy-seat; (x) Sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the Veil, separating the Holy, the Hekal, from the Holy of Holies; (xi) Sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat on the Veil; (xii) Mixing together the blood of the he-goat and the bullock and applying the mixture on the golden altar. Here the rule is laid down that if he performed any one of the rites in connection with the he-goat before such of the bullock as should have preceded it, that rite is invalid and must be performed again in its proper order. If, however, he performed any of the rites in connection with the bullock before such of the he-goat as should have preceded it, that rite is not invalid.]
- (9) It has no validity.
- (10) [I.e., he performed rite (x) before rite (ix), v. n. 1].
- (11) Which has reference to the rites performed within the Veil, and which implies an inflexible rule invalidating the irregularity of the service.
- (12) [I.e., he performed rite (vii) before (ii).]
- (13) Hence there is one who holds that the casting of the lots is not indispensable. That contradicts the above statement that even R. Judah (and all the more R. Nehemiah) considers it indispensable.
- (14) [I.e., he performed rite (xii) before rite (xi). The blood of the bullock here means that which he mixed with the blood of the he-goat.]
- (15) Whereas this irregularity in connection with the bullock concerned a service performed outside the Holy of Holies.
- (16) [And the irregularity consequently concerned rites (vii) and (ii), v. p. 190, n. 5.]
- (17) This refers to the dispute of R. Judah and R. Simeon where he failed to make confession.

Yoma 40b

[With reference to] It shall be set alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him — how long must it stay alive? Until the blood of its fellow-sacrifice is sprinkled, this is the opinion of R. Judah.²

R. Simeon holds: Until the confession [of sin].³ Wherein do they differ? — As it was taught: ‘To make atonement over him’ — Scripture speaks of atonement through blood, thus does it also say: And when he hath made an end to atoning for the holy place,⁴ just as there it refers to atonement by blood, so does it refer here to atonement by blood this is the opinion of R. Judah.

R. Simeon says: ‘To make atonement over him’ — Scripture speaks of atonement by words [confession].

Come and hear:⁵ The disciples of R. Akiba asked him: If it [the lot ‘for the Lord’] came up in the left hand, may he turn it to the right? He replied: Do not give all occasion for the Sadducees to rebel!⁶ The reason, then, [of his negative answer] is so as not to give an occasion for the Sadducees to rebel, but, without that, we would turn it, yet you said that the casting of the lots is indispensable, and since the left hand has determined its destination,⁷ how can we turn it? — Raba answered: This is what they said: If the lot had come up in the left hand, may one change it and the he-goat to the right?⁸ Whereupon

YOMA - 28a-61b

he answered: Give no occasion to the Sadducees to rebel.

Come and hear: If [Scripture] has said: The goat, ‘upon which it [the lot] is’⁹ I would have said he must place it thereon. Therefore it says: ‘[on which it] fell’, i.e., once it has fallen upon it, he no more need [place it on its head]. Now in respect of what [was this said]¹⁰? Would you say: In respect of a command,¹¹ which would imply that the placing of the lots is not even a command!¹² Rather must you say it means that it is in respect of indispensability;¹³ hence we learn that the casting is indispensable, and the placing of the lot [upon the head] is dispensable.¹⁴ Raba said: This is what he means: If it had said: ‘Upon which it is’, I would have said: let him leave it there until the time for the slaughtering; therefore it says: [upon which it] fell, to intimate that once it had fallen upon it, it needs nothing else.¹⁵

Come and hear: And offer him for a sin-offering¹⁶ i.e., the lot designates it for the sin-offering, but the naming¹⁷ [alone] does not designate it a sin-offering. For I might have assumed, this could be inferred a minori: If in a case where the lot does not sanctify,¹⁸ the naming does sanctify, how much more will the naming sanctify where the lot also does so sanctify? Therefore [Scripture] says: ‘And offer him for a sin-offering’ [to intimate] it is the lot which designates it a sin-offering, but the naming does not make it a sin-offering.

(1) With reference to the he-goat that is to be sent away. Lev. XVI, 10.

(2) [In accordance with his view that confession is not indispensable so that if the he-goat died after the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock (rite vii) before the confession over the he-goat (rite viii) the service is valid.]

(3) Infra 65a.

(4) Ibid. 20.

(5) Tosef. III, 2, the version in the Talmud is somewhat modified.

(6) The substitution of Sadducees for ‘Minim’ (Judeo-Christian heretics) is undoubtedly due to the censors’ dislike of any word that may appear as even an implied attack on the Church. The

heretics will claim this manipulation an ‘additional proof’ of the Pharisees’ doing with the law whatever pleased them. Thus they would be helped to rebel, arguing at once in favor of their heresy and against the Pharisees.

(7) For the Lord, even before the lot was actually placed on the he-goat.

(8) If the lot ‘For the Lord’ came up in the left hand so that the he-goat standing opposite the priest at his left hand was thereby designated a sin-offering for the Lord, that on the right being designated for Azazel, may he exchange the he-goats and the lots so that whereas the lot decided which is which, the manipulation will have afforded him the comfort of knowing that without formally changing the lots, the ‘right one’ will be designated for the Lord.

(9) Intimating that it lies there for a considerable time.

(10) That once the lots are cast nothing more is necessary.

(11) I.e., there is no longer any command to be fulfilled after the casting of the lots.

(12) Surely this is impossible!

(13) I.e., that once the lots are cast there is nothing else deemed indispensable for determining the destination of the he-goats.

(14) A refutation of R. Johanan.

(15) The verse serves to indicate that once it ‘fell upon it’ there is not even a command to be placed there, as a sign or assurance that it will be offered up for the purpose designated.

(16) Lev. XVI, 9: And Aaron shall present the goat upon which the lot fell for the Lord, and offer it for a sin-offering.

(17) By the high priest. The above verse, in which the offering-up follows immediately ‘upon which the lot fell’ indicates that the coming up of the lot decides the matter, not the naming by the priest.

(18) As with the sacrificial couples of birds, where either owner or priest by verbal statement makes the designation, where, however, the casting of lots would be useless.

Yoma 41a

Now whose is the anonymous opinion in the Sifra?¹ R. Judah’s, and he teaches: The lot designates the sin-offering and the naming does not make it a sin-offering. Hence we see that the casting of the lots is indispensable. This will be a refutation of the opinion that it is not indispensable. It is a refutation.

R. Hisda said: The special designation of the couples² is made either by the owner³ or by the priest’s action.⁴ R. Shimi b. Ashi said:

YOMA - 28a-61b

What is the basis of R. Hisda's dictum? Because it is written: She shall take [... for a burnt-offering]⁵ and And the priest shall offer one [as a sin-offering]⁶ i.e., [the designation is made] either at the [owner's] taking [purchasing] or at the offering-up [by the priest].

They raised the following objection: 'And make it a sin-offering'⁷ i.e., the lot makes it a sin-offering, but the naming [alone] does not make it a sin-offering. For I might have assumed, this could be inferred a minori: If in a case where a lot does not sanctify, the naming does, how much more should the naming sanctify, where the lot does? Therefore [Scripture] says: 'And make it for a sin-offering' [to intimate] it is the lot which makes it a sin-offering, but the naming does not make it a sin-offering. Here it is neither the times of its purchase, nor of its being offered, and yet he states that it should designate? —

Raba said: This is what he said: If in a case where the lot does not sanctify even at the time of the purchase and even at the time of the offering, the naming does sanctify it at the time of either purchase or offering, how much more shall the naming, at either the time of purchase or of offering, sanctify it in a case where the lot sanctifies outside the time of either purchase or offering? Therefore [Scripture] says: 'And make it a sin-offering', i.e., the lot makes it a sin-offering but the naming does not make it a sin-offering.

Come and hear: If someone defiled the Sanctuary⁹ whilst poor and put aside money for his bird-couple-offering, and afterwards became rich,¹⁰ and said thereupon: This [money] be for the sin-offering and that for the burnt-offering he adds to the money for the sin-offering to bring his obligatory offering, but he may not add to his burnt¹¹ offering to bring his obligatory offering. Now here¹² it is neither the time of the purchase,

nor the time of the offering and yet he teaches that it is designated?¹³ —

R. Shesheth said: How do you reason?¹⁴ Surely R.. Eleazar said in the name of R. Hoshiaia: If someone defiled the Sanctuary whilst rich, and brought the offering of a poor person, he has not done his duty. Now, since he has not done his duty, how could he have designated¹⁵ it? Must you not, rather, say that he had designated it when already poor? Thus here,¹⁶ too, the case is that he said it from the time when he set [the money] aside.¹⁷ But according to R. Hagga in the name of R. Josiah who said: He has done his duty¹⁸ —

(1) A Tannaitic commentary (Midrash) on Leviticus.

(2) Of sacrificial birds (Lev. XII, 8 and XV, 30), as to which is to be the burnt-offering and which the sin-offering.

(3) At the purchase the owner can decide which is to serve for either sacrifice.

(4) If not designated by the owner, the priest has the right to name each bird for the sacrifice he chooses, i.e., either sin-, or burnt-offering.

(5) Lev. XII, 8.

(6) Ibid. XV, 30.

(7) Lev. XVI, 9. So literally. E.V. 'offer it for a sin-offering'.

(8) The designation by naming, which now is assumed to take place at the time of the sanctification by the lot, i.e., neither at the time of the purchase, nor at that of the offering.

(9) By entering it in uncleanness, Lev. V, 2.

(10) With the consequence that he must offer the contingent sacrifice of a rich person: a lamb as a sin-offering, whereas a poor person had to offer up two turtledoves or two young pigeons as sin- and burnt-offering resp. (Lev. V, 6 and 11.)

(11) Ker. 28a. He may add to the original money designated for the poor man's sin-offering for his new sin-offering, but he may not use the money designated for the poor man's burnt-offering to add thereto the sum necessary for the purchase of the rich man's sin-offering (his lamb). The latter is forbidden, because once he had designated, the money for the burnt-offering, it may no more be changed for any other offering.

(12) After the designation.

(13) And that he may no more change it.

(14) Do you consider the Baraita to be in order?

(15) The poor man's sin-offering no more applies to him, how could he have designated it a burnt-offering after becoming rich, since he does not

YOMA - 28a-61b

have to bring a burnt-offering at all (only the poor man brings a burnt- and sin-offering, one pigeon each, the rich man's lamb serving as sin-offering only).

(16) In reply to the objection raised against R. Hisda.

(17) Correct the Baraitha to read: If someone defiled the Sanctuary whilst poor and put aside money for his couple and said at the time when he set the money aside 'This be, etc.' and afterwards became rich.

(18) So that the Baraitha as it stands need not be corrected.

Yoma 41b

what is there to be said?¹ — Do not read: 'And said thereupon', but 'And thereupon he bought and said'.² But if 'thereupon he bought' [then it states] 'he may add and bring his obligatory sacrifice', it must mean that he redeems⁴ [the bird-offering]? But surely a bird-offering may not be redeemed?⁵—

R. Papa said: For instance, if he bought one single pigeon. If he bought it as the burnt-offering, then he adds to the money for his sin-offering the money for his [new] obligatory sacrifice, the burnt-offering [of the bird] becoming a freewill-offering; if he bought it as the sin-offering he may not add to the money for the burnt-offering for the purchase of his [new] obligatory sacrifice and that sin-offering is left to perish. The text [above] states: R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Hoshiaia: 'If one defiled the Sanctuary whilst being rich and brought the offering prescribed for a poor person, he has not done his duty, R. Hagga in the name of R. Josiah says: He did perform it.'

The following objection was raised: If a poor leper brought the offering prescribed for a rich person, he has performed his duty; if a rich person brought the offering prescribed for a poor one, he has not performed his duty?⁶ — There it is different because it is written: This [shall be the law of the leper].⁷ If that is so, then [let it apply] in the first part [of the Mishnah] too? — Surely the Divine Law includes that case through the word

Torath ['law']!⁸ As it was taught: the word Torath ['the law']⁷ includes a poor leper, who brought a rich [leper's] sacrifice. One might have assumed that even a rich leper who brought a poor leper's sacrifice [might be included so as to have performed his duty], therefore it says: 'This'. Let us infer from it [for one who defiled the Sanctuary]? — The Divine Law [by saying]: And if he be poor,⁹ excludes [all but the leper].¹⁰

MISHNAH. HE BOUND¹¹ A THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL ON THE HEAD OF THE HE-GOAT WHICH WAS TO BE SENT AWAY,¹² AND [MEANTIME] HE PLACED IT [AT THE GATE] WHENCE IT WAS TO BE SENT AWAY; AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WAS TO BE SLAUGHTERED, AT THE PLACE OF THE SLAUGHTERING.¹³ HE CAME TO HIS BULLOCK A SECOND¹⁴ TIME, PRESSED HIS TWO HANDS UPON IT AND MADE CONFESSION. AND THUS HE WOULD SAY: O LORD, I HAVE DEALT WRONGFULLY, I HAVE TRANSGRESSED, I HAVE SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, THY HOLY PEOPLE, O LORD, PRAY FORGIVE THE WRONGDOINGS, THE TRANSGRESSION, AND THE SINS, WHICH I HAVE COMMITTED, TRANSGRESSED, AND SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, THY HOLY PEOPLE. AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES, THY SERVANT: FOR ON THIS DAY ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU, TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL THE SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD. AND THEY RESPONDED: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER.

GEMARA. They raised the question: AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WAS TO BE SLAUGHTERED AT THE PLACE OF THE SLAUGHTERING — does this refer to the tying [of the strap]¹⁵ or to the placing [of the animal]?¹⁶

YOMA - 28a-61b

Come and hear: For R. Joseph learned: He bound a crimson-colored strap on the head of the he-goat which was to be sent away and placed it against the gate whence it was to be sent away; and the he-goat which was to be slaughtered at the place where it was to be slaughtered, lest they become mixed up one with the other, or with others. It will be quite right if you say it refers to the binding [of the strap], but If you say it refers to the placing [of the animal], granted that it would not be mixed up with its fellow [he-goat] because the one had a strap, whilst the other had none, but it could surely be mixed up with other he-goats?¹⁷ Hence we learn from here that It refers to the tying [of the strap]. This proves it.

R. Isaac said: I have heard of two straps, one in connection with the [red] heifer,¹⁸ the other with the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, one requiring a definite size, the other not requiring it, but I do not know which [requires the size].

R. Joseph said: Let us see: The strap of the he-goat which required division,¹⁹ hence also required a definite size, whereas that of the heifer which does not need to be divided, does not require a definite size, either.

Rami b. Hama demurred to this: That of the heifer also requires weight?²⁰ —

Raba said: The matter of this weight is disputed by Tannaim.²¹ But does the strap of the heifer not have to be divided?

[Against this] Abaye raised the following objection: How does he do it?²² He wraps them²³ together with the remnants²⁴ of the strips [of scarlet wool]! Say: with the tail²⁵ of the strip.

R. Hanin said in the name of Rab: If the cedar-wood and the scarlet thread were [merely] caught by the flame,²⁶ they are usable [for the ceremony]. — They raised the following objection: If the strap caught fire,

another strap is brought and the water of lustration prepared.²⁷

Abaye said: This is no contradiction; one speaks of a flame which blazes²⁸ up, the other of one which is subdued.²⁹

Raba said: Concerning the weight of [the heifer's strap] there is a division of opinion among Tannaim, for it was taught: Why does he wrap them³⁰ together? In order that they form together one bunch — this is the opinion of Rabbi.

R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says: In order that they have [sufficient] weight to fall into the midst of the burning heifer. —

When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said in the name of R. Johanan: I heard of: three [different] straps, one, that of the [red] heifer, the other, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, the third of the leper; one having a weight of ten Zuz,³¹ the other a weight of two sela's,³¹ the third a weight of one shekel,³¹ and I do not know how to specify it.

When Rabin came, he specified it in the name of R. Jonathan:

- (1) How will R. Hisda meet the objection raised against him from the Baraita?
- (2) The change implies only that one word had been omitted. Thus the question against R. Hisda is answered.
- (3) Lit., 'what is it?'
- (4) Divesting it of its sacred character by changing its purpose and adding thereto the money required for the lamb.
- (5) Tem. 23b.
- (6) Neg. XIV, 12. An objection against R. Hagga.
- (7) Lev. XIV, 2 indicating there must be no duration.
- (8) Indicating that there is ultimately one Torah, one law governing all lepers.
- (9) Ibid. 21.
- (10) 'If he be poor'; the 'he' is emphatic, indicating that this law applies only to a leper; but any other person, obliged to bring an offering of higher or lesser value, according to pecuniary condition, may bring the 'poor man's offering' and yet have its duty performed although he be rich himself.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(11) To prevent any confusion between the he-goats, or between them and the third he-goat, to be offered up at the additional service (Num. XXIX, 11).

(12) Destined for Azazel, in the wilderness, whence it was hurled to its death from a rock. The word Azazel has been variously interpreted, but it seems to be the name of a place (a rough rock) rather than that of a demon.

(13) To be explained in the Gemara.

(14) V. supra 35b: HE CAME TO HIS BULLOCK, that was the first time.

(15) I.e., he tied the strap about its neck, the place of the slaughtering.

(16) I.e., he placed it where it had to be slaughtered.

(17) At the place where sacrifices were slaughtered, since it had no distinguishing mark.

(18) v. Num. XIX, 1ff

(19) Infra 67a: What did he (who sent the he-goat away) do. He divided the strap of crimson wool, tying one half to the rock, the other half between his horns.

(20) To fall right into the midst of the burning heifer' as Scripture (Num. XIX, 6) requires it.

(21) V. infra.

(22) With reference to the red heifer v. Parah III, 13.

(23) The hyssop and cedar-wood.

(24) There are, then, remnants of strips, hence there must have been division here, too.

(25) Simply the end of the strap, thinned out like a tail, hence no evidence of a division.

(26) Cf. supra n. 1.

(27) Lit., 'and he sanctifies'.

(28) A fire which unexpectedly rises and spreads; a fire diverted from its course. Or: a fire which unexpectedly rises and spreads;

(29) In the former case another strap is to be brought since it did not come in contact with the fire itself; but not in the latter case.

(30) Cedar-wood, hyssop and scarlet, Num. XIX, 6.

(31) Zuz — the smallest silver coin corresponds to either one quarter or one half of a shekel. Sela' — is either five or ten Zuzim. The shekel weighs about twelve grams. V. Krauss, T.A. II, 404.

Yoma 42a

That of the heifer had the weight of ten Zuz, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away had the weight of two Sela's, and that of the leper weighed one shekel.

R. Johanan said: About the [strap used in connection with] the heifer R. Simeon b.

Halafta and the Sages are disputing, one saying it weighed ten shekels, the other it weighed but one shekel. As a mnemotechnic [sign use]:¹ 'Whether one gives much, or one gives little'.² —

R. Jeremiah of Difti said to Rabina: They are not disputing in regard to [the strap of] the heifer, but in regard [to that of] the he-goat-to-be-sent-away; and on the day [of their dispute] died Rabia b. Kisi, and as a sign to remember this coincidence they uttered: [The death of the righteous], Rabia b. Kisi, obtains atonement, even as the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. —

R. Isaac said: I heard of two slaughterings, one of the [red] heifer, the other of his bullock,³ one being permissible to a lay Israelite,⁴ the other being invalidated if performed by a lay Israelite, and I do not know which is which. It is reported: Concerning the slaughtering of the heifer and of his bullock [there is a dispute between] Rab and Samuel, one holding the heifer to be invalidated [if killed by a lay Israelite], but that his bullock [so slaughtered] is fit, while the other holds that his bullock is invalidated [if a commoner killed], but [so killed] the heifer is fit. It may be ascertained that it is Rab who holds that [the slaughtering of] the heifer [by a lay Israelite] renders it invalid.

For R. Zei'ras⁵ said: The slaughtering of the heifer by a lay Israelite is invalid and Rab said thereupon: 'Eleazar' and 'Statute'⁶ we learned in connection therewith. — But as for Rab, wherefore the difference between [the law] in the case of the heifer, because 'Eleazar' and 'Statute' is written in connection therewith, when also in connection with 'his' bullock 'Aaron'⁷ and 'Statute' is written? The slaughtering is not [regarded as a Temple] service.⁸ Then this ought to apply to the heifer as well? — It is different with the heifer, because it is [in the category of] offerings for Temple repair.⁹ — So much the more then!¹⁰ —

YOMA - 28a-61b

R. Shisha son of R. Idi said: It is the same as with the [inspection of] appearances of leprosy,¹¹ which is not a service, yet requires a priest's service. Now according to Samuel, who holds the killing of 'his' bullock by a lay Israelite is invalid, wherefore the difference [in law] in the case of 'his' bullock, in connection with which 'Aaron and 'Statute' are written, when also in connection with the heifer 'Eleazar' and 'Statute' are written? —

It is different there, because it is written: And he shall slay it before him,¹² which means that a lay Israelite may slaughter and Eleazar should watch it.¹³ And [how does] Rab [explain this]? — [It means] he¹⁴ must not divert his attention from it. Whence does Samuel know that he must not divert his attention from it? — He infers that from And the heifer shall be burnt in his sight.¹⁵ And [why the repetition according to] Rab? —

One refers to the slaughtering, the other to the burning;¹⁶ and it was necessary to mention both. For if the Divine Law had written it concerning the slaughtering [alone, I would have said]: There [attention is necessary] because it is the beginning of the service, but with the burning [one could] say: 'No [attention is necessary]' therefore it was necessary [for the Divine Law] to mention [it also touching burning]. And if the Divine Law had written it [only] touching the burning, one would have said [attention is necessary there], because just now the heifer is being made ready,¹⁷ but [during] slaughtering no [attention is necessary]. Therefore it was necessary [for the Divine Law] to mention [that too]. — What does this exclude?¹⁸ Is it to say to exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting in of the ashes?

(1) Ber. 5b.

(2) The usual meaning: Whether one gives much or little, the main matter is that he direct his heart to our Father who is in heaven, is irrelevant here, the accent being put, for mnemotechnic reasons, on: the one (stands for) much, the other for little, i.e., one of the disputants ascribes the maximum, the other the minimum weight.

(3) The bullock which the high priest had to bring for himself on the Day of Atonement.

(4) I.e., a non-priest.

(5) Var. lec. 'Rab'.

(6) Num. XIX, 3: And ye shall give her to Eleazar the priest i.e., it requires a priest's service; ibid. 21: And it shall be a perpetual statute i.e., it is indispensable that the priest do so, as prescribed.

(7) Lev. XVI, 3: Herewith shall Aaron come... with a young bullock; and ibid. 34: And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you.

(8) Since a lay Israelite may perform it, the word 'statute', mentioned in connection with his bullock, does not refer to the slaughtering.

(9) The heifer is not offered up on the altar, as any other sacrifice, hence there is no distinction as to the services to be performed in connection with it, and all alike require a priest.

(10) On the contrary, how much more ought a lay Israelite to be permitted to slay the red heifer.

(11) Lev. XIII, 2.

(12) Num. XIX, 3.

(13) 'He' referring to a lay Israelite; 'before him' (lit., 'before his face'), to Eleazar.

(14) 'He' refers to Eleazar i.e., he shall slaughter it and keep his mind on this important ceremony.

(15) Num. XIX, 5.

(16) That is that both rites require attention.

(17) The burning for the purposes of the ashes is the central part of the ceremony, to 'prepare' the heifer for her cleansing purpose.

(18) I.e., with regard to what function is no attention essential.

Yoma 42b

Surely Scripture says: [And it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel] for a water of sprinkling?¹ — Rather it excludes the casting in of cedarwood, hyssop, and scarlet, because they are not part of the heifer itself. It was reported: If the heifer was slaughtered by a lay Israelite, R. Ammi said it is valid. R. Isaac, the Smith, said it was invalid. 'Ulla said it is valid, whilst some there are who say [that he said] it was invalid.

R. Joshua b. Abba raised an objection in support of Rab: I know only that the sprinkling of its water is not valid if performed by a woman, as [when done] by a man; and that it is valid only [if done] by day.² Whence do I know that the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the

YOMA - 28a-61b

sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet [may not be done by night]?³ To teach us that Scripture said: [This is the statute of] the law.⁴ I might have assumed that this should include also the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of the ashes, to teach us that Scripture said: 'This'.⁵ — What causes you to include those, and to exclude these? —

Since Scripture both extends and limits, say, we shall infer everything from the [regulations touching] the sprinkling of its water: Just as the sprinkling of its water is not proper if done by a woman, as it is [if performed] by a man, and not valid except if done by day, thus include also the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet.

Since these [functions] may not be performed by a woman, so may they be performed only by day; but I exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of its ashes, which, since they may be performed by either man or woman, hence may also be performed by night. But how is this a refutation?⁶ Will you say that because [the slaughtering is stated to be] invalid [if performed] by a woman, it must be invalid, also, if performed by a lay Israelite,⁷ there would be as counterproof the sprinkling of its waters, which, whilst invalid [if performed] by a woman, yet may be done by a lay Israelite!

Said Abaye: This is the refutation: Why is the woman excluded [from the slaughtering], because [Scripture said]: 'Eleazar', [implying] but not a woman; that [must be applied to] the lay Israelite also, for [the analogue inference]: 'Eleazar' [the priest], [implies] but not a lay Israelite.

'Ulla said: In that whole section [of the red heifer] there are [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent [of preceding or following] implications: And ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priests [implies] only this one to Eleazar, but not [the heifers] in later generations to Eleazar;⁹ some say: In later generations [you shall give it] to the high priest, others: In later generations to a common priest. It is quite right according to him who holds that in later generations [the heifer is to be handed over] to a common priest,¹⁰ but whence does he infer who holds that in later generations [it is to be given] to the high priest? —

He infers it from [the identical word] 'Statute', 'Statute', used [also]¹¹ in connection with the Day of Atonement.¹² And he shall bring it forth¹³ [implies] that he must not bring forth another one with her, as we have learnt:¹⁴ If the heifer refused to go forth, one may not send a black one with her, lest people say: They slaughtered a black [heifer], nor may another red heifer be brought forth with her, lest people say: They slaughtered two. —

R. Jose said: This comes not under this title,¹⁵ but because it is written: [And he shall¹⁶ bring it forth]; 'it', [implies] by itself. And the [anonymous] first Tanna [surely wrote] 'it'.¹⁷ —

Who is this first Tanna? It is R. Simeon who 'interprets¹⁸ the reason of biblical law'. What is the difference between them? — There is a difference

- (1) Num. XIX,⁹ which implies that special watch must be kept with these till the sprinkling.
- (2) Because day is stated specifically, Num. XIX, 12.
- (3) No special verse is required that these may not be performed by a woman since 'Eleazar' or 'priest' is written throughout the section (Rashi).
- (4) Ibid 2, 'law' implying uniform regulations for the whole ceremony.
- (5) I.e., 'Do what is written here, but do not add to these regulations' (Rashi).

YOMA - 28a-61b

(6) Of Samuel, 42a, who holds that a lay Israelite may slaughter the heifer, for since the objection was raised in support of Rab, it must needs be an attack on Samuel's view.

(7) Whereas Samuel is said supra to declare it valid.

(8) Num. XIX, 3.

(9) Eleazar at that time was deputy high priest, and that heifer, by express statement of Scripture, was entrusted to him. In future, however, it would be given either to the high priest, or to a common priest (R. Hananel).

(10) For, since Scripture did not expressly state that it be handed over to the high priest, or his deputy, but merely by implication, the assumption seems justified that any priest could officiate at the ceremony.

(11) Lev. XVI, 29 and Num. XIX, 21, on which this analogy is based.

(12) Where the service is to be performed by the high priest.

(13) Num. XIX, 3.

(14) Parah III, 7.

(15) I.e., this is not the real reason, rather, etc.

(16) The bracketed portion is omitted in the Talmud and supplied from the Mishnah, Parah III, 7.

(17) Which seemingly justified the excluding interpretation.

(18) Kid. 68b: Such interpretation will accordingly modify the law, extending or limiting it.

Yoma 43a

if one should bring forth an ass with her.¹ And he shall slay it [implies] that one must not slaughter any other [heifer] with it. Before him¹ [implies] according to Rab that he must not divert his attention from her; according to Samuel, that a lay Israelite may slaughter, and Eleazar look on.² And Eleazar the priest shall take of its blood with his fingers³ [is written] according to Samuel in order to refer it [the rite] back to Eleazar;⁴ according to Rab:⁵ this is a limitation following a limitation and a double limitation serves to widen the scope, viz., that even a common priest may do it.

And the priest shall take cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet,⁶ [is written] according to Samuel, that even a common priest [may take and cast it] according to Rab:⁷ it is necessary [to mention it], for you might have thought and said: Since these things do not belong to

the heifer itself, they do not require any priest's service, therefore Scripture informs us [that they do]. Then the priest shall wash his clothes,⁸ [implies] in his priestly garments. And the priest shall be unclean until the even,⁸ [implies] that he shall be in his priestly garments¹⁰ even in future generations. That will be quite right according to him who holds that [the heifer ceremony] will in future generations be performed by a common priest,¹¹ but according to him who holds that in future generations [the heifer ceremony will be performed by] the high priest, now, since a high priest is required, is it necessary to state that he must be in his priestly garments? —

Yes, Scripture does [occasionally] take the trouble to mention things which might have been inferred a minori. And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and lay them up¹² — 'a man,' [is written] to declare fit a lay Israelite;¹³ 'that is clean' — to declare fit a woman; and 'lay them up' [implies] one who has understanding how to lay them up, that excludes one deaf and dumb, an idiot, and a minor, who have not the understanding of how to lay them up. We learned elsewhere:¹⁴ All are fit to prepare [the waters of lustration]¹⁵ with the exception of the deaf and dumb, the idiot, and the minor.

R. Judah declares fit a minor and disqualifies a woman and an hermaphrodite. What is the reason for the Rabbis' view? — Because it is written: And for the unclean they shall take of the ashes of the burning of the purification from sin [and put upon them running water in a vessel],¹⁶ i.e., they¹⁷ whom I declared unto thee unfit for the gathering [of the ashes] I also declared unto thee unfit for the preparation [of the waters of lustration], but they whom I declared fit to thee for the gathering, I have also declared unto thee fit for the preparation. And [what does] R. Judah [say]? —

YOMA - 28a-61b

If that were so,¹⁸ Scripture should have said: 'He shall take [we-Lakah]';¹⁹ what is the meaning of they shall take? To intimate that even a minor whom I declared unto thee unfit there, is fit to act here.²⁰ — Whence does he know that a woman is unfit? — Because Scripture says: ['he shall put'] i.e., he, but not she, shall put. — And the Rabbis? —

If the Divine Law had written 'He shall take', 'he shall put', one might have assumed the same man must both give and put, therefore Scripture wrote 'and they shall take'. And if the Divine Law had stated 'they shall take' and [also] 'they shall put', one might have assumed that there must be two to take and put, therefore Scripture wrote: 'they shall take' and 'he shall put', to indicate that even if [it is right] two take [the ashes] and one puts [the running water in a vessel]. —

And a clean man shall take hyssop, and cup it in the water [and sprinkle],²¹ according to the Rabbis:²² 'A man' [implies] but not a woman; 'clean' is [written] to declare fit²³ even a minor; according to R. Judah:²⁴ 'a man' [implies] but not a minor; 'clean' to declare fit a woman. An objection²⁵ was raised: 'All are qualified to sprinkle except one whose sex is unknown, an hermaphrodite and a woman; but a child that is without²⁶ understanding, a woman may aid in sprinkling'

(1) According to the first Tanna that would be permitted, because the presence of the ass could not mislead people into the assumption that it was he who is sacrificed; according to Rabbi, it would be forbidden, for 'it' excludes permission for any other animal to be brought forth together with her.

(2) V. supra 42a.

(3) Ibid. 4.

(4) Since 'he shall slay' refers, according to Samuel, to the lay Israelite, it was necessary to emphasize that the sprinkling had to be done by 'Eleazar', otherwise it might have been assured that it could be performed by the lay Israelite who did the slaughtering.

(5) Who refers 'he shall slay' to the priest, the repetition of 'Eleazar' here is apparently superfluous.

(6) The repetition indicating that no limitation is intended, but only exemplification.

(7) Who permits a common priest to receive the blood, this passage being independent of the preceding implication.

(8) Lev. XIX, 7.

(9) It was superfluous to state 'the priest' again, since we are dealing but with him, the implication therefore is that he must do it in his priestly garments.

(10) When performing the red heifer ritual.

(11) Who does not draw an analogy from the identical words 'statute', occurring both in connection with the Day of Atonement and with the heifer; hence it is necessary to state that in the future, nonetheless, he must then wear his official garb.

(12) Num. XIX, 9.

(13) For gathering up the ashes.

(14) Parah V, 4.

(15) I.e., to put water over the ashes.

(16) Num. XIX, 17.

(17) 'They' referring to such as were declared fit for the immediately preceding rite of gathering the ashes mentioned in verse 9.

(18) That 'they' refers to such as are mentioned in verse 9.

(19) Just as in verse 9 the singular is used.

(20) A minor is not permitted to gather the ashes, but he may put the water in the ashes.

(21) Num. XIX, 18.

(22) Who hold that the mixing of the ashes and water may be done only by such as are fit to gather the ashes, thus excluding a minor.

(23) Had the same regulation implied in verse 9 applied also to sprinkling, the phrase 'a clean man' would have been superfluous here.

(24) Who disqualifies a woman and declares fit a minor for the mixing of the ashes with the water.

(25) Parah XII, 10.

(26) Corrected according to the Mishnah. The Talmud here reads: a child that has understanding.

Yoma 43b

and here R. Judah does not dispute?¹ —

Abaye said: Since the Master said that this chapter contains [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent of preceding or following implications he surely disputes. And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean;² 'clean' implies that he was unclean before,³ that informs us that a Tebul-Yom is qualified [to officiate] at the heifer [ceremony].

YOMA - 28a-61b

R. Assi said: When R. Johanan and Resh Lakish engaged in investigating questions about the heifer, they were unable to produce more than what a fox can bring up from a plowed field, but they said this chapter contains [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent of preceding or following implications.⁴

A Tannas recited before R. Johanan: All the slaughterings may be performed by a lay Israelite with the exception of that of the [red] heifer. R. Johanan said to him: Go out and teach it in the street!⁶ We do not find that slaughtering is disqualified [if performed] by a lay Israelite. Nor would R. Johanan not listen only to a Tanna [in this matter] he would not even listen to his own master, for, whereas R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: The slaughtering of the heifer by a lay Israelite is invalid [he added]: But I say, it is valid, for we do not find that slaughtering [of sacrifices] by a lay Israelite is invalid.

HE CAME TO HIS SECOND BULLOCK: Why is it that in the first confession he does not say 'And the children of Aaron, Thy holy people' and in the second confession he mentions: 'The children of Aaron, Thy holy people'? — The school of R. Ishmael taught: Common sense dictates⁷ this: It is better that one innocents obtain atonement for the guilty, than that one guilty obtain atonement for the guilty.

MISHNAH. HE KILLED IT [THE BULLOCK] AND RECEIVED ITS BLOOD IN A BOWL. AND HE GAVE IT TO THE ONE WHO SHOULD STIR IT UP ON THE FOURTH TERRACE WITHIN THE SANCTUARY⁹ LEST IT CONGEAL.¹⁰ HE TOOK THE COAL-PAN AND WENT UP TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, CLEARING THE COALS TO BOTH SIDES, TOOK A PANFUL OF THE GLOWING CINDERS FROM BELOW, CAME DOWN AND PLACED THE COAL-PAN ON THE FOURTH

TERRACE IN THE TEMPLE COURT.¹¹ ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE OUT [THE CINDERS] WITH A SILVER COAL-PAN, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE OF GOLD, BUT THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH A GOLDEN [COAL-PAN] IN WHICH HE WAS TO BRING THEM. IN [THE INNER SANCTUARY] ON OTHER DAYS¹² HE WOULD TAKE THEM UP WITH A COAL-PAN CONTAINING FOUR KABS, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS,¹³ THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, IN WHICH HE BRINGS OUGHT [THE CINDERS] IN, TOO.

R. JOSE SAID: ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING ONE SE'AH, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, IN WHICH HE ALSO BRINGS IN [THE CINDERS]. ON OTHER DAYS THE PAN WAS HEAVY, TODAY IT WAS LIGHT.¹⁴ ON OTHER DAYS ITS HANDLE WAS SHORT, TODAY IT WAS LONG.¹⁴ ON OTHER DAYS IT WAS OF YELLOWISH GOLD, TODAY OF RED GOLD. THIS IS THE STATEMENT OF R. MENAHEM. ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD OFFER HALF A MINA [OF INCENSE] IN THE MORNING AND HALF A MINA IN THE AFTERNOON, TODAY HE ADDS ALSO HIS TWO HANDS FULL.¹⁵ EVERY DAY IT WAS FINE, BUT TODAY THE FINEST POSSIBLE.¹⁶ ON OTHER DAYS THE PRIESTS WOULD GO UP ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE RAMP¹⁷ AND COME DOWN ON THE WEST SIDE, TODAY THE HIGH PRIEST GOES¹⁸ UP IN THE MIDDLE AND COMES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE.

R. JUDAH SAYS: THE HIGH PRIEST ALWAYS GOES UP IN THE MIDDLE AND COMES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE. ON OTHER DAYS THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM THE LAVER, THIS DAY FROM A GOLDEN LADLE. R. JUDAH SAYS: THE HIGH PRIEST ALWAYS SANCTIFIES HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM A GOLDEN LADLE. ON OTHER DAYS THERE WERE

YOMA - 28a-61b

FOUR WOOD-PILES THERE,¹⁹ TODAY FIVE, THUS SAYS R. MEIR. R. JOSE SAYS: ON OTHER DAYS THREE, TODAY FOUR. R. JUDAH SAYS: ON OTHER DAYS TWO, TODAY THREE.

GEMARA. But it is written: And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting?²⁰ R. Judah said: Read: Of the Hekal.²¹ Our Rabbis taught: 'And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting'²² —

(1) Tosaf s.v. Velo expresses amazement at the fact that the questioner overlooks the Tosefta, in which R. Judah actually does dispute the anonymous Mishnah. It is to be found in Parah XII, 8, which, as Tosaf suggests, the questioner may not have known the Mishnah containing no such dispute of R. Judah's.

(2) Num. XIX, 19.

(3) The word 'Tahor' (a clean person) is superfluous, since Scripture just speaks of him, hence it must mean one who is clean again, hence was unclean before. The inference for a Tebul-Yom (v. Glos.) thus appears justified.

(4) Hence it is impossible to explain them on one schema, because of the particular condition of this chapter, but for the tradition, the inferences would appear incompatible.

(5) V. Glos. s.v. (b).

(6) I.e., it is not fit for the Academy, we cannot accept your report.

(7) Lit., 'the norm of justice'.

(8) The high priest is adjudged innocent, after having besought and obtained forgiveness for himself.

(9) V. Gemara, loc. cit.

(10) Through being kept there until the time of the smoking of the incense.

(11) Now he would take the incense with his hands and place it in the golden pan.

(12) Tamid V, 5.

(13) This list will prove' helpful: 1 log=6 eggs; 1 Kab =4 logs; 1 Se'ah =6 Kabs.

(14) The lighter pan and the longer handle were to assist the high priest in his heavy labor on the Day of Atonement.

(15) Both the daily incense on the golden altar in the inner Sanctuary and the special incense for the day — the latter on a golden pan — were on the Day of Atonement, offered up by the high priest alone.

(16) I.e., ground very thin, thus of finest quality. Ex. XXX, 36.

(17) To the outer altar there were no steps, but the ramp, built 'In the south of the altar, covering

nine cubits of height. The priests went up to the right and down to the left.

(18) Var. lec., 'Today they went up, etc.' V. Gemara.

(19) Explanation in the Gemara.

(20) Lev. XVI, 17. How then could the priest stir the blood on the fourth terrace in the Sanctuary?

(21) I.e., the fourth terrace leading from the Sanctuary to the Court. v. Mid. III, 6.

(22) Lev. XVI, 17.

Yoma 44a

one could assume, not even in the Temple Court, therefore it says: 'in the tent of meeting'. I know [this prohibition] only for the tent of meeting in the wilderness. Whence do we know thereof for Shiloh and the everlasting Sanctuary? To teach us that [Scripture] says in the holy place. I know [the prohibition] only during the time of [the smoking of] the incense, whence [do I know that it applies also] during the time of the sprinkling of the blood? To teach us that, Scripture says: until he come out and have made atonement for himself. —

I know it only at the [time of] his entering. Whence do I learn at his coming forth? To teach us that it says: until he come out. And he shall have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of the house of Israel, i.e., the atonement for himself precedes that for his household, and the atonement for his household precedes that for his brethren, the priests and the atonement for his brethren, the priests, precedes that for all the assembly of Israel.

The Master said: I know [of the prohibition] only for the time of [the smoking of] the incense. How is this implied? — Raba, and thus also R. Isaac b. Abdimi, and thus also R. Eleazar said: Scripture says: 'And he shall have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of the house of Israel'. What atonement is there which obtains evenly for himself, his household, his brethren, the priests, and the whole assembly of the house of Israel? It is

YOMA - 28a-61b

the smoking of the incense. But does the incense obtain atonement? —

Indeed, for R. Hananiah cited:¹ We learn that the incense obtains atonement for what was said: And he put on the incense and made atonement for the people.² And the School of R. Ishmael taught: Why does incense obtain atonement for [the sin] of the evil tongue [evil speech]? Let that which is [performed] in secret³ come and obtain atonement for what is committed in secret! We have learnt elsewhere:⁴ People must keep away from the place between Ulams and altar at the time of the smoking of the incense. R. Eleazar said: This was taught only during the time of the smoking of the incense in the Sanctuary, but during the time the incense was smoked in the Holy of Holies, people had to keep away from the Hekal, but not from the place between the Ulam and the altar.

R. Adda b. Ahabah, or as some say, Kadi,⁶ raised the following objection: R. Jose says: 'Just as they keep away from the place between Ulam and altar during the [smoking of] the incense, so do they keep away at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed priest's bullock,⁷ and of the bullock offered up because of an error of the congregation,⁸ and of the he-goats [offered up] because of idolatry.⁹ What gradation of sanctity is there, then, between the Hekal and the space between Ulam and altar? [None] except that from the Hekal men keep away both during the time of the smoking of the incense, and outside of the time of the smoking of the incense, but from the space between Ulam and altar people keep away only in the time of the incense. At any rate, at the time of the smoking of the incense, they do keep away.¹⁰ Would you not say [it means] during the time of the smoking [of the incense] in the Holy of Holies?¹¹ —

No, [the reference is to the time of smoking] in the Hekal.¹² If so, [how explain] 'what then is the gradation between the two places', etc.? Is the above the only difference in

gradation?¹³ Is there not also this difference: that from the Hekal they keep away during the time both of the smoking of the incense in the Hekal itself, and of the smoking of the incense in the Holy of Holies, whereas from the place between Ulam and altar they keep away only during the time of the smoking of the incense in the Hekal itself? — This [exactly] is what he teaches: 'Except that from the Hekal men keep away, both during the time of the smoking of incense [in the Hekal] and outside of the time of the smoking of the incense [in the Hekal],¹⁴ but from the place between Ulam and altar they keep away

(1) 'Ar. 16a.

(2) Num. XVII, 12.

(3) In the Holy of Holies, hence — since none but the high priest could enter it — 'in secret'.

(4) Kel. I, 9.

(5) The hall leading to the interior of the Temple.

(6) Either the name of an otherwise unknown Amora, or 'As the case may be'; or an anonymous Amora; or 'a fictitious one', cf. B.M. 2a.

(7) V. Lev. IV, 3ff.

(8) Lev. IV, 13ff.

(9) Num. XV, 24; traditionally interpreted as the sin of idolatry.

(10) Even from the space between the [Ulam and the altar].

(11) Which refutes R. Eleazar.

(12) But at the time of the incense smoking in the Holy of Holies they separate only from the Hekal but not from the space between Ulam and the altar.

(13) Lit., 'and no more'.

(14) I.e., when incense is offered in the Holy of Holies.

Yoma 44b

only in the time of the smoking of the incense [in the Hekal]. — But there is also this gradations that they keep away from the Hekal both during its own sanctification¹ and that of the Holy of Holies, whereas from the space between Ulam and altar they do not keep away except when the Hekal is being sanctified? —

YOMA - 28a-61b

Raba said: The term ‘keep away’ includes it all in one.²

The Master said: So do they keep away at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed priest's bullock, and of the bullock offered up because of an error of the congregation, and of the he-goats offered up because of idolatry. Whence do we know that? — **R. Pedath said:** We infer that from the identity of the word ‘atonement’ [occurring also] with reference to the Day of Atonement.

R. Aha b. Ahabah said: Conclude from this that the gradations of sanctity³ are Biblical, and thus they have learnt them by tradition, for if it should enter your mind that they are only Rabbinical enactment, then what [in law] is the difference in the space between Ulam and altar [from which they must keep away] for fear that they might enter by accident, they should [analogically] keep away from the whole Temple Court out of fear that they might accidentally enter? — The space between Ulam and altar, since it is not marked off in any fashion, is not recognizable sufficiently, whereas the Temple Court, since there is the outer altar to mark it off, is sufficiently recognizable.⁴

Raba said: Conclude from this that the holiness of Ulam and Hekal is the same. For if it should enter your mind that they are of two different degrees of sanctity, then the sanctity of the Ulam itself is due only to rabbinic enactment; shall we then enact a preventive measure to prevent the violation of another preventive measure?⁵ — No, the Ulam and the space between Ulam and altar are of one degree of sanctity, the Hekal and the Ulam, however, are of two degrees of sanctity.

ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM OUT WITH A SILVER COAL-PAN: What is the reason? The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel.⁶

TODAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH A GOLDEN PAN IN WHICH HE WAS TO BRING THEM IN: Why? [To prevent] weakness of the high priest.⁷

ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM UP WITH A COAL-PAN CONTAINING FOUR KABS: A Tanna taught:⁸ One Kab of the embers became scattered,⁹ and he swept it into the channel.¹⁰ One [Baraitha] teaches one Kab, and another two Kabs? It is quite right according to the one which teaches ‘one Kab’, for it is in accord with what the Rabbis said, but the one that taught ‘two Kabs’ is in accord neither with the Rabbis nor with R. Jose?¹¹ —

R. Hisda said: It is R. Ishmael, the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, for it was taught: R. Ishmael, son of R. Johanan b. Beroka said: He brought [the cinders] in a pan containing two Kabs. —

R. Ashi said: You can also say that it is in accord with R. Jose and he said it thus: On other days he would take them up with a pan containing a Se'ah of the wilderness,¹² and pour it into one containing three Jerusalem Kabs.

ON OTHER DAYS THE PAN WAS HEAVY, TODAY IT WAS LIGHT: A Tanna taught: On other days it was of thick size, but this day it was thin.

ON OTHER DAYS ITS HANDLE WAS SHORT, TODAY LONG: Why that? So that the arm of the high priest may support it. A Tanna taught: On other days it had no covering,¹³ today it had one — this is the statement of the son of the Segan.¹⁴

ON OTHER DAYS ITS GOLD WAS YELLOWISH: **R. Hisda said:** There are seven kinds of gold:¹⁵ gold; good gold; gold of Ophir;¹⁶ fine¹⁷ gold; spun¹⁸ gold; locked¹⁹ gold; Parwayim²⁰ gold. Gold and good gold, as it is written:²¹ And the gold of that land is

YOMA - 28a-61b

good. Ophir gold: [so called] because it derives from Ophir. Fine [Mupaz] gold,

- (1) I.e., which would include also the sprinkling of blood.
- (2) They both come under one head, independent of the particular rite which is the cause for the keeping away.
- (3) Enumerated in Mishnah Kelim 1, 6-9.
- (4) So as to prevent their entering by mistake, or accident.
- (5) In Bez. 3a.
- (6) Supra 39a.
- (7) That is why he did not have to pour it into another pan. Having the whole heavy program of the Day of Atonement on his shoulders, all legitimate relief is provided.
- (8) V. Tamid 33a.
- (9) When he emptied the coal-pan containing four Kabs into one containing only three.
- (10) V. Shek. IV, 2.
- (11) According to whom three Kabs would be scattered.
- (12) Corresponding to six 'desert' or five Jerusalem Kabs, the difference between the two being one sixth. The desert Se'ah has five Jerusalem Kabs and when the priest pours out three, two remain.
- (13) A difficult word, obscure in etymology: variously translated as case, covering. v. Otzar ha-Geonim, ed. B.M. Lewin VI, 21: 'attachment', a contrivance to prevent the handle of the coal-pan from getting too hot. J.T. נרתיק, 'case', 'casket'.
- (14) Perhaps the son of R. Hanina the Segan; perhaps also the last to hold this title, v. Bacher. Agada I, 55.
- (15) Mentioned in the Bible.
- (16) I Kings X, 11.
- (17) Ibid. 18. Tosaf cites the J.T. explaining it to be gold without dross or alloy.
- (18) Ibid. 16.
- (19) Ibid. 21. The AJP Bible translates it 'pure' gold. 'Closed' to all dross, hence 'solid' would suit it as well.
- (20) II Chron. III, 6, obviously the name of a place. The explanation here is homiletical.
- (21) Gen. II, 12.

Yoma 45a

because it resembles [the shining jewel] Paz. Spun gold, because it is spun like a thread. Locked [rare] gold, because when its sale is opened, all other shops are being locked up.¹ Gold of Parwayim, because it looked like the blood of a bullock [par].

R. Ashi said: There are but five [varieties], each having gold and good gold. Thus was it also taught:² 'On other days the gold was yellowish, this day it was red and that was the Parwayim gold, which looks like the blood of a bullock.'

ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD OFFER UP HALF [A MINA], etc., ON OTHER DAYS IT WAS FINE, TODAY MOST FINE: Our Rabbis taught: Why was it necessary to state 'beaten small'³ since it is written already: And thou shalt beat some of it very small?⁴ It is but to intimate that it must be most fine.

ON OTHER DAYS THE PRIESTS WOULD COME UP ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF THE RAMP: Because a master said: Any turn you make shall be but to the right, i.e., toward the east.⁵

BUT TODAY HE COMES UP IN THE MIDDLE, AND GOES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE: Why? To honor the high priest.⁶

ON ALL DAYS THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM THE LAVER, etc.: Why? To honor the high priest.

ON OTHER DAYS THERE WERE FOUR WOOD-PILES THERE: Our Rabbis taught:⁷ On other days there were two wood-piles, today three; one for the big wood-pile; one for the second pile for the incense, and one which is added for this day;⁸ this is the opinion of R. Judah.

R. Jose said: On other days three, today four: one for the big wood-pile, one for the second pile of the incense, one to keep up the fire,⁹ and one which was added for this day. R. Meir said: On all days four and today five; one for the big wood-pile, one for the second pile for the incense, one to keep up the fire, and one for [the burning of] limbs and fat-pieces which had not been consumed on the eve, and one which was added on this day. At

YOMA - 28a-61b

any rate all are agreed about two, whence do they know it? —

Scripture says: It is that which goeth up on its firewood upon the altar all night,¹⁰ i.e., the big pile. And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby,¹⁰ i.e., the second pile for the incense. Whence does R. Jose infer the [pile for] keeping up the fire? He infers that from: And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby.¹⁰ And R. Judah? This [verse] refers to the kindling of the [splinters of] fig-wood,¹¹ for it was taught: R. Judah used to say: Whence do we know that the kindling of the fig-tree splinters must take place only on the top of the altar? To teach us that, it says: 'And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby'.

R. Jose said: Whence do we know that a [special] pile is made up to keep the fire burning? To teach us that it says: 'And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby.' But whence does R. Jose infer that the fig-tree splinters must be kindled [on the top of the altar]? —

He infers it from whence R. Simeon infers it. For it was taught:¹² And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar¹³ — that teaches that the kindling of the fig-tree wood must be done by a priest and in a ministering vessel;¹⁴ thus, R. Judah. R. Simeon said to him: How could it enter your mind that a lay Israelite could come up to the altar? Rather does [this passage] teach that the kindling of the fig-wood must take place on the top of the altar. And R. Judah? If we had to infer it from there, we might assume he may stay on the ground and kindle it with bellows, therefore he informs us [as above]. Whence does R. Meir know about limbs and fat-pieces unconsumed from the eve before [requiring a special pile]?¹⁵ —

He infers it from 'And the fire'. And the Rabbis? — They do not interpret the 'And' [waw]. But, what, according to the Rabbis, does he do with the limbs and fat-pieces

unconsumed from the eve before? — He returns them to the big pile, for it was taught: Whence do we know of limbs and fat-pieces unconsumed from the eve before

- (1) For as long as such gold was obtainable in one shop, none would go to buy in any other.
- (2) In support of the explanation of 'Parwayim'.
- (3) Lev. XVI, 12.
- (4) Ex. XXX, 36, for all days of the year, therefore a minori for the Day of Atonement.
- (5) [The ramp being on the southern side of the altar, by ascending on the eastern side of the ramp, the east of the altar, towards which he has turned is immediately on his right, thus obviating unnecessary movement in the Temple.]
- (6) [As a mark of distinction he has the privilege of walking about freely in the Temple without restricting his movements to the minimum. Var. lec.: 'They' i.e., the high priest and those who accompany him as a mark of honor].
- (7) V. Tosef. Yoma III.
- (8) To take thence embers for the incense to be smoked in the Holy of Holies.
- (9) In case the fire of the great pile did not keep up strong, one added fire from here.
- (10) Lev. VI, 2.
- (11) Whereby the big pile was lit.
- (12) Supra 24b.
- (13) Lev. I, 7.
- (14) I.e., the priest must perform this in his priestly vestments.
- (15) Since he uses the above passage for his own interpretation.

Yoma 45b

that he lays them in order on the altar, and if the latter cannot hold them, that he lays them on the ramp, or on the gallery,¹ until the great pile is made? To teach us that, Scripture says: Whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar.² And R. Meir?³ — [This is to teach] you may place back [there] unconsumed parts of the 'burnt-offering', but you may not place there unconsumed parts of the incense, for R. Hanania b. Minumai, of the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, said [with reference to]: 'whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar' — you place back unconsumed parts of the burnt-offering, but you do not place back unconsumed parts of the incense. At any rate all agree that one

YOMA - 28a-61b

adds [an additional pile] on that day; whence do they infer that? —

They infer that from: ‘And the fire’, for even he who does not expound a ‘waw’, expounds ‘waw he’ [and the].⁴ What does ‘Fire shall be kept burning upon the altar continually’⁵ mean? — It is required as it was taught: ‘Fire shall be kept burning on the altar continually’; it shall not go out — that teaches concerning the second pile for the incense that it shall be laid in order only on the outer altar.⁶ Whence do we know that about fire, for the coal-pan, [on the Day of Atonement] and for the candlestick?⁷

That can be inferred as follows: The word Esh [fire] is mentioned in connection with the incense,⁸ and the same word is mentioned in connection with coal-pan and candlestick; hence just as the former comes upon the outer altar, so do the latter come upon the outer altar. Or turn this way⁹ [perhaps]: the word Esh [fire] is mentioned in connection with incense and is also mentioned in connection with coal-pan and candlestick; just as for the former it comes [for the altar] ‘near to it’,¹⁰ so for the latter it comes [from the altar] near to it.¹¹ To teach us [the right law] Scripture says: ‘Fire shall be kept burning on the altar,’ it shall not go out i.e., the continual fire whereof I spoke¹² to you must be nowhere else but on the top of the outer altar. We thus learned it for the fire of the candlestick, whence do we know it for the fire of the coal-pan?

This can be inferred: [The word] ‘Esh’ [fire] is stated in connection with the coal-pan, and ‘Esh’ is used in connection with the candlestick, hence just as the former comes from the outer altar, so does the latter come from the outer altar. But, perhaps turn this way: [the word] ‘Esh’ is mentioned in reference to the incense, and ‘Esh’ is used in connection with the coal-pan; hence just as the former comes from [the altar] near to it, so the latter too comes from [the altar] near to it. Therefore it says: And he shall take a

censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord¹³ Now which altar is [only] partly before the Lord, but not wholly before the Lord?

You must say it is the outer altar.¹⁴ Now it was necessary [for Scripture] to mention both ‘from off the altar’ and from ‘before the Lord’. For if the Divine Law had written only ‘from off the altar’ I might have said: That ‘altar’ means the inner altar, hence the Divine Law said: ‘from before the Lord.’¹⁵ And if the Divine Law had written: ‘From before the Lord’ [alone], I might have said it must be exactly before the Lord,¹⁶

(1) The Sobeb v. Glos.

(2) Lev. VI, 3. This is superfluous in view of the preceding ‘it is that which goeth up on its firewood’, hence the derivation.

(3) How does he explain this verse.

(4) As in this case where it is written ‘and the fire’ a superfluous letter may have some intimation, two unnecessary ones must have it.

(5) Lev. VI, 6.

(6) ‘The altar’ in the cited verse referring to the outer altar.

(7) I.e., that they are to be fetched from the other altar.

(8) According to Rashi the word ‘Esh’ is not really mentioned, but implied: he shall smoke it ‘and there can be no smoke without fire’; but Tosaf. cites Num. XVI, 18, where the word fire is actually explicit in connection with incense.

(9) I.e., argue thus; a suggestion opposed to the preceding one is occasionally introduced by this composite word.

(10) The inner altar is in the neighborhood of the outer altar.

(11) I.e., the inner altar which is nearest to the candlestick and the Holy of Holies.

(12) I.e., the perpetual light of the candlestick, v. Ex. XXVII, 20.

(13) Lev. XVI, 12.

(14) Since the inner altar is entirely facing the inner Sanctuary.

(15) ‘Mi-lifne’ — ‘from before’ is taken to mean ‘only part of the altar is before the Lord.’

(16) I.e., just opposite the entrance of the Sanctuary.

Yoma 46a

but not to one side or to the other,¹ therefore it was necessary [to have both phrases]. R.

YOMA - 28a-61b

Eleazar said in the name of Bar Kappara: R. Meir used to say: For any of the limbs of the [daily] burnt-offering which remained over,² a special pile is to be arranged, even on the Sabbath. What is he teaching us? Have we not learnt: Every day there were four piles of wood there?³ —

R. Abin said: It was necessary [to state it] for those which became [somewhat] invalidated.⁴ [This however] is only when the fire has already touched them, but not when the fire has not taken hold of them. Some there are who say: Whether they were valid or invalid⁴ [the same rule applies]: If the fire had touched them, a special pile is needed but if not, not. [You say] ‘Even on the Sabbath’. [Surely] we have learnt thus: AND TODAY FIVE [PILES OF WOOD]!⁵ —

R. Aha b. Jacob said: It was necessary [to mention that]. The thought might have arisen in you that this applied only when the Day of Atonement fell [immediately] after Sabbath, because the fat-pieces of the Sabbath may be offered up on the Day of Atonement, but not [if it fell] in the middle of the week, therefore he informs us [that it applies then too].

Raba said: Who is it that does not care what flour he grinds?⁶ Have we not learnt: On all other days?⁷ [These were four]-This is a real difficulty. Now he [Bar Kappara] disputes with R. Huna who holds: The continual offering suspends the Sabbath only at its beginning, but not at its end.⁸ [To turn to] the main text: The continual offering suspends the Sabbath only at its beginnings not at its end. What does it not suspend? —

R. Hisda says: It suspends the Sabbath, but not the law of Levitical impurity. Rabbah said: It suspends the law of Levitical impurity,⁹ but not the Sabbath. Said Abaye to Rabbah: There is a difficulty on your view as well as on the view of R. Hisda. According to you, there is a difficulty: Why does it suspend the law of Levitical impurity? Because Scripture said: In its due season¹⁰ i.e., even in

Levitical uncleanness, [it should suspend also] the Sabbath, [since] ‘in its due season’ [implies] even on the Sabbath? —

And according to R. Hisda there is a difficulty. Wherefore the difference [in law in the case of] Sabbath touching which it is written: ‘In its due season’ [i.e.] even on the Sabbath; the same should apply to Levitical impurity, since ‘In its due season’ [implies] even in Levitical uncleanness.¹¹ He answered: There is no difficulty according to my view, nor is there any difficulty according to R. Hisda. There is no difficulty on my view; for the beginning is like the end

- (1) Though it is on the western side of the altar.
- (2) I.e., the limbs had been only partly consumed.
- (3) One of which was meant for the limbs of the burnt-offering of the Temple, which remained over.
- (4) I.e., Only in so far that they were not to be offered at the altar at the outset, though once they had been brought upon the altar they could be allowed to remain there to be consumed.
- (5) And the same regulation governs both the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement, and it was taught that for the limbs of the continual dusk-offering a special pile was established on the Day of Atonement.
- (6) I.e., does not care what argument he offers. Just as one who does not care what flour he grinds, will hurt his body through indigestible food, so will one who is not sensitive to careless thinking in his study, hurt his mind. V. Lewin, Otzar VI, 55, 170.-D.S. adduces a reading from the Aruk, ‘he does not care what comes before him’, i.e., he ignores texts in theorizing.
- (7) Which includes the Sabbath.
- (8) This offering is sacrificed on the Sabbath day, notwithstanding the fact that the labor involved many kinds of work expressly forbidden on that day. But only at the beginning. i.e., if the beginning of that sacrifice has to be made on the Sabbath. Of the Friday dusk-offering, however, the limbs must be smoked before the Sabbath. Since it belongs to Friday it would be desecration to continue it on the Sabbath.
- (9) Cf. supra 6b.
- (10) Num. XXVIII, 2.
- (11) For if no clean priest is present to sprinkle the blood, even one in the state of Levitical uncleanness is permitted to do so.

YOMA - 28a-61b

Yoma 46b

[consequently] in the case of the law of Levitical impurity, since it is suspended at the beginning it is also suspended at the end, but with regard to the Sabbath, since it is not suspended at the beginning¹ it is also not suspended at the end. Nor is there any difficulty according to R. Hisda: He does not hold that the end is like the beginning: [consequently] with regard to the Sabbath, since it is inoperative when a community sacrifice is concerned, it is suspended also at the end of the sacrifice, whereas as regards the law of Levitical uncleanness, since in the face of a community sacrifice it is only suspended,² it is suspended only at the beginning which is essential for [the obtainment of] atonement, but not at the end, which is not essential for atonement.

It was stated: If one puts out the fire of the coal-pan or of the candlestick, Abaye holds him guilty,³ Raba holds him not guilty. If he put it out on the top of the altar, all agree that he is guilty, they dispute it only if he brought it down to the ground and put it out there. Abaye holds him guilty ‘because it is fire of the altar’; whereas Raba holds him guilty, ‘since he snatched it away, he has snatched it’.⁴ According to whose opinion will be, then, what R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha: ‘One who takes an ember down from the altar and puts it out is guilty’ shall we say it will be in accord with Abaye?⁵—

You may also say that it is in accord with Raba, for in the one case it was not snatched away’ for its ordained use,⁶ in the other case it was snatched away’ from the altar for its ordained use. Some there are who say: None disputes the case where he took it down to the floor and put it out there, [all agreeing] that he is not guilty, the dispute concerns but the case where he put it out on the top of the altar. Abaye holds he is guilty ‘because it is the top of the altar’, whereas Raba holds him

guilty, ‘since he snatched it away, he has snatched it’.

According to whose opinion, then, will be the teaching of R. Nahman in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha viz.: ‘One who brings an ember down from the altar and puts it out is guilty’, — will you not say it will be in accord with neither Abaye nor Raba? — [No], there it was not snatched away for its ordained use, here it was snatched away’ for its ordained use.

(1) The Friday dusk-offering must be offered before Sabbath since the blood of the offering would become useless, invalidated, if not sprinkled before sunset.

(2) Only ‘with difficulty’ but never imperative, every attempt must be made to prepare the sacrifice in Levitical cleanness.

V. Supra 7b.

(3) Of having transgressed the prohibition: ‘It shall not go out’ i.e., it must not be put out, Lev. VI, 6.

(4) And it has lost its sacred character, hence what he put out on the floor was no more a coal sanctified on the altar whence he does not become guilty of transgressing the prohibition.

(5) The adopted opinion in disputes between Abaye and Raba is in the overwhelming majority in accord with Raba, whence the question as to the meaning of his teaching an invalid opinion. V. B.M. 22b.

(6) To place it in the coal-pan.

Yoma 47a

CHAPTER V

MISHNAH. THEY BROUGHT OUT TO HIM THE LADLE AND THE PAN. [FROM THE LATTER] HE TOOK HIS TWO HANDS FULL [OF INCENSE] AND PUT IT INTO THE LADLE, A TALL [HIGH PRIEST] ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE, A SHORT ONE ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE. HE TOOK THE PAN¹ IN HIS RIGHT [HAND] AND THE LADLE IN HIS LEFT [HAND].

GEMARA. THE PAN? But was it not taught:² He took the pan and went up to the top of the altar, took out the burning coals, and went down? — There the reference is to

YOMA - 28a-61b

the pan of burning coals, here to the pan of the incense. For it was taught:³ One brought out for him the empty ladle from the Cell of Vessels, and the heaped pan of incense from the Cell of the House of Abtinas.⁴

HE TOOK HIS TWO HANDS FULL AND PUT IT INTO THE LADLE, A TALL [HIGH PRIEST] ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE, A SHORT ONE ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE: For what purpose was the ladle on the Day of Atonement necessary? Surely the Divine Law said: [And he shall take] his hands full and bring its — Because [otherwise] it is impossible.⁶ For how shall he do it? Shall he bring in [the pan of burning coals] and then again bring in [the incense]?⁷ The Divine Law refers to one ‘bringing in’, not to two ‘bringings in’. —

Shall he take the incense in his handfuls and place the pans [of burning coals] on top of it, entering thus? Then when he comes [within the veil] how shall he act? Shall he take it between his teeth and set the pan [of burning coals] down? Now, if such procedure is unseemly in the presence of a mortal king, how much less seemly is it before the Supreme King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He? —

Thus it is impossible and since it is impossible, we do it as we find it in connection with the [offerings of the] princes.⁹ He took the pan¹⁰ in his right hand and the censer into his left hand.¹¹ ‘The native below and the alien in the heavens above?’ This one [the ladle] is small, the other [coal-pan] large,¹² and even where both are alike, as with R. Ishmael b. Kimhith, the one is hot and the other cold.

It was reported about R. Ishmael b. Kimhith that he was able to take four Kabs in his two handfuls, saying: All women are valiant but the valor of my mother exceeded them all.¹³ Some interpret it¹⁴ as referring to the crumb-dough,¹⁵ in accord with Rabbah b. Jonathan

who said in the name of R. Yehiel that crumb-dough is very helpful to a sick person. Others say it refers to the [healthy] semen [she received], in accordance with what R. Abbuha asked.

For he raised a contradiction: It is written: For thou hast sifted¹⁶ me with strength unto the battle¹⁷ but it is also written, Who has girded me with valor [for the battle]¹⁸ [to interpret the divergence thus]: David said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Lord of the Universe, Thou hast [first] ‘carefully sifted’ and then strengthened me.

It was told of R. Ishmael b. Kimhith¹⁹ that one day he talked in the street to an Arab, and spittle from his mouth flew on his garments,²⁰ whereupon his brother Jeshebab entered and ministered in his stead. Thus their mother saw²¹ two high priests on one day.

Furthermore, it is told of R. Ishmael b. Kimhith that he went out and talked with a certain lord²² in the street, and spittle from his mouth squirted on his garments, whereupon Joseph his brother entered and ministered in his stead so that their mother saw two high priests²¹ on one day. The Sages said unto her: What hast thou done to merit such [glory]? She said: Throughout the days of my life the beams of my house have not seen the plaits of my hair.²³ They said to her: There were many who did likewise and yet did not succeed.²⁴

Our Rabbis taught: with his fists²⁵, that means that he must not make a measure for his fistful.²⁶ The question was: How about making a measure for his handfuls? Is it only there²⁵ since it is written, ‘With his fist’,²⁷ whereas here²⁸ where it is not written ‘With his handfuls’ but ‘his hand full of fine incense,’ [it matters] not,²⁹ or does he derive [the meaning of] ‘full’ from [the word], full’ [occurring in connection with] his fist?³⁰ —

YOMA - 28a-61b

Come and hear: AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE'. Would you not say that it means: If he wishes to make a measure he may do so?³¹ — No, this is what it means: In the same manner would he take the hands full within the Holy of Holies.³² May not you then conclude from this that he takes the handfuls [outside] and repeats it inside again! — [No], perhaps it means that if he wants to have a measure made, he may do so;³³ or, that he must take neither less nor more.³⁴

Our Rabbis taught: His fistfull.³⁵ One might have assumed that it may come forth on both sides, therefore Scripture says: 'With his fist'.³⁶ From 'With his fist' I might have inferred that he should just take some with his finger-tips hence Scripture says: His fistful', i.e., in the manner in which people take a fistful. How so? He bends three of his fingers³⁷ up to his wrist and takes a fistful.

(1) V. Gemara.

(2) Infra 48b.

(3) Ibid.

(4) V. supra.

(5) Lev. XVI, 12.

(6) To perform the rite without the ladle.

(7) In his handfuls.

(8) Shall he put the pan on the incense and enter.

(9) Num. VII, 14; One ladle... . full of incense.

(10) This refers to the pan of burning coal.

(11) This is illogical for the ladle with the incense should be in his right hand and the less important pan in the left.

(12) Hence the heavier of the two, and therefore carried in the right hand.

(13) Lit., 'has ascended to the roof'. She has taken exceedingly good care of her children. The phrase is reminiscent of Prov. XXXI, 29. נָרַג may be interpreted as valor (Jast.); as vine (Aruch) or bundles of green (R. Han.) i.e., children.

(14) The mother's valor or the children's power.

(15) Which she ate during her pregnancy or on which she fed her children.

(16) With reference to his inner constitution. E.V. 'girded me'.

(17) II Sam. XXII, 40.

(18) Ps. XVIII, 33. The texts of II Sam. XXII and Ps. XVIII are almost identical, hence changes or deviations must have a definite idea underlying each. 'Sifted' is an ad hoc interpretation. The words 'for the battle' are not found in Ps. XVIII, 33.

(19) Tosaf. Yoma III.

(20) It was on the day of Atonement, he was to minister as high priest and the spittle defiled and thus prevented him from officiating.

(21) Both her sons.

(22) In the Tosaf. the reading is 'a king' and the incident reported to have occurred on the eve of the Day of Atonement.

(23) Especially a married woman would always cover her hair, as a sign of modesty. [Buchler (JQR. 1926) p. 8 identifies this high priest with Simeon (Ishmael) the son of Kamithos who was appointed by Gratus in the year 17-18.] The sight of a married woman's hair is an impropriety. Git. 90a.

(24) In obtaining such distinction. Your suggestion is insufficient.

(25) Lev. VI, 8.

(26) I.e., he must not use a measure instead of his fist.

(27) I.e., with his fist only, not with a measure.

(28) Lev. XVI, 12.

(29) Does the prohibition of using a measure not apply here.

(30) V. Lev. II, 2; the word 'full' written thus implies prohibition of an artificial measure. By inference from the identity of phrase the same may be assumed to apply here.

(31) This may be explained to refer to the ladle, to mean that one could have a measure made in accord with the high priest's size of hand.

(32) The Mishnah here means: And this was the method of measurement within; i.e., the priest would empty incense from the ladle into his hands and then put it over the burning coals in the pan.

(33) I.e., one cannot conclude from the Mishnah either way.

(34) Thus was the measure-two exact hands full-rigidly so.

(35) Lev. II, 2.

(36) Lev. VI, 8. No more, just as much as the closed fist will contain.

(37) Grasping with them.

Yoma 47b

In the case of the [meal-offering baked in a] griddle and the [meal-offering of the] stewing-pan¹ he makes it even with his thumb from above and with his small finger from below. And this was the most difficult service in the Sanctuary. [You say] 'this is'; and nothing else? Was there not the pinching of the bird's head² and was there not the taking of the fistfuls?³ - But say, rather, this was one of the difficult priestly functions in the Sanctuary. — R. Johanan said: R. Joshua b.

YOMA - 28a-61b

Uza'ah asked: How about that which is between [the fingers of the fist]?⁴ —R. Papa answered: That which is inside needs no question for it surely belongs to the fistful. Concerning that which is on the outside, too, there is no doubt, it surely is considered a remainder.⁵ The question attaches only to such portions as are in between [the fingers]. How about these? —

Said R. Johanan: R. Joshua b. Uza'ah had subsequently solved [the question] viz., concerning [the portion] in between, uncertainty prevails.⁶ How then shall he act? —

R. Hanina said: He shall burn [as an offering] first the fistful and then the portions in between [the fingers]. For, if we were to burn up [the ‘in between’ portions] first, perhaps they are considered remainders, and it would thus be a case where the remainders became reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning [of it on the altar], whereas the Master has said⁷ that if remainders became reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning thereof no more fistfuls may be burnt up on their account! If that be so, then even now apply thereto the rule:⁸ Whatever had partly been used in fire offering must no more be burnt [as an offering].⁹

Said R. Judah, son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi: He burns them [the remainders] up as wood, in accord with R. Eliezer, for it was taught:¹⁰ R. Eliezer said: For a sweet savour,¹¹ for this you must not bring them up but you may bring them up as fuel. This will be in accord with R. Eliezer, but what is there to be said in accord with the Sages?¹²

R. Mari said: Fat priests¹³ take the fistful. Now that you have come to this answer, according to R. Eliezer, too, [there is a procedure which may be adopted] at the outset,¹⁴ viz., fat priests should take the fistful.

R. Papa inquired: How about the middle [portions] ‘in between’ connection with the [two] hands full?¹⁵ — What is he inquiring about? If he derives [the meaning of the word] ‘full’ from ‘full’ [occurring] there¹⁶ it is the same [as the first question].¹⁷ —

This is what R. Papa asks: [Should we say that] we require that ‘he shall bring it his hands full’,¹⁸ which is the case here, or is it required that he take...bring in, which is not the case here?¹⁹ — The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa said: It is obvious to me that ‘his fistful’ means: In the manner in which people usually take a fistful, but R. Papa asked: If he had taken the ‘fistful’ with his finger-tips, what is the law then, or [if he took it] from below upward, or from the sides, what then? — The questions remain unanswered.

R. Papa said: It is obvious to me that the ‘handfuls’ are to be taken as men usually take them, but he asked: If he took the ‘handfuls’ with his finger-tips, what then? or from below upward, or from the side; or if he swept it with one hand and with the other and then brought the hands together? — The questions remain unanswered.

(1) V. Lev. II, 5 and 7.

(2) Zeb. 64b, based on Lev. V, 8.

(3) The priest's taking of the handfuls of incense, Lev. XVI, 12, v. infra 49b.

(4) Is it considered part of the fistful to be offered on the altar, or the remnant which went to the priests?

(5) Belonging to the priests.

(6) As to where they are to belong.

(7) Men. 9a.

(8) Men. 58a.

(9) An interpretation of Lev. II, 12. And since he first burns up the fistful he should not be permitted to burn up after that the remainders as an offering.

(10) Zeb. 77b.

(11) Lev. II, 12, on which the rule cited last is based.

(12) Who extend the prohibition even against burning them as fuel (v. Zeb. 77b). What is one therefore to do with the portions ‘in between’.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(13) Whose fingers are fat without any space between them for any quantity to get in.

(14) The proposal to burn it as fuel is even according to R. Eliezer not one which is to be adopted at the outset, v. Zeb. ibid.

(15) Sc. of incense offered on the Day of Atonement.

(16) I.e., in connection with the fistful; just as with the fistful any heaping is not burnt up as offering, the same would apply to heapings of the two hands full. The analogy based on the use of the word 'full' in both Lev. II, 2, which refers to the first, as in ibid. XVI, 12, which deals with the two hands full.

(17) Asked supra, whether a measure may be made for the hands full.

(18) Lit., 'his hands full... and he shall bring' v. Lev. XVI, 12.

(19) For he has not placed it between his fingers, it having entered there by itself, hence the required personal effort-and he shall take it-was absent.

Yoma 48a

R. Papa asked: If he stuck the fistful on to the side of the vessel, what then? Does the law require that it be put into the middle of the vessel, which is the case here, or must it be placed inside the vessel properly, and this was not done in our case? — The question remains unanswered. Mar, the son of R. Ashi asked: If he overturned the vessel and placed the fistful on the bottom of the vessel, how then? Does the law require placing it in the vessel, which was done here, or is it to be placed properly, which has not been done? The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa asked: With regard to the 'handfuls' are they to be heaped or leveled? — R. Abba said to R. Ashi: Come and hear: The 'handfuls' whereof they spoke are to be neither leveled, nor heaped, but liberally measured. — We learned elsewhere:¹ If the blood was poured out on the pavement² and he gathered it up, it is invalidated. But if it was poured out of the vessel on the pavement and he gathered it up, it is usable. Whence do we know this?³ —

For the Rabbis taught: And [the anointed priest] shall take of the blood of the bullock,⁴ i.e., from the blood of life⁵ and not from the

blood of the skin, nor from the last blood oozing out.⁶ 'From the blood of the bullock' i.e., the blood from the bullock shall he receive [straight]. For if you were to interpret from the blood of the bullock' [as meaning] 'from the blood⁷ i.e.' even if only part of the blood, has not Rab Judah said: He who receives the blood must receive the whole of the bullock's blood, as it is said: And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out at the base of the altar,'⁸ hence it is evident from here that from the blood of the bullock' must be interpreted as 'blood from the bullock [straight]';⁹ he¹⁰ holding the view: One may remove [a letter] and add [one] and thus interpret.¹¹

R. Papa asked: If the incense was scattered from his handfuls, how then? Is his hand to be compared to the neck of the animal¹² so that the incense would be invalidated, or is it to be compared to a ministering vessel and thus is not invalidated? — The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa asked further: If, in taking the handfuls of the incense, he had an [unlawful] intention,¹³ what then? Do we say that we infer [the meaning] of 'full' [by analogy of] 'full' occurring with the meal-offering,¹⁴ [viz.,] as in that case an [unlawful] intention effects an invalidation, so here too, an unlawful intention will effect an invalidation, or is it not so? —

R. Shimi b. Ashi said to R. Papa: Come and hear: R. Akiba added [the cases of]¹⁵ the fine flour, the incense, the balm, and the embers [of the sanctuary]. that if a Tebul Yom¹⁶ had touched part of them, he invalidated all of them .¹⁷ Now the assumption is that since a Tebul Yom invalidates them '¹⁸ so does their being kept overnight,¹⁹ and since their being kept overnight invalidates them, so does unlawful intention.²⁰

R. Papa asked:

(1) Zeb. 25a.

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (2) Before having been received into a vessel, as prescribed.
(3) That it is necessary for the blood to flow from the neck of the animal straight into a vessel.
(4) Lev. IV, 5.
(5) The blood coming forth in a jet, with which life leaves the body of the animal.
(6) Of the vein which was cut.
(7) The Hebrew words are Mi-dam ha-par, 'From the blood of the bullock'. The 'mi' has partitive meaning-'from the blood', part of it, not all of it.
(8) Lev. IV, 7.
(9) Meaning not from the skin, the vein, but that which is the bullock's life, with the jetting away of which his life too is gone.
(10) The Tanna of the cited Baraitha.
(11) In order to remove a contradiction. This interpretation involves a change in the Hebrew text. Instead of מִדָּם הַפְרֵר the ad hoc reading is: מִדָּם מַהְפֵר involving a removal of one letter from the first word and its addition to the second word.
(12) When the blood flows from the neck of the animal to the pavement, instead of being received in a vessel, it is invalidated. Does the same law apply when the incense is scattered?
(13) An intention at the moment of slaying to eat of the flesh beyond the allotted time renders the animal in question 'a vile thing' (Zeb. 25a). If the priest has similar intention, i.e., to offer up the incense tomorrow instead of today, would the same consequence ensue for the incense?
(14) V. supra p. 223.
(15) V. Hag. 23b, Sonc. ed., for notes.
(16) One who has bathed in daytime but must await the sunset to be perfectly clean. V. Lev. XXII, 7.
(17) The vessel of ministry combining the various constituent parts of the flour, etc., as one. V. Hag., Sonc. ed., 23b for notes.
(18) Through the union effected by the vessel of ministry.
(19) In virtue of the fact that they were contained in a vessel of ministry. V Me'il. 10a.
(20) I.e., since the incense by being placed in a vessel of ministry received a holy character in respect of contact with a Tebul Yom, and being kept overnight, it becomes invalidated through unlawful intention.

Yoma 48b

If he, in removing the coals [for the incense], had an unlawful intention — what then? Are preliminary¹ means of a religious act to be considered as the act itself or not? — The question remains unsolved.

The question was asked of R. Shesheth: If the blood was carried [to the altar] in the left hand, what is the law?² R. Shesheth answered: You have learnt it: He took the pan of burning coals in his right hand and the ladle in his left.³ But he could have settled that point to them from what we have learnt:⁴ [He carried] the right hind-leg in the left hand with the inside of the skin outward.⁵ — If the argument were based on that I might have assumed this applies only to a carrying [of such things] which are not indispensable to atonement,⁵ but in the case of a carrying [of things] which are indispensable to atonement,⁶ [it would] not [apply], therefore he has to bring [the above reference].⁷

- (1) So that his unlawful thought in connection with the preliminary act would have the same effect as such thought in connection with the religious act in itself and so the incense is rendered invalidated. Another interpretation would limit the effects of his unlawful intention to the preliminary act, here to the embers.
(2) All the other rites in connection with the blood sprinkling must be performed with the right. V. Zeb. 16b and 24a.
(3) Whence we may infer that even in this case he is within the law.
(4) Tam. IV, 3.
(5) I.e., the carrying of the limbs.
(6) E.g., the carrying of the blood to the place of sprinkling.
(7) Referring to the incense which is indispensable to atonement.

Yoma 49a

They raised the following objection:¹ A lay Israelite, an onen,² one inebriate or one with a blemish are invalidated for the receiving, the carrying, and the sprinkling of the blood, and so is one seated, and the left hand. This is a refutation. —

But R. Shesheth himself has asked this question in refutation!³ For R. Shesheth said to the Amora⁴ of R. Hisda who asked of R. Hisda: May the blood be carried by a lay Israelite? He answered: It is proper and a scriptural verse supports me: And they killed

YOMA - 28a-61b

the Passover lamb, and the priests dashed⁵ of their hand, and the Levites flayed them.⁶ And R. Shesheth raised this question: A lay Israelite, a mourner, an inebriate, or one blemished are invalidated for the receiving, the carrying, or the sprinkling of the blood, and so is one seated and the left hand!⁷ — After having heard it, he raised it in objection [against R. Hisda]. But R. Hisda had cited a scriptural passage [in support]? — They served only the purpose of a portico.⁸

R. Papa asked: If another⁹ [priest] took his hands full and put it into his [the high priest's] hands — how then? Is what we require that it be 'his hands full' which we have here, or is it required that he both 'take [his hands full] and bring it in', which was not the case here? — The question remains unsolved.

R. Joshua b. Levi asked: If he had taken his hands full and then died, what about someone else entering [within the Holy of Holies] with his [the first one's] handfuls? —

Said R. Hanina: This is a question of the older generation!¹⁰ Shall we say that R. Joshua b. Levi was older?¹¹ But R. Joshua b. Levi had said: R. Hanina permitted me to drink a cress-dish¹² on the Sabbath? [You say] to drink? That is self-evident, for we have learnt:¹³ One may eat all kinds of food for a remedy, and one may drink every kind of drink as a medicine? —

Rather to grind and to drink cress-dish on the Sabbath. What case do you mean? If it be a case of danger, surely it is allowed;¹⁴ and if the case be without danger, it surely is forbidden?¹⁵ — In truth the case referred to is one dangerous and this is how the question ran: Does it cure so that one may for this purpose desecrate the Sabbath, or does it not effect a cure so that one may not desecrate the Sabbath in connection with it? And why was it R. Hanina?¹⁶ —

Because he was familiar with medicine, for R. Hanina said:¹⁷ Never did a man consult me concerning a wound inflicted by a white mule and recover. But we see that people recover? — Say: And it was cured.¹⁸ — But we see them cured? — The reference here is to red mules, the end of whose feet is white. — At any rate we learn from here that R. Hanina was the older one?¹⁹ —

Rather, this is what he said: Our question is like one of the former generation.²⁰ But did R. Hanina express such a view?²¹ Did not R. Hanina say: With a bullock,²² i.e., but not with the blood of a bullock;²³ and, furthermore, was it not R. Hanina who said: If he took the hands full of the incense before the slaying of the of the bullock, he has done nothing?²⁴ —

This is what he [R. Hanina] said: Since he²⁵ asks the question, the inference is justified that he holds 'With a bullock' includes also 'with the bullock's blood'; now, according to [this] his view, his question is like the question of an older generation. — What about that?²⁶ —

R. Papa said: If [we say that] he takes the handful first and then must take it again,²⁷ then his fellow may enter with his Hafinah,²⁸ because the Hafinah is still the same; but if [we say] that he takes the handfuls once but does not take them again, then your question arises.

Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua to R. Papa: On the contrary! If [we say that he] performs the Hafinah twice, none else should enter with his Hafinah, because it is impossible that the second take not either a bit less [than the handfuls of the first]²⁹ or a bit more; but [if we say that] he performs only one Hafinah, does your question arise. For the question had been raised: Must he perform the Hafinah twice? —

Come and hear: AND SUCH WAS ITS MEASURE. Now does not that mean that as

YOMA - 28a-61b

the measure in the outside Hafinah, so was it in the Hafinah within the Holy of Holies? — No, perhaps the meaning here is that if he wanted to make a measure he could do so, or, that he must not take either more or less in the one case than in the other.³⁰

Come and hear:

(1) Zeb. 16a.

(2) V. Glos.

(3) Hence he obviously knew the Mishnah, how then could he have given the wrong answer!

(4) V. Glos. s.v. (b).

(5) II Chron. XXXV, 11.

(6) I.e., the blood which they received at the altar side from those who killed the Passover, namely, lay Israelites who are fit for slaughtering sacrifices, v. Supra 43a.

(7) Which shows that R. Shesheth knew of the Mishnah disqualifying the carrying with the left hand, how then did he solve the question put to him contrariwise.

(8) The laymen served only the purpose of a portico, holding the bowls up to view, but not handing them to the altar.

(9) Lit., 'his fellow'.

(10) The fact that this question asked by a teacher of the older generation has been also put by myself is an implicit compliment to our learning; R. Joshua b. Levi being of the older generation.

(11) The older of the two scholars. Hence Hanina's remark about the 'older generation'.

(12) 'Drink' because usually mixed with wine or oil.

(13) Shab. 109b.

(14) And is not in need of any special argument for dispensation.

(15) And no effort to permit it would be legitimate.

(16) Of whom the question was asked.

(17) Hul. 7a.

(18) The first interpretation referred to the person injured by the mule,' the second to the wound.

(19) Since R. Joshua refers to Hanina as 'R. Hanina', one must assume that the former cannot have been older, for in that case he would have called him by his first name, Instead of saying 'R. Hanina, etc.'

(20) He said to his pupils: This question of yours has been already asked by older scholars than you, viz., R. Joshua b. Levi, and it remained unsolved.

(21) Did he himself doubt as to whether the high priest may enter the Holy of Holies with the handfuls of incense that had been taken by someone else.

(22) Lev. XVI, 3.

(23) I.e., one priest must both slay the bullock and enter the Holy of Holies with its blood. This interpretation excludes the possibility of one's entering with the blood of a bullock slain by someone else.

(24) The ministration is invalid and must be repeated in proper form and order, infra 60b. As the taking of the hands full must not be performed before, but after the slaying of the bullock, the first high priest must have slain his bullock and the one who takes his place must slay another bullock, it is evident that he cannot use the handfuls taken by the first high priest, which took place before the slaying of the second bullock. Hence it seems impossible that R. Hanina could have asked the question attributed to him here.

(25) Since R. Joshua asked the question, he must hold that the second priest need not bring another bullock, for if that were his view, the taking of the handful of the incense before the slaying of the bullock would have been invalidated. Hence the apposite remark that others of an earlier generation who, in opposition to him hold that 'with a bullock' includes even 'with the blood of his bullock' have already asked the question.

(26) The original question: If a priest had taken the hands full of incense and thereupon had died, may another enter with his 'handfuls'?

(27) Within the Holy of Holies, v. infra and supra 47a.

(28) The handfuls taken by the high priest. V. Glos.

(29) As not all handfuls of people are of the same capacity.

(30) v. supra 47a and notes.

Yoma 49b

How does he do it?¹ He takes hold of the dish² with his finger-tips according to some with his teeth — and pulls it with his thumb until it reaches his elbows, then he turns it over in his hands and heaps up the incense in order that its smoke may come up slowly; some say he scatters it in order that its smoke may come up fast; and this is the most difficult ministration in the Sanctuary. This alone? None other? But is there not the pinching of the bird's head? And the taking of [an exact] fistful of the incense? —

Rather [say] this is one of the more difficult ministrations in the Sanctuary.³ [At any rate] infer from here that he had to perform the Hafinah twice. — The inference is right. The

YOMA - 28a-61b

question was raised: If the priest slew [the animal] and died, may someone else enter with its blood? Do we say 'With a bullock' [includes] even 'with the blood of the bullock', or 'With a bullock' only but not with its blood?⁴—

R. Hanina said: 'With a bullock', but not with its blood. R. Lakish said: 'With a bullock', and even with its blood. R. Ammi said: 'With a bullock', but not with the blood of the bullock. R. Isaac the Smith said: 'With a bullock' and even with its blood. R. Ammi raised the following objection: Ones may be counted in⁵ for the Paschal lamb, or one may withdraw from being counted in it until it be slaughtered. Now, if that view were correct,⁶ this should read: Until he sprinkles [the blood]. — There [is a special situation], because It is written: Miheyoth Misneh, i.e., as long as the lamb is alive.⁸

Mar Zutra raised the following objection: One must not redeem⁹ with a calf or with a beast of chase, or with what had been slaughtered or with a cross-bred, or with a Koy,¹⁰ only with a lamb.¹¹ There is a different case, because [the meaning of] lamb [here] is inferred from 'lamb'¹² [mentioned in connection] with the Paschal lamb. Then just as that must be male, without blemish, and one year old,¹³ this too ought to be male, without blemish, and one year old? — [To prevent such interpretation], Scripture states: Thou shalt redeem... thou shalt redeem,¹⁴ to include both. If [repetition of] 'Thou shalt redeem' means to include, then all ought to be included? — What value would the word 'lamb' have in that case!

(1) The second Hafinah, in the Holy of Holies.

(2) I.e., the ladle when containing the handfuls.

(3) Supra 47b and notes.

(4) V. supra 49a and notes.

(5) Pes. 60b.

(6) V. Ex. XLI, 4.

(7) That the blood, in the service, takes the place of the bullock itself.

(8) E.V. And if (the household) be too little for a lamb', here the ad hoc interpretation is: as long as it is itself — read מהנייה i.e., as long as the animal

is whole, before it is slaughtered, as long as it is alive.

(9) A firstling of an ass, Ex. XIII, 12, 13.

(10) A kind of bearded deer or antelope (Jastrow), which belongs either to the genus of cattle or of beast of chase.

(11) V. Bek. 12a. Since the emphasis is on 'lamb' (Ex. XIII, 13) and a slaughtered lamb is excluded, the inference appears justified, that a slaughtered lamb is no more considered to be a lamb. Hence a refutation of the view that blood can be considered as of equal ritual value with the animal itself.

(12) Ex. XII, 3ff

(13) Ibid. 5.

(14) Ibid. XIII, 13.

Yoma 50a

R. Isaac the Smith raised the following objection to R. Ammi's view: 'Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth'.¹ — [It means]: he shall take it out in its completeness.² And the bullock of the sin-offering and the he-goat of the sin-offering?³ —

R. Papa answered: Nobody disputes with regard to skin, flesh, and excrement, the dispute applies only to the blood,⁴ one holding blood to be designated 'bullock', the other holding that blood is not designated 'bullock'.

R. Ashi said: It seems reasonable to hold with the view that blood is designated 'bullock', for it is written: Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place; with a young bullock.⁵ Now does he bring it in with its horns? [Is it not] rather, with its blood, and yet it is called 'bullock'. And the other?⁶ [It means this:] 'How⁷ is Aaron legally permitted to enter the Sanctuary? With a young bullock for a sin-offering'. — But derive its from the fact that it is a sin-offering whose owners have died and 'as sin-offering whose owners have died is left to die'?¹⁰ —

Said Rabin the son of R. Ada to Raba: Your own disciples said in the name of R. Amram: This¹¹ is a community sin-offering and the sin-offering of the community is not left. For we learned:¹² R. Meir said: 'Are not the bullock of 'the Day of Atonement and the

YOMA - 28a-61b

pancakes of the high priest and the Paschal lamb¹³ each offerings of an individual and yet they suspend the law of Sabbath and the laws touching Levitical impurity? Would you not infer therefrom that there must be a view according to which these are considered offerings of the congregation?¹⁴

But according to your own arguments when it states:¹⁵ R. Jacob said to him:¹⁶ But are there not the bullock to be offered for an error of the congregation, and the he-goats to be offered up for idolatry and the festive offering,¹⁷ all of which are community-offerings, and yet they suspend neither the laws of the Sabbath, nor those of Levitical impurity? Would you infer from this that there must be a view that they are sacrifices of an individual?¹⁸

Rather [what you must therefore say is] he answered the first Tanna whom he heard saying that a community-sacrifice suspends the laws both of the Sabbath and those touching Levitical impurity, whilst the sacrifice of an individual suspends neither the laws of the Sabbath nor those affecting Levitical uncleanness, whereupon R. Meir said: ‘Is [the law concerning] the offering of an individual a general rule, is there not the bullock of the Day of Atonement? Are there not the pancakes of the high priest and the Paschal lamb, all of which are private offerings, and yet they suspend both the Sabbath and the impurity laws?’ And also R. Jacob said: ‘Is the law concerning the offering of the community a rule, are there not the bullock for an error of the community, and the he-goats for idolatry, and the festive offering, all of which are community-offerings yet suspend neither the laws of the Sabbath, nor those touching Levitical impurity?’

Rather accept this principle: Whatsoever has a fixed time,¹⁹ suspends both the laws of the Sabbath and those touching Levitical impurity, even [though the sacrifice concerned be that] of an individual; and

whatsoever has no definite time fixed suspends neither the Sabbath laws nor those affecting Levitical uncleanness even if a community-offering [were involved].²⁰

Abaye raised the following objection:²¹ If the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement had been lost and other [animals] had been set aside in their stead,²² then they must all be left to die; similarly, if the he-goats [offered in expiation] for idolatry had been lost and others had been set aside in their stead,²² they must all be left to die; this is the view of R. Judah.

R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: They should be left to go to pasture until they become unfit for sacrifice,²³ whereupon they should be sold and the money realized should go to the fund for [providing] freewill-offerings, because ‘a community-sacrifice is not left to die’.²⁴ Bullock here refers to the bullock offered up for an error of the community. — But the text reads ‘of the Day of Atonement’? —

This refers to the he-goat. But it was stated: If the bullock of the Day of Atonement and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement had been lost and others were set aside in their stead,²² they must all be left to die, this is the view of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: They should be left to go to pasture until they become unfit for sacrifice, whereupon they should be sold and the money realized for them should go to the fund for providing freewill-offerings, because a community-offering is not left to die’? —

Do not read:²⁵ ‘For a community-sacrifice is not left to die’, read rather, for ‘a sacrifice belonging to partners is not left to die’.²⁶ What is the practical difference?²⁷ — That the priests will not have to bring a sacrifice for an error in a legal decision.²⁸ —

Come and hear: For R. Eleazar asked:

(1) Lev. IV, 12. The animal is slain already and yet Scripture calls it a ‘bullock’.

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (2) I.e., all that is left of it the emphasis being on 'the whole'.
- (3) Ibid. XVI, 27. This shows that the body of the bullock itself after it is slain is still designated 'bullock'.
- (4) Whether blood by itself is equivalent to the whole animal so that the terms may be used indiscriminately or not?
- (5) Lev. XVI, 3.
- (6) How will he explain this verse?
- (7) With such ministrations in view is Aaron permitted to enter the sanctuary, to perform all details in connection with the bullock.
- (8) That another priest may not enter with the blood of a bullock slain by the first priest who died.
- (9) Tem. 15a.
- (10) Hence no further ministration is possible with it.
- (11) Bullock of the Day of Atonement.
- (12) V. Tem. 14a (Mishnah); v. next note.
- (13) This is omitted in Mishnah Tem. hence var. lec. 'it has been taught' instead of 'we have learnt', v. note 2.
- (14) In accord with the view of the first Tanna, whom R. Meir opposes, that only community-offerings can suspend these laws.
- (15) Tosef. Tem. I.
- (16) To the same first Tanna whom R. Meir opposes.
- (17) Brought by the pilgrims to the Temple on the occasion of a festival (Ex. XXIII, 14).
- (18) The assumption being that only thus could they fail to suspend either of the laws.
- (19) The Pancakes of the high priest are to be offered at a definite time every day, whereas the festive offering may be brought for seven days following the festival, hence having no definite time.
- (20) Hence we have no proof that any Tanna is of the opinion that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is a community-sacrifice.
- (21) Infra 65a.
- (22) When they are found again, they are deprived of food until they die.
- (23) Because of a blemish or their repulsive appearance.
- (24) Hence we see that these Tannaim consider the bullock of the Day of Atonement a community-offering, in clear contradiction of the statement above.
- (25) In the cited Baraitas.
- (26) The bullock brought by the high priest on the Day of Atonement being considered a sacrifice belonging to partners because all the priests share in the atonement effected by it.

- (27) Since in either case the animal is not left to die, whether we call it a community sacrifice or one belonging to partners?
- (28) If the Beth din by error had wrongly advised the priests, such error would not be considered 'error of the community', as when a whole tribe by mistake transgresses the law, but would be considered a sacrifice of partners, which is not left to die. Herein lies the practical difference, hence the justification of the distinction.

Yoma 50b

According to him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is a private sacrifice, is a substitute made for it valid¹ or not? Does not this imply that there is one who considers it a community-offering?² — No, the inference is that there is one who considered it an offering of partners.³

[To turn to] the main text: R. Eleazar asked: According to him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is an offering of an individual, is a substitute made for it valid or not?¹ What is his question? [Shall we say, as to] whether [the validity of a substitute] is dependent on him who consecrated it, or on him who attains atonement thereby?⁴

Obviously [it may be objected] we make it dependent on him who obtains atonement thereby.⁴ for R. Abbuha said in the name of R. Johanan: He who consecrates must add the fifth to and he who obtains atonement thereby can render valid a substitute,¹ and one who separates the priestly gift from his own produce for that of his neighbor has the benefit of the pleasure!⁵ In truth it is obvious that the matter depends on him who obtains atonement, and this is what he asked: Have his fellow-priests a definite share in the atonements or do they receive their forgiveness merely by implication?⁷

Come and hear: There are some aspects of the original sacrificial animal severer than those of a substitute animal, there are some aspects in which the substitute animal has more rigid rules than the original sacrificial animal. More severe are the regulations

YOMA - 28a-61b

touching the original inasmuch as it applies both to an individual and to a community, suspends the Sabbath law, and the law concerning Levitical impurity, and renders a substitute [valid,] all these things not applying to the substitute animal.⁸ More severe are the regulations touching a substitute animal than those of the original sacrificial animal, inasmuch as a substitute is effected⁹ even if it have a permanent blemish, and it cannot be made available [on redemption] for profane use, either to be shorn, or put to work,¹⁰ all these things not applying to the original animal.¹¹

Now what kind of sacrifice is meant here? If we are to assume an individual's sacrifice [is meant]. How could it suspend the laws of either Sabbath or those touching Levitical impurity; if, again, the reference be to a community sacrifice, how could it be replaced? Hence the reference here must be to the [high priest's] bullock, and [it is stated that] 'it suspends both Sabbath and impurity laws' because it has a definite time; and 'renders its substitute [valid]' — because It is the offering of an individual!¹² —

Said R. Shesheth: No, the reference here is to the ram of Aaron.¹³ Thus, indeed, does it also appear logical. For if we were to assume the reference is to the bullock, [the question would arise, Is it] that the substitute of the bullock does not suspend the Sabbath or the laws of impurity, but on a week-day it can be offered; surely is it not the substitute of a sin-offering,¹⁴ and 'the substitute of a sin-offering is left to die'? —

No! in truth, [the reference here is to] his bullock, and what does substitute mean here? [That which goes by] the name of substitute.¹⁵ — But, if so, sacrifice here, too, should mean [that which goes by the name of] an original sacrifice?¹⁶ —

No, he does not deal with [whatever goes by the name of] an original sacrifice. Whence that? — Since it states: 'There are

restrictions In the law regarding substitute animals, in that even a permanently blemished animal is affected, and it cannot be made available for profane use either to be shorn or put to work'. Now if the thought should arise in you that the word 'sacrifice' here meant [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrificial animal, surely there is

(1) V. Lev. XXVII, 10.

(2) A substitute for a congregational sacrifice is not valid. V. Tem. 13a.

(3) A substitute for a sacrifice of partners is not valid, 13a.

(4) This is the problem: If it is determined by the one who consecrated then in his case the substitute would be valid, since it is the high priest, from whose possession it comes, who consecrated it. If, however, it depends on those who obtain forgiveness, then no such substitution would be possible. There are many. i.e., his fellow-priests, who obtain forgiveness with the bullock, and no substitute can be made in the case of a sacrifice of partners. (9) If someone consecrates an animal for his fellow, whose duty is thereby to be fulfilled, and it suffers a blemish and he wishes to redeem it, the one who consecrated it is considered its owner and must add a fifth to its value (v. Lev. XXVII, 19), whereas he who is to obtain atonement thereby, would not have to add the fifth, because Scripture insists (*ibid.*): And he that sanctified...will redeem it, then he shall add the fifth part of the valuation.

(5) He has the privilege of bestowing it upon whatever priest he chooses. This shows that there is no question that the validity of a substitute is determined by the one who consecrated the original sacrifice. What point then was there in R. Eleazar's question?

(6) Through the bullock of the high priest, i.e., are they to be considered partners in the sacrifice from the time of its dedication.

(7) Jast.: circuit, transference in direction. Rashi: floating, unsettled condition. Goldschmidt: from Syriac: the bearer (of atonement). i.e., the high priest.

(8) No substitute for a substitute is valid.

(9) The animal itself, even though it be blemished, partakes of sacrificial holiness, although unfit for the altar.

(10) I.e. even after redemption the substitute may neither be shorn nor put to work, though its flesh may be consumed as non-holy meat.

(11) If the original sacrificial animal had been blemished the owner who consecrated it could consecrate only its value, hence the animal on redemption was made available for profane use without any reservation.

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (12) Which solves the question of R. Eleazar.
(13) I.e., the ram brought by the high priest for his own atonement on the Day of Atonement, v. Lev. XVI, 3.

(14) V. Lev. ibid.

(15) The teaching speaks here of a substitute in general, not of a substitute of any particular original sacrificial animal. The restriction concerning substitutes lies in the fact that no substitute ever suspends the law of the Sabbath, even though the substitute be offered up.

(16) Without referring to any original sacrifice in particular; why then refer the term either to his bullock or the ram of Aaron?

Yoma 51a

the first-born and the tithe of cattle, the laws of which affect even a permanently blemished animal, and which are not available [on redemption] for profane use to be subjected to shearing or work. Hence [you must say] he does not deal with [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrifice.¹ Why is it different with substitute animals? —

The substitutes all have uniform rules, whereas the original sacrificial animal includes first-born and tithe for cattle. Now, as to R. Shesheth, why does he refer the teaching to the ram of Aaron, let him rather refer to the Paschal lamb, which suspends the laws of the Sabbath and of Levitical uncleanness and can have a substitute because it is an individual's sacrifice? — He holds that a Paschal lamb is never offered for one individual.² Then let him put the case as dealing with the second Paschal lamb? — Is that able to suspend the laws of Levitical impurity?

Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua to Raba: Why does the Tanna³ designate the Paschal lamb an individual's sacrifice and the festal offering a community sacrifice? Would you say because the latter is offered up by large crowds?⁴ So is the Paschal lamb offered up by large crowds. — There is the second Paschal lamb, which is not offered up by large crowds. Said he to him: If so, it ought to suspend the laws of Sabbath and those of Levitical impurity.⁵ — He answered: Yes, he

holds in accord with him who says that it suspends [them]. For it was taught: The second Paschal lamb suspends the Sabbath, but not the laws of Levitical impurity.⁶

R. Judah says: It suspends also the laws of Levitical impurity. What is the reason for the view of the first Tanna? He will tell you: 'You have postponed it⁷ only because of Levitical impurity, how then shall it suspend the laws of Levitical impurity?' And R. Judah? — He will tell you: Scripture says: According to all the statute of the Passover shall they keep it,⁸ i.e., even in Levitical impurity. The Torah gave him an opportunity to do it in Levitical purity, but if he was not privileged to do so, let him do it even in impurity.

(1) But with one particular type of original sacrifice.

(2) This is the view of R. Judah (Pes. 91a), there being always more than one to subscribe to the cost of the Paschal lamb, which must be eaten up within its prescribed limited time, Ex. XII, 10.

(3) Supra 50a.

(4) I.e., on festivals when there are many pilgrims in the Temple.

(5) Since the reference is to the second Paschal lamb. MS.M.: '(how state that) it suspends the law of Sabbath.'

(6) Pes. 95b.

(7) The offering of the Paschal lamb, v. Num. IX, 11.

(8) Ibid. IX, 12.

Yoma 51b

But let him infer it¹ from the words of the Divine Law: 'which is of himself',² i.e., he shall bring it from what belongs to him, for it was taught 'which is of himself', that means he must bring it of his own possession, not from community funds.

One might have assumed he must not bring it from community funds, because the congregation obtains no atonement therefrom, but he may bring it from the funds of his fellow-priests, because they do obtain atonement therefrom, therefore Scripture says: 'which is of himself'.

YOMA - 28a-61b

One might have assumed he must [de jure] not bring it from funds beside his own, but that if he [de facto] had done so, it would be valid, therefore Scripture says again: ‘which is of himself’, repeating the condition in order to render conformity with it indispensable.³ — But according to your own view: If his fellow-priests have no part in it, how can they obtain atonement, [even by implication]⁴?

Rather must you say it is different with regard to the private treasury of Aarons for the Divine Law has declared it free to his fellow-priests, thus also with regard to the [question of a] substitute sacrifice [we say] the private treasury of Aaron is different since the Divine Law has made it free for his fellow-priests.

MISHNAH. HE WENT THROUGH THE HEKAL⁶ UNTIL HE CAME TO THE PLACE BETWEEN THE TWO CURTAINS WHICH SEPARATED THE HOLY FROM THE HOLY OF HOLIES AND BETWEEN WHICH THERE WAS [A SPACE OF] ONE CUBIT. R. JOSE SAID: THERE WAS BUT ONE CURTAIN, AS IT IS SAID: AND THE VEIL SHALL DIVIDE UNTO YOU BETWEEN THE HOLY PLACE AND THE MOST HOLY.⁷

GEMARA. R. Jose gave a proper rejoinder to the Rabbis. What about the Rabbis? — They will tell you: Those things⁸ applied at the Mishkan,⁹ but in the Second Temple, because there was lacking the partition wall¹⁰ which had been in the first Temple — and the Sages were doubtful as to whether its sacredness partook of the character of the Holy or the Holy of Holies, they made two curtains.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: He was walking between altar and candlestick.¹² This is the view of R. Judah. R. Meir says: Between the table¹³ and the altar. Some there are who say: Between the table and the wall.¹⁴ Who are the ‘some’? —

R. Hisda said: It is R. Jose. who said: The entrance was to the north.¹⁵ And R. Judah? — He will tell you that the entrance was to the south. According to whose view was that of R. Meir? If it agreed with R. Judah's, let him enter as R. Judah states,¹⁶ if it agreed with R. Jose, let him enter as R. Jose states! In truth he agrees with R. Jose, but he will tell you the tables¹⁷ were placed between north and south, hence they would interrupt his walk, preventing him from getting himself in.¹⁸ Or, if you like you might say: In truth, the tables were placed from east to west, but it does not seem proper

(1) The answer to the question above of R. Eleazar concerning the relation of the fellow-priests to the high priest's Day of Atonement bullock.

(2) Lev. XVI, 6 with reference to his bullock.

(3) Lev. XVI, 11 surely indicates that they have no share in the bullock, but receive atonement only by implication through the high priest's atonement, although the bullock is his own private property.

(4) So Bah.

(5) I.e., in respect of the bullock of the Day of Atonement.

(6) V. Glos.

(7) Ex. XXVI, 33.

(8) The one curtain referred to in Exodus.

(9) The Sanctuary in the wilderness.

(10) I Kings VI, 16 refers to the two cedar-covered partitions, with a vacant space between them, which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies, occupying the space of one cubit, but the text: And he built twenty cubits on the hinder part of the house with boards of cedar from the floor unto the joists, leaves it undecided from which of the two holy areas the space of one cubit was to be deducted.

(11) In the second Temple that partition was replaced by two curtains with a space between them.

(12) As he entered, he moved southward between the inner altar and candlestick, which was to the south, walking toward the curtain.

(13) The table was placed next to the northern wall, the candlestick next to the southern wall, the golden altar between them. According to R. Judah the high priest walked toward the Holy of Holies between altar and candlestick, that is on the southern side. According to R. Meir between table and altar, i.e., on the northern side.

(14) According to R. Jose between table and wall, on the northern side.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(15) R. Jose held that there was but one curtain, clasped on the north side, and since the entrance was on the north side, the high priest of necessity was walking along the northern wall.

(16) R. Judah also agreed that the immediate entrance into the Holy of Holies had to be on the northern side but he held that there were two curtains, with the outer one clasped to the southern side, through which he first entered, hence the high priest was walking along the southern wall till he reached the outer entrance, then walking along between the two curtains towards the north till he reached the second entrance leading immediately into the Holy of Holies.

(17) Solomon had made ten tables arranged in two rows of five tables, to the left and right of the table of showbread. The Sages discuss if these tables were placed lengthwise from south to north or from east to west. R. Meir held the former view, so that all the tables were placed in the northern half of the Sanctuary (Ex. XXVI, 35): And thou shalt put the table on the north side. Now the breadth of the Sanctuary was twenty cubits, its northern half ten cubits; the length of a table two cubits, so that each row of five tables filled the northern half of the Temple hall, without any free space between tables and wall. If any space were left free, then the row of the tables would to that extent encroach upon the southern half. Thus the tables would block the high priest on his walk between the table and the wall.

(18) Between the table and the wall.

Yoma 52a

to go straight ahead [towards the seat of the Divine Presence].¹ And R. Jose? — Israel is so beloved that Scripture does not wish to burden their messenger.² As to R. Judah, let him enter between the candlestick and the wall! — His garments would become blackened.³ R. Nathan said: Concerning the ‘cubit of partition’, the Sages did not decide as to whether its sanctity was that of the Holy of Holies or of the Holy Place outside of it.

To this Rabina demurred: What was their reason? Shall we say because it is written: And the house which King Solomon built for the Lord, the length thereof was three score cubits, and the breadth thereof twenty cubits, and the height thereof thirty cubits.⁴ [Also] it is written: And the house, that is, the Temple before [the Sanctuary] was forty cubits long⁵

and it is further written: And before the Sanctuary which was twenty cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and twenty cubits in the height thereof⁶ — so that we do not know whether the [space of] a cubit of the partition was to be deducted from the twenty or the forty, — perhaps it is to be deducted from neither the twenty nor the forty, the account referring only to the free spaces, not to the walls. As a proof [is the fact] that whenever the walls are mentioned, they are mentioned separately, for we have learnt: The Sanctuary was a hundred cubits square and a hundred cubits in height. The wall of the Ulam⁷ was five [cubits thick] and the Ulam eleven. The wall of the Sanctuary six, and its interior forty cubits, the partition one cubit and the Holy of Holies twenty cubits, the wall of the Sanctuary six, the cell six and the wall of the cell five!⁸ —

Rather, the question is whether the sanctity of the partition is as that of the inner part [the Holy of Holies], or the outer part, and this is as R. Johanan reported: Joseph of Huzal asked: [It is written], And a Debir in the midst of the house from within he prepared to set there the ark of the covenant of the Lord.¹⁰ The question was asked [in the Academy]: What does Scripture mean to say? [Does it mean] ‘a Debir in the midst of the house; from within he prepared to place the ark there’; or ‘a Debir in the midst of the house from within’?¹¹ — But could they have any doubt? Surely it was taught: Issi b. Judah said: There are five verses in the Torah [the grammatical construction of] which is undecided:

(1) on the assumption that they were placed between east and west, so that he could walk unhandicapped along the north wall towards the Holy of Holies, the suggestion is offered that it would not be in accord with the reverence due to that sacred place for the high priest to walk straight towards it, ‘feasting his eyes all the time on that most awe-inspiring place, through the opening through which he was to enter, hence R. Meir’s view.

(2) The high priest, as representative of Israel, is permitted to avoid the weary detour between table

YOMA - 28a-61b

and altar and to proceed straight along the north wall towards the Holy of Holies.

(3) From the smoke (soot) of the candlestick on the wall.

(4) I Kings VI, 2.

(5) Ibid. 17.

(6) I Kings VI, 20.

(7) The hall leading into the interior of the Temple.

(8) V. Mid. IV. 6 and 7. Hence the question above is answered.

(9) E.V. ‘Sanctuary:’ here taken to denote the space between the partition dividing the Holy from the Holy of Holies.

(10) I Kings VI, 19.

(11) According to the first interpretation the cubit partition would be excluded then from the Holy of Holies. Does the ‘from within’ belong to the first part of the verse, referring to the Debir or to the second interpretation and refer to the Holy of Holies?

Yoma 52b

‘lifted up’,¹ ‘like almond-blossoms’;² ‘tomorrow’,³ ‘cursed’⁴ and ‘rise up’.⁵ It was also taught:⁶ Joseph of Huzal is the same as Joseph the Babylonian, and is identical⁷ with Issi b. Judah, also with Issi b. Gur Aryeh,⁸ also with Issi b. Gamliel, also with Issi b. Mahalalel. What was his real name?

Issi b. Akiba!⁹ — In the Torah there is no other,¹⁰ but in the Prophets there is. But is there in the Torah no other; surely there is for R. Hisda asked:¹¹ [It is written], And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings,¹² [does it mean] of lambs; and sacrificed peace-offerings unto the Lord [namely of oxen]; or [does the word] ‘oxen’ refer to all [sacrifices]?¹³ — R. Hisda had indeed his doubts about it, but to Issi b. Judah it was obvious.

MISHNAH. THE OUTER CURTAIN WAS HELD BACK BY A CLASP ON THE SOUTH SIDE AND THE INNER CURTAIN ON THE NORTH SIDE. HE WALKED ALONG BETWEEN THEM UNTIL HE REACHED THE NORTH SIDE. WHEN HE REACHED THE NORTH SIDE HE TURNED ROUND TO THE SOUTH AND WENT ON ALONG THE CURTAIN, TO HIS LEFT, UNTIL HE

REACHED THE ARK. WHEN HE REACHED THE ARK HE PUT THE PAN OF BURNING COALS BETWEEN THE TWO BARS.¹⁴ HE HEAPED UP THE INCENSE UPON THE COALS AND THE WHOLE HOUSE BECAME FULL WITH SMOKE. HE CAME OUT BY THE WAY HE ENTERED¹⁵ AND IN THE OUTER HOUSE¹⁶ HE UTTERED A SHORT PRAYER. HE DID NOT MAKE THE PRAYER LONG SO AS NOT TO FRIGHTEN ISRAEL.

GEMARA. To what are we referring here? If it be the first Sanctuary, was there then a curtain?¹⁷ Again, if it is to the second Sanctuary, was there then an Ark? Surely it has been taught: When the Ark was hidden, there was hidden with it the bottle containing the Manna,¹⁸ and that containing the sprinkling water,¹⁹ the staff of Aaron,²⁰ with its almonds and blossoms, and the chest which the Philistines had sent as a gift to the God of Israel, as it is said: And put the jewels of gold which you return to Him for a guilt-offering in a coffer by the side thereof and send it away that it may go.²¹ Who hid it? — Josiah hid it. What was his reason for hiding it? —

He saw the Scriptural passage: The Lord will bring thee and thy King whom thou shalt set over thee,²² therefore he hid it, as it is said: And he said to the Levites, that taught all Israel, that were holy unto the Lord: Put the holy ark into the house which Solomon, the son of David, King of Israel did build. There shall no more be a burden upon your shoulders now. Serve now the Lord your God and His people Israel.²³ And R. Eleazar said: We derive by analogy²⁴ between the words ‘there’, ‘generations’ and ‘to be kept’ occurring in these passages!²⁵ In truth we refer to the second Sanctuary and what does ‘He came to the Ark’ mean? I.e., he came to the place of the Ark. But the text reads: HE PLACED THE PAN OF BURNING COALS BETWEEN THE TWO BARS?²⁶ — Read [it to mean]: ‘as if it were between the two bars’.

YOMA - 28a-61b

HE HEAPED THE INCENSE UPON THE COALS. We learn here in accordance with the view that he heaped it [the incense]²⁷ up. One [Baraitha] taught: He begins to heap it up on the inner side, which is to him the outer side,²⁸ whereas another taught: he begins to heap it up on the outer side which is to him the inner side.

Abaye said: It is a matter of dispute among Tannaim. Further said Abaye: The view of him who holds he begins to heap it on the inner side, which is to him the outer side, seems logical, for we have learnt:²⁹ One teaches him: Be careful

(1) Gen. IV, 7: The meaning could be: If thou doest well (good!) — but thou must bear the sin, if thou doest not well; or the usual interpretation: If thou doest well, there will be forgiving (or lifting up of face); and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door.

(2) Ex. XXV, 33: Three cups, made like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop and a flower, or: Three cups, like almond-blossoms... a knop and a flower.

(3) Ex. XVII, 9: Go out and fight with Amalek tomorrow; I will stand on the top of the hill, etc.

(4) Gen. XLIX, 6, 7: And in their self-will they houghed oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce. Or: And in their self-will they houghed the cursed oxen. Their anger was fierce. (The cursed oxen would thus be an uncomplimentary reference to Shechem, a descendant of Canaan cursed in Gen. IX, 25).

(5) Deut. XXXI, 16: Behold thou art about to sleep with thy fathers; and (this people) will rise up. Or: Behold thou art about to sleep with thy fathers and (wilt in future) rise up. This people will go astray after the foreign gods. — Tosaf. s.v. endeavors to account for the curious order of the sentences quoted.

(6) Pes. 113b.

(7) Issi as an abbreviation of Joseph is perfectly possible. Tosaf.

(8) Judah is called Gur Aryeh (a lion's whelp) in the blessing of Jacob, hence the substitution here, v. Gen. XLIX, 9.

(9) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., p. 585. n. 6.

(10) Now Joseph of Huzal is here identified with Issi b. Judah and yet among the ambiguous passages here enumerated, the passage which aroused his question (I Kings VI, 20) is not mentioned!

(11) Hag. 6b.

(12) Ex. XXIV, 5.

(13) I.e., also to burnt-offerings, the meaning depending on the pause: If we pronounce 'Oloth' (burnt-offerings) at the end of the middle pause, or read on without such pause in the middle.

(14) V. Ex. XXV, 13f.

(15) Just as, on entering, he turned southwards until he reached the Ark, thus as he left, he did not turn his face, but went backwards, with his face toward the Ark (Rashi).

(16) In the Sanctuary.

(17) V. supra 51b.

(18) Ex. XVI, 33.

(19) Num. XIX, 9.

(20) Num. XVII, 25.

(21) I Sam. VI, 8. Hence it is evident that it was placed together with the Ark and the fear was justified that together with the latter these things might be exiled and lost.

(22) Deut. XXVIII, 36.

(23) II Chron. XXXV, 3.

(24) That the other objects enumerated were hidden at the same time as the Ark.

(25) Ex. XXX, 6 and ibid. XVI, 33, the word 'there' occurs, justifying the inference that something must occur in both the Ark and the manna; in the passage referring to the latter, Ex. XVI, 33, as well as in the passage referring to the oil for anointing (ibid. XXX, 31) the priests the word 'generations' occurs, again indicating some justified inference of something in common; finally, in connection with the manna as well as in the passage about the staff of Aaron the word 'to be kept' occurs (Ex. XVI, 33 and Num. XVII, 25). From all these word analogies the inference is drawn that what manna, bottle, oil, staff of Aaron and Ark had in common is that having been placed in or near the Ark, they also were hidden together. Hence the reference in the Mishnah could not be to the second Sanctuary either.

(26) He placed it just where the two staves had been in the first Sanctuary.

(27) V. supra 49b.

(28) I.e., he commences to heap up the incense from the inside part of the coal-pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working outwardly towards his arm. I.e., he commenced to heap up the incense on the outer side of the pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working towards the inside, away from his arm, with the precaution suggested below.

(29) Tamid 33a.

Yoma 53a

not to start in front of thee lest thou be burnt.¹

Our Rabbis taught: And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord:² i.e., he

YOMA - 28a-61b

must not put it in order outside and thus bring it in. [This is] to remove the error from the minds of the Sadducees who said: He must prepare it without, and bring it in. What is their interpretation? — For I appear in the cloud upon the ark-covers 'that teaches us that he prepares it outside and brings it in'.

The Sages said to them: But it is said already 'And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord'.⁴ If so for what purpose then is it stated 'For I appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover'? It comes to teach us that he puts into it a smoke-raiser.⁵ — Whence do we know that he must put a smoke-raiser into it? — Because it is said: So that the cloud of the incense may cover the ark-cover.⁶ But if he did not put a smoke-raiser into it, or that he omitted one of its spices he is liable to death. But [why not] infer this⁷ from the fact that he effected an entrance for no purpose.⁸ R. Shesheth said: We speak here of the case that he was in error about the entrance,⁹ but deliberate in omitting the spice.

R. Ashi said: You might even set the case when he was deliberate with regard to both but [here we deal with the case] where he brought in two incenses, one incomplete, the other defective, so that he is not guilty because of the purposeless entrance because he had offered up a perfect incense, but he is guilty in regard to the incense because he had offered up one defective incense.

The Master had said: 'Whence is it known that he must place a smoke-raiser into it? To teach us that, it is said: "So that [the cloud] may cover, etc."¹⁰ [What need of] one scriptural verse added to another?¹¹ — Said R. Joseph: This is what is meant: From here I know only about the leaf of the smoke-raiser, whence do I know about the root?¹² To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'¹³

Said Abaye to him: But the opposite has been taught; for it was taught: If when he put in

the root of the smoke-raiser, it would rise up straight like a stick until it reached the ceiling beams; as soon as it reached the beams of the ceiling it would come slowly down the walls until the house became full of smoke, as it is said: And the house was filled with smoke?¹⁴ —

Rather, said Abaye, this is what it means: Now I know only about the root of the smoke-raiser, whence do I know also about its leaf? To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'.

R. Shesheth said: I know only about the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness; whence do I know about Shiloh and the eternal Sanctuary? To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]' But that we infer from, And so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting, that dwelleth with them?¹⁵ — Rather is this meant: Now I know about the Day of Atonement,¹⁶ whence do I know about the other days of the year? To teach us that, Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'.

R. Ashi said: One [passage] refers to the commandment, the other to its indispensableness.¹⁷ Raba said: One refers to the penalty incurred, the other to the prohibition.¹⁸ It was taught: R. Eliezer said: That he die not,¹⁹ i.e., the penalty, For I appear in the cloud, i.e., the prohibition. I might have assumed that both were stated before the death of the sons of Aaron,²⁰ to teach us [the true fact] it is written: After the death of the two sons of Aaron.²¹ One might assume that both were said after the death of the two sons of Aaron; to teach us [the true fact] it is written: 'For I will appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover.'²² How is that [to be explained]? The prohibition [was stated] before the death, the penalty after the death. — How is this inference made?

Raba said: 'For I will appear in the cloud' — but He had not appeared²³ yet. Then why were they punished? — As it was taught: R. Eliezer said: The sons of Aaron died only

YOMA - 28a-61b

because they decided a question of law in the presence of Moses their Master. What was it they decided? — And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar²⁴ [means] although the fire was coming down from heaven²⁵ yet was it obligatory to bring private²⁶ fire.

HE CAME OUT BY THE WAY HE ENTERED: Whence is this known? — Said R. Samuel b. Nahmani in the name of R. Jonathan: Scripture said: So Solomon came to the high place that was at Gibeon, [unto] Jerusalem.²⁷ What has Gibeon to do with Jerusalem?²⁸ Rather, [Scripture] compares his departure from Gibeon towards Jerusalem with his entrance from Jerusalem into Gibeon, i.e., just as when he entered Gibeon from Jerusalem his face was directed towards the high place, in the same way as he had come in; in the same manner as he left Gibeon for Jerusalem his face was turned toward the high place even in the same way as when he had come in.²⁹ In similar manner the priests as they ministered, the Levites on their service, the Israelites on their posts³⁰ — as they left they would not turn their face back, to go out, but would turn their face sideways to leave. Thus also a disciple taking leave of his master, must not turn his face back to go away, but must turn sideways to depart.

As was the case with R. Eleazar, whenever he took leave of R. Johanan: if R. Johanan wanted to leave, R. Eleazar would stand on his place, the head bowed, until R. Johanan disappeared from his sight but when R. Eleazar wished to take leave he would walk backwards until he disappeared from the sight of R. Johanan. When Raba was about to take leave of R. Joseph he would go backwards, so that his feet were bruised and the threshold of the house of R. Joseph was stained with blood.

(1) The incense which he had heaped up towards his end and which burns continually may touch his arm and burn it whilst he is working it towards the other side.

(2) Lev. XVI, 13.

(3) The Sadduceans in literal translation have this interpretation: 'I, the Lord, am to be visited', i.e., seen, in the Holy of Holies, in the cloud of the smoke of incense, which must be a cloud, i.e., prepared outside, so that when, in the Holy of Holies I am seen, it is in the cloud of incense, all ready and rising up, as the high priest enters.

(4) Which clearly shows that the incense is put in the fire inside.

(5) The name of a plant used as an ingredient of the incense and whose effect lay in achieving a straight rising smoke.

(6) Lev. XVI, 13.

(7) That he is culpable if he omitted one of its ingredients.

(8) That is indicated already by the passage in Lev. XVI, 2: That he come not at all times ... lest he die, which indicates that a fruitless entrance incurs such penalty, hence no additional source of that law is necessary.

(9) To which no penalty of death is attached.

(10) The incense without the smoke-raiser could not possibly effect such 'covering'.

(11) From the passage 'For in the cloud, etc.' we inferred the necessity of the smokeraiser, why then an additional verse?

(12) Whether the roots or the leaf achieved the straight smoke. R. Joseph holds that the leaves had such property, Abaye attributed that quality to the root.

(13) 'Cover' may refer to the capacity to just cover the ark-cover, but not to rise above it.

(14) Isa. VI, 4. This proves that the root is more effective for producing the straight smoke.

(15) Lev. XVI, 16, i.e., wherever he shall dwell with them, shall they do this.

(16) The portion of the Torah refers to the Day of Atonement.

(17) 'So that it may cover' is the command. He shall not come at all times ... for in a cloud shall I appear — and not otherwise is the prohibition that the incense is indispensable.

(18) Lit., 'warning'.

(19) Lev. XVI, 13.

(20) Who died in expiation of their sin; and thus assumed it was their neglect to put the smoke-raiser into the incense.

(21) Lev. XVI, 1.

(22) This is the literal rendering.

(23) I.e., when this scriptural verse was uttered the Lord had not appeared yet. But if the reference were to a time after the death of the two sons of Aaron, He would have appeared already, namely on exactly that day, as it is said: And the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. (Lev. IX, 23).

(24) Lev. I, 7.

(25) V. supra 21b.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(26) Although their decision was correct, they incurred penalty for their presumptuousness in rendering a decision before their master, instead of requesting him to render it for them.

(27) II Chron. I, 13.

(28) The indeterminate ‘Jerusalem’ in the text is ambiguous and therefore invites ad hoc interpretation.

(29) So that the text means: In the same manner as Solomon journeyed to Gibeon, so did he proceed on his return journey from Gibeon to Jerusalem.

(30) V. Ta'an. 24a.

Yoma 53b

The people told R. Joseph that Raba did that, whereupon he said to him: May it be the will [of God] that you raise your head above the whole city.¹ R. Alexandri said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: One who prays [the ‘Amidah]² should go three steps backwards, and then recite ‘peace’.³ R. Mordecai said to him: Having taken the three steps backwards, he ought to remain standing, as should a disciple who takes leave of his master; for if he returns at once, it is as with a dog who goes back to his vomit. It has also been taught thus: One who prays shall take three steps backwards and then pronounce ‘peace’. And if he did not do so, it would have been better for him not to have prayed at all.

In the name of R. Shemaya they said: He should pronounce ‘peace’ towards the right, then towards the left, as it is said: At His right hand was a fiery law unto them,⁴ and it is also said: A thousand may fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand.⁵ For what reason ‘and it is also said’? — You might have said it is the usual thing to take a thing with the right hand,⁶ come therefore and hear: ‘A thousand may fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand’.⁷

Raba saw Abaye pronouncing ‘peace’ first towards the right and he said to him: Do you mean that your right hand is meant? It is your left hand, which is the right of the Holy One, blessed be He. R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna said: I saw Abaye and Raba who were taking all three steps with one genuflection.

AND HE UTTERED A SHORT PRAYER IN THE OUTER HOUSE: What did he pray? Raba son of R. Adda and Rabin son of R. Adda both reported in the name of Rab: ‘May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, that this year be full of heavy rains and hot’. But is a hot year an advantage? — Rather: If it be a hot one, let it be rich in rain. — R. Aha the son of Raba concluded the prayer in the name of R. Judah [thus]: May there not depart a ruler from the house of Judah, and may the house of Israel not require that they sustain one another, and permit not the prayers of travellers to find entrance before you.

R. Hanina b. Dosa was walking along a road when rain came down upon him. He said: ‘Lord of the Universe! All the world is comfortable and Hanina is afflicted!’ The rain stopped. As he came home, he said: ‘Lord of the Universe! All the world is afflicted and Hanina is comfortable!’⁹ The rain came again. R. Joseph said: Of what use is the prayer of the high priest against R. Hanina b. Dosa!

Our Rabbis taught:¹⁰ It happened with one high priest that he prolonged his prayer. His fellow priests undertook to enter after him. As they began to enter he came forth. They said to him: Why did you prolong your prayer? — He said: Is it disagreeable to you that I prayed for you, for the Sanctuary, that it be not destroyed? — They said to him: Do not make a habit of doing so, for thus have we learnt: He would not pray long lest he terrify Israel.¹¹

MISHNAH. AFTER THE ARK HAD BEEN TAKEN AWAY, THERE WAS A STONE FROM THE DAYS OF THE EARLIER PROPHETS,¹² CALLED THE SHETHIYAH,¹³ THREE FINGERS ABOVE THE GROUND, ON WHICH HE WOULD PLACE [THE PAN OF BURNING COALS]. HE WOULD TAKE THE BLOOD FROM HIM WHO WAS STIRRING IT, AND ENTER [AGAIN] INTO THE PLACE WHERE

YOMA - 28a-61b

HE HAD ENTERED,¹⁴ AND STAND [AGAIN] ON THE PLACE ON WHICH HE HAD STOOD,¹⁵ AND SPRINKLE THEREOF ONCE UPWARDS¹⁶ AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS, AIMING TO SPRINKLE NEITHER UPWARDS NOR DOWNWARDS BUT KEMAZLIF [MAKING THE MOVEMENT OF SWINGING A WHIP]. AND THUS WOULD HE COUNT: ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO, ONE AND THREE, ONE AND FOUR, ONE AND FIVE, ONE AND SIX, ONE AND SEVEN. THEN HE WOULD GO OUT AND PUT IT ON THE GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY. ONE WOULD BRING HIM THE HE-GOAT, HE WOULD SLAY IT, RECEIVE ITS BLOOD IN A BASIN, ENTER [AGAIN] THE PLACE HE HAD ENTERED BEFORE, STAND [AGAIN] ON THE PLACE HE HAD STOOD ON BEFORE AND WOULD SPRINKLE THEREFROM ONCE UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS. THUS WOULD HE COUNT; ONE, ONE AND TWO, etc. THEN HE WOULD GO OUT AND PLACE IT ON THE SECOND GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY.

R. JUDAH SAID: THERE WAS NO MORE THAN ONE GOLDEN STAND. HE WOULD¹⁷ TAKE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK AND PUT DOWN THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT, SPRINKLE THEREOF UPON THE CURTAINS FACING THE ARK OUTSIDE, ONCE UPWARDS, SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARD, AIMING TO SPRINKLE NEITHER UPWARDS NOR DOWNWARDS, BUT KE-MAZLIF [MAKING THE MOVEMENT OF SWINGING A WHIP]. THUS WOULD HE COUNT [AS ABOVE]. THEN HE WOULD TAKE THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT, DEPOSITING THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, AND SPRINKLE THEREOF UPON THE CURTAIN FACING THE ARK OUTSIDE ONCE UPWARDS, SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS [AS ABOVE]. THEN HE WOULD POUR THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT EMPTYING THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE.

GEMARA. [The Mishnah] does not teach ‘After the Ark has been hidden away’, but ‘After the Ark had been taken away’, this is in accord with him who holds that the Ark went into exile to Babylonia, for it was taught: R. Eliezer said: The Ark went into exile to Babylonia, as it was said: In the following year King Nebuchadnezzar sent and had him brought to Babel together with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord.¹⁸

R. Simeon b. Yohai said: The Ark went into exile to Babylonia, as it was said: Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord,¹⁹ i.e., the Ten Commandments contained therein R. Judah b. Ilai²⁰ said: The Ark was hidden [buried] in its own place, as it was said: And the staves were so long that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place, even before the Sanctuary; but they could not be seen without; and there they are unto this day.²¹

Now he²² disputes ‘Ulla for ‘Ulla said: R. Matthiah b. Heresh asked R. Simeon b. Yohai in Rome:²³ Now since R. Eliezer had taught us on the first and second occasion that the Ark went into exile to Babylonia (the first was the one which we said just now: ‘And he had him brought to Babel together with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord’, but what is the second one? — Because it is written: And gone is from the daughter of Zion

(1) R. Joseph being blind would not have noticed this reverent conduct of his pupil. On learning it he pronounced a prayerful hope, which was fulfilled. For Raba did become head of the Academies of both Sura and Pumbeditha.

(2) Lit., ‘(prayer read) standing’. The prayer par excellence, v. P.B. p. 44ff.

(3) At the end of that prayer one says: May He who maketh peace in His high places, make peace for us and for all Israel. This is the pronouncement of ‘peace’.

(4) Deut. XXXIII, 2.

(5) Ps. XCI, 7.

(6) People would usually use their right hand, but there is no particular importance attached to it to bestow ceremonial preference upon it.

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (7) Which suggests that the right hand is granted greater victory, hence is more significant than the left.
- (8) Who would pray for dry weather, as better for their comfort on the road.
- (9) As he had no fields and thus no need of rain.
- (10) Tosef. Yoma II.
- (11) By his delay, attributable either to his failure to obtain forgiveness or to personal mishap.
- (12) According to Sot. 48b this term includes Samuel, David and Solomon.
- (13) Root: Shatha — to lay a foundation, thus foundation stone. From it, as the Gemara says, the world was founded or started.
- (14) Into the Holy of Holies.
- (15) Between the two staves.
- (16) In the direction of the ‘ark-cover’.
- (17) This continues R. Judah’s account. (5) V. Gemara. (6) Lev. XVI, 18: And he shall take the blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. The inference is that since but one act of ‘putting’ is mentioned the two were mixed, by pouring the first into the second.
- (18) II Chron. XXXVI, 10.
- (19) Isa. XXXIX, 6, dabar, ‘thing’, here taken as ‘word’, i.e., the word(s) i.e., the ten commandments.
- (20) Corrected according to Jer. Shek. VI; cur. edd. b. Lakish.
- (21) I Kings VIII, 8.
- (22) The one who reports in this Baraita the view of R. Simeon b. Yohai.
- (23) Who had gone there to plead with the Emperor on behalf of the people of Israel afflicted by emergency decrees of the Governor, see Graetz II, 443 (Engl. ed.).

Yoma 54a

all her splendor.¹ What does ‘all her splendor’ mean? All that is enclosed within her.² What do you say now? — He answered: I say that the Ark was hidden in its place, as it is said: ‘And the staves were so long, etc.’

Rabbah said to ‘Ulla: How does it follow from this?³ — Because it is written: ‘Unto this day’. But does the term ‘Unto this day’ mean everywhere ‘forever’? Is it not written: And they [the children of Benjamin] did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Israelites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, unto this day.⁴ Would you say here too that they did

not go into exile? Surely it was taught:⁵ R. Judah said: For fifty-two years no human being passed as it is said: For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation; because they are burned up, so that none passeth through, and they hear not the voice of the cattle; both the fowl of the heavens and the beast are fled and gone,⁶ and the numerical⁷ value of Behemah is fifty-two.

Furthermore, R. Jose said: For seven years sulfur and salt prevailed in the land of Israel, and R. Johanan said: What is the basis of R. Jose’s view? He infers it from the analogy of the words ‘covenant’, ‘covenant’. Here Scripture reads: And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week;⁸ and in another place it is written: Then men shall say: Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord, the God of their fathers.⁹ — He answered: Here the word ‘there’ is used, there this expression¹⁰ is not used. — Would you say that wherever the word ‘there’ is used, it implies ‘forever’, but the following objection can be raised: 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 remnants of the Amalekites that escaped, and dwelt there unto this day.¹¹ But Sennacherib, King of Assyria, had come up already and confused all the lands as it is said: I have removed the bounds of the peoples, and have robbed their treasures.¹² This is a refutation.

R. Nahman said: It was taught that the Ark was hidden away in the Chamber of the wood-shed. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Thus were we also taught:¹³ It happened to a certain priest who was whiling away his time that he saw a block of pavement that was different from the others. He came and informed his fellow, but before he could complete his account, his soul departed. Thus they knew definitely that the Ark was hidden there. What had he been doing?¹⁴

YOMA - 28a-61b

R. Helbo said: He was playing with his axe. The school of R. Ishmael taught: Two priests, afflicted with a blemish, were sorting the woods when the axe of one of them slipped from his hand and fell on that place, whereupon a flame burst forth and consumed him.¹⁵

R. Judah contrasted the following passages: And the ends of the staves were seen¹⁶ and it is written but they could not be seen without¹⁶ — how is that possible? — They could be observed, but not actually seen. Thus was it also taught: ‘And the ends of the staves were seen One might have assumed that they did not protrude from their place. To teach us [the fact] Scripture says: ‘And the staves were so long’. One might assume that they tore the curtain and showed forth; to teach us [the fact] Scripture says: ‘They could not be seen without’. How then? They pressed forth and protruded as the two breasts of a woman, as it is said: My beloved is unto me as a bag of myrrh, that lieth betwixt my breasts.¹⁷

R. Kattina said: Whenever Israel came up to the Festival, the curtain would be removed for them and the Cherubim were shown to them, whose bodies were inter-twisted with one another, and they would be thus addressed: Look! You are beloved before God as the love between man and woman.

R. Hisda raised the following objection: But they shall not go in to see the holy things as they are being covered,¹⁸ in connection with which Rab Judah in the name of Rab said: It means at the time when the vessels are being put into their cases?¹⁹ —

R. Nahman answered: That may be compared to a bride: As long as she is in her father's house, she is reserved in regard to her husband, but when she comes to her father-in-law's house, she is no more so reserved in regard to him.²⁰

R. Hana son of R. Kattina raised the following objection: It happened with a priest who was whiling away his time²¹, etc. — He was answered: You speak of a woman, who has been divorced. When she is divorced, she goes back to her earlier love.²² Of what circumstances are we treating here?²³ If we were to say the reference is to the first Sanctuary — but there was no curtain!²⁴ If, again, the reference be to the second Sanctuary, but there were no Cherubim? — In truth the reference is to the first Sanctuary and as to ‘curtain’ the reference here means the curtain at the entrances, for R. Zera said in the name of Rab: There were thirteen curtains in the Sanctuary, seven facing the seven gates, two [more], one of which was at the entrance to the Hekal,²⁵ the other at the entrance to the Ulam;²⁶ two to the Debir; two, corresponding to them, in the loft.²⁷

R. Aha b. Jacob said: In truth the reference here is to the second Sanctuary, but it had painted Cherubim, as it is written: And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of Cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers, within and without,²⁸ and he overlaid them with gold fitted upon the graven work.²⁹ And it is written also: According to the space of each, with Loyoth [wreaths round about].³⁰ What does ‘according to the space of each with Loyoth’ mean?

Rabbah son of R. Shilah said:

- (1) Lam. I, 6.
- (2) Hadarah (her inner chamber); i.e., all that is enclosed within Zion, in its Sanctuary, the Ark, etc.
- (3) The inference that the Ark, etc. was hidden in its place.
- (4) Judg. I, 21.
- (5) Shab. 145b.
- (6) Jer. IX, 9.
- (7) The numerical value serves only as ‘Asmakta’ or intimation. Rashi goes through a closely reasoned argument to account for the fifty-two years.
- (8) Dan. IX, 27.
- (9) Deut. XXIX, 24; before that statement there is the reference to brimstone and salt: And that the

YOMA - 28a-61b

whole land is brimstone and salt (v. 22). Thus the severe punishment for the forsaking of the covenant is that sulfur and salt cover the land. ‘One week’ in Dan. IX means a week of years.

(10) In the case of the Ark Scripture reads: ‘There unto this day’, implying for ever, whilst in the absence of ‘there’ in Judges I, 21, no such claim is made.

(11) I Chron. IV, 42-3.

(12) Isa. X, 13. The King of Babylon boasts of his achievements. Hence the sons of Simeon could not have dwelt there ‘forever’.

(13) Mish. Shek. VI, 2.

(14) To incur such punishment. The answer being that, unmindful of the reverence due to the Sanctuary, he had been playing around with his axe.

(15) or ‘it.’

(16) I Kings VIII, 8.

(17) Cant. I, 13.

(18) Num. IV, 20.

(19) This is said of the Levites in the wilderness, who, whilst carrying the vessels on their shoulders, were not permitted to look at them before they were covered. How much less would the Holy of Holies be profaned by being shown to the masses who had come to celebrate the Festival; the Cherubim being above the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies.

(20) Before marriage there is reserve, which is given up in marriage, to be assumed again when divorce has taken place. Israel in the wilderness is comparable to the bride in her father's home; in the Temple to the bride in her husband's care.

(21) Which shows that the same reserve still obtains in the Temple.

(22) I.e., to the reserve of original prenuptial state.

(23) Of what time speaks this account of the curtain being unrolled and the Cherubim shown to the pilgrims.

(24) I.e., between the Holy and the Holy of Holies, but a partition; v. supra 52b.

(25) V. Glos.

(26) I.e., in the cubit space of partition between the Holy and the Holy of Holies.

(27) Just above the entrance to the Holy of Holies.

(28) I Kings VI, 29.

(29) Ibid. 35.

(30) Ibid. VII, 36.

Yoma 54b

Even as a man embracing his companion.¹ Resh Lakish said: When the heathens entered the Temple and saw the Cherubim whose bodies were inter-twisted with one another, they carried them out and said: These Israelites, whose blessing is a blessing, and

whose curse is a curse, occupy themselves with such things! And immediately they despised them, as it is said: All that honored her, despised her, because they have seen her nakedness.²

AND IT WAS CALLED SHETHIYAH: A Tanna taught: [It was so called] because from it the world was founded.³ We were taught in accord with the view that the world was started [created] from Zion on. For it was taught: R. Eliezer says: The world was created from its centre, as it is said: When the dust runneth into a mass, and the clods keep fast together.⁴

R. Joshua said: The world was created from its sides on, as it is said: For He saith to the snow: ‘Fall thou on the earth’; likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of His mighty rain.⁵

R. Isaac the Smith said: The Holy One, blessed be He, cast a stone into the ocean, from which the world then was founded as it is said: Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened, or who laid the corner-stone thereof?⁶

But the Sages said: The world was [started] created from Zion, as it is said: A Psalm of Asaph, God, God, the Lord [hath spoken],⁷ whereupon it reads on: Out of Zion, the perfection of the world,⁸ that means from Zion was the beauty of the world perfected.

It was taught: R. Eliezer the Great said: These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven.⁹ The generations [the creations] of heaven¹⁰ were made from the heaven and the generations of the earth were made from the earth.

But the Sages said: Both were created from Zion, as it is said: ‘A Psalm of Asaph: God, God, the Lord, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.’ And Scripture further says:

YOMA - 28a-61b

'Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined forth', that means from it the beauty of the world was perfected.

HE TOOK THE BLOOD FROM HIM THAT WAS STIRRING IT:, etc. What does 'KE-MAZLIF' mean? — R. Judah showed it to mean

(1) 'Loyoth' is connected with the root signifying 'attach', hence 'companions'.

(2) Lam. I, 8.

(3) Tosef. II. The suggestion is that Zion was created first, and around it other clods, rocks, formations, continents, were formed until the earth was completed.

(4) Job XXXVIII, 38.

(5) Ibid. XXXVII, 6. The picture here (Rashi) is that of a skeleton or frame, which filled in, gradually solidifying from all sides towards the centre, which is last in foundation. All Scriptural verses here are used as intimation not logically but illustratively. Here is an amazing anticipation of the modern theory that the world was founded by the solidification of vapors, the Talmudic account ascribing this gradual creation to the will of God.

(6) Job XXXVIII, 6.

(7) Ps. L, 1.

(8) Ibid. v. 2.

(9) Gen. 11, 4.

(10) All things of heaven, the stars, sun and moon.

Yoma 55a

'as one swinging a whip'. — A Tanna taught: As he sprinkled, he did so not upon the ark-cover,¹ but against its thickness. And when he is to sprinkle upwards he first turns his hand down, and when he is to sprinkle downwards he first turns his hand up. — Whence do we infer this?²

R. Aha b. Jacob said in the name of R. Zera: Scripture says: And sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover.³ Now with regard to the he-goat it need not be said [that he should sprinkle] downwards,⁴ for that can be inferred from [the procedure with] the bullock where [the sprinkling] downward^s [is made], when then is it mentioned here too? To compare [the sprinkling] 'upon' [the ark-cover with the sprinkling] 'before' [it]: Just as [the sprinkling] 'before' does not

mean 'before' actually,⁶ so does sprinkling 'upon' [here] not mean really 'upon'.⁷

On the contrary! It was not necessary to state with regard to the bullock [that the sprinkling should be done] 'upon' [the ark-cover], for that could be inferred from the fact that the he-goat's blood was sprinkled upon [it], why then was it mentioned to compare the sprinkling 'before' [it], to the sprinkling 'upon' [it], viz. just as 'upon' means exactly, so shall 'before' here mean 'upon exactly'?⁸ How can you say this?

Granted, if you say that the 'downward' sprinkling in the case of the he-goat is mentioned for the purpose of comparison,⁹ then [sprinkling] 'upward' written in connection with the bullock is necessary in accord with the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob; for the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob taught: Upon the face of the ark-cover on the east,¹⁰ this [special case] establishes a general rule viz., that wherever Scripture says 'before' ['face'] it means 'on the east'; but if you say that the 'upwards' in connection with the bullock is mentioned for the purpose of comparison, then for what purpose is the 'downward' in connection with the he-goat mentioned?

Our Rabbis taught: 'And he shall sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover'. From this we know how often the he-goat's blood is to be sprinkled upwards, viz., once; I do not know, though, how often 'downwards', so that I infer that thus: The word 'blood' is used in connection with the downward [sprinkling] of the bullock's blood, and the same word 'blood' is used about the downward [sprinkling] of the goat's blood: hence just as 'downwards' with the bullock means seven times, so does 'downwards' with the goat mean 'seven times'. Or argue it this way: The word 'blood' is used in connection with the 'upward' [sprinkling] of the goat's blood, and the word 'blood' is used in connection with the downward [sprinkling] of the he-goat's blood; hence just as

YOMA - 28a-61b

'upwards' with the he-goat means once, thus also shall 'downwards' with the he-goat mean 'once'?

Let us see what comparison is legitimate: One may infer 'downwards' from 'downwards'; but one may not infer 'downwards' from 'upwards'. On the contrary: It is legitimate to infer [one aspect of] one matter from [another aspect of] the same matter, but one may not infer one matter from an extraneous one!¹¹ To teach [the true facts] Scripture says: And [he shall] do with its blood¹² as he did with the blood of the bullock.¹³ Now it was not necessary¹⁴ to say 'as he did', why then was it said? To show that all the 'doings' of them should be alike; as there were seven sprinklings downward with the bullock, so shall there be seven sprinklings downward with the goat.

We learn thus how many [sprinklings] downwards there are to be both with bullock and he-goat. But I do not know how many [sprinklings] upwards are to be made with the bullock's blood. And so I infer: The word 'blood' is used for the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the he-goat, and the word 'blood' is used for the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock. Hence, [the inference that] just as the upward sprinkling in the case of the he-goat has to be made once,¹⁵ so shall the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock be made once. Or argue it this way: The word 'blood' is used for the downward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock, and the word 'blood' is used in the case of the upward [sprinkling] of the bullock: hence just as seven downward sprinklings have to be made with the bullock's blood, so must seven upward sprinklings be made with the bullock's blood! Let us see what comparison is legitimate: One may fitly infer [something about] upward [sprinklings] from [other] upward [sprinklings], but one may not infer [something about] upward [sprinklings] from downward [sprinklings].

On the contrary: It is legitimate to infer one [aspect of one] matter from [another aspect of the same] matter, but one may not fitly infer one matter from an extraneous one.¹⁶ Scripture therefore teaches: 'And he shall do with his blood as he did with the blood of the bullock'! It was not necessary to say 'with his blood', why then was it said? To intimate that all the 'doings' of them should be alike: just as seven sprinklings downward were made in the case of the bullock, so shall seven sprinklings downward be made in the case of the goat; and just as only one upward sprinkling was made with the he-goat, so only one sprinkling upward had to be made in the case of the bullock.

ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO: Our Rabbis taught: [He counted] One, one and one, one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven¹⁷ — this is the view of R. Meir. R. Judah says: One, one and one, two and one, three and one, four and one, five and one, six and one, seven and one. Yet they are not conflicting,¹⁸ each counting as is customary in his place. At any rate, both agree that the first sprinklings must be counted with each of the following. What is the reason thereof? —

R. Eleazar said: In order that he make no mistake in the count.¹⁹ — R. Johanan said: Scripture said: 'And before the ark-cover shall he sprinkle'. Now it was not necessary to say 'shall he sprinkle'. [For what teaching purpose] why then was it said, 'He shall sprinkle'? — To indicate that the first sprinkling shall be counted with each subsequent one. — What is the [practical] difference between the two? — In case he had not counted, but also had made no mistake.²⁰

HE WENT OUT AND PLACED IT ON THE GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY: We have learned there:²¹ There were no money chests²² [provided] for obligatory bird-offerings, to prevent confusion. What does 'to prevent confusion' mean? — R. Joseph said: To prevent confusion between

YOMA - 28a-61b

freewill and obligatory offerings.²³ — Abaye said to him: Let him make two and inscribe on them: This is a freewill-offering, the other obligatory. — R. Judah

- (1) I.e., not on the top surface thereof.
- (2) That the two upward sprinklings are not made actually upon the ark-cover.
- (3) Lev. XVI, 15, with reference to the he-goat.
- (4) I.e., ‘before the ark-cover’.
- (5) V. infra.
- (6) The blood in the downward sprinkling fell on the ground not on the ark-cover. V. Rashi. Cur. edd.: ‘does not mean upon’.
- (7) Not only not exactly upwards, but really downwards.
- (8) So that in his downward sprinkling the blood is to touch the thickness of the ark-cover, whilst in his upward sprinkling it should touch its upper surface.
- (9) As is stated at first.
- (10) So lit., Lev. XVI, 14.
- (11) I.e.. the he-goat from the bullock.
- (12) Sc. of the he-goat.
- (13) Lev. XVI, 15.
- (14) Since the sprinkling ‘upon’ or ‘before’ has been expressly mentioned in connection with the he-goat. Any apparently superfluous word or words were chosen for intimation or indication.
- (15) As the Scriptural text indicates.
- (16) The assumption that different parts of the same procedure are governed by similar rules seems more justified than that similar aspects of altogether different matters have such regulations.
- (17) Tosef. II.
- (18) In the place of R. Meir the tens were counted first, the singles following, whilst the opposite way of counting prevailed in the city of R. Judah.
- (19) And include the one sprinkled upward among the seven which he has to sprinkle downwards (Bertinoro).
- (20) If counting is obligatory, he had failed to do it properly. If the only purpose is the prevention of error and he has managed to avoid it, then de facto all is right.
- (21) J. Shek. VI, 6.
- (22) These were special money chests into which persons who had a freewill-offering of a bird to offer would put in money in payment of the offerings which the priests would make on their behalf. No such chests were however available for obligatory offerings of a bird.
- (23) There were different regulations governing the ritual of the freewill and obligatory offerings respectively, for of the obligatory birds one was offered up as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering, whereas all freewill-offerings were burnt-offerings, these differences implying distinctions in

the ritual. Now if one of the money chests were confused with another, so that the priest would offer a freewill-offering from the money meant for obligatory offerings and vice versa, the offering would be rendered invalid.

Yoma 55b

does not consider such inscriptions [of any value]. For we have learnt: R. JUDAH SAID: THERE WAS NO MORE THAN ONE STAND. Now why not two? Evidently because they might be mixed up! But then let him provide two and write upon them: This is for the bullock and this for the he-goat? Hence you must assume that R. Judah does not consider such inscriptions [of any value].

An objection was raised in the Academy: There were thirteen money chests in the Temple, on which were inscribed: ‘new shekels’, ‘old shekels’, ‘bird-offerings’, ‘young birds for the whole offering’, ‘wood’, ‘frankincense’, ‘gold for the mercy-seat’, and on six of them: ‘freewill-offerings’. ‘New shekels’: [i.e.] those shekels due each year; ‘old shekels’: [i.e.] one who had not paid his shekel last year must pay it the next year. ‘Bird-offerings’, these are turtle-doves. ‘Young birds for the whole offerings’, these are young pigeons; and both of these are for whole offerings. This is the view of R. Judah.²—

When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said: In the West³ they said: It is a preventive measure against the case of a sin-offering whose owner has died.⁴ But do we indeed take that into consideration? Have we not learnt: If someone sends his sin-offering from a far-away province,⁵ it is offered up in the assumption that he is alive?⁶—

Rather [the preventive measure is] against the case of a sin-offering whose owner has assuredly died.⁷ But in that case let us separate four Zuz⁸ and cast them into the sea,⁹ so that the rest will be available for use!

YOMA - 28a-61b

R. Judah rejects the principle of Bererah.¹⁰ Whence do we know this? Would you say from what we have learnt:¹¹ If a man buys wine from the Cutheans¹² on the eve of Sabbath, as it is getting dark,¹³ he may say: Let the two logs¹⁴ which I am about to set apart¹⁵ be heave-offering

- (1) Because the priest might overlook them.
- (2) Shek VI, 6; for notes v. Sonc. ed. a.l. Hence R. Judah apparently did consider inscriptions of value.
- (3) Palestine.
- (4) A sin-offering, the owner of which died, must not be sacrificed but must be left to die, v. supra 50a. Now if the owner died, then the money for the value of the sin-offering which he may have put in one of the chests must be thrown into the sea. That money, being unusable and confused with other monies in the chest, would render them all useless. This is the confusion referred to above, hence the non-provision of money chests for obligatory offerings of a bird.
- (5) Lit., 'province of the sea'.
- (6) V. Git. 28a.
- (7) It is known that he died after having deposited his money in the chest for the bird-offerings before having offered it up.
- (8) The usual price of one dove.
- (9) And thus free the rest of the monies for their designated purposes, on the assumption that these four Zuz represented the money for the sin-offering of a bird and was that deposited by the deceased.
- (10) Lit., 'choosing', 'choice', then subsequent selection, retrospective designation, i.e., the legal effect resulting from an actual selection or disposal of things previously undefined as to their purpose (Jast.).
- (11) Demai VI, 4.
- (12) Before the prohibition against their wines had been decreed. As the Cutheans (Samaritans) were suspected of neglecting the laws of Terumah and tithe the buyer must himself set these aside before he can be permitted to drink any of the wine.
- (13) If the purchase took place on the Sabbath eve immediately before dusk (when there is no time to remove these priestly and Levitical dues from the wine) and he requires the wine for the Sabbath. It is prohibited to separate priestly or Levitical dues on the Sabbath, v. Bez. 36b.
- (14) A log (v. Glos.) is c. 549 cubic centimeters.
- (15) For the hundred logs contained in the cask he bought.

Yoma 56a

ten¹ tithe-offering, and nine second tithe, and after he sets aside the redemption² money for the second tithe he may drink it at once. These are the words of R. Meir.

(1) 'Logs which I am about to set aside'.

(2) Lit., 'to profane'. 'to desecrate'; to cause the loss of priestly status or of sacred use, to make available for private use. With money (cf. Deut. XIV, 25) that he has at home or anywhere else.

Yoma 56b

R. Judah, R. Jose and R. Simeon prohibit it. Hence we see that he rejects the principle of Bererah! — How does that follow? Perhaps the matter is different there, as the motive is taught there: They said to R. Meir: Don't you admit that if the bottle burst he would be found retrospectively to have drunk untithed wine? He said to them: If it bursts.¹ —

Rather is it to be derived from what Ayo taught: for he taught: R. Judah said: No man may stipulate two possibilities at the same time. But if the Sage comes from the east, his 'Erub² applies eastwards alone; if he comes from the west, his 'Erub applies westwards alone, but never in both directions. And we asked concerning it: What is the difference touching both directions that it cannot apply, it is only because the principle of Bererah is rejected,³ the same ought to apply even [where the condition was 'if the Sage comes] from the east or west'?

Thereupon R. Johanan said: In this case the Sage has arrived already.⁴ But now that we maintain that R. Judah rejects the principle of Bererah whilst upholding the value of inscriptions [notices],⁵ also for the Day of Atonement let there be prepared two stands with such inscriptions! Because the high priest is fatigued, he would not pay attention to them. For should you not agree to this consideration, he could really do without any such inscriptions, for one [contains] more [blood], and the other less.⁶ And if you were

YOMA - 28a-61b

to say, he does not receive the whole of it,⁷ but R. Judah said: He who slays the animal, must receive the whole blood, as it is said: The whole blood of the bullock he shall pour upon the base of the altar.⁸ And if you were to say some thereof might be spilled; — still, one [blood] is lighter [in color], the other darker. Hence you must needs explain that the high priest, because of his fatigue, could not pay sufficient attention [to the difference in the blood]; thus is it here: because of his fatigue the high priest could not pay sufficient attention [to the inscriptions].

Once a man went down [to the praying desk] in the presence of Rabah⁹ and read: Then he came forth, and placed it upon the second stand in the Temple. He took the blood of the bullock and deposited the blood of the he-goat. He said to him: In one point in accord with the Sages,¹⁰ in another with R. Judah?¹¹ Rather say: He deposited the blood of the he-goat and took the blood of the bullock.

AND HE SPRINKLED THEREOF UPON THE CURTAIN OUTSIDE OPPOSITE THE ARK: Our Rabbis taught: And so shall he do for the tent of meeting.¹² What does that come to teach? That as he sprinkles in the Holy of Holies, thus must he sprinkle in the Hekal, i.e., just as in the Holy of Holies he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward, from the blood of the bullock, thus shall he sprinkle in the Hekal. That dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness¹³ i.e., even when they are unclean, the Divine Presence is among them.

A certain Sadducee¹⁴ said to R. Hanina:

- (1) This is a contingency that need not be reckoned with, since a guard may be appointed to watch out for such theoretical situations.
- (2) The word 'Erub' means interweaving, mixture, confusion, conjunction. It signifies also a symbolical act, by which the legal fiction of community or continuity is established. With reference to the Sabbath limits: a person deposits, before the Sabbath (or the Holy Day), certain eatables to remain in their place over the next day, by which act he transfers his abode to that place

and his movements on the Sabbath are measured from it as the centre. On the Sabbath in the area around a town or place the limits are two thousand cubits in every direction. The case here discussed is that of one who expects a scholar outside his city and is desirous of meeting him. He deposits the 'Erub for this purpose. V. 'Er., Sonc. ed., pp. 252f. notes.

(3) It being held that the choice the man made between the two Sages on the following day may not have been his choice at twilight on the previous day when the validity of the 'Erub must take effect.

(4) Sc. at twilight of the Sabbath eve he was already within the permitted Sabbath limit of that man's town though the latter was unaware of the fact. As the validity of the 'Erub was made dependent on an event that, though unknown to the speaker, had actually taken place before twilight of the Sabbath eve there can be no question as to the 'Erub's effectiveness. It is not the speaker's subsequent knowledge of the fact that renders the 'Erub valid retrospectively, but the presence of the Sage at the crucial moment. The question of Bererah, therefore, does not at all arise.

(5) As so proved from Shek. VI, 5.

(6) One contains the blood of the bullock which is of a larger quantity than that of the he-goat.

(7) Sc. the blood of the bullock.

(8) Lev. IV, 7.

(9) He acted as deputy of the congregation (public reader) and read the order of the service of the Day of Atonement.

(10) The reference to the second stand.

(11) Stating that he took first the blood of the bullock and then deposited the blood of the he-goat.

(12) Lev. XVI, 16.

(13) Ibid.

(14) A censorial corruption of Min (v. Glos.). A Sadducean would not have spoken of Israel as 'you'.

Yoma 57a

Now you are surely unclean, for it is written: Her filthiness was in her skirts.¹ — He answered: Come and see what is written concerning them: 'That dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness', i.e., even at the time when they are unclean, the Divine Presence is among them. — But may something inferred by analogy be used as basis of another by analogy?² —

YOMA - 28a-61b

The inference here came from the subject itself for which inference was made, together with another, thus cannot be considered inference by analogy.³ This will be well in accord with the view that such inference is not inference by analogy, but what can be said according to the view that even that is inference by analogy? — Only the localities are inferred here from one another.⁴ Or, if you like, say: He infers the outside [sprinklings] from the inside ones simultaneously.⁵ It was taught: When he sprinkled, he did not sprinkle directly upon the curtain, but towards it.

R. Eliezer b. Jose said: I saw its in Rome and there were upon it many drops of blood both of the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement. — Perhaps these stains were those from the [blood of] the bullock [offered up] for an error of the community,⁷ or of the goats [offered in expiation] for idolatry? — He saw that they were in their regular order.⁸ It has also been taught in connection with the bullock offered up for an error of the community: When he sprinkled the drops were not to reach the curtain, but if they did, they just did.¹⁰

And R. Eleazar b. Jose said: I saw it in Rome and there were upon it many drops of blood from the bullock offered up for an error of the congregation and from the he-goats offered up for idolatry. But perhaps they came from the bullock and he-goat of the Day of Atonement? — He saw that they were not in their regular order. If the blood [of the one] was mixed up with the blood [of the other],¹¹ — Raba holds, he sprinkles once upwards and seven times downwards, and it serves for both.

When this was reported before R. Jeremiah, he said: Those foolish Babylonians, because they live in a dark country, they utter dark teachings.¹² Surely he would be giving the upward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat before the downward sprinkling [of the blood] of the bullock, whereas the Torah

said: And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place,¹³ [implying] he must complete [the sprinkling of] the blood of the bullock, then complete [the sprinkling of] the blood of the he-goat.

Rather, said R. Jeremiah: He sprinkles once upward and seven times downward in the name of the bullock, and then he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward in the name of the he-goat. If the blood of one was mixed up with the blood of the other in the midst¹⁴ of the last sprinklings, then R. Papa wanted to say before Raba, he makes seven downward sprinklings in the name of the bullock and he-goat, then makes one upward in the name of the he-goat.

Said Raba to him: Now they had just called us foolish, now they might call us the most foolish of the foolish for we teach them but they learn not. Surely now he would be making the downward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat before the upward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat, whereas the Torah said: Sprinkle first upward, then downward.

(1) Lam. I, 9.

(2) Above (55a) we inferred the number of upward and downward sprinklings with the blood of the bullock and the he-goat respectively. Here again an attempt is made to infer through analogy the number of upward and downward sprinklings in the Sanctuary from the sprinklings in the Holy of Holies. The rule is that in the laws appertaining to sacrifices something obtained by analogy may not become the basis or source of new inference by analogy; such inference is legitimate only when based upon the Biblical text itself.

(3) In the primary analogy the main law prescribing upward and downward sprinklings is definitely taught in the Biblical text, both in the case of the bullock and the he-goat, it is only their number that is inferred from one another. In such a case the primary analogy may be made the basis for a further analogy. It is only when the very law itself is mentioned in one case only and then inferred through analogy for the other that no further inference by analogy may be made. If e.g., no reference had been made in the Biblical text to any upward or downward sprinkling, such regulation being based on inference from one to the other, it would then be wrong to endeavor to

YOMA - 28a-61b

derive another law by analogy from the first law inferred by analogy.

(4) I.e., whereas in the first analogy the inference was made from one animal for the other, the second is concerned in the localities — i.e., the Holy of Holies and the Temple, extending the sprinkling regulations from the former to the latter.

(5) The second inference is not made via the animals but directly from the sprinklings within the Holy of Holies to those outside, in the Temple Proper.

(6) V. Me'il. 17b: R. Eliezer was in Rome and had occasion to see the holy vessels in the royal treasury, among them the curtain of the Holy of Holies.

(7) Lev. IV, 13 and Num. XV, 24.

(8) One on top of the other, as the result of the motion of the priest, in the manner of one swinging a whip.

(9) V. D.S. Cur. edd. ‘We also learnt’.

(10) De facto it did not matter: even if the drops reached the curtain there was no cancellation of the service.

(11) The blood of the bullock with the blood of the he-goat.

(12) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., 60b.

(13) Lev. XVI, 20.

(14) I.e., after he had made the upward sprinkling with the blood of the bullock.

Yoma 57b

Rather, said Raba, he makes seven downward sprinklings in the name of the bullock, then makes one upward and seven downward sprinklings in the name of the he-goat. If the cups [of blood] have become confused,¹ then he sprinkles, and sprinkles again, and sprinkles once more, three times.² If parts of the blood became mixed up and part not, then obviously when he makes the sprinklings he makes them from that part which is definitely known [to be unmixed]; but as for the other,⁴ is it to be considered a remainder and must thus be poured out at the bases of the altar, or is it to be considered ‘rejected’ [from sacred use] and must be poured into the canal?⁶ — R. Papa said: Even according to the view that one cup renders the other a remainder,⁷ that applies only where he could make the sprinklings if he wanted to do so but in this case,⁸ even if he so

desired, he would be unable to make the sprinkling.

R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said to R. Papa: On the contrary! Even according to the view that one cup renders the other ‘rejected’, that applies only if he rejected it with his hands [deliberately], but where he had not rejected it with his hands it would not apply? For it has been taught: Above it is said: And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out,⁹ and below: And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out.¹⁰ Whence do we know that, in the case of a sin-offering, if he had received the blood in four cups and sprinkled from each one cup thereof¹¹ one sprinkling, all the remaining blood must be poured out at the base? To teach us that Scripture said: ‘And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out’. One might have assumed that even if he made the four sprinklings from one of the [cups], to teach us correctly, Scripture said: ‘And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out’ i.e., only this is to be poured out at the base but they [the rest] are to be poured into the canal.

R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon said: Whence do we know that if he received the blood of a sin-offering in four cups and made the four sprinklings from one of them, that they must all be poured out at the base? To teach us that Scripture said: ‘And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out’.¹² But according to R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon is it not written: ‘And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out’? — R. Ashi said: This is meant to exclude the [blood that] remains in the neck of the animal.

HE POURED THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT: We were taught in accordance with the view that one mixed [the blood] to sprinkle upon the horns [of the inner altar], for it has been said: R. Josaia and R. Jonathan [were disputing], one said: One mixed [the bloods], the other one did not do so. It may be ascertained that it is R. Josaia

YOMA - 28a-61b

who held that one mixed [the bloods]; for he said: Although Scripture does not state: 'together',¹³ is it not written: it is as if 'together' were written. You might also say that it is R. Jonathan, but here it is different, because Scripture states 'once'.¹⁴ It has been taught contrary to this, our reply: 'And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat'¹⁵ i.e., that they are to be mixed. This is the view of R. Josaia.

(1) The priest not knowing which of the cups contained the blood of the bullock and which the blood of the he-goat.

(2) In each case he makes one sprinkling upward and seven downward from one cup then again from the second cup, finally again from the first cup, so that in any case the blood of the bullock would have been sprinkled before that of the he-goat. For, if the first cup was actually that containing the bullock's blood, and the second that containing the he-goat's blood, he has fulfilled his duty properly, with the first and second series of sprinklings. If, however, the first cup happened to be that of the he-goat, then such sprinkling was of no avail, and the second cup being that containing the bullock's blood and the third again the one containing the he-goat's blood, are in order and the service is performed in accord with the regulations which postulate that the sprinklings made with the bullock's blood came first.

(3) As e.g., when the blood contained in two cups was poured into a third, so that each of the two cups contained a quantity of blood.

(4) The mixed blood in the third cup.

(5) V. Zeb. 47a: the remaining blood was poured over the western base of the outer altar.

(6) I.e., since the sprinklings did not come from it, shall the blood be relegated, together with all waste of the Temple Court, through the canal, to the brook of Kidron.

(7) Whenever the priest has received the blood in two cups but has sprinkled from one only, the blood in the other cup is poured out over the base of the altar.

(8) Where part of the blood of the two cups was poured into a third.

(9) Lev. IV, 25.

(10) Ibid. v, 34.

(11) The blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled upon the four corners of the altar.

(12) Thus we see that the first Tanna treats the blood in the cup or cups from which no sprinkling has been made as rejected, to be poured out in the canal, whereas R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon treats it as the remainder, to be poured out over the base.

(13) In Sanh. 66a these two Sages debate the question as to whether literal direction is necessary to indicate that a prohibition does not refer to two persons together where the contrary might be assumed, R. Judah holding that such direction is necessary while R. Jonathan holds it is not. Thus, on the view of R. Josaia, even though no definite instruction is to be found in the text, the inference that the blood of the bullock and he-goat be sprinkled together, appears legitimate according to the analogous consistence of the view.

(14) Ex. XXX, 10. And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once (a year). The word is here interpreted to mean that one sprinkling is to be made of the blood of both animals.

(15) Lev. XVI, 18.

Yoma 58a

R. Jonathan said: [He sprinkled] separately from the one and from the other. Said R. Josaia to him: But was it not said already: 'Once'? To this R. Jonathan replied: But was it not said already: 'From the blood of the bullock and the blood of the he-goat'? Why then was the word 'once' stated? To tell you, [sprinkle] once, but not twice from the blood of the bullock; once and not twice from the blood of the he-goat. Another [Baraitha] taught: 'And he shall take from the blood of the bullock and from the blood of the he-goat' i.e., that the two shall be mixed together. You say that they shall be mixed together! but perhaps he should sprinkle separately from the one and from the other? To teach us the right thing, Scripture says: 'once' and the anonymous [Baraitha] is in agreement with the view of R. Joshua.

HE POURED THE [CONTENTS OF] THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE: Rami b. Hama asked of R. Hisda: If he placed one bowl into another and this received the blood, what then? Is homogeneous matter considered an interposition or not?¹ He answered: You have learnt that already: **HE POURED [THE CONTENTS OF] THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE.** Does this mean that he placed the full bowl into the empty one?² — No, it means that he poured the full

YOMA - 28a-61b

vessel into the empty one.³ But the first part states already: HE POURED THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT? — [It is repeated] in order [to make sure] that he will mix it very well indeed.

Come and hear: If he stood upon any vessel, or upon his fellow's foot, it is invalid!⁴ — It is different with his neighbor's foot, because he [his fellow] does not abandon it.⁵ Some there are who say: This is how he asked of him: Is such the manner of ministration or not?

Come and hear: For the school of R. Ishmael taught:[And they shall take] all the vessels of ministry, wherewith they minister in the sanctuary,⁶ i.e., two⁷ vessels, but one ministry [service].

Rami b. Hama asked of R. Hisda: If he deposited bast in the bowl and he received the blood therewith, what then? Is heterogeneous matter considered an interposition or not? Is it not considered an interposition, since it penetrates [the blood], or is there no difference? — He replied to him: We have learnt that: He empties out the water until the sponge is reached.⁹ — It is different with water because it is very weak. Some there are who say: This is how he answered him: In the case of the blood¹⁰ it is permitted, but in the case of the fistful it is invalid.¹¹

(1) The priest is to receive the blood. If one bowl is considered an interposition, then the priest, whose hand does not hold the bowl containing the blood, is not really receiving the blood, the ministration then should be cancelled as invalid. (This discussion refers, as Rashi explains, not just to the Day of Atonement, but to the service on any day of the year). The two bowls are homogeneous and if they be considered as interposition, then the above question follows. With regard to heterogeneous matter, there is no doubt; it surely is considered an interposition, v. Tosaf. s.v. זע.

(2) That would indicate that homogeneous matter is not considered an interposition and would thus settle the above question in the affirmative.

(3) So that the situation is entirely different and no inference as to the interposition of homogeneous matter is possible.

(4) If the priest, in receiving the blood, stood upon a vessel, then that vessel was interposing between the floor of the Sanctuary and the priest, therefore invalidating the service. (Zeb. 24a). Similarly, if he stood upon his fellow's foot. The foot, however, is homogeneous and the fact that the service is cancelled, would seem to indicate that homogeneous matter is considered an interposition, so that the question above would appear to be answered.

(5) Homogeneous matter is not considered an interposition, but a human foot is an undeniable entity.

(6) Num. IV, 12.

(7) I.e., vessels in the plural means at least two (although the plural is indefinite as to the maximum, there is the undeniable minimum of two); whereas the word ministry refers to one ministration only.

(8) The bast is heterogeneous to the bowl, hence should be considered an interposition. But since the blood penetrates the bast and reaches the bowl, does it cancel the interposing bast, so that, as it were, the priest had received the blood in the bowl proper, as viewed retroactively, or not?

(9) Parah VI, 3: If someone was mixing the ashes (of the red heifer) in the water of a trough of stone, and there was a sponge in the trough then the water in the sponge is invalid, as a sponge is not a vessel. What should he do? The water in the trough should be poured out until the sponge is reached and the water is valid. Hence we see that a sponge is not considered interposing so as to invalidate the whole water, and similarly here, the bast should not be considered as interposing between the bowl and the blood.

(10) Because it is thin.

(11) For the fistful of the flour-offering was required to be received in the vessel after having first been taken, analogous to the receiving of the blood, hence any interposing object would render the ministration invalid.

Yoma 58b

MISHNAH. AND HE SHALL GO OUT UNTO THE ALTAR THAT IS BEFORE THE LORD,¹ — THAT IS THE GOLDEN ALTAR.² THEN HE BEGINS TO SPRINKLE³ DOWNWARD.⁴ WHENCE DOES HE COMMENCE? FROM THE NORTH-EAST HORN [OF THE ALTAR], THEN THE NORTH-WEST, THEN THE SOUTH-WEST, THEN THE SOUTH-EAST. WHERE HE COMMENCES [SPRINKLING] ON

YOMA - 28a-61b

THE OUTER ALTAR,⁵ THERE HE COMPLETES [SPRINKLING] ON THE INNER ALTAR. R. ELIEZER SAID: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED. AND HE WOULD SPRINKLE EVERY HORN FROM BELOW UPWARDS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE HORN AT WHICH HE WAS STANDING, WHICH HE WOULD SPRINKLE FROM ABOVE DOWNWARDS. THEN HE SPRINKLED THE TOP⁶ OF THE ALTAR SEVEN TIMES AND POURED OUT THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD AT THE WESTERN BASE OF THE OUTER ALTAR. AND [THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD SPRINKLED] ON THE OUTER ALTAR HE POURED OUT AT THE SOUTHERN BASE. BOTH MINGLED IN THE CANAL⁷ AND FLOWED INTO THE BROOK KIDRON AND THEY WERE SOLD TO GARDENERS AS MANURE AND BY USING THEM ONE TRANSGRESSES THE LAW OF TRESPASS.⁸

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: ‘And he shall go out unto the altar’, what does that mean to teach? R. Nehemiah said: Since we find that, in connection with the bullock offered up for [the transgression in error of] ‘any of the commandments’,⁹ the priest stands outside the altar and sprinkles towards the curtain,¹⁰ one might have assumed that here the same would take place, therefore Scripture said: ‘And he shall go out unto the altar’, hence he must have been found before on the inner side of the altar.¹¹ — Another [Baraitha] taught: ‘Before the Lord’. What does that mean to teach?

R. Nehemiah said: Since we find with the bullock and he-goat of the Day of Atonement that the priest stands on the inner side of the altar and sprinkles upon the curtain, as he sprinkles one might have assumed here the same would be the case, therefore Scripture has come to teach us: The altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the tent of meeting,¹² that implies: the altar before the Lord, but not the priest before the Lord. How that? He stands outside the altar and sprinkles.

HE BEGAN TO SPRINKLE DOWNWARD: Our Rabbis taught: He began to sprinkle downward. Whence did he commence? From the south-eastern horn, [proceeding to] the south-western, north-western and north-eastern horns respectively. This is the view of R. Akiba. —

R. Jose the Galilean says: [He started from] the north-eastern, [proceeding to] the north-western, south-western and south-eastern horns respectively.¹³ At the place where, according to R. Jose the Galilean, he commenced, there according to R. Akiba, he stopped. At the place where R. Akiba would have him start, there R. Jose the Galilean would have him stop. All agree at any rate that he does not start at the point he first comes to.¹⁴ What is the reason? Said Samuel: Scripture said: And he shall go out unto the altar, i.e., only after he has gone over the whole altar. But according to R. Akiba he ought to go around it to the right.¹⁵ Shall we say [then] that they are disputing a teaching of Rami b. Ezekiel?

For Rami b. Ezekiel said: Concerning the sea¹⁶ which Solomon made, [Scripture states]: 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, and all their hinder parts were inward.¹⁷ Hence you are taught that all the turns you make [in the Temple] must be to the right, i.e., eastward;¹⁸ one Master [R. Jose the Galilean] agreeing with Rami b. Ezekiel, the other Master [R. Akiba] disagreeing? —

No, all agree with the view of Rami b. Ezekiel and the matter of dispute here is, rather, this: One Master holds that [the regulations] within¹⁹ are inferred from [those] without,²⁰ the other Master holding we do not infer [the regulations] ‘within’ from [those] ‘without’. But according to R. Akiba, granted that he does not infer ‘within’ from ‘without’, let him

YOMA - 28a-61b

be permitted to do it one way if he so chooses, or the other way if he so chooses?²¹ —

R. Akiba will tell you: As far as de jure regulation is concerned he ought to start at the horn to which he had come first, for Resh Lakish has said: One must not forego the occasion for performing a religious act;²² and the reason why he does not do so is because Scripture said: 'And he shall go out unto the altar,' i.e., until he has gone outside the whole altar. Therefore as soon as he has sprinkled the blood on this horn, he returns to the horn with which he should have started from the beginning.²³

(1) Lev. XVI, 18.

(2) Ex. XXX, I.

(3) Lit., 'to cleanse from sin'.

(4) Lit., 'he goes down' i.e., he applies the blood to the horn of the altar beginning at the top and leading his finger downward.

(5) Zeb. 53a.

(6) This word is variously interpreted in the Gemara. It may mean 'back', i.e., top; it has been claimed as 'the pure, real surface' (of gold) i.e., free from coals or ashes; as the centre of the altar front.

(7) V. Shek. IV, 2.

(8) Lev. V, 15.

(9) Lev. IV, 1ff.

(10) V. infra.

(11) The text should have read: 'He shall make atonement on the altar that is before the Lord.' 'And he shall go out unto the altar' has no special significance. But since we find that on the occasion of other sacrifices he was standing outside, the words 'and he shall go out' here indicate that in this case he was on the inner side.

(12) Lev. IV, 7. The words 'before the Lord' are in themselves superfluous — for obviously the altar was 'before the Lord' — but are to indicate that only the altar was 'before the Lord' but not the priest. The latter stood outside and did not interpose between the altar and the curtain either when he sprinkled the blood on the corners or against the curtains.

(13) The dispute hinges on the question as to whether there were one or two curtains before the Holy of Holies. R. Akiba holds there were two, the outer one clasped on the south side. As the priest came from the Holy of Holies from the south in order to proceed with the sprinkling against the curtain, the first horn of the altar he meets is the south-western, however, he did not sprinkle, because of the interpretation of 'And he shall go

out unto the altar' (v. infra) so that he begins the sprinkling on the south-eastern side and then turning to the left continues with the outer corners. R. Jose the Galilean holds, in accord with R. Jose, that there was but one curtain, clasped on the north side, so that as the priest came forth from the north he reached first the north-western horn of the altar, where, however, he did not sprinkle but at the north-eastern horn, and then turning to the right he returned to the north-western horn to continue his sprinkling.

(14) Coming from the west, he first reaches one of the western horns of the altar (v. previous note), yet does not commence with it.

(15) V. p. 273, n. 5.

(16) The water reservoir in the Temple of Solomon.

(17) I Kings VII, 25.

(18) This is derived from the order in which the sides are enumerated; the phrase 'eastward' does not apply here but is taken from the passage where this principle is originally quoted in connection with the ramp. v. supra 45a and Zeb. 62b.

(19) The inner altar.

(20) The Sea of Solomon.

(21) Either to the right or to the left.

(22) V. supra 33a.

(23) V. p. 273, n. 5.

Yoma 59a

Or if you like, say: If we hold that the sprinkling [on the inner altar] was done in walking around,¹ there would be general agreement that we infer 'within' from 'without', but the dispute here rests on this: one Master holds the sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand, the other Master holding the sprinkling was done in walking around. Or if you like, say: All agree that the sprinkling [on the inner altar] was done by circular movements of the hand, the point of dispute here is: one Master holds, we may infer [the regulations touching] the hand from [those governing] the foot, the other Master holding that we do not infer the 'hand' from the 'foot'. But does R. Jose the Galilean hold that the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand?

Surely, since the second part reads: R. Eliezer said: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED,² it follows that

YOMA - 28a-61b

the first Tanna did not hold so?3 Hence it is obvious, as we have answered before: One Master holds the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand, whereas the other Master holds it was done by walking around. And if you like to say: The dispute lies therein: that one Master holds that the [phrase] ‘round about’ [mentioned in connection] with the inner altar signifies the same as ‘round about’ [mentioned in connection] with the outer altar,⁴ whereas the other Master holds that the whole of the inner altar occupied as much space as one horn of the outer altar.⁵

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Two high priests had survived the First Sanctuary. One said: I had done the sprinkling [in the inner altar] by circular movement of my hand; the other said: I had done the sprinkling by walking around the altar. The first advanced a reason for his procedure, so did the second. The first said: The ‘round about’ of the inner altar had to be as the ‘round about’ of the outer altar; the other stating: The whole of the inner altar occupied as much space as one horn of the outer altar.

R. ELIEZER SAID: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED. With whom does our Mishnah agree? — With R. Judah. For it was taught: R. Meir said, R. Eliezer said: He remained in his place and sprinkled. And all the sprinklings he made from above downward with the exception of the one athwart, which he made from below upward. R. Judah said, R. Eliezer said: He remained in his place and sprinkled. All the sprinklings he made from below upward with the exception of this one right before him which he made from above downward, to prevent his garments from becoming sullied.⁶

THEN HE SPRINKLED THE TOP [TIHARO] OF THE ALTAR: What does ‘TIHARO’ mean? — Rabbah son of R. Shila said: The centre of the altar-front, as people say: ‘The moon-light [Tiharo] shines,’ meaning thereby the middle of the day. An

objection was raised: As he sprinkles, he sprinkles neither upon the ashes, nor upon the embers, but he removes the coal to both sides and sprinkles?⁷ — Rather, said Rabbah son of R. Shila: [It means] the cleared surfacea of the altar, as it is written: And the like of the very heaven for [tohar] clearness.⁹

It was taught: Hanania said: He would sprinkle¹⁰ standing on the north side.¹¹ — R. Jose said: He would sprinkle standing on the south side.¹¹ Wherein are they disputing? — One [Hanania] holds the entrance was through the curtain on the south, whereas the other [R. Jose] holds it was on the north side.¹² At any rate all agree that on the place where he completed the sprinkling on the horns there he would sprinkle on the top thereof. What is the reason? — Scripture says: And he shall cleanse it...and hallow it,¹³ i.e., where he hallows it,¹⁴ there shall he cleanse it [we-Tiharo].¹⁵

AND THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD HE SPRINKLED UPON THE WESTERN BASE OF THE OUTER ALTAR: For Scripture said: And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out [etc.],¹⁶ and as he comes forth [from the Sanctuary] he meets this [side of the altar base] first.

AND THAT OF THE OUTER ALTAR HE POURED ON THE SOUTHERN BASE: Our Rabbis taught: ‘The base of the altar’¹⁷ i.e., the southern base. You say it is the southern base. But perhaps it is not so, but rather the western base? I will tell you: Let his coming down from the ramp be inferred from his going out of the Sanctuary: Just as when he goes out of the Sanctuary [he pours out the remainder of the blood] at [the point] nearest to him, and which is it? — the western base, so when he comes down from the ramp [he pours out the remainder of the blood] at the point nearest to him, and which is it? — the southern base.

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Both times [blood was poured out] at the western base.

YOMA - 28a-61b

— R. Simeon b. Yohai: No, [it was] at the southern base. — It is quite right, according to R. Ishmael: He holds that one may infer that concerning which no details are given from that which is thus described,¹⁸ but what is the reason of R. Simeon b. Yohai? — R. Ashi said: He holds the entrance [to the Sanctuary] was at the south.¹⁹ The teaching of the school of R. Ishmael was taught in the school of R. Simeon b. Yohai:²⁰ In both cases it was the southern base. As a mnemotechnic sign remember: The men won over the man.²¹

BOTH MINGLED IN THE CANAL AND FLOWED, etc.: Our Rabbis taught: One transgresses the law of trespass with [sacrificial] blood. These are the words of R. Meir. R. Simeon and the Sages hold: One does not commit such trespass.

(1) As was the case with the sprinkling on the outer altar.

(2) So that the sprinkling was done by the circular movement of his hand.

(3) The first Tanna (anonymous) of our Mishnah is R. Jose the Galilean, in accordance with his view in the Baraita cited. Now since R. Eliezer, in disputing, states that the sprinkling was made by circular movements of the hand, it is obvious that R. Jose did not think so. Hence the statement 'All agree that the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand' is wrong.

(4) V. Lev. XVI, 18. And...he shall put it upon the horns of the altar round about. In the case of the outer altar, the sprinkling was done by walking around, the analogy would render the same procedure proper with the inner altar.

(5) One cubit square.

(6) The purpose of this procedure was practical, beyond any ritualistic significance: he sprinkled upon the horn before him from above downward, lest some blood drip into his sleeve.

(7) The first interpretation of the word 'Tiharo' would identify it with the middle of the side of the altar. But the passage just adduced indicates it must be the top. Cf. supra, p. 69, n. 2.

(8) Lit., 'exposed (part)'.

(9) Ex. XXIV, 10.

(10) The seven sprinklings on the top of the altar, as explained supra.

(11) I.e., on the side where he completed the round of sprinkling on the altar.

(12) V. supra p. 274, n. 1, 5.

(13) Lev. XVI, 19.

(14) On the horns, i.e., on the horn where he completes the hallowing.

(15) By means of the seven sprinklings.

(16) Lev. IV, 7.

(17) Lev. IV, 30 with reference to an individual sin-offering.

(18) With regard to blood-offerings which are sprinkled on the inner altar there is the Biblical statement: Upon the base of the altar... which is at the entrance to the tent of meeting (Lev. IV, 7 and 18), this being the western base; there being no such statement concerning those offerings of which the blood is on the outer altar, the inference is legitimate.

(19) [The whole of the outer altar being on the northern half of the court so that when the priest came out of the Sanctuary the first base he met was the southern, v. supra 16b.]

(20) [I.e., R. Ishmael had retracted his view so that the disciples of R. Simeon b. Yohai could report the teaching in the name of R. Ishmael (Rashi).]

(21) 'The men drew nigh', i.e., won over the man, viz., the disciples of R. Simeon prevailed upon R. Ishmael to agree with them.

Yoma 59b

Now the dispute touches only the question as to whether [there is a trespass] Rabbinically;¹ according to Biblical law, however, there is no trespass.² When [do we know] these things? — 'Ulla said: Scripture said: 'To you'³ i.e., it belongs to you.

The school of R. Simeon taught: To make atonement⁴ i.e., I have given it for atonement, but not for [the law of] trespass [to apply]. R. Johanan said: Scripture said: 'It' i.e., [implying that] it is before atonement: just as after atonement one cannot be guilty of trespass concerning it,⁵ thus can one before atonement not be guilty of trespass concerning it. But perhaps say: It is after the atonement as before the atonement: just as before the atonement one may become guilty of trespass concerning it, so also after atonement may one become guilty of trespass concerning it? — There is nothing concerning which one can become guilty of trespass, once the atonement touching it has been fulfilled.⁶ But there is the removal of the ashes [from the altar]?⁷ —

YOMA - 28a-61b

- (1) Making the offender liable to pay the capital value of the blood.
- (2) And the offender is exempt from the extra payment of the fifth, v. Lev. V, 16.
- (3) Lev. XVII, 11 . I have given it (the blood) to you.
- (4) Ibid. ‘To make atonement’, implies but for no other ritual purpose, such as the application of the law of trespass.
- (5) Once atonement has been effected with any sacrifice the law of trespass does not apply to it, v. infra.
- (6) Once it has served its purpose it is no longer considered the property of the Sanctuary for laws of trespass to apply to it.
- (7) V. Lev. VI, 3. The Biblical regulation And he shall put them (the ashes) beside the altar, (ibid.), indicates that they must be hid away, are not available for private use, and are hence still the property of the Sanctuary, to which the laws of trespass apply though the commandment concerning it has already been fulfilled.

Yoma 60a

That is because referring to the removal of the ashes and the priestly garments¹ there are two verses [written] for the same purpose² and wherever two verses have the same purpose no deduction can be made from them [for other precepts].³ That will be right according to the Rabbis who hold: ‘And he shall put them there’⁴ signifies that they must be hidden away but what can be said according to R. Dosa who holds that the garments of the [high] priest may be used for a common priest? —

That is because concerning the removal of the ashes and the heifers whose neck is to be broken are two verses written for the same purpose, and wherever two verses are written for the same purpose no deduction can be made from them. That will be right according to the view that holds from two identical Scriptural statements no deduction can be made; but what can be said in accordance with the view that such deduction is permissible? —

There are two limiting qualifications: And he shall put them⁶ and the one whose neck was broken.⁷ For what purpose are three

Scriptural verses necessary in connection with the blood?⁸ —

One is to exclude [blood] from [the rule touching] leftovers,⁹ one to exclude it from the rule touching trespass,¹⁰ and one to exclude it from the rule touching ritual uncleanness.¹¹ But no verse is necessary to exclude it from the rule touching Piggul¹² for we have learnt: Whatever has that which renders [the offering] permissible, whether for human beings¹³ or for service on the altar¹⁴ can make one liable on its account for Piggul. And blood itself is a thing which renders the offering permissible.¹⁵

MISHNAH. CONCERNING EVERY MINISTRATION OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT MENTIONED¹⁶ IN THE PRESCRIBED ORDER IF ONE SERVICE WAS DONE OUT OF ORDER BEFORE ANOTHER ONE, IT IS AS IF IT HAD NOT BEEN DONE AT ALL. IF HE SPRINKLED THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT BEFORE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, HE MUST START OVER AGAIN, SPRINKLING THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT AFTER THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK. IF BEFORE HE HAD FINISHED THE SPRINKLINGS WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES] THE BLOOD WAS POURED AWAY, HE MUST BRING OTHER BLOOD, STARTING OVER AGAIN AND SPRINKLING AGAIN WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES]. LIKEWISE, IN MATTERS OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE GOLDEN ALTAR, SINCE THEY ARE EACH A SEPARATE ACT OF ATONEMENT.¹⁷ R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON SAY: WHEREVER HE STOPPED, THERE HE MUST BEGIN AGAIN.¹⁸

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Concerning every ministration of the Day of Atonement mentioned in the prescribed order, if one service was done [out of order] before another one, it is as if one had not done it at all. R. Judah said: When does this apply? Only with regard to service performed in white garments, within [the Holy of Holies], but any service performed in white garments

YOMA - 28a-61b

without, if in connection with them he performed one out of order before the other one, then what he has done is done [valid].

R. Nehemiah said: These things apply only to service performed in white garments, whether performed within [the Holy of Holies] or without, but in case of services performed in golden garments outside, what has been done, is done.

Said R. Johanan: And both expounded it on the basis of one Scriptural passage: And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you... once in the year.¹⁹

(1) I.e., the garments with which the high priest performed the service of the Day of Atonement, v. Lev. XVI, 23.

(2) Lit., 'that come as one', i.e., in both there is a special verse stating that the same law applies.

(3) In both cases the Biblical law stipulates that they must not be used; Lev. XVI, 23 and VI, 3 (v. infra). The Torah should have stated the law in one case, for the other to be inferred in the usual manner. The identical statement in both cases — thus ruling out the usual analogy — indicates that both deal with unusual cases, from which no deduction would be legitimate.

(4) Lev. XVI, 23.

(5) Deut. XXI, 1f. 'There' (in the valley) indicates that it shall be buried there.

(6) Lev. VI, 3.

(7) Deut. XXI, 6. The definite article (ha-'arufah) is interpreted as implying limitation. The limitation excludes other things from the operation of this law.

(8) On 59b three Amoraim had inferred that the law of trespass does not apply to blood from three special, otherwise superfluous phrases. The Gemara now suggests that since three such special phrases appear, with but one of them necessary according to each Amora, they must each serve a limiting purpose.

(9) Portions of sacrifices left over beyond the legal time must be burnt. But blood of such leftovers is not included in the principle of leftovers, and, therefore, if one ate such blood, the penalty incurred derives only from the fact that he ate blood, not any additional penalty because he has eaten of leftovers.

(10) The law of trespass does not apply to blood.

(11) If someone ate of holy sacrifices in a state of Levitical impurity, the penalty, if unwittingly, is a sin-offering, as it is for eating blood. The law does not apply to the blood of sacrifices, which if eaten

in a state of Levitical impurity involves only one sin-offering, viz., for eating blood.

(12) Piggul i.e., vile (ness) is the term used for a sacrifice that is rejected because of an improper intention in the mind of the officiating priest at the time of the sacrificing. Such improper intention includes his intention to dispose of the same beyond its legal space or time. (Lev. VII, 18 and ibid. XIX, 7.)

(13) The priests or owners by whom portions of the offering are consumed.

(14) On which the prescribed sacrificial portions are burnt.

(15) Zeb. 43a. The sprinkling of the blood makes parts of sacrifices permissible to the owner or priests; just as it makes certain portions of the animal fit to be offered up on the altar.

(16) In our Mishnah.

(17) Therefore every act of atonement completed, even if out of order is valid, without any repetition necessary.

(18) Even if the individual act of atonement has not been completed. These Rabbis hold that one may continue, or start again, even in the midst of a service, even though this service had been started out of order.

(19) Lev. XVI, 34.

Yoma 60b

R. Judah holds: [This means] the place on which once a year atonement is obtained: whereas R. Nehemiah holds that it refers to the objects through which once a year atonement is obtained.¹ But according to R. Judah, is then 'place' written here?² —

Rather is this the reason for R. Judah's view: It is written 'This', and it is written 'Once', one excludes [services performed in] white garments, the other [those performed in] golden garments.³ And R. Nehemiah?⁴ — One excludes the golden garments, the other the remaining blood,⁵ which [if done out of order] do not impair [the service]. And R. Judah? —

If [an act performed in white garments out of order] impairs the service,⁶ it impairs it here too, and if it does not impair [the service] it does not impair it here either;⁷ as it was taught:⁸ And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place,⁹ i.e., if he has

YOMA - 28a-61b

obtained atonement he has completed it, if not, not. This is the opinion of R. Akiba.

R. Judah said to him: Why should we not interpret thus: If he has completed it, he has obtained atonement, if not, not, to say, that if one of the sprinklings is missing, he has done nothing? And we inquired: What is the difference between them and R. Johanan and R. Joshua b. Levi, each gave an answer: One said: They differ only as to the interpretation of the text, while the other said: The remaining blood¹⁰ is what they differ in. But did R. Johanan hold thus?¹¹

Surely R. Johanan said: R. Nehemiah taught in accordance with the view that the remaining blood [offered not as prescribed] impairs [the service]?¹² This is a refutation. R. Hanina said: If he took the handfuls of the incense before the slaying of the bullock, he has done nothing. According to whom is this? [Presumably] not according to the view of R. Judah. Surely he said that the word 'statute' was written only in connection with ministrations performed in white garments within [the Holy of Holies]! — [No], you may say that it is even in agreement with R. Judah's view, inasmuch as what is necessary for a service performed within is considered as a service within.

We learned: IF BEFORE HE HAD FINISHED THE SPRINKLINGS WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES] THE BLOOD WAS POURED AWAY, HE MUST BRING OTHER BLOOD, STARTING OVER AGAIN AND SPRINKLING WITHIN AGAIN. Now, if this view were right [it] should read: 'He should start again with the taking of the handfuls'?¹³ —

(1) The word 'statute' denotes that the order for this day is statutory, hence any disregard would render a service out of order invalid. R. Judah holds that this 'statute'- limitation has reference to the place whence once a year atonement is obtained, i.e., the Holy of Holies, whereas R. Nehemiah assumes it refers to the objects, by means of which, or in which, once a year atonement is obtained, i.e., both place and

garments. Hence according to R. Judah the order is indispensable within the Holy of Holies, but not in the rest of the Sanctuary in which atonement is obtained frequently, and not but once in the course of the year. According to R. Nehemiah both place and garments, in which atonement must be obtained, have indispensable order of regulations.

- (2) That the term 'statute' should refer to it?
- (3) 'This' and 'Once' being limitations.
- (4) How does he explain these two limitations?
- (5) Even if the pouring out had been delayed beyond the order, services performed meantime remain valid. The fact that this is done in white garments has no effect on the enforcement of the order in which it is to be done.

(6) I.e., those parts of the service that were to follow it, but which were performed before it.

(7) And there is no reason to exclude the remainder of the blood.

(8) [That according to R. Judah the omission of the rite in connection with the remainder of the blood impairs the service, and consequently the term 'statute' should apply to it equally with the other acts performed in white garments.]

(9) Lev. XVI, 20.

(10) R. Akiba holds: the mission of the rite connected with it does not impair the atonement, as the main sprinklings had been made and the atonement is complete, even if the remaining blood has not been poured away; whereas R. Judah holds: If all is completed, then he has obtained atonement, if not (and failure to pour away the remaining blood would be included in this indispensable program) not.

(11) That according to R. Nehemiah the remaining blood presents no handicap. Since above R. Johanan said that both used one Scriptural passage as their text and R. Nehemiah was consequently held to infer that the disposal of the remaining blood according to order was not indispensable.

(12) V. Zeb. 11a.

(13) Since R. Hanina holds that taking the handfuls of the incense before the slaughtering of the bullock is invalid, he would have to take afresh a new handful before slaughtering the second bullock.

Yoma 61a

He does not treat of the incense.¹

'Ulla said: If he slew the he-goat before sprinkling the blood of the bullock, he has done nothing. We learned: IF HE SPRINKLED THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT BEFORE THE BLOOD OF THE

YOMA - 28a-61b

BULLOCK, HE MUST START OVER AGAIN, SPRINKLING THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT AFTER THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK. Now, if this view were right, [it] should read: ‘He shall start over again’ and slaughter?² — ‘Ulla explained this to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary;³ and thus also R. Afes explained it to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary.

LIKEWISE IN MATTERS OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE GOLDEN ALTAR: Our Rabbis taught: And he shall make atonement for the most holy place,⁴ i.e., the Holy of Holies [for] The tent of meeting, i.e., the Sanctuary;⁵ [for] the altars in the literal sense. ‘He shall make atonement’ — this [refers to] the courts; ‘the priests’ in the literal sense; ‘the people’, i.e., Israel; ‘He shall make atonement’, this refers to the Levites. Then they are all declared alike in respect of one atonement, for all other sins they⁷ obtain atonement through the he-goat-that-is-to-be-sent-away,⁸ this is the view of R. Judah.

R. Simeon said: Just as the blood of the he-goat [the rites of which are] performed within obtains atonement for Israel in all matters of impurity touching the Sanctuary and its holy things,⁹ thus also does the blood of the bullock obtain atonement for the priests in all matters of impurity touching the Sanctuary and its holy things; and just as the confession over the he-goat-to-be-sent-away obtains atonement for Israel with regard to all other transgressions, so does the confession over the bullock obtain atonement for the priest for all other transgressions.¹⁰

Our Rabbis taught: ‘And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place’, this refers to the Holy of Holies; ‘The tent of meeting’, i.e., the Sanctuary; the altar, in its literal sense — this teaches that for all of these special [independent] atonements must be obtained. Hence they said: If he sprinkled some of the sprinklings made within, and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other

blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings within.

R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say: He shall start but from the place where he stopped. If he has completed the sprinkling due within and the blood was poured away, then he shall bring other blood and he shall start from the beginning with the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. If he had sprinkled some of the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary.

R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say: He need start but from the place where he had stopped. If he had completed the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinkling due on the altar. If he had made some of the sprinklings due on the altar and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and he shall start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due on the altar.

R. Eliezer and R. Simeon said: He shall not start except from the place where he had stopped. If he had completed the sprinklings due on the altar and the blood was poured all agree that this is no handicap. Said R. Johanan: Both¹¹ infer it from one scriptural passage: With the blood of the sin-offering of atonement... once a year.¹² R. Meir holds: I have spoken to thee of one sin-offering [whereby to obtain one atonement], not of two sin-offerings; R. Eleazar and R. Simeon holding, I have spoken of one sprinkling, not of two sprinklings.¹³

It was taught: Rabbi said: R. Jacob taught me a difference with regard to the logs.¹⁴ But is there no [dispute]? Surely it has been taught: If he made some of the sprinklings within [the Sanctuary],¹⁵ and the blood was poured away, he must bring another log [of oil] and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due within.

YOMA - 28a-61b

R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: He starts again from the place he had stopped at. If he had completed the sprinklings due within [the Sanctuary] and the log was spilt, he shall bring another log and start again from the beginning with the application on the thumbs¹⁶ and toes.¹⁶ If he had made some of the applications on the thumbs and toes and the log was spilt, he shall bring another log and start over again from the beginning with the applications on the thumbs and toes.

R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: He shall start where he had stopped before. If he had completed the applications due on the thumbs and toes and the log was spilt, then all agree that the applications on the head are not a handicap.¹⁷ Say rather: R. Jacob taught me also [the difference of opinion] concerning the log.¹⁸

The Master had said: The applications on the head are no handicap. Why that? Shall I say because Scripture says: And what remaineth over of the oil,¹⁹ but then [when it says]: But that which is left of the meal-offering, etc.,²⁰ would you say that there, too, it constitutes no handicap?²¹ — It is different there because it is written: ‘And the rest’²² and what remaineth over, etc.²³

(1) He would certainly have to take anew the handfuls.

(2) [It is assumed that the reference is to the sprinklings within the Holy of Holies, with the result that the he-goat was slaughtered before the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock.]

(3) But the slaying of the he-goat took place in its proper place, after the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled within.

(4) Lev. XVI, 33.

(5) These sprinklings atone for any impurity that occurred in the Holy of Holies or the Sanctuary, if any person should have entered there unwittingly in a state of impurity. V. Shebu. 7b.

(6) If any impurity occurred to any person at the altar, he staying there for a period co-extensive with the time of one prostration.

(7) Priest, Levites and Israelites.

(8) Besides those of impurity. In the case of other transgressions the he-goat-to-be-sent-away obtains forgiveness for both priests and commoners. But

for the sin implied in any impurity in the Temple, it is the bullock which obtains forgiveness for the priests, and the he-goat which brings it to Israel.

(9) Without confession. As there was no confession with that he-goat.

(10) V. Sheb. 13b.

(11) The anonymous authority who is R. Meir on the one hand, and R. Eleazar and R. Simeon on the other.

(12) Ex. XXX, 10.

(13) The word נָתַר rendered ‘sin-offering’ means also ‘purge from sin’, hence sprinkle.

(14) With regard to the log of oil used for the purification of the leper (v. Lev. XIV, 21) R. Jacob had taught that unlike the sprinklings of the Day of Atonement, there was no dispute concerning the question here where one must start again after a service had been performed out of order.

(15) This refers to the purification rite of a leper, v. Lev. XIV, 16.

(16) Lev. XIV, verse 17.

(17) Hence the dispute between the Rabbis did affect the log of oil as well.

(18) The report had been originally misread. As R. Hananel suggests, it read: ‘R. Jacob had not made any difference with regard to the log’. In its original interpretation it implied: There was no difference of opinion among the Rabbis touching the log. But, since that report was now refuted, the meaning must have been: R. Jacob taught me that there was no difference between the log and the other case; in both the Rabbis are of divergent opinion.

(19) Lev. XIV, 29 which indicates that the oil used for the head is but a remainder and not an essential part of the rite.

(20) Ibid. II, 10.

(21) In reality it does, v. Men. 9a.

(22) Ibid. XIV, 17 with reference to the oil applied to the thumbs and toes.

(23) The oil applied on the thumbs and toes is thus designated ‘remainder’ and that applied on the head ‘remainder of remainder’ and therefore constitutes no handicap.

Yoma 61b

R. Johanan said: If the guilt-offering of a leper had been slaughtered not for its own purpose,¹ — therein we find a dispute between [on the one hand] R. Meir, and R. Eleazar and R. Simeon [on the other]. R. Meir, who said he must bring another one and start all over from the beginning, would here consistently hold that he must bring another [animal as] guilt-offering and slay it, whereas R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, who say:

YOMA - 28a-61b

He shall start at the place he had left off before, would hold that here there is no redress.²

R. Hisda demurred to them: Surely it is written: ‘It’s — This is a refutation. It was taught in accord with R. Johanan: If the guilt-offering of a leper had been slaughtered not for its own purpose, or if one had not sprinkled of its blood upon the thumbs and toes, it is considered a burnt-offering in regard to the altar and requires the [prescribed]⁴ libations and he requires another guilt-offering to render him right again.⁵ —

And R. Hisda? — He will answer you: What means, he requires? — He requires, but he has no remedy [to get it]. But would a Tanna teach: ‘He requires’ when he has no remedy [of getting it]? Indeed, as it was also taught: [Concerning] a baldheaded Nazirite Beth Shammai taught he requires to pass through a razor [over his head],⁶ whereas Beth Hillel said: He need not pass through a razor [over his head].

And R. Abina said: When Beth Shammai say: It is necessary, [they mean] he requires to [do so] but he has no remedy.⁷ He thus contradicts R. Pedath, for R. Pedath said: Beth Shammai and R. Eleazar say one and the same thing. ‘Beth Shammai’, as we have stated above, and ‘R. Eleazar’ as we have learnt:⁸ If he⁹ have no thumb or toe, he⁹ can never obtain purity. R. Eleazar said: One should place it on the place due, and thereby the duty is done. R. Simeon said: If he placed it on [the thumb and toe of] the right, he has done his duty.

Our Rabbis taught: And the priest shall take [receive] of the blood of the guilt-offering¹⁰ — one might have assumed that is to be done with a vessel, therefore the text reads: ‘And he shall put it’ i.e., just as the ‘putting’ must be done by the priest himself, so must the ‘taking’ be by the priest himself. One might have assumed the same applied to the blood

which is to be used for [sprinkling upon] the altar, therefore the text reads: For as the sin-offering... so is the guilt-offering.¹¹ Just as a vessel is necessary [for receiving the blood of a] sin-offering,¹² so is a vessel necessary [for the blood of] the guilt-offering. You thus find yourself stating that in the case of the guilt-offering of the leper two priests receive the blood thereof, one in his hand,¹³ the other in a vessel.¹⁴ The first who receives it in the vessel proceeds to the altar, whereas the other who receives it in his hand goes to the leper. We have learnt there: All of them¹⁵ render the garments Levitically impure and are to be burnt in the place where the ashes are deposited. This is the opinion of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon.

The Sages say: They do not render the garments ritually unclean and they are not to be burnt in the place where the ashes are deposited, except the last one because with that he completed the atonement. —

Raba asked the following question of R. Nahman: How many he-goats is he to send away?¹⁶ — He answered: Should he perhaps send his flock away?¹⁷ — He said to him:

(1) [I.e., he offered it in the name of some other sacrifice. In such a case the sacrifice is valid but is not accounted to the owner in fulfillment of his duty and the owner must consequently bring anew the offering which was due from him.]

(2) [R. Meir, who holds that part of a service that has not been completed is of no account, would similarly regard this incomplete guilt-offering as not offered and would require another guilt-offering; whereas R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, who do not disregard that part of the service which had been performed, would hold that he cannot bring a new guilt-offering as Scripture explicitly states ‘One lamb for a guilt offering’ (Lev. XIV, 12) and not two.]

(3) Lev. XIV, 12: ‘And offer it as a guilt-offering’, i.e., only the one which has been waved together with the oil. This unequivocal statement of the Torah R. Meir too must accept, hence the interpretation just offered is to be rejected.

(4) V. Num. XV, 1ff.

(5) I.e., the leper becomes pure, normal again, so that he may eat holy things (sacrificial meat). This shows that there is a view that he can bring a new guilt-offering, which supports R. Johanan.

YOMA - 28a-61b

(6) Num. VI, 5: All the days of his vow of the Naziriteship there shall no razor come upon his head, until the days be fulfilled, i.e., but when the days are fulfilled he shall have his hair cut.

(7) This bald-pate cannot do so. Yet it is stated 'he requires'.

(8) Naz. 46b.

(9) The leper.

(10) Lev. XIV, 14.

(11) Ibid. XIV, 13.

(12) V. Zeb. 97b.

(13) For sprinkling on the leper himself.

(14) For the sprinkling on the altar.

(15) All the bullocks and he-goats mentioned in our Mishnah, in connection with blood poured away before the completion of the individual atonement or the whole service in question, and for which substitutes are obligatory, must be burnt outside the three camps (that of the priests, the Levites, and of Israel) and they render the garments of those occupied with burning impure. Lev. XVI, 27-28.

(16) [Where, for instance, the blood of the he-goat was poured away after the sprinklings in the Holy of Holies in which case he has to bring anew two goats and cast lots afresh.]

(17) Obviously only one he-goat-to-be-sent-away is dealt with in Lev. XVI.