

YOMA - 62a-88a

15c

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud



YOMA

Book III

Folios 62a-88a

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

WITH NOTES

CHAPTERS VI - VIII

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771

www.613etc.com

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 62a

Does he not burn¹ his flock? — How compare these two? With regard to this, it is written 'it',² touching the other it is not written 'it'.

It was stated: R. Papi said in the name of Raba: He sends away the first. — R. Shimi said in the name of Raba: He sends away the last. It is quite right according to R. Shimi in the name of Raba, who said he sends the last away: that is because with him he completes the atonement, but what is the view of R. Papi in the name of Raba? —

He holds with R. Jose who says: The commandment is properly fulfilled with the first one. Which view of R. Jose is referred to here? Shall I say it is R. Jose's view in the case of the baskets — for we learned: There were three baskets, each of three se'ahs, in which they took up Terumah out of the [shekel] chamber³ and on them were inscribed [the letters] Alef, Beth, Gimel. And it was taught: R. Jose said: Why were Alef, Beth, Gimel inscribed upon them? So that one may know which of them was taken up first [out of the shekel chamber], so as to use it first, for the commandment properly applies to the first! But perhaps it is because at the time when the first is to be used, the others are not ready for use?⁴

Rather [do we refer to the view of] R. Jose touching the Paschal sacrifice, for it has been taught:⁵ If one set aside his Passover sacrifice and it was lost [went astray] and he set aside another one in his place and then the first was found again, so that both are before him, then he may offer up whichever he wants. This is the view of the Sages. R. Jose says: The commandment attaches properly to the first, but if the second be better than [the first] then he may offer it.

CHAPTER VI

MISHNAH. THE TWO HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ARE REQUIRED TO

BE ALIKE IN APPEARANCE, IN SIZE, IN VALUE, TO HAVE BEEN BOUGHT AT THE SAME TIME. BUT EVEN IF THEY ARE NOT ALIKE THEY ARE VALID. IF ONE WAS BOUGHT ONE DAY AND THE OTHER THE FOLLOWING DAY, THEY ARE VALID. IF ONE OF THEM DIED BEFORE THE LOT WAS CAST ANOTHER ONE IS BOUGHT FOR THE SECOND ONE. BUT [IF IT DIED] AFTER THE LOT WAS CAST ANOTHER PAIR MUST BE BOUGHT AND THE LOTS CAST FOR THEM OVER AGAIN. AND IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR THE LORD DIED, HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] SHOULD SAY: LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR THE LORD HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD. AND IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR AZAZEL DIED HE SHOULD SAY: 'LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR AZAZEL HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD. THE OTHER ONE IS LEFT TO PASTURE UNTIL IT BECOMES BLEMISHED WHEN IT IS TO BE SOLD AND ITS VALUE GOES TO THE TEMPLE FUND. FOR THE SIN-OFFERING OF THE CONGREGATION MUST NOT BE LEFT TO DIE.⁶ R. JUDAH SAYS: IT IS LEFT TO DIE. FURTHERMORE SAID R. JUDAH: IF THE BLOOD WAS POURED AWAY, THE GOAT-TO-BE-SENT-AWAY WAS LEFT TO DIE. IF THE GOAT-TO-BE-SENT-AWAY DIED THE BLOOD IS POURED AWAY.

(1) And yet it states that 'all of them are burnt on the place where the ashes are deposited'.

(2) Lev. XVI, 10, with reference to the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. 'It' implies only 'one'.

(3) Into which the shekels were thrown in the month of Adar, with which the priests filled the three baskets for the communal offerings. V. Shek. III, 2.

(4) When one basketful is taken up first one would obviously use that first, but the goat of the first pair could not be sent away before all the sprinklings of blood had been made, when the second is as fitting to be sent away as the first.

(5) *Infra* 64a.

(6) V. Tem. IV, 3.

Yoma 62b

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall take. . . two he-goats,¹ now the minimum of he-goats is two; why then is 'two' mentioned?

YOMA - 62a-88a

To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if the two are not alike they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'He-goat', 'he-goat',² which is inclusive [widens the scope]. Now the reason, then, is only that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid. Whence do we derive this indispensability? — You might have thought that we say: 'Two' is written three times.³ But now that the Divine Law has twice written 'he-goat' what is the purpose of 'two' written three times? —

One applies to appearance, the other to size, the third to value. It has been similarly taught in connection with the lambs of the leper: And he shall take two lambs.⁴ Now the minimum of lambs is two, then why does the text say: 'Two'? To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if the two be not alike, they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Lamb', 'lamb',⁵ which is inclusive [widens the scope]. Now the reason is only that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid, whence do we assume this indispensability?—

You might have thought we say: It is written: [This] shall be [the law].⁶ But now that the Divine Law has said: 'Lamb', 'lamb', what purpose serves 'shall be'? —

That refers to the rest of the status of the leper.⁷ It was similarly taught in connection with the [birds of] the leper: Birds;⁸ now the minimum of birds is two. Why then is 'two' mentioned? To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if they be not alike, they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Birds', 'birds',⁹ which is inclusive. Now the reason then is that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not included it, one would have assumed that they are invalid. Whence do we derive this indispensability? —

You might have thought that we say that it is written 'shall be'. But now that the Divine Law through 'birds', ['birds'] includes it, what purpose serves 'shall be'? — Because of the rest of the status of the leper. If so, in the case of the daily burnt-offerings let us make a similar deduction: 'Lambs', 'lambs',¹⁰ since the minimum of lambs is two, why does the text read: 'Two'? To indicate that they shall be alike. And whence do we know that even if they are not alike they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Lamb', 'lamb',¹¹ which is inclusive.¹² But as far as proper performance of the precept is concerned is it indeed required¹³ [that the lambs shall be alike]? —

Here we need it for what has been taught: Two for the day¹⁰ i.e., against the day.¹⁴ You say: Against the day, but perhaps it really means, the daily duty? When it says: The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at even,¹¹ behold the daily duty is already stated, hence how do I apply the words: 'Two for the day'? I.e., against the day. How is that? The continual morning offering was being slain on the north-western corner, on the second ring,¹⁵ whereas that of the even was slain on the north-eastern corner on the second ring.¹⁵ But the additional sacrifices of the Sabbath certainly must be alike.¹⁶

Our Rabbis taught: If he [the high priest] slew two he-goats of the Day of Atonement outside [the Temple court] before the lots were cast, then he is guilty in respect of both; if, however, after the lot was cast, then he is guilty¹⁷ in respect of the one cast 'for the Lord', but free in respect of the one cast 'for Azazel'.¹⁸ If before he has cast the lots, he is guilty in respect of both of them. But what [sacrifice] are they fit for?¹⁹ —

Said R. Hisda: Since [each] is fit to be offered up as the he-goat [the rites of which are] performed without.²⁰ But why is it impossible to offer it up as the he-goat [of which rites are] performed within [the Holy of Holies]? presumably because it still lacks the casting

YOMA - 62a-88a

of the lot? But then it ought to be unfit to be used as the he-goat [of which rites are performed] without, for the reason that it still lacks the other ministrations of the Day?²¹ —

R. Hisda holds: One may not call the absence of any functions due on the same day a lack of time.²²

Said Rabina: Now that R. Hisda said that the absence of the casting of the lot has the same significance as the absence of a [direct] action,²³ then in view of what Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: ‘Peace-offerings which have been slain before the doors of the Temple have been opened are invalid, as it is said: And he shall slay it at the gate of the tent of meeting,²⁴ i.e., at the time when it is open, but not when it is closed’;

- (1) Lev. XVI, 5.
- (2) Ibid. 9, 10.
- (3) Lev. XVI, 5, 7, 8 and thus indicates indispensability.
- (4) Ibid. XIV, 10.
- (5) Ibid. 12, 13.
- (6) Ibid. 2. ‘Shall be’ implies precise instructions from which there may be no deviation.
- (7) I.e., to the other regulations relating to the purification of the leper.
- (8) Lev. XIV, 4.
- (9) Ibid. 5, 6.
- (10) Num, XXVIII, 3.
- (11) Ibid. 4.
- (12) It is inclusive, i.e., as long as it is a lamb, even if not exactly like the other, it is included in the terms of the commandment.
- (13) This, however, is nowhere stated.
- (14) I.e., the morning sacrifice is to be offered up against (opposite) the sun-rise, viz., on the western side of the altar, and the evening sacrifice on the opposite, namely, the eastern side (R. Han.).
- (15) To the north of the altar were rings, twenty four, six rows of four each, at which they slaughtered the animal offerings. (V. Mid. III, 5.). On these rings the animals were securely tied before slaying. When the morning sacrifice was slain on the western side the light of the sun poured freely in, just as in the eve, when the sacrifice was slain on the eastern side, the rays of the sinking sun were unimpeded. Always in the direction opposite to the light of the day. Tosaf. suggests that the second ring rather than the first was used to prevent the animal from polluting the altar with

excrements.

(16) [Since in connection with this only ‘two lambs’ is stated (V. Num. XXVIII, 9) but not the inclusive ‘one lamb’. V, Rashi and R. Han.]

(17) On the score of Lev. XVI, 3ff:

(18) The he-goat destined for Azazel would in any case be killed outside the Sanctuary hence nothing illegitimate took place, no change of place.

(19) That he should be liable for slaughtering them outside the Temple court.

(20) I.e., in the Sanctuary proper, without the Holy of Holies. The additional sacrifice for the Day of Atonement, a he-goat, is offered up, its blood sprinkled without (Num. XXIX, 11).

(21) i.e., the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock and he-goat and the taking and offering of the handfuls of incense, all of which must take place before the additional sacrifice is offered up.

(22) The absence of the ministrations of the day mentioned in n. 3 does not affect the validity of the he-goat offered as an additional offering, as these do not constitute a defect in the he-goat itself, but are absent because the time for them had not yet arrived. Whatsoever is bound to come within the day, may not be considered wanting on that day. [This distinguishes it from the casting of lots, the absence of which constitutes a lack in the very he-goat which consequently renders it unfit for use within].

(23) In the offering itself, rendering it unfit for Temple use.

(24) Lev. III, 2.

Yoma 63a

if someone had slain them outside before the doors of the Temple had been open, he would be free, because the lack of opening is like the lack of a [direct] action.¹ But does R. Hisda adopt the principle of ‘since’?²

Surely R. Hisda said: If someone had slaughtered the Passover sacrifice outside on any of the other³ days of the year, then, if he did it in its own name, he is free, but if he did it not in its own name, he is culpable.⁴ The reason [that he is culpable] lies in his having slaughtered it not in its own name. But if he had slaughtered it without any indication it is [as if — slaughtered] in its name, and he would be free? Why that? Let us say: Since it would be fit for a sacrifice not in its own name, within the Temple⁵ [he should be liable]? Now, how compare? There a removal

YOMA - 62a-88a

is necessary,⁶ whereas this needs no such removal.

Rabbah b. Shimi taught these [two statements of R. Hisda] as [emanating] from Rabbah. He then raises a difficulty from [the one view of] Rabbah against [the other given by] Rabbah; but answers [the difficulty] as we have answered.

When R. Dimi [came from Palestine] he said in the name of R. Jeremiah, who said it in the name of R. Johanan: If one slaughtered a Paschal sacrifice outside on any of the other days of the year, whether in its name or not in its name, he is exempt.

Said R. Dimi: I have reported this statement in the presence of R. Jeremiah [and queried]: It is all correct [in the case where it was slaughtered] in its name, since it is not fit [for the Temple], but [where it was] not in its name [why should it be exempt]? Surely it would be fit as a sacrifice not in its own name within the Temple? And he said this [in reply]: The removal [of the name of a sacrifice] outside [the Temple] is not deemed [an effective] removal.⁷ —

When Rabin came [from Palestine], [he said that] R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Johanan: If one had slain a Passover sacrifice outside on any of the other days of the year, whether in its own name or not in its own name, he is culpable. Even ‘in its own name’? But have we not learnt: A sacrifice whose time has not yet come [may be such] either because of itself or because of its owner. Which is a sacrifice whose time has not yet come because of its owner? If the owner, either man or woman, was afflicted with gonorrhoea, or was a woman after child-birth or a leper and had offered up their sin-offering or their guilt-offering outside [before the appointed time], they are free.⁸ But if they offered up their whole-offerings or their peace-offerings outside, they are culpable.⁹

And R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi said: They did not teach thus only if they were offered up in their own name, but if they were not offered up in their own name, they were not culpable.¹⁰ Now at any rate, then, when offered up in their own name, the owners are culpable. But why that? Let us say, Since they are fit to be offered up in their own name within [they should be culpable]? — How compare? There a removal is necessary, but here Passover sacrifice during the rest of the days of the year is a peace-offering.¹¹ R. Ashi taught:¹² the owner is culpable, as we had stated above.

R. Jeremiah of Difti taught he is not culpable, because he is of the opinion that the Passover sacrifice during the rest of the days of the year requires a removal,¹³ and the removal outside [the Temple] is not [effective]. Therein he disputes with R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi.¹⁴ The Master said: ‘When the lot has been cast, he is culpable in respect of the one [he-goat] cast ‘for the Lord’, and free with respect to the one cast ‘for Azazel’.

Our Rabbis taught: What man soever there be of the house of Israel that killeth an ox or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it without the camp, and hath not brought it unto the entrance of the tent of meeting to present it as an offering unto the Lord.¹⁵

(1) So that the offerings were not fit for Temple use, and thus involve no guilt when offered outside.

(2) הוֹאִיל either derived from יָעַל — ע and א interchange frequently — thus: it helps — and followed by — ‘because’ since; or הָאִלָּא + אִילָּא ‘look now, if’, i.e., once this is so, that also may be granted; or from the Biblical יָאָל ‘accepted, agreed that this is so, that also ought to be accepted’, implying that because something is permitted in one case, the permission should be extended to all analogous cases.

(3) Besides the eve of Passover, the fourteenth of Nisan, which is the proper date for this sacrifice.

(4) Because in this case it is a peace-offering, which should have been slain within the Temple.

(5) It could be used within as a peace-offering.

(6) [It could not be used within as a peace-offering unless it had been expressly removed at the time of slaughtering from its original purpose as

YOMA - 62a-88a

Passover sacrifice, and consequently as long as no such removal had been made it cannot be said to be fit for use within the Temple.] The he-goat offered within as well as the one without are sin-offerings in either situation.

(7) [Although a Paschal lamb on any other days in the year can be removed from its original purpose and offered as a peace-offering, such a removal is effective only when it is offered within the Temple, but where it is offered outside, the Paschal lamb retains its original name and purpose and consequently involves no guilt for having been slaughtered outside.]

(8) V. Lev. XV, 14, 29; XII, 6, XIV, 10.

(9) In the case of sin-offerings or guilt-offerings, which were offered up outside before they were due, no culpability is involved, because they are not acceptable within before their time has come, neither as obligatory nor as freewill-offerings. But burnt-offerings or/and peace-offerings, which are accepted even when not obligatory, are fit to be offered up within even before the appointed time, hence they involve culpability when offered up without. V. Zeb. 112b.

(10) This exemption applies only when the guilt-offering was offered up in its own name outside, in which case being before its appointed time it would be unfit for the Temple. But if it was offered up for another purpose than that originally designated, e.g., for a burnt — or peace-offering, where it would be acceptable within at any time, there is culpability when offered up without.

(11) Without the need of an express removal from its original purpose.

(12) With reference to the statement reported by Rabin.

(13) Before it can be offered as a peace-offering.

(14) Who holds that a removal outside the Temple is an effective removal.

(15) Lev. XVII, 3, 4.

Yoma 63b

From [the word] ‘offering’ I might have assumed that even offerings for the temple repair [are included], which are also called ‘offerings’, in accord with the Scriptural words: And we have brought the Lord's offering,¹ therefore the text reads: ‘And hath not brought it unto the entrance of the tent of meeting’, i.e., whatsoever is fit to be brought to the tent of meeting, if offered up outside, involves culpability; but whatsoever is fit to be brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, if offered up outside, does not

involve culpability. Thus I would exclude only those which are not fit to be offered up at the entrance of the tent of meeting, but I would not exclude [the cow for the sin-offering² and] the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, which are fit to be brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, therefore the text reads: ‘Unto the Lord’ i.e., only those assigned to the Lord, to the exclusion of such as are not assigned to the Lord. But do the words ‘Unto the Lord’ imply exclusion? I shall raise a contradiction: It may be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord,³ i.e., the fire-offerings.⁴ Whence do we know that one may not dedicate it before its time has come?⁵ Therefore the text reads: ‘As an offering’. ‘Unto the Lord’, includes the he-goat-to-be-sent-away!⁶

Said Raba: There [the meaning is determined] by the context, and here too [its meaning is determined] by the context: There ‘Unto the entrance implies inclusion, therefore ‘Unto the Lord’ implies exclusion; here ‘An offering made by fire’ implies exclusion, hence ‘Unto the Lord’ has inclusive⁷ meaning. Now the only reason then is that the Divine Law included it, but if it had not done so I would have assumed that the he-goat-to-be-sent-away could be dedicated before its time.⁸ But⁹ the lot does not determine except such [an animal] as is fit ‘for the Lord’?¹⁰ —

Said R. Joseph: This is in accord with Hanan the Egyptian, for it was taught:¹¹ Hanan the Egyptian says: Even if the blood is in the cup, may he bring its mate and pair them.¹² But admitted that Hanan does not accept the opinion concerning ‘rejection’¹³ you surely did not hear that Hanan does not accept the opinion as to the necessity of casting the lots? Perhaps he [the high priest] would have to bring [two] and cast lots [afresh]?¹⁴ —

Rather, said R. Joseph, this [Baraita]¹⁵ is in accord with R. Simeon, for it was taught: If one of them died, he brings another one

YOMA - 62a-88a

without casting lots, this is the view of R. Simeon!

Rabina said: The reference [in the Baraita] is to a case in which one of them became blemished and was redeemed with another one.¹⁶ But whence will you say that a blemish renders it [the scapegoat] invalid? As it was taught: Nor make an offering by fire of them,¹⁷ this refers to the pieces of fat. From here I could infer only as to all the pieces. Whence do we know that it applies also to parts thereof? Therefore the text reads: 'Of them'. 'The altar'¹⁷ i.e., the sprinkling of the blood. Unto the Lord,¹⁷ that includes the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. Now it was necessary [for the Scripture] to write [disqualifying a scapegoat], the blemished animal and one whose time has not yet come.

For if the Divine Law had written only about the animal whose time has not yet come, I would have assumed there [it is disqualified] applies because its time has not yet come, but in the case of one blemished whose time had come, I might have assumed that [the disqualification does] not [apply]. And if the Divine Law had written about the blemished animal alone, I might have assumed the reason [for its being disqualified] there lies in repulsiveness, but with the animal whose time has not yet come, and where there is no repulsive feature, one might have assumed [the law] does [not] apply, hence it was necessary [to write about both].

(1) Num. XXXI, 50.

(2) The red heifer. Tosaf. supports Rashi's elimination of this reference to the red heifer, because the latter was not brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, hence is logically excluded from the present discussion.

(3) Lev. XXII, 27.

(4) Only from the eighth day are they acceptable as offerings.

(5) I.e., that an offering cannot be dedicated before the eighth day.

(6) This shows that 'Unto the Lord' implies inclusion.

(7) The he-goat-to-be-sent-away is not 'for the Lord', but fit to be brought unto the entrance of the tent of meeting. So 'Unto the Lord' excludes

whatsoever is not assigned for the Lord. In the other passage 'An offering made by fire' excludes, of course, the goat, which is to be hurled from the precipice, whereas 'Unto the Lord' is complimentarily inclusive, hence the goat must not be offered up before it is eight days.

(8) I.e., before it is eight days old.

(9) V. Tem. 6b.

(10) And that implies a minimum age, hence invalidation before its time.

(11) Zeb. 34b.

(12) Even if the blood of the he-goat to be sprinkled up within is in the cup, when the he-goat-to-be-sent-away dies, no new casting of the lots is necessary according to Hanan, but, as is assumed at present, one may simply bring another he-goat from outside and pair it and appoint it for Azazel even without lots. Thus we see that Hanan does not hold the principle that the lot does not determine, etc.; and consequently the he-goat-to-be-sent-away need not necessarily have reached its proper time hence a scriptural verse is necessary to teach that it must do so.

(13) He does not accept the view of R. Judah in our Mishnah that the scapegoat is to be rejected as unfit on account of the mishap to the other.

(14) Leaving the one, upon whom the lot 'for the Lord' now falls, to pasture until it acquires a blemish, whilst obtaining atonement through the blood of the first. At any rate, however, casting the lots is necessary, hence one whose time had not yet come would be invalidated, because the lot determines only what is 'fit for the Lord', i.e. whose time has come.

(15) Which requires a special text to teach that the he-goat-to-be-sent-away must be of minimum age.

(16) Where the he-goat-to-be-sent-away suddenly became blemished, its successor obtained by means of redemption needs no lot to determine its purpose, and, since no list was required, there is no implied obligation as to proper minimum age.

(17) With reference to blemished animals. Lev. XXII, 22.

Yoma 64a

Raba said: [It¹ was necessary] for the case that he² had a sick person in the house, for whom he killed the mother-animal on the Day of Atonement.³ But is it forbidden in such a case?⁴ Does not the Divine Law say: Ye shall not kill its and this is not killing?⁶ — In the West [Palestine] they said: Hurling it down from the [mountain] peak, that is its killing.

YOMA - 62a-88a

IF THAT 'FOR THE LORD' DIED, etc.: Rab said: The second of the first pair is to be offered up, the second of the second pair should be left to pasture.⁷ — R. Johanan said: The second of the first pair should be left to pasture, the second pair should be offered up. In what principle do they differ?—

Rab holds: Living animals are not rejected [forever], whereas R. Johanan holds: Living animals are rejected [forever]. What is the reason for Rab's view? He infers it from those whose time has not yet come: An animal whose time has not yet come, although it is as yet unfit, when it later becomes fit again, will be quite in order. Thus also here. How can this be compared? There it was never fit at all. Here it was once fit and then rejected? —

Rather is this the reason of Rab's view: He infers it from an animal afflicted with a passing blemish: An animal afflicted with a passing blemish surely although now unfit, yet when it is fit again, is quite in order. Thus also here. But whence do we know if touching the former? Because it is written: Because their corruption is in them, there is a blemish in them¹⁰ i.e., only as long as a blemish is in them are they not acceptable, but when their blemish passes they are acceptable. And R. Johanan? —

The Divine Law stated 'in them'¹⁰ i.e., only these are acceptable after the blemish has passed, but all other animals rejected [through temporary unfitness] once they have been rejected, stay rejected. And Rab? — The words 'in them' signify that only as long as they are in their natural form are they not acceptable, but as soon as they are mixed up with others, they are acceptable; as we have learnt,¹¹ if the members of unblemished [whole-offerings] were mixed up with the members of blemished [animals], R. Eliezer says: If the head of one of them had been offered,¹² the heads of all may be offered; if the legs of one of them had been

offered, the legs of all may be offered. The Sages, however, say: Even if all the members with exception of one have been offered, this one must go forth to the place of burning. And the other one [R. Johanan]? He infers that from [the fact that instead of] 'bam' [is written] 'bahem'.¹³ — And the other one [Rab]? — He does not expound from 'Bahem' instead of 'bam'. But according to Rab, granted that animals cannot be rejected for ever, if he wishes let him offer this, and if he wishes let him offer the other?¹⁴ —

Raba said: Rab holds to the view of R. Jose, who said: The command attaches properly to the first. — Which [view of] R. Jose are you referring to? Shall I say, You say [the view of] R. Jose concerning the baskets, for we have been taught:¹⁵ There were three baskets each of three se'ahs,¹⁶ in which they took up Terumah out of the shekel-chamber, and on each of them was inscribed: Alef, Beth, Gimel. And we have been taught: R. Jose said: Why is Alef, Beth, Gimel inscribed upon them? So that one may know out of which of them the Terumah was taken up [out of the shekel-chamber] first, to use it first, for the command properly applies to the first! — But perhaps it is different there because at the time when the first is to be used, the others are not ready for use yet?¹⁷—

Rather is it R. Jose's view concerning the Passover sacrifice, for it was taught: If someone has separated his Passover sacrifice and it is lost, and he thereupon puts aside another one in its place, and afterwards the first one is found again, so that both are standing [ready to be used], then he can offer up whichever he prefers; this is the view of the Sages. R. Jose holds the commandment attaches properly to the first,¹⁸

(1) The verse disqualifying a scapegoat that has not reached its proper time.

(2) Who was the purveyor to the community of these animals.

(3) In case of a dangerously ill person the slaying of an animal for food or remedial purpose is permitted. Raba suggests the case that the

YOMA - 62a-88a

purveyor of the he-goat had, on the Day of Atonement, slain its mother for the patient. But in view of the prohibition (Lev. XXII, 28:) whether it be cow or ewe, ye shall not kill it and its young both in one day, the he-goat would thus become an animal that was wanting in time all the Day of Atonement, after the lot had been cast.

(4) To use the young as scapegoat.

(5) Lev. XXII, 28.

(6) The prohibition is now interpreted to refer to the technical ritual slaying, whereas the scapegoat is being hurled down the precipice.

(7) Until it acquires a blemish.

(8) If they are temporarily invalidated, they can still be used by means of the substitution of another animal as pair.

(9) Because it was wanting in time and thus was never rejected.

(10) Lev. XXII, 25.

(11) Zeb. 77b.

(12) Before the confusion of the other members with the members of the whole-offerings had been noticed.

(13) From the fact that the Divine Law used the longer word 'Bahem' instead of the shorter 'bam', which has the identical meaning, this inference is attempted. The rival view ignores this variation as not intended for additional inferences.

(14) Whereas the law here is stated to require only the first.

(15) V. supra 59b and notes.

(16) I.e., 144 eggs.

(17) But here although the lots had been cast, the goat could not be slain until after the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled. In the interim the he-goat with it had died, two others were brought in, and when the time for slaying the goat had come, the latter was already in readiness.

(18) For notes v. supra 59b.

not know whether [it means] the second of the first pair, or the second of the second pair. But from the words 'shall be set alive's [I infer: only this one] but not one whose pair has died.⁴ How does that follow? — 'It shall now be set alive', [and] not the one that has been set [alive] before [but whose pair has died].

We learned: **FURTHERMORE DOES R. JUDAH SAY: IF THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, THE SCAPEGOAT IS LEFT TO DIE; IF THE SCAPEGOAT DIED, THE BLOOD IS Poured AWAY.** Now that is quite right according to R. Johanan, who holds living animals are rejected [permanently], — therefore the scapegoat is left to die. But according to Rab, who holds that living animals are not rejected [permanently], why should the scapegoat be left to die? —

Rab will answer you: What I say, I say in accordance with the view, not of R. Judah, but of the Sages.⁵ It is quite right according to Rab: Therein lies the difference between the Sages and R. Judah; but according to R. Johanan, wherein lies the difference?⁶ — Raba said: That is what we have said [above]: The Mishnah points to be in accord with Rab.

We learned: **FOR A COMMUNITY SIN-OFFERING IS NOT LEFT TO DIE.** This [implies] that one of an individual, in such a case, would be left to die. Now that will be right according to R. Johanan,⁷ following R. Abba in the name of Rab, for R. Abba said In the name of Rab:

- (1) In the state of holiness, without being rejected.
- (2) The second mentioned in the Mishnah, that it is left to pasture.
- (3) Lev. XVI, 10. One that 'shall be set alive', not one which had been set alive again, a second time.
- (4) Hence the second in the Mishnah must refer to the second of the first pair.
- (5) [Who, as is to be inferred from the words of R. Judah, held that the second in the first pair is to be offered, because in their view living animals are not rejected permanently].

Yoma 64b

but if the second one be very much better, he shall offer it up.

Raba said: Our Mishnah points to be in accord with Rab, whereas the Baraitha is in accord with R. Johanan. Our Mishnah is in accord with Rab for it reads: **IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR THE LORD DIED, HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] SHOULD SAY: LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR THE LORD HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD'** [implying] that the other remains as it is.¹ The Baraitha is in accord with R. Johanan, for it reads: **As to the second.**² I do

YOMA - 62a-88a

(6) R. Johanan holds that the Sages insist that the second of the first pair must not be offered. Wherein then does R.

Judah, in his additional remark ('Furthermore') differ from the Sages.

(7) Who holds that the second of the first pair is left to pasture.

Yoma 65a

All agree that if he had obtained atonement through [the animal that] had not been lost, [the animal that] had been lost must be left to die;¹ but according to Rab it would be as if someone has set aside two sin-offerings as a guarantee [that one of them should be available if the other be lost],² and R. Oshaia said: If someone had set aside two sin-offerings for the purpose of guarantee, he gains atonement through one of them and leaves the other to pasture? —

Since Raba said that Rab followed the view of R. Jose,³ who holds the commandment properly attached to the first, it is as if it⁴ had from the very beginning been set aside [in substitution] for the one that was lost. We learned: R. JUDAH SAYS: IT SHALL BE LEFT TO DIE. It is quite right in the view of R. Johanan who said that the second of the first pair must be left to pasture [that is, according to the Rabbis]⁵ and [it is this one which] according to R. Judah be left to die,⁶ so that he obtains atonement through the second one of the second pair; but if the view of Rab who said that the second of the second pair must be left to pasture, and [it is this one which] according to R. Judah must be left to die, then according to R. Judah⁷ through which can he obtain atonement? —

Do you understand that R. Judah refers to the second of the second pair? R. Judah refers to the second of the first pair.⁸ Others framed the [above] question [against Rab]⁹ in the following manner: Furthermore did R. Judah say: If the blood was poured away, the scapegoat is left to die; if the scapegoat died the blood is poured away. Now it is in order according to Rab: In the first part [of the Mishnah] they are disputing about the sin-

offering of the community, and in the latter part about [the rejection of] living animals,¹⁰ but according to R. Johanan: What does 'Furthermore signify?'¹¹ — This difficulty remains.¹²

FURTHERMORE SAID R. JUDAH: IF THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, THE SCAPEGOAT IS LEFT TO DIE. It is quite right that when the blood was poured away the scapegoat must die, because the command with it had not been fulfilled, but when the scapegoat died, why should the blood be poured away; surely the commandment therewith had been fulfilled?—

The School of R. Jannai said: Scripture said: [The goat] shall be set alive before the Lord, to make atonement,¹³ i.e., how long must he stay alive? Until the time that his fellow's blood is sprinkled. We have learnt elsewhere: If the inhabitants of a town sent their shekels¹⁴ and they were stolen or lost, then, if Terumah¹⁵ has been taken up already, they¹⁶ swear an oath before the Temple treasurers; and if not they swear an oath before the people of the town; and the people of the town must pay the shekels anew. If they were found again or the thieves restored them, then both are taken as shekels¹⁷ and they do not count as prepayment for the dues of the next year. R. Judah says: They count for the next year.¹⁸ What is the reason of R. Judah's view? —

Raba said: R. Judah holds that obligatory offerings of one year may be brought up in the following year.

Abaye raised the following objection against him:¹⁹ If the bullock or the he-goat of the Day of Atonement were lost and he had set aside others in their place, also, if the goats offered up for idolatry [were lost] and others were set aside for them, then they must all be left to die, this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Eliezer and R. Simeon hold: They shall be left to pasture until they become blemished, when

YOMA - 62a-88a

they should be sold and the money realized for them should go for freewill-offerings, for the sin-offerings of the community must not be left to die.²⁰ —

He [Raba] answered:

(1) [If one had set aside an animal as sin-offering and the animal got lost, and after setting aside another in its stead, the lost animal was found, then according to Rabbi he obtains atonement with whichever he chooses and the other is left to die. The Sages, however, hold that it is left to pasture, as the law which requires that a sin-offering, the owner of which has obtained atonement by another, is to be left to die applies only if it was found after the atonement rites had been performed, but not if found before the atonement (V. Tem. 23a). Now in connection with this R. Abba said that there is no disagreement between Rabbi and the Sages where the atonement was obtained through the one which had not been lost, i.e., through the second, all agreeing in such a case that the first one is left to die. (In accordance with the established old law that if a sin-offering had been lost and the owner obtained atonement through another, when it is found again it is left to die). The dispute concerns a case where atonement was obtained through the first, after it had been lost and found again, Rabbi holding that what is set aside in substitution for that which had been lost is subject to the same law as the lost animal itself and hence must be left to die, whereas the Sages do not share the view. Now in our Mishnah on the view of R. Johanan, who holds that the second of the first pair is left to pasture, it rightly gives as reason 'For no community sin-offering is left to die'; for had it been of an individual it would be left to die, since the atonement is being obtained through the one which had suffered no mishap, and had never been rejected.]

(2) [According to Rab who rules that the atonement is being obtained through the second of the first pair which had been rejected, how could the Mishnah state by implication that if it had been the sin-offering of an individual it would under similar circumstances be left to die? Not only would this not be the case according to the Sages, who rule that whatever is set aside in substitution for that which had been lost is not subject to the same law as the lost animal itself (v. previous note), seeing that he has obtained atonement through the one that had been rejected; but even according to Rabbi (v. *ibid*) it would not have to be left to die, since the second of the second pair has never been set aside as substitution for the one that had been lost, seeing

that its predecessor is still alive. It was merely set aside as a companion to the other which had to be brought in place of the one (the first goat cast for Azazel) that had died. But since living animals cannot be permanently rejected, he should in such a case be able to offer either, just as in the case where one sets aside two offerings as a guarantee for each other.]

(3) V. *supra* 64a.

(4) [I.e., the second of the second pair, and hence but for the fact that it was a public sacrifice it would have been left to die.]

(5) The authority of the first view reported anonymously in the Mishnah.

(6) [It is now assumed that R. Judah's rule that it must be left to die has reference to the one which, according to the Rabbis, is left to pasture, since R. Judah perforce is of the opinion that living animals are permanently rejected as has been established, *supra* 64b.]

(7) [He surely cannot obtain atonement by means of the first, seeing that he holds that living animals are permanently rejected.]

(8) [For in the view of Rab, R. Judah differs from the Rabbis also on the question of the fitness of the second of the first pair for sacrifice; whilst the Rabbis hold that it is offered, R. Judah holds that it is left to die.]

(9) Raised *supra* 64b.

(10) The Rabbis holding that they are not permanently rejected, hence atonement is obtained through the second of the first pair, whereas R. Judah (as has just been explained) holds that the second in the first pair is left to die and the second in the second pair is offered up.

(11) The Rabbis, too, agree that the second in the first pair remains rejected.

(12) Even as stated *supra* 64b that the Mishnah is in support of Rab.

(13) Lev. XVI, 10.

(14) Through messengers to Jerusalem to pay their Temple dues.

(15) Lit., 'heave-offering', here denoting the contribution of Shekels taken up at stated times from out of the shekel-chamber in the Temple from which public sacrifices were bought, v. Shek. III, 1ff.

(16) The messengers take the oath of bailees in accord with Ex. XXII, 10.

(17) For the current year.

(18) For notes v. Shek., *Sonc. ed.*, II, 1.

(19) Shebu. 11a.

(20) Hence we see that R. Judah does not permit the obligation of one year to be kept in order to be brought up the following year, otherwise he would not have ruled that this should be left to die, which contradicts the view just expressed.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 65b

You speak about community sacrifices? It is different with community sacrifices, even as R. Tabi said, in the name of R. Josiah.

For R. Tabi said in the name of R. Josiah: Scripture said: This is the burnt-offering of every new moon throughout the months of the year.¹ The Torah indicates: Renew and bring Me an offering of the new Terumah.² That will be right concerning the he-goat.³ But can it be said in the case of the bullock? Preventive measure attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of preventive measure shall they be left to die?⁴ And, furthermore, the statement of R. Tabi in the name of R. Josiah characterizes the action as merely a meritorious deed, for R. Judah said in the name of Samuel: It is a meritorious deed to offer the community sacrifices, which are due in Nisan, from the new Terumah. If he had offered them from the old, he has fulfilled his duty, but has omitted a meritorious deed! —

Rather, said R. Zeira: [The reason why they cannot be offered in the following year is] because the lot of one year cannot determine for the following year. But let us cast lots again? — There is the fear that people might say the lots do determine from one year for the next. That will be reasonable as far as the he-goat is concerned, but what can be said about the bullock? — The prohibition attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall they be left to die? —

The Rabbis before Abaye said that to be a preventive measure on account of a sin-offering whose owner had died.⁵ That will be right in the case of the he-goat, but what of the case of the bullock? — The restriction in the case of the bullock derives from the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall they be left to die? —

Rather is it a restriction because of a sin-offering whose year is past.⁶ Is that [but] a preventive measure? This is itself a sin-offering whose year is past.⁷ This is no difficulty, in accord with the view of Rabbi. For it was taught:⁸ A full year,⁹ one counts three hundred and sixty-five days according to the year of the sun, this is the view of Rabbi. The Sages say: One counts twelve months from day to day.

(1) Num. XXVIII, 14.

(2) V. R.H., Sonc. ed., p. 25, nn. 8 — 9.

(3) Which was provided from the funds of the shekel-chamber.

(4) It would seem sufficient that they be left to pasture.

(5) If the priest should die that year.

(6) I.e., the fear that by the next Day of Atonement it may be more than a year old. All the he-goats offered up as sin-offerings are invalidated after they have reached the age of one year.

(7) Obviously this sin-offering will be past one year this time next year.

(8) R. H. 6b.

(9) Lev. XXV, 30. The reference here is to the time (one year) during which the seller of a dwelling house in a walled city may redeem the property sold by cancellation of contract.

Yoma 66a

And if the year be a prolonged year, the advantage belongs to the seller.¹ That is right as far as the he-goat is concerned. But what can be said in the case of the bullock? — The preventive measure attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall he be left to die? And, furthermore, a sin-offering, whose [first] year is past, is left to pasture,² for Resh Lakish³ said: As to a sin-offering which has passed its year, we look upon it as if it were standing on the cemetery⁴ and it is left to pasture? —

Rather, said Raba, is the restriction due to the fear of an offense,⁵ for it was taught:⁶ One may neither consecrate anything, nor vow any 'valuation',⁷ nor declare anything as devoted⁸ nowadays.⁹ And if one had consecrated or vowed a 'valuation', or

YOMA - 62a-88a

declared anything as devoted, if an animal, it should be uprooted;¹⁰ if fruits, vessels or covers, one should let them rot; if money or metal vessels, they are to be taken to the Salt [Dead] Sea.¹¹ And what does ‘uprooting’ mean? Locking the door before it, so that it die of itself. What kind of offense [is here contemplated]? If an offense in connection with the offering up, that ought then to apply to other cases of pasturing animals also?¹² If an offense in connection with shearing or working it, then that ought to apply to other pasturing animals too?

In truth the offense contemplated is one in connection with the offering-up, but with those which are not to be offered up¹³ one is not pre-occupied, whereas with this one, since it is to be offered up, he would be pre-occupied. Now as to the question itself whether we fear the possibility of an offense, Tannas are disputing. For it was taught in one [Baraitha]: A Paschal lamb which was not offered up on the first Passover may be offered up on the second,¹⁴ and if not offered up on the second, may be offered up in the following year. And another [Baraitha] taught: It must not be offered up. Is it not then that they dispute touching [the fear of] an offense? —

No, all agree we are not apprehensive as to a possible offense; but here they are disputing in the matter at issue between Rabbi and the Sages,¹⁵ and there is no contradiction [between the two Baraithas]; the one is in accord with Rabbi, the other with the Rabbis [Sages].¹⁶ — But was it not taught: The same applies to the money?¹⁷ Hence rather infer from here that they are disputing in regard to the fear of the offense. — That inference is accepted.

MISHNAH. HE THEN CAME TO THE SCAPEGOAT AND LAID HIS TWO HANDS UPON IT AND HE MADE CONFESSION. AND THUS WOULD HE SAY: I BESEECH THEE, O LORD, THY PEOPLE THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL HAVE FAILED, COMMITTED INIQUITY AND

TRANSGRESSED BEFORE THEE. I BESEECH THEE, O LORD, ATONE¹⁸ THE FAILURES, THE INIQUITIES AND THE TRANSGRESSIONS WHICH THY PEOPLE, THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL, HAVE FAILED, COMMITTED AND TRANSGRESSED BEFORE THEE, AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES, THY SERVANT, TO SAY: FOR ON THIS DAY SHALL ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU, TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD. AND WHEN THE PRIESTS AND THE PEOPLE STANDING IN THE TEMPLE COURT HEARD THE FULLY-PRONOUNCED NAME COME FORTH FROM THE MOUTH OF THE HIGH PRIEST, THEY BENT THEIR KNEES, BOWED DOWN, FELL ON THEIR FACES AND CALLED OUT: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM ‘FOR EVER AND EVER. THEY HANDED IT OVER TO HIM WHO WAS TO LEAD IT AWAY. ALL WERE PERMITTED TO LEAD IT AWAY,¹⁹ BUT THE PRIESTS MADE IT A DEFINITE RULE NOT TO PERMIT AN ISRAELITE²⁰ TO LEAD IT AWAY. R. JOSE SAID: IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT ARSELA OF SEPPHORIS LED IT AWAY, ALTHOUGH HE WAS AN ISRAELITE. AND THEY MADE A CAUSEWAY FOR HIM BECAUSE OF THE BABYLONIANS, WHO WOULD PULL ITS HAIR, SHOUTING TO IT: ‘TAKE²¹ AND GO FORTH, TAKE AND GO FORTH’.

GEMARA. But he did not say: ‘The sons of Aaron, thy holy people’; which Tanna is of this opinion? — R. Jeremiah said: This is not in accord with R. Judah, for if it were in accord with R. Judah, surely he said: They, too, obtain atonement from the scapegoat?²² Abaye said: You might even say that it is in accord with R. Judah: Are the priests not included in ‘Thy people Israel’?

Our Rabbis taught: A man²³ [means] to declare a non-priest eligible;²⁴ appointed²³

(1) According to Rabbi, the count always goes according to the number of the days of the solar year, independent as to intercalation or non-intercalation of the extra month, so that the sin-

YOMA - 62a-88a

offering need not necessarily have passed its first year by the next Day of Atonement.

(2) And not to die.

(3) Pes. 97a.

(4) Which no priest is permitted to enter, i.e., the animal must not be slaughtered.

(5) Lit., 'stumbling-block'.

(6) That the fear of an offense is taken into consideration.

(7) V. Lev. XXVII, 3.

(8) Ibid. 28.

(9) After the destruction of the Temple, things consecrated, valued or devoted in favor of it, since not available for the Sanctuary to which they are properly assigned, must be destroyed.

(10) This is soon explained.

(11) [So MS.M. Cur. edd.: he should take the value of the benefit derived from them to the Salt Sea.]

(12) If the offense lies in the possibility that it may be offered up instead of being left to pasture until it acquires a blemish, the same apprehension would be justified with regard to any other animal which is ruled to be left to pasture.

(13) In other cases where animals are ruled to be left to pasture, these animals themselves will never become fit for offering, since they are left to pasture till they become blemished, when they are sold and with the proceeds another animal is bought for offering. Hence he would not be preoccupied with the thought of offering them, as in the case of the animal which is to be offered up on the next Day of Atonement and which he might thus offer up before.

(14) The second Passover for those who were far away or ritually unclean on the fourteenth of Nisan. To some such person this lamb may be sold. V. Num. IX, 9.

(15) As supra 65b, whether a complete year denotes a solar year or exactly twelve months.

(16) [According to Rabbi it would perforce be past its first year on the following Passover, when it would be disqualified for a Paschal lamb, hence it cannot be offered in the coming year; whereas, according to the Sages, it might still be under a year, hence it may be retained for the coming year.]

(17) [I.e., the same dispute which is found in connection with the Paschal lamb applies also to money which had been set aside for one year's Paschal lamb, whether it may be used for the next year. Now in the case of money, surely the point at issue between Rabbi and the Sages does not apply.]

(18) Lit., 'wipe off'.

(19) Var. lec., high priests.

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

(21) Sc. our sins.

(22) V. supra 61a.

(23) V. Lev. XVI, 21.

(24) For taking away the scapegoat into the wilderness.

Yoma 66b

[means] that he must be prepared [from the previous day]; 'appointed' [means] that [it is to send away]; even on the Sabbath 'appointed', even if in a state of uncleanness.¹ [You say]: 'Man [means] to declare a non-priest eligible', but that is obvious? — You might have thought that since [the term] Kapparah [atonement] is written in connection therewith,² therefore he informs us [as above]. — 'Appointed', i.e., even on the Sabbath. What does this teach?³ —

R. Shesheth said: It is to say that if it is sick, he may make it ride on his shoulder. According to whose view is this? Not according to R. Nathan, for R. Nathan said: A living being carries itself!⁴ — You may even say that this is in accord with R. Nathan: when it is sick it is different,⁵ however.

Rafram said: This is to say that [the laws of] 'Erub⁶ and carrying out⁷ apply on Sabbath, but do not apply on the Day of Atonement.⁸ 'Appointed', i.e., even in a state of uncleanness.⁹ What does that teach? — R. Shesheth said: It is to say that if he who is to carry it away became unclean, he may enter in impurity the Temple Court¹⁰ and carry it away.

R. Eliezer was asked: What about his carrying it on his shoulder? — He said: He could carry you and me.¹¹ If he who is to take it away became sick, may he send it away through someone else? — He said: I wish to keep well, I and you!¹² If he pushed it down and it did not die, must he go down after it and kill it? — He said to them: So perish all Thine enemies, O Lord.¹³ But the Sages say: If it became sick, he may load it on his shoulder; if he pushed it down and it did not die, he shall go down and kill it.

YOMA - 62a-88a

They asked R. Eliezer: 'What about So-and-so¹⁴ in the world to come?' — He replied, 'Have you asked me only about this one?'¹⁵ 'May one save the lamb from the lion?' — He said to them: 'Have you asked me only about the lamb?'¹⁵ 'May one save the shepherd from the lion?' — He said to them: 'Have you asked me only about the shepherd?'¹⁶ 'May a Mamzer¹⁷ inherit?' — [He replied]: 'May he marry the wife of his brother who died without issue?'¹⁸ 'May one whitewash his house?'¹⁹ — [He replied]: 'May one whitewash his grave?' — [His evasion was due] not to his desire to divert them with words [counter-questions], but because he never said anything that he had not heard from his teacher.²⁰

A wise woman asked R. Eliezer: Since with regard to the offense with the golden calf all were evenly associated, why was not the penalty of death the same?²¹ — He answered her: There is no wisdom in woman except with the distaff. Thus also does Scripture say: And all the women that were wise-hearted did spin with their hands.²²

It is stated: Rab and Levi are disputing in the matter. One said: Whosoever sacrificed and burned incense died by the sword; whosoever embraced and kissed [the calf] died the death [at the hands of Heaven];²³ whosoever rejoiced in his heart died of dropsy. The other said: He who had sinned before witnesses and after receiving warning,²⁴ died by the sword; he who sinned before witnesses but without previous warning, by death; and he who sinned without witnesses and without previous warning, died of dropsy. Rab Judah said: The tribe of Levi did not participate in the idolatry, as it is said: Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp.²⁵

Rabina was sitting and reporting this teaching, whereupon the sons of R. Papa b. Abba objected to Rabina: Who said of his father and of his mother: 'I have not seen him, etc.'?²⁶ — 'His father', that is the father of his mother, an Israelite; 'brother', the

brother of his mother, an Israelite; 'sons', that means the sons of his daughter [which she had] from an Israelite.

AND THEY MADE A CAUSEWAY FOR HIM, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: These were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, and because they [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians,²⁷ they called them [the Alexandrians] by their [the Babylonians'] name. It was taught: R. Judah said, They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians. — R. Jose said to him: May your mind be relieved even as you have relieved my mind!²⁸

MISHNAH. SOME OF THE NOBILITY OF JERUSALEM USED TO GO WITH HIM UP TO THE FIRST BOOTH. THERE WERE TEN BOOTHS FROM JERUSALEM TO THE ZOK²⁹

- (1) This is soon explained.
- (2) And this term as a rule occurs only in connection with a rite performed by priests.
- (3) What Sabbath desecration could the taking of the scapegoat to the wilderness involve?
- (4) V. Shab. 90a. Hence no transgression would be involved in carrying it.
- (5) A sick being, unable to 'carry itself', might logically be assumed to be an exception to R. Nathan's rule.
- (6) v. Glos.
- (7) I.e., transferring an object from public to private grounds and vice versa, both of which were prohibited on the Sabbath.
- (8) Since the word 'anointed' is here interpreted as referring to the suspension of the Sabbath law, the inference is justified that no such prohibition existed on the Day of Atonement, or else it would be illogical to say that a special statement permits the suspension of these laws on the Day of Atonement which fell on a Sabbath, since they would be operative on any Day of Atonement, even if it fell on a weekday. The laws of 'carrying out' and 'Erub belong together, hence strictly speaking, the Gemara need not have mentioned both; when one is applied, the other automatically applies too.
- (9) How should the laws on Levitical uncleanness apply to the taking of the scapegoat to the wilderness?
- (10) When he receives it from the high priest.
- (11) R. Eliezer made a point of not answering any question concerning which he had not received a

YOMA - 62a-88a

definite tradition or interpretation from his teachers.

(12) This, too, is an evasive answer: You and I are well, hope to keep well, why trouble about such hypothetical situations?

(13) Judg. V, 31.

(14) Peloni. It may have been a general question concerning 'John Doe', or it may refer to Solomon's (Rashi), or to Absalom's (R. Han.) regard for the Davidic Dynasty being responsible for the substitution of the vague Peloni. [Some see in Peloni a reference to Jesus, Finkelstein L. to Philo. Bokser, B.Z. Pharisaism in Transition pp. 18ff, rightly regards these identifications as hardly supported by any facts.]

(15) Ali his answers are evasive.

(16) Some see in the question about the shepherd a reference to David, who as lion (King) or as shepherd had taken the lamb (Bathsheba) from her husband. Others see the lamb in Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, whom the lion (David) sent to his death.

(17) May a bastard (the issue of a union forbidden under the penalty of extinction) inherit his father?

(18) Why don't you ask the whole question: How far does he participate in the rights and duties of normal Jews?

(19) May one whitewash one's house in spite of the fact that one ought to remain conscious all the time of the destruction of the Temple, etc.

(20) [V. Suk., Sonc. ed., p. 122. Bokser, op. cit. pp. 108f sees in these questions differences of opinion on important points of law. The question about sheep concerned the ban against cattle-raising which the Rabbis wished to enforce (v. B.M. 84b) and which R. Eliezer opposed as having no precedent in tradition. The questions relating to the Mamzer involved the imposition of certain discriminations against the Mamzer of which R. Eliezer did not approve, and similarly he refused to accept the prohibition of the other Rabbis of plastering one's house in sad remembrance of the destruction of the Temple, not finding any support for it in tradition].

(21) Scripture mentions three forms of penalties: Some died by the sword (Ex. XXXII, 27), others by the plague (ibid. 35), the rest by dropsy as the result of their drinking the water containing the gold dust, which Moses had offered them in expiation (ibid. 20).

(22) Ex. XXXV, 25.

(23) I.e., died by the plague.

(24) Penalty could be imposed only when the offense had been committed in the presence of two witnesses who accuse the defendant, after he had been warned as to the consequences of his offense.

(25) Ex. XXXII, 26. (cont.) and said: 'Whoso is on the Lord's side, let him come unto me'. And all the

sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.

(26) Deut. XXXIII, 9. Here seems scriptural proof that the Levites, in punishing the guilty, ignored relationships, such as father or mother, but executed punishment on all. Thus their relatives, other Levites, must have been guilty.

(27) This hatred caused them to look down upon the Babylonians as remiss in their religious duties, and to father upon them other people's wrongs.

(28) R. Jose was a Babylonian. He welcomes the interpretation, which freed his fellow-countrymen from the charge of such boorish conduct.

(29) Lit., 'the peak', the mountain top from which the scapegoat was precipitated. Also used to denote the precipice itself.

Yoma 67a

[A DISTANCE OF] NINETY RIS, SEVEN AND A HALF OF WHICH MAKE A MIL.¹ AT EVERY BOOTH THEY WOULD SAY TO HIM: HERE IS FOOD AND HERE IS WATER. THEY WENT WITH HIM FROM BOOTH TO BOOTH, EXCEPT THE LAST ONE.² FOR HE WOULD NOT GO WITH HIM UP TO THE ZOK,³ BUT STAND FROM AFAR, AND BEHOLD WHAT HE WAS DOING. WHAT DID HE DO? HE DIVIDED THE THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL, AND TIED ONE HALF TO THE ROCK, THE OTHER HALF BETWEEN ITS HORNS, AND PUSHED IT FROM BEHIND. AND IT WENT ROLLING DOWN AND BEFORE IT HAD REACHED HALF ITS WAY DOWN HILL IT WAS DASHED TO PIECES. HE CAME BACK AND SAT DOWN UNDER THE LAST BOOTH UNTIL IT GREW DARK. AND FROM WHEN ON DOES IT RENDER HIS GARMENTS UNCLEAR?⁴ FROM THE MOMENT HE HAS GONE OUTSIDE THE WALL OF JERUSALEM. R. SIMEON SAYS: FROM THE MOMENT HE PUSHES IT INTO THE ZOK.⁵

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: There were ten booths and twelve mils⁶ [distance] — this is the view of R. Meir. R. Judah says Nine booths and ten mils; R. Jose says: Five booths and ten mils. And they are all available by means of an 'Erub.⁷ R. Jose said: My son Eliezer suggested to me: As long as I have an 'Erub, two booths would do even for ten mils.⁸ With whose view will agree what was

YOMA - 62a-88a

taught: But not from the last booth, for nobody would go with him up to the Zok, but standing afar, would behold what he was doing? According to whom [is this]? According to R. Meir.⁹

AT EVERY BOOTH THEY WOULD SAY TO HIM: HERE IS FOOD AND WATER: A Tanna taught: Never did any one [who carried the goat away] find it necessary to use it, but¹⁰ [the reason of this provision is because] you cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has no bread in his basket.¹¹

WHAT DID HE DO? HE DIVIDED THE THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL: But let him tie the whole [thread] to the rock? — Since it is his duty [to complete his work with] the he-goat, perhaps the thread might become fast white, and he would be satisfied.¹² But let him tie the whole thread between its horns? — At times its head [in falling] is bent and he would not pay attention.¹³

Our Rabbis taught:¹⁴ In the beginning they would tie the thread of crimson wool on the entrance of the Ulam¹⁵ without: if it became white they rejoiced; if it did not become white, they were sad and ashamed. Thereupon they arranged to tie it to the entrance of the Ulam within. But they were still peeping through and if it became white, they rejoiced, whereas, if it did not become white, they grew sad and ashamed. Thereupon they arranged to tie one half to the rock and the other half between its horns.

R. Nahum b. Papa said in the name of R. Eleazar ha-Kappar: Originally they used to tie the thread of crimson wool to the entrance of the Ulam within, and as soon as the he-goat reached the wilderness, it turned white. Then they knew that the commandment concerning it had been fulfilled, as it is said: If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white wool.¹⁶

BEFORE IT HAD REACHED HALF ITS WAY DOWN HILL: The question was raised: As to those limbs [pieces] are they permitted for general use?¹⁷ Rab and Samuel are in dispute on this point, one saying: They are permitted, the other they are forbidden. The one who holds they are permitted [argues thus]:

(1) [So that ninety ris is the equivalent of twelve mils.]

(2) I.e., the one who accompanied him to the last booth, the one before the Zok.

(3) [Because according to calculation there was a distance of two mils between the last booth and the Zok which was beyond the walking limits of the Sabbath or Festivals.]

(4) V. Lev. XVI, 26.

(5) Cf. p. 312, n. 6.

(6) [V. n. 1. This allowed for one mil(=2000 cubits) the permissible walking distance between one booth and another and two mils from the last booth to the Zok].

(7) This 'Erub signified the transferring of one's abode to the place where certain foods were deposited, with the consequence that his movements on the Sabbath would be assumed to start from that abode and were permitted within 2000 cubits in every direction.

(8) Suppose some Jerusalemites deposited on the eve of the Day of Atonement some eatables at the end of the 2000 cubits which are the legal maximum for walking out of the city on the Sabbath. Then they are permitted to accompany the man appointed to take away the scapegoat a distance of 2000 more cubits (the maximum as from the present fictitious abode). The guard of other booths eight and four mils off Jerusalem could do the same, in every direction. Now one may go 2000 cubits with him from Jerusalem, where guards from the first booth join him up to the second and so on, until his destination is reached.

(9) According to R. Jose and R. Judah even the last reaches the Zok.

(10) V. supra 18b.

(11) The craving of him who lacks the opportunity to gratify it is much more intense than the craving of him who has such opportunity.

(12) If the thread should turn white suddenly before the goat had yet been hurled down, the appointed man might be so happy with the sign of forgiveness obtained as to neglect going through with the prescribed ceremony of pushing the he-goat downward, thus leaving the command unfulfilled.

(13) To the change in color, since the thread would be out of his sight.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(14) V. R.H. 31b.

(15) The Hall leading to the interior of the Temple.

(16) Isa. I, 18.

(17) I.e., may they e.g., be sold so that the profit therefrom be enjoyed. Hana'ah (general use) stands for any enjoyment except Akilah, eating for human consumption, therefore using it for profit, as a gift, etc.

Yoma 67b

For it is written: 'in the wilderness';¹ the one who holds they are forbidden [argues]: Because Scripture says: cut off.² But as for him who considers them forbidden, for what purpose does he use the word 'wilderness'? He needs it in accord with what was taught: 'Into the wilderness', 'to the wilderness', 'in the wilderness',³ that means to include Nob, Gibeon, and Shiloh and the Permanent House.⁴ And what does the other [teacher] do with 'cut off'? — He needs it, in accord with what was taught: Gezerah,⁵ [the term] 'Gezerah' means something that is 'cut off';⁶ another explanation: Gezerah means something that goes to pieces as it goes down; another interpretation: 'Gezerah'⁷ — perhaps you might say this is a vain thing? Therefore the text reads: I am the Lord, I have decreed⁷ it and you are not permitted to criticize it.

Raba said: The view of him who says they are permitted is more reasonable, for the Torah did not say 'Send away!' to create [possibility of] offense.⁸ Our Rabbis taught: Azazel — it should be hard and rough.⁹ One might have assumed that it is to be in inhabited land, therefore the text reads: 'In the wilderness'. But whence do we know that it [is to be in] a Zok?¹⁰ — Therefore the text reads: 'Cut off'.¹¹ Another [Baraita] taught: Azazel, i.e., the hardest of mountains, thus also does it say: And the mighty [Ele] of the land he took away.¹² The School of R. Ishmael taught: Azazel — [it was so called] because it obtains atonement for the affair of Uza and¹³ Aza'el.—

Our Rabbis taught: Mine ordinances shall ye do,¹⁴ i.e., such commandments which, if they

were not written [in Scripture], they should by right have been written and these are they: [the laws concerning] idolatry [star-worship], immorality and bloodshed, robbery and blasphemy. And My statutes shall ye keep,¹⁴ i.e., such commandments to which Satan objects, they are [those relating to] the putting on of sha'atnez,¹⁵ the halizah¹⁶ [performed] by a sister-in-law, the purification of the leper, and the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. And perhaps you might think these are vain things, therefore Scripture says: I am the Lord,¹⁴ i.e., I, the Lord have made it a statute and you have no right to criticize it.

FROM WHEN ON DOES IT RENDER HIS GARMENTS UNCLEAN? Our Rabbis taught: Only he who is to take the goat away renders his garments unclean, but he who sends the appointed man away¹⁷ does not render his garments unclean. One might have assumed that [he does so] as soon as he goes forth outside from the wall of the Temple court, therefore the text reads: He that letteth go.¹⁸ If [you derive from] 'he that letteth go' [one might infer that] only when he reaches Zok, therefore the text reads: 'And he that letteth go'.¹⁹ How then is it?

R. Judah says: As soon as he goes out of the walls of Jerusalem. R. Jose says: Azazel and wash [are written in close proximity] i.e., only when he reaches the Zok.

R. Simeon says: And he that letteth go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, i.e., he flings it down headlong and his garments become then unclean.

MISHNAH. HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] CAME TO THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WERE TO BE BURNT,²⁰ HE CUT THEM OPEN AND TOOK OUT THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS²¹ AND PUT THEM ON A TRAY, AND BURNT THEM UPON THE ALTAR. HE TWISTED THEM [THE BEASTS] AROUND CARRYING POLES AND BROUGHT THEM OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING. FROM

YOMA - 62a-88a

WHAT TIME DO THEY RENDER GARMENTS UNCLEAN?²² AFTER THEY HAVE GONE OUTSIDE THE WALL OF THE TEMPLE COURT. R. SIMEON SAYS: FROM THE MOMENT THE FIRE HAS TAKEN HOLD OF MOST OF THEM.

GEMARA. And he burnt them up? How could that thought arise in you?²³ — Rather say: To burn them [later] on the altar.

HE TWISTED THEM AROUND CARRYING POLES: R. JOHANAN SAID: SO IN THE FORM OF A NET-NETWORK. — A TANNA TAUGHT: HE DID NOT CUT THEM UP AS ONE CUTS UP THE FLESH OF A BURNT-OFFERING, BUT [HE LEFT] THE SKIN ON THE FLESH. WHENCE DO WE KNOW THIS? BECAUSE IT WAS TAUGHT:²⁴ RABBI SAID: IT IS SAID HERE: SKIN... FLESH... AND DUNG²⁵ AND IT IS SAID THERE: SKIN... FLESH... AND DUNG²⁶

(1) Lev. XVI, 22. This phrase is superfluous and comes to teach that just as the wilderness belongs to all so are the broken limbs of the he-goat it contains free for the use of all.

(2) Ibid. i.e., cut off from use, forbidden.

(3) Ibid. vv. 10, 21, 22.

(4) I.e., The Jerusalem Temple. The law applies to all these places.

(5) The Hebrew for the 'cut off'.

(6) I.e., something that rises steep, and not in a slope.

(7) The root meaning of the word is: cut off, guard. Thus: to institute a preventive measure, to enact a prohibition, to decree. All these root-meanings are here brought into play: It is 'cut off', hence descending precipitately. — It is cut, 'split', hence dashed in pieces. — It is a decree, divine, hence no criticism is allowed. (8) It would be an offense for an unwary man who found them to make use of these animals, and the Torah would place no such stumbling-block in the way of the average person. Hence the assumption that the members of the goat's body are free to be used.

(9) Az and el mean strong, irresistible, impudent.

(10) Zok means a mountain peak; it may be the special name of the mountain whence the he-goat was flung down.

(11) V. Supra p. 315, n. 7.

(12) Ezek. XVII, 13.

(13) This is a reference to the legend of fallen angels, based partly on Gen. VI, 4 and also on foreign lore. V. Jung, L. 'Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan literature'.

(14) Lev. XVIII, 4.

(15) A web of wool and linen, v. Deut. XXII, 11. All the laws mentioned in this group cannot be explained rationally; they are to be taken on faith, as the decree of God.

(16) The ceremony of taking off the brother-in-law's shoe, v. Deut. XXV, 5ff.

(17) I.e., those who accompany him.

(18) Lev. XVI, 26.

(19) [This argument is not clear. v. Rashi. Tosef. (Yoma III) reads: One might have assumed as soon as he goes forth outside the wall of the Temple court, therefore the text reads: 'For Azazel shall wash his clothes'. If 'for Azazel shall wash his clothes', I might [infer] only when he reaches Zok, etc.]

(20) Ibid. 27: And they shall burn in the fire their skin, and their flesh.

(21) Lev. IV, 8-10.

(22) V. Lev. XVI, 28.

(23) That took place much later.

(24) Zeb. 50a.

(25) Lev. XVI, 27.

(26) With reference to the bullock brought by an anointed priest for a sin-offering. Ibid. IV, 11.

Yoma 68a

just as above it is [carried forth] by means of cutting up and not by flaying, so here also it is by means of cutting up and not by flaying. Whence do we know it there? — For it was taught: 'And its inwards, and its dung, and he shall carry forth',¹ that teaches that he must carry it forth complete.²

One might have assumed that he must also burn it complete, therefore it is said here: 'with its head and with its legs' and there also it is said: its head and its legs,³ hence just as there it is [offered] by means of cutting up, so here also it is [carried forth] by means of cutting up.

One might assume that just as there it is by means of flaying, so here too, therefore the text reads: 'And its inwards and its dung'. How is this implied [in the Scriptural text]? — R. Papa answered: Just as the dung is enclosed in the inwards, so shall the flesh be enclosed in the skin.⁴

FROM WHAT TIME DO THEY RENDER GARMENTS UNCLEAN? [etc.] Our Rabbis

YOMA - 62a-88a

taught:⁵ [And the bullock and... the he-goat] he shall carry forth without the camp and they shall burn. There⁶ you allot them three⁷ camps and here only one camp?⁸ Then, why does it read: 'without the camp'? To tell you: As soon as he goes outside the one camp, the garments are rendered unclean. Whence do we know it there?⁹ — For it was taught:¹⁰ Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp,¹¹ i.e., without the three camps. —

You say: Without the three camps, but perhaps it means [only] 'without one camp'? When Scripture says, in connection with the bullock of the congregation: 'without the camp', whereas no such statement [of the text] is necessary, for it is said already: And he shall burn it as he burned the first bullock,¹² why then was 'without the camp' stated? To allot it another camp; and when Scripture says, Without the camp', in connection with the removal of the ashes whereas no such statement is necessary,¹³ since it is said already: Where the ashes are poured out,¹¹ this means to allot it a third camp. What does R. Simeon¹⁴ do 'Without the camp'?¹⁵

He needs it, as it was taught: R. Eliezer says: It is said here: 'Without the camp', and it is said there: Without the camp:¹⁶ Just as here it means outside the three camps, so does it mean there outside the three camps; and just as there it means to the east of Jerusalem,¹⁷ so does it mean here to the east of Jerusalem. But according to the view of the Sages where were they burnt? In accordance with what was taught: Where were they burnt?

(1) Lev. IV, 11-12.

(2) But the skin of the bullock, and all its flesh, with its head, and with its legs, and its inwards, and its dung, omitting no part of the animal's anatomy, hence justifies the statement that 'shall he carry forth', in the following verse, means he shall carry it forth complete.

(3) Lev. I, 8, 9. With reference to a burnt-offering of the flock.

(4) The skin of the bullock and all its flesh, occurring in the same passage with and its dung justifies the analogy: as the dung is enclosed, etc.

(5) Zeb. 105b.

(6) In connection with the bullock which the congregation or the anointed priest had to offer up as a sin-offering for an offense committed in error.

(7) Three camps, outside of which it is to be burnt, are 'allotted', designated in connection with it: the priestly camp, the camp of the Levites, the camp (the city) of Israel as shown infra.

(8) This bullock would apparently be burnt outside of the first camp (as 'without the camp' is mentioned only once). What difference justifies such discrimination? The difference would lie in the nature of the sacrifice, but there is practically no such difference, both being offered up inside and having the same regulation with regard to their burning and to their defiling of the garments.

(9) V. p. 318, n. 8.

(10) Sanh. 42b.

(11) Lev. IV, 12.

(12) Ibid. v. 21.

(13) V. ibid. VI, 4.

(14) Who, in our Mishnah, says: The garments are rendered unclean only from the moment the fire has taken hold of most parts of the sacrifice.

(15) Lev. XVI, 27.

(16) Num. XIX, 4. With reference to the red heifer.

(17) As indicated in the words towards the face of the tent of meeting, that is, he stands in the east facing the entrance of the Tabernacle to the west.

Yoma 68b

to the north¹ of Jerusalem, and without the three camps. R. Jose says: They were burnt in the place² where the ashes of the sacrifices were deposited. Raba said: Who is the Tanna disputing with R. Jose. It is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it was taught: [The bullock shall he carry forth to] where the ashes are poured out, and burn it, i.e., there shall be ashes [from before].³ R. Eliezer b. Jacob says: It means that its place shall be sloping. Said Abaye: Perhaps they are disputing as to whether the place shall be sloping!⁴ —

Our Rabbis taught: And he that burneth them⁵ i.e., he that burneth renders his garments unclean, but not he who kindles the fire, nor he who puts the wood in order. And who is 'He that burneth'? He who assists at

YOMA - 62a-88a

the time of the burning. One might have assumed that even after they have become ashes, they shall still defile the garments, therefore Scripture says: 'them, i.e., only as long as they [are 'they'] do they defile the garments, but not once they have become ashes.

R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon says: The bullock [itself] defiles the garments, but when the flesh is burnt to hard lumps it no more defiles the garments. What is the difference between the two views? — If it has been reduced to lumps of charred flesh.⁶

MISHNAH. THEY SAID TO THE HIGH PRIEST: THE HE-GOAT HAS REACHED THE WILDERNESS. AND WHENCE DID THEY KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS? THEY USED TO SET UP GUARDS AT STATIONS⁷ AND FROM THESE TOWELS WOULD BE WAVED, THUS WOULD THEY KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS. **R. JUDAH SAID:** BUT DID THEY NOT HAVE A GREAT SIGN? FROM JERUSALEM TO BETH HIDODO⁸ WAS THREE MILS. THEY COULD WALK A MIL, RETURN THE MIL, THEN TARRY THE TIME IT TAKES TO WALK A MIL, AND THUS KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS. — **R. ISHMAEL SAID:** BUT THEY HAD ANOTHER SIGN TOO: A THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL WAS TIED TO THE DOOR OF THE TEMPLE, AND WHEN THE HE-GOAT REACHED THE WILDERNESS THE THREAD TURNED WHITE, AS IT IS WRITTEN: THOUGH YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET THEY SHALL BE AS WHITE AS SNOW.⁹

GEMARA. Abaye said: One may infer from here that Beth Hidodo is in the wilderness and this is what he [the Tanna of the Mishnah] informs us: that R. Judah holds: As soon as the he-goat has reached the wilderness the commandment concerning it is fulfilled.

CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST [THEN] CAME TO READ. IF HE WISHED TO READ IN LINEN GARMENTS HE COULD DO SO, OTHERWISE HE WOULD READ IN HIS OWN WHITE VESTMENTS. THE SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANT¹⁰ WOULD TAKE A SCROLL OF THE LAW AND GIVE IT TO THE HEAD OF THE SYNAGOGUE,¹¹ AND THE HEAD OF THE SYNAGOGUE GAVE IT TO THE SEGAN,¹² AND THE SEGAN GAVE IT TO THE HIGH PRIEST, AND THE HIGH PRIEST STANDS AND RECEIVES IT, AND READS [THE SECTION] BEGINNING] 'AFTER THE DEATH...'¹³ AND 'HOWBEIT ON THE TENTH. . .' ¹⁴ THEN HE WOULD ROLL UP THE SCROLL OF THE LAW AND PUT IT IN HIS BOSOM AND SAY, 'MORE THAN WHAT I HAVE READ OUT BEFORE YOU IS WRITTEN HERE. AND ON THE TENTH...' ¹⁵ WHICH IS IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS HE RECITES BY HEART. THEN HE RECITES IN CONNECTION THEREWITH EIGHT BENEDICTIONS: FOR THE LAW, FOR THE TEMPLE SERVICE, FOR THE THANKSGIVING, FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS AND FOR THE TEMPLE SEPARATELY,¹⁶ AND FOR ISRAEL SEPARATELY AND FOR JERUSALEM SEPARATELY,¹⁷ FOR THE PRIESTS SEPARATELY AND FOR THE REST OF THE PRAYER.¹⁸ HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS DOES NOT SEE THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BEING BURNT, AND HE THAT SEES THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BEING BURNT DOES NOT SEE THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS: NOT THAT HE WAS NOT PERMITTED BUT BECAUSE THE DISTANCE APART WAS GREAT AND BOTH RITES WERE PERFORMED AT THE SAME TIME.

GEMARA. Since it states: IN HIS OWN WHITE VESTMENT,¹⁹ the inference is that reading is not a [Temple] service, and then it states: IF HE WISHED TO READ IN THE LINEN GARMENTS HE COULD DO SO,

YOMA - 62a-88a

from which one may learn that priestly garments may be enjoyed for private use!²⁰ Perhaps it is different with reading, because it is a necessity for the [Temple] service. For the question was raised: Are the priestly garments allowed for private use or not allowed! —

Come and hear: They would not sleep in the holy garments.²¹ Now they could not sleep in them, but they could eat in them!²² — Perhaps it is different with the eating, because it is necessary for the service, for it was taught: And they shall eat those things wherewith atonement was made;²³ this teaches that the priests eat and the owner obtains atonement. ‘They could not sleep in them’, but could they walk around in them? — In truth they might not walk around in them either

(1) For all the ceremony in connection with the sin-offering took place in the north.

(2) Before Beth ha-Deshen; when ashes have been deposited there it is Beth ha-Deshen. After they have been deposited it is Shefek ha-Deshen, the place where ashes have been poured out. (v. Rashi).

(3) V. Lev. IV, 12.

(4) I.e., the discussion may concern only the question as to whether the place must be sloping, and not whether ashes must have been deposited there first, R. Eliezer b. Jacob agreeing that ashes must have been deposited there before.

(5) Lev. XVI, 28.

(6) In this case the flesh has been dissolved without having become ashes. According to the first Tanna they render the garments unclean as long as they are not ashes, hence, in this case would still have this defiling effect. According to R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon it is only as long as they are bullocks, i.e., whole, that they render garments impure, whereas as charred flesh they are no more bullocks, hence do not affect the garments any more.

(7) Jastr. from Grk. Diadoche — relays, guard at stations, corrupted into dirchaot.

(8) Not definitely identified. J.T. Beth Horon, var. lec. Haroro, Beth Hadure.

(9) Isa. I, 18.

(10) [Hazzan. There is no certainty in regard either to the origin or rank of the Hazzan. Here he appears a second in rank to the Head of the Synagogue].

(11) [ראש הכנסת Identified with the **, the officer who administered the external affairs of the synagogue, v. Krauss, Synagogale Altertumer, p. 116ff. and J.E. II, 86.]

(12) V. Gos.

(13) Lev. XVI.

(14) Lev. XXIII, 26-32.

(15) Num. XXIX, 7-11.

(16) What ‘separately’ means is not clear. Some texts including, J.T. omit. V. also Sotah 40b.

(17) [J.T. and separate editions of the Mishnah omit ‘for Jerusalem’, which makes the number exactly eight].

(18) V. Gemara.

(19) Robe, garment; either the Greek stole, or a derivation of Talal, cf. Talith — Jast, and does not necessitate sacred priestly vestments.

(20) For private clean use, as against the possibility of impurity in sleep.

(21) Tamid 25b.

(22) Although eating is not part of the service, it is permissible for priests to eat in their official garments.

(23) Ex. XXIX, 23.

Yoma 69a

but it is necessary [to make special mention of sleep] on account of the last clause:¹ they may take them off, fold them, and put them under the head. ‘They may take them off, fold them, and put them under the head’! You may infer, then, hence that priestly garments may be enjoyed for private use? —

R. Papa said: Do not say, ‘Under their heads’, but rather say, ‘Next to their heads’. R. Mesharsheya said: You may infer, thence, that one may keep the Tefillin next to oneself whilst asleep. It is also logical that [the meaning here is] next to their heads’. For if the thought should arise in you that [it means] ‘under their heads’, surely you ought to derive [the prohibition of that] on account of the mixed texture [of wool and linen], for among [the garments which consisted of a mixed texture] is also the girdle, so that even if the private enjoyment [of priestly garments] is permitted, surely here he is deriving benefit from a mixed texture! — That will be right according to the view that the girdle of the high priest [on the Day of Atonement] is identical with the girdle of the

YOMA - 62a-88a

common priest during the rest of the year; but what can be said according to the view that the girdle of the high priest is not identical with that of the commoner?² —

And if you were to say mixed textures are forbidden only for wearing and putting on, but not for lying on, surely was it not taught: Neither shall there come upon thee,³ i.e., but you may spread it under you; but the Sages declare that this too is forbidden, because a fringe [of the mattress, etc.] might wind itself round the flesh. And if you were to say: Something was placed in between, but did not R. Simeon b. Pazzi in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi say on the authority of Rabbi, in the name of the Holy Community of Jerusalem: Even if there were ten mattress covers, one on top of the other, with mixed textures under them, it would still be forbidden to sleep on them. Rather, therefore, must you say [the meaning is]: ‘Next to their heads’. This is conclusive.

R. Ashi said: In reality, read: ‘Under their heads’. [And as to the question]² But he would enjoy mixed textures? [the answer is], Priestly garments are stiff, for even so did R. Huna, son of R. Joshua say: The shrunk felt-cloth of Naresh⁴ is permitted.⁵

Come and hear: As to priestly garments, it is forbidden to go out in them in the province,⁶ but in the Sanctuary whether during or outside the time of the service, it is permitted to wear them, because priestly garments are permitted for private use. This is conclusive. But in the province [it is] not [permitted]? Surely it was taught: The twenty-fifth of Tebeth is the day of Mount Gerizim,⁷ on which no mourning is permitted. It is the day on which the Cutheans demanded the House of our God from Alexander the Macedonian so as to destroy it, and he had given them the permission, whereupon some people came and informed Simeon the Just.⁸ What did the latter do? He put on his priestly garments, robed himself in priestly garments, some of the noblemen of Israel went with him

carrying fiery torches in their hands, they walked all the night, some walking on one side and others on the other side, until the dawn rose. When the dawn rose he [Alexander] said to them: Who are these [the Samaritans]?

They answered: The Jews who rebelled against you. As he reached Antipatris,⁹ the sun having shone forth, they met. When he saw Simeon the Just, he descended from his carriage and bowed down before him. They said to him: A great king like yourself should bow down before this Jew? He answered: His image it is which wins for me in all my battles. He said to them: What have you come for? They said: Is it possible that star-worshippers should mislead you to destroy the House wherein prayers are said for you and your kingdom that it be never destroyed! He said to them: Who are these?

They said to him: These are Cutheans who stand before you. He said: They are delivered into your hand. At once they perforated their heels, tied them to the tails of their horses and dragged them over thorns and thistles, until they came to Mount Gerizim, which they plowed and planted with vetch, even as they had planned to do with the House of God. And that day they made a festive day.¹⁰ If you like say: They were fit to be priestly garments, or, if you like, say: It is time to work for the Lord: they have made void Thy law.¹¹

THE SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANT WOULD TAKE A SCROLL OF THE LAW. One may infer from here that one may show honor to the disciple in the presence of his master?¹² — Abaye said: It is all done for the sake of the high priest.¹³

AND THE HIGH PRIEST STANDS. From this you can infer that he was sitting before, but surely we have learnt:¹⁴

(1) Which permits the sleeping on them, independent of any fear that impurity may occur

YOMA - 62a-88a

in the sleep, since the garments were taken off the body.

(2) According to the first view both are of linen, without any mixture, hence may be worn. But according to the second view, the commoner did wear a different kind of belt, made up of mixed texture, v. supra 6a notes, hence the difficulty.

(3) Lev. XIX, 19.

(4) Near Sura.

(5) That felt-cloth was so hard that one could not have worn a garment of that material. The prohibition of mixed texture, however, applies only to such material as may be worn as garments and warm the body.

(6) I.e., outside the Temple.

(7) On which the Samaritans (Cutheans) had their Temple.

(8) One of the surviving members of the Great Synod, v. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 2, n. 1.

(9) Antipatris, in Judah, on the way from Jerusalem to Caesarea, was built by King Herod and called after his father, Antipater.

(10) Prohibiting every public mourning. This shows that Simeon wore the priestly garments outside Jerusalem.

(11) Ps. CXIX, 126. [In Megillath Ta'anith the day of the destruction of the Temple on Mount Gerizim is 21st Kislev. According to Josephus it was destroyed by Hyrcanus in the year 128 B.C.E. For the literature on the subject v. Lichtenstein, H., HUCA, vol. VIII-IX, p. 288].

(12) The question is, shall we consider this an answer to the problem propounded elsewhere and not answered (B.B 119b; Sotah 40b) as to whether it is legitimate to show honor to a subordinate in the presence of his superior, (disciple in presence of master). The solution, inferred from here, would be the affirmative.

(13) I.e., what happens here serves but to indicate how many subordinates the high priest has, i.e., how exalted his position is. The problem is still unsolved as to a situation in which the honor would be intended exclusively for the benefit of the disciple or subordinate.

(14) [Read with var. lec.: 'A Master said', as what follows is no Mishnah].

Yoma 69b

Nobody may sit down in the [Temple] Court except the kings of the house of David alone, as it is said: Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord?¹ — It is as R. Hisda had explained [elsewhere]: In the women's court, so also here. 'In the women's court'. — Where was R. Hisda's statement made? —

In connection with the following: An objection was raised, it was taught: Where did they read therein?² In the Temple. R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: On the Temple Mount, as it is said: And he read therein before the broad place that was before the water gate;³ and R. Hisda said: In the women's court.⁴ And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God.⁵ What does 'great' imply? —

R. Joseph said in the name of Rab: He magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name.⁶ R. Giddal said: [He recited], Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting even to everlasting.⁷ Said Abaye to R. Dimi: But perhaps it means that he magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name? — He answered: One does not pronounce the Ineffable Name outside [the limits of the Temple]. But may one not? Is it not written: And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose. [. . . and Ezra praised the great God].⁸ And R. Giddal [commenting thereupon] said: He magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name?—That was a decision in an emergency.⁹ And [they] cried with a great [loud] voice unto the Lord, their God.¹⁰ What did they cry? —

Woe, woe, it is he¹¹ who has destroyed the Sanctuary, burnt the Temple, killed all the righteous, driven all Israel into exile, and is still dancing around among us! Thou hast surely given him to us so that we may receive reward through him.¹² We want neither him, nor reward through him! Thereupon a tablet fell down from heaven for them, whereupon the word 'truth'¹³ was inscribed. (R. Hanina said: One may learn therefrom that the seal of the Holy One, blessed be He, is truth). They ordered a fast of three days and three nights, whereupon he¹¹ was surrendered to them. He came forth from the Holy of Holies like a young fiery lion. Thereupon the Prophet said to Israel: This is the evil desire of idolatry, as it is said: And he said: This is wickedness.¹⁴ As they took hold of him a hair of his beard fell out, he raised his voice and it

YOMA - 62a-88a

went [was audible] four hundred parasangs. Thereupon they said: How shall we act? Perhaps, God forbid, they might have mercy upon him from heaven! —

The prophet said unto them: Cast him into a leaden pot, closing its opening with lead. Because lead absorbs the voice, as it is said: And he said: This is wickedness. And he cast her down into the midst of the measure, and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof.¹⁴ They said: Since this is a time of Grace, let us pray for mercy for the Tempter to evil.¹⁵ They prayed for mercy, and he was handed over to them. He said to them: Realize that if you kill him, the world goes down. They imprisoned him for three days, then looked in the whole land of Israel for a fresh egg and could not find it.¹⁶ Thereupon they said: What shall we do now? Shall we kill him? The world would then go down. Shall we beg for half-mercy?¹⁷ They do not grant ‘halves’ in heaven.¹⁷ They put out his eyes and let him go. It helped inasmuch as he no more entices men to commit incest.¹⁸ In the West [Palestine] they taught it thus: R. Giddal said: [And Ezra praised...the] great [God]:¹⁹ i.e., he magnified Him by pronouncing the Ineffable Name.

R. Mattena said: He said: The great, the mighty, and the awful God.²⁰ The interpretation of R. Mattena seems to agree with what R. Joshua b. Levi said: For R. Joshua b. Levi said: Why were they called men of the Great Synod? Because they restored the crown of the divine attributes to its ancient completeness.²¹ [For] Moses had come and said: The great God, the mighty, and the awful.²² Then Jeremiah came and said: Aliens are destroying²³ His Temple. Where are, then, His awful deeds? Hence he omitted²⁴ [the attribute] the ‘awful’. Daniel came and said: Aliens are enslaving his sons. Where are His mighty deeds? Hence he omitted the word²⁵ ‘mighty’. But they came and said: On the contrary! Therein lie His mighty deeds that He suppresses His wrath,²⁶ that He extends long-suffering to the wicked.

Therein lie His awful powers: For but for the fear of Him, how could one [single] nation persist among the [many] nations! But how could [the earlier] Rabbis²⁷ abolish something established by Moses? R. Eleazar said: Since they knew that the Holy One, blessed be He, insists on truth, they would not ascribe false [things] to Him.²⁸

AND HE READ: AFTER THE DEATH’ AND ‘HOWBEIT ON THE TENTH DAY’: A question was raised: One may skip in reading from the Prophets, but one may not skip in reading from the Torah!²⁹ — That is no difficulty: The one [prohibition] applies where [the passage skipped is] sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter, the other where it is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter.³⁰ — But surely it is in connection therewith that it was taught: One may skip in reading from the Prophets, but one may not skip in reading from the Torah; and how much may be skipped [in the Prophets]? So much as is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter. This implies that in reading from the Torah one may not skip at all? —

Said Abaye: There is no difficulty: [The permission applies] here, where one theme is concerned, [the prohibition] there, where two themes are concerned.³¹ Thus also it was taught: One may skip in the reading from the Torah, if the theme be one and same, in reading from the Prophets, even if two themes be involved; in each case, however, only when it is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter. Nor may one skip from one Prophetic Book to another, but in case of one of the twelve Minor Prophets one may skip even [from one Book to another],

(1) I Chron. XVII, 16. Only the descendants of David who, through his son, built the Temple, are permitted to feel sufficiently at home there to be permitted to sit down in the Temple Court, as Scripture indicates.

(2) I.e., when any public reading took place in the Temple.

(3) Neh. VIII, 3. Ezra read the Law ‘in the presence of the men and the women’.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(4) [The text from 'it is as R. Hisda explained' to this point is in disorder. MS.M. reads: 'Said R. Hisda, In the women's court. An objection was raised: Where did they read therein? In the (Temple) Court... water-gate? — Said R. Hisda, In the women's court'. Ronsburg (Glosses) deletes 'An objection was raised'. In any case our present text seems to be a conflation of two readings].

(5) Neh. VIII, 6.

(6) [Shem ha-Meforash. Lit., 'the Distinguished Name' synonymous with the Shem ha-Meyuhad 'the Unique Name', and generally held identical with the Tetragrammaton uttered as written, v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 408, n. I].

(7) I Chron. XVI, 36.

(8) Neh. VIII, 4-6.

(9) Not to be taken as precedent. Lit. 'a decision for the moment'.

(10) Ibid. IX, 4. [Here too the text is in disorder as the verse has no connection with the preceding verse to which it is adduced in explanation of the emergency referred to, the incident in the first verse having taken place on the first of the seventh month, whilst that of the second verse on the twenty-fourth. Var. lec. accordingly omit the first quotations from ibid. VIII, 4 and substitute in its place the second verse ibid. IX, 4; v. Bah.]

(11) The evil desire, tempter of idolatry.

(12) For resisting him successfully Israel would be rewarded.

(13) I.e., I agree with you: you spoke the truth.

(14) Zech. V, 8.

(15) The evil desire, for idolatry is also the evil desire for immorality. The two were found to go hand in hand.

(16) Whereas there is no good in idolatry there is at least some good in the desire for sex indulgence. Perpetuation of the race depends upon it. So does human food. The people who found themselves with the opportunity to destroy the temptation of flesh-love discovered that, when the genius of sex-love is cancelled, no eggs are available.

(17) To ask that temptation or the tempter should live, but not tempt, is to ask a thing that Heaven will not grant. The tempter lives to tempt. But by depriving its flame of its major glare, by keeping it within lawful limits, one promotes domesticity and prevents depravity.

(18) Lit., 'against relatives'.

(19) [On the variant given supra p. 327. n. 6, the reference is to 'great' mentioned in Neh. IX, 4.]

(20) Ibid. 32.

(21) The crown, I.e., the praise of the Lord. By re-embodiment of the attributes, which Jeremiah and Daniel had omitted.

(22) Deut. X, 17.

(23) Or, revel in.

(24) In his prayer, Jer. XXXII, 17f.

(25) In his prayer, Dan. IX, 4ff.

(26) So MS.M. cur. edd. He subdues his inclination.

(27) Jeremiah, Daniel.

(28) Since to them the circumstances indicated that He desired to hide His mighty or awful deeds.

(29) Meg. 24a.

(30) The interpreter would follow immediately the reader. If the rolling did not involve so much time that, at the end of his interpretation of the passage just read, the interpreter would have to stop to await the reading of the new Hebrew passage, well and good. For to keep the congregation waiting for the continuation of the service is unseemly. But 'Howbeit on the tenth day' is so near Lev. XVI, that before the interpreter would have concluded his Aramaic interpretation of the last Hebrew passage, the new passage would have been started and read, for him to interpret without loss of time.

(31) This distinction is not technical, but pedagogical. If both passages although near — so that the interpreter need not keep the congregation waiting — deal with two subjects, one shall not skip from one to another, because closer attention is necessary for an understanding of the laws of the Torah. But where one subject only is involved, as in the reading on the Day of Atonement, such skipping is permitted. Meg. 24a.

Yoma 70a

provided one does not skip from the end of the Book to its beginning.

THEN HE WOULD ROLL UP THE SCROLL OF THE LAW, etc.: Why all that?1 — So as not to discredit the scroll of the Law.2

AND ON THE TENTH, WHICH IS IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS, HE RECITED BY HEART: Why that? Let him roll up [the scroll] and read from it [again]? — R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said in the name of R. Shesheth: Because it is not proper to roll up a scroll of the Law before the community, because of respect for the community.3 Then one should bring another scroll and read therefrom? — R. Huna, son of R. Judah said: Because it would discredit the first [scroll]. Resh Lakish said: Because of an unnecessary blessing.4 But we do take into consideration [the reason that it would] discredit [the first scroll]? Has not R. Isaac, the Smith, said: If the beginning of the month of Tebeth falls on

YOMA - 62a-88a

the Sabbath, one brings three scrolls of the Torah, and reads from one about the affairs of the day,⁵ in the second about the new moon, in the third about Hanukkah?⁶ — Three men [reading] from three scrolls do not imply a discredit [for the first and second scroll], one man reading from two scrolls does.⁷

THEREUPON HE PRONOUNCED EIGHT BLESSINGS: Our Rabbis taught: For the Torah, as one pronounces it in the Synagogue;⁸ for the Temple service; for the thanksgiving;⁹ for the forgiving of iniquity, as usual;¹⁰ for the Sanctuary separately; for the priest separately; for Israel separately; and for the rest of the prayer.

Our Rabbis taught: The rest of the prayer: [Accept my] song, petition, supplication before Thee for Thy people Israel, which are in need of salvation.' He would conclude with: '[Blessed art Thou, O Lord] who hearkenest unto prayer.' Thereupon each would bring a scroll of the Torah from his house and read therefrom, in order to show the multitude its beauty.¹¹

HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST... NOT THAT IT WAS NOT PERMITTED, etc.: That is self-evident? — You might have thought as Resh Lakish does: For Resh Lakish said: One must not permit a Mizwah to pass by unnoticed; and what Mizwah is there here? In the multitude of the people is the king's glory.¹² Therefore we are informed¹³ [that it was permitted].

MISHNAH. IF HE READ IN THE GARMENTS OF LINEN, HE WOULD THEN SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIP OFF HIS CLOTHES, GO DOWN AND IMMERSE HIMSELF, COME UP AND DRY HIMSELF. THE GOLDEN VESTMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM, HE PUT THEM ON, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, WENT OUT, OFFERED UP HIS OWN RAM AND THE RAM OF THE PEOPLE,¹⁴ AND THE SEVEN

UNBLEMISHED, ONE-YEAR-OLD-LAMBS.¹⁵ THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER.

R. AKIBA SAID: THESE WERE OFFERED UP TOGETHER WITH THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE MORNING, WHEREAS THE BULLOCK FOR THE WHOLE-OFFERING¹⁵ AND THE HE-GOAT WHICH IS OFFERED UP OUTSIDE¹⁶ WERE OFFERED UP TOGETHER WITH THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE AFTERNOON. HE THEN SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIPPED OFF HIS CLOTHES, WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. THE WHITE VESTMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM, HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. THEN HE WOULD GO IN TO BRING OUT THE LADLE AND THE FIRE-PAN. HE WOULD SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIP OFF HIS CLOTHES, GO DOWN AND IMMERSE HIMSELF, COME UP AND DRY HIMSELF. THE GOLDEN GARMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM. HE PUT THEM ON, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, AND WENT IN TO BURN UP THE AFTERNOON INCENSE, AND TO TRIM THE LAMPS. HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET AND STRIPPED. THEN HE WENT DOWN, IMMERSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. THEY WOULD THEN BRING TO HIM HIS OWN GARMENTS, HE PUT THEM ON. THEY WOULD ACCOMPANY HIM TO HIS HOUSE. HE WOULD ARRANGE FOR A DAY OF FESTIVITY FOR HIS FRIENDS WHENEVER HE HAD COME FORTH FROM THE SANCTUARY IN PEACE.

GEMARA. The question was raised: How does he [R. Akiba] mean: They [the seven lambs] were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the morning, whereas the bullock for the whole-offering and the he-goat which is offered up outside were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the afternoon; or did he mean, perhaps, this: they were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the morning and together also with them the bullock for the whole-

YOMA - 62a-88a

offering, whereas the he-goat which is offered up outside is offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the afternoon?¹⁷ Furthermore, when, according to R. Eliezer who omits reference to him, is the bullock for the whole-offering being sacrificed? Furthermore, according to both R. Eliezer and R. Akiba, when are the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering¹⁸ smoked? —

Raba said: You have no properly arranged order [of the service] except you adopt either the view of R. Eliezer, as taught in the School of Samuel, or the view of R. Akiba as reported in the Tosefta. For the School of Samuel taught: R. Eliezer said, He went forth, prepared his own ram, and the ram of the people and the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering, but the bullock for the whole-offering and the seven lambs, and the he-goat that was offered up outside were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the afternoon. What is the teaching of R. Akiba as recorded in the Tosefta?¹⁹ —

For it was taught: R. Akiba said, The bullock for the whole-offering, and the seven lambs were offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning, as it is said: [Ye shall offer these] beside the burnt-offering of the morning which is for a continual burnt-offering.²⁰ After that the service of the day

- (1) Why was it necessary for him to say: More than I have read before you is written here?
- (2) His reciting by heart may suggest to the congregation that the passage in question is missing from the scroll.
- (3) Whom one should not keep waiting for the continuation of the service.
- (4) Any unnecessary mention of His name is a transgression of the third command, wherefore in doubtful circumstances a blessing should rather be unpronounced than repeated. A new scroll would require a new blessing and is therefore to be avoided, as leading to an unnecessary, i.e., unlawful mention of His name.
- (5) The portion of the Torah, due to be read on that Sabbath, one of the fifty-two Sabbaths of the year, to each of which is apportioned a Sidrah from the Pentateuch.
- (6) V. Meg. 29b.

(7) The suggestion that one of the scrolls is defective is more reasonable in the case of one and the same person reading from two, than in the case of three different persons, each of whom reads his portion from one special scroll.

(8) V. P.B. p. 147.

(9) Op. cit. p. 50ff.

(10) As we have it in the Day of Atonement Liturgy.

(11) To 'adorn oneself' before Him in the performance of His commandments, i.e., to perform them in a manner aesthetically satisfactory is a duty which our Rabbis derived from Ex. XV, 2: He is my God and I will glorify Him. In pursuit of that ideal, a pious Jew would build his tabernacle in most careful and beautiful form, would have his scroll written by excellent scribes, would have his prayer shawl adorned, or made from costly wool or silk. To show his scroll to the people would be an exhibition of his natural pride in that precious possession.

(12) Prov. XIV, 28. Consequently it might be thought that one must not depart from witnessing one rite in favor of the other.

(13) That it is permitted to pass by a Mizwah unnoticed, if one is engaged in the performance of another. The prohibition to ignore the opportunity of performing a Mizwah applies only when one is not engaged, or about to be engaged, in another good deed.

(14) Lev. XVI, 24.

(15) Num. XXIX, 8.

(16) I.e., its blood was sprinkled on the outer altar. Ibid. v. 11.

(17) R. Akiba's statement is not clear enough. Either of the two interpretations are possible, dependent on where the end of the clause is placed.

(18) Mentioned in the Mishnah Supra 67b.

(19) A collection of oral laws, outside of the Mishnah, but considered authoritative. Several such collections are

mentioned and ascribed to various Sages.

(20) Num. XXVIII, 23.

Yoma 70b

and after that the he-goat which is to be offered outside, as it is said: One he-goat for a sin-offering, beside the sin-offering of atonement;¹ and after that his own ram and the ram of the people, after that the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering, and after that the Daily whole-offering of the afternoon. What is the reason for R. Eliezer's view? — He [the high priest] performs [the service] in accord with the order written [in

YOMA - 62a-88a

Scripture's text]: first he performs what Leviticus enjoins and then he performs what Numbers prescribes.² And R. Akiba? —

It is in accord with the reason he himself states: Beside the burnt-offering of the morning, which is for a continual burnt-offering which shows that the additional sacrifices were offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning. What does R. Eliezer do with the passage: Beside the sin-offering of atonement?³ He uses it [for the teaching]: Both⁴ atone for similar kinds of sins.⁵ R. Judah said in his [R. Akiba's] name: One⁶ is offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning, and six⁶ with the Daily whole-offering of the afternoon. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said in his name: Six were offered up with the Daily whole-offering of the morning and one together with the Daily whole-offering of the evening. What is [the reason] of the Rabbis?—

There are two verses written: It is written: 'Beside the burnt-offering of the morning'⁷ and it is written: 'And he come forth and offer his burnt-offering'.⁸ He therefore prepares one part with the one, and the other with the other. Wherein are they disputing?—

R. Judah holds: He offered one first, as it is written: 'Beside the burnt-offering of the morning', and then he performed the service of the day, because of a [possible] weakness of the high priest. R. Simeon b. Eleazar holds: Since he once started, he performs the service of the six, lest he be negligent [and will not offer them after the service of the day]. But as to the service due that day, he is zealous.⁹ All, at any rate, agree that it was but one ram;¹⁰ according to whose view is that? —

In accord with Rabbi. For it was taught: Rabbi says:¹¹ [The] 'one ram'¹² spoken of here is the same ram which is mentioned in the Book of Numbers.¹³ R. Eleazar son of R.

Simeon says: Two rams are involved, one mentioned here, the other in the Book of Numbers. What is the ground of Rabbi's view? Because Scripture says: 'One'. — And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon: 'One' here means, the [unique] outstanding one of his flock. And Rabbi? — He infers that from, and all your choice vows.¹⁴ And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — One refers to obligatory offerings, the other to voluntary ones and [a statement concerning both] is necessary.¹⁵

HE WOULD SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET. Our Rabbis taught: And Aaron shall come in to the tent of meeting.¹⁶ For what purpose does he enter? To fetch ladle and fire-pan

(1) Ibid. XXIX, 11.

(2) [Hence the additional offerings and the Daily afternoon whole-offering prescribed in Numbers are offered last].

(3) [Which implies that the he-goat offered outside is offered before his own ram and the ram of the people].

(4) [The he-goat whose blood is sprinkled outside and the he-goat, the sin-offering of the atonement, whose blood is sprinkled within].

(5) Sheb. 2a. Atonement is made by the he-goat whose blood is sprinkled outside, as well as by: Beside the sin-offering of atonement.

(6) Of the seven lambs.

(7) Which shows that the additional offerings were offered in conjunction with the Daily offering of the morning.

(8) Lev. XVI, 24. [How this implies that the additional offerings were to be offered in conjunction with the Daily offering of the evening is not clear. V. Strashun Glosses].

(9) His zeal for the service of the Day of Atonement will enable him to overcome any weakness that may supervene.

(10) Which is offered up on the Day of Atonement on behalf of the congregation.

(11) V. supra 3a.

(12) Lev. XVI, 5.

(13) Num. XXIX, 8.

(14) Deut. XII, 11.

(15) One could not have inferred the law that the choicest of animals have to be brought in the case of voluntary offerings from the obligatory ones, or vice versa, because to one view the former is preferable, more pleasing because spontaneous, whereas to the other the performance of one's duty takes preference. Hence two texts are necessary to include both kinds of offerings.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(16) Lev. XVI, 23.

Yoma 71a

for the whole portion here follows the order with the exception of this verse.¹ Why? — R. Hisda said: We have it on tradition² that the high priest underwent five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day. And if you were to say that they are recorded in their normal order, you would find but three immersions and six Sanctifications.³

To this R. Zera demurred: But perhaps⁴ he interrupted [the service of the day] with the he-goat that was to be offered up outside? — Abaye replied: Scripture said, 'He come forth and offer his burnt-offering'⁵ i.e., on his first coming forth he is to offer his burnt-offering, and that of the people.⁵

Raba said: Scripture said, And shall put off the linen garments [etc].⁶ . Now it was necessary [to add] 'which he put on', for can a man put off except what he had put on before? What then is the purpose of stating 'which he put on'? I.e., which he had put on before.⁷ —

To this Rabba son of R. Shila demurred: But perhaps he interrupted with the he-goat to be offered up outside? — Surely it is written: 'He come forth and offer, etc.' — But is the rest of the section written in accord with the actual order? Surely the verses say: And the fat of the sin-offering shall he make smoke on the altar,⁸ and then: And the bullock of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering,⁹ whereas we learned: HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS DOES NOT SEE THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BURNT,¹⁰ whereas the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering were smoked up afterwards?¹¹ — Read: From this passage on.¹² But what makes you find fault¹³ with the verses, why don't you find fault with the Mishnah rather? — Said Abaye: Scripture states: And he that letteth go... and he that burneth,¹⁴ i.e., just as the letting go takes place before, so does the burning.¹⁵ —

On the contrary! [Say:] Just as the burning takes place now,¹⁶ so does the letting go take place now!¹⁷ — 'And he that letteth go' implies [to that which was referred to] before.¹⁸

Raba said, Scripture says: [But the goat... for Azazel] shall be set alive.¹⁹ How long must it needs be set alive? Until the time of Atonement — Now when is the time of Atonement? At the time when the blood is sprinkled, not beyond it.²⁰ When he who was to take [the he-goat] away came back and met the high priest in the street, he would say to him: Sir high priest, we have fulfilled your request. If he met him in his house, he would say to him: We have fulfilled the request of Him Who grants life to all who live.

Rabbah said: When Rabbis in Pumbeditha would take leave of each other, they would say: May He Who grants life to all who live, grant you a long, happy, and right life! — I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living.²¹

Rab Judah said: That means the place of markets [public thoroughfare].²² For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they add to you.²³ But are there years, which are years of life, and years, which are not years of life? — R. Eleazar said: These are such years of man as have changed from evil to good.²⁴ Unto you, O men, I call.²⁵

R. Berekiah said: They are the disciples of the wise, who resemble women, and do mighty deeds like man.²⁶ R. Berekiah also said: If a man wishes to offer a libation upon the altar, let him fill the throat of the disciples of the wise with wine, as it is said: 'Unto you, O men, [Ishim]²⁷ I call'. Furthermore did R. Berekiah say: If a man sees that Torah ceases from his seed, let him marry the daughter of a disciple of the wise, as it is said: Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground

YOMA - 62a-88a

(1) The whole of chapter XVI of Leviticus describes the service of the Day of Atonement, as it actually took place, with the exception of v. 23 which, followed by the statement, And he shall bathe... and come forth, and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of his people (v. 24), would cause one to infer that the high priest had first entered to fetch the ladle and the fire-pan, and afterwards had offered up his burnt-offering and that of his people; whereas actually he fetched ladle and fire-pan after having offered up these burnt-offerings. V. Supra 32b notes.

(2) The Mishnah cites the traditional number of immersions and sanctifications, supra 19a, 30a and 31a. Every change of garments necessitated two sanctifications and one immersion.

(3) And if one were to assume that the order is exactly described also in vv. 23-24 i.e., that the offering of the two burnt-offerings did not interrupt the service of the Day of Atonement by taking place before the fetching of ladle and fire-pan, then only three changes of garments would be involved, viz., the offering of the continual sacrifice of the morning, performed in the golden garments, the service of the day including the fetching of ladle and fire-pan, in white garments, and the offering up of the two burnt-offerings and the rest of the service, in golden garments again, thus three changes involving but three immersions and six sanctifications. The Biblical account would thus contradict, or render impossible, the tradition as preserved in the Mishnah. To harmonize the two the interpretation is offered that in reality the offering of the burnt-offerings came between the service of the day and the fetching of censer and fire-pan, implying two more changes of garments; for the high priest would offer the two burnt-offerings in white garments, into which and from which he would change from and into the golden garments, so that the five traditional changes and immersions as well as the ten sanctifications traditionally reported are thus established: the continual offering of the morning, due in the golden garments, the service of the day in white ones, the offering up of the two burnt-offerings in the golden garments, the fetching of censer and fire-pan in the white ones, and finally, the additional sacrifices and the continual offering of the evening, in the golden ones.

(4) Since all that is required is harmony between the Mishnaic statement as to five immersions and six sanctifications, it is not necessarily the last suggestion that must be adopted. The he-goat to be offered up outside, prescribed in Num. XXIX, 11 ('the sin-offering of the atonement') too, required two immersions and four sanctifications, hence the number of sanctifications and immersions could be harmonized on this assumption too. The interruption of the service of

the day with the he-goat of which no mention is made in the service of the day prescribed in Leviticus, would involve no rearrangement of the Biblical text, such as the first suggestion implied.

(5) Lev. XVI, 24 states that he offers up the two rams, his own and the people's, as soon as he has left the Holy of Holies. Whereas, if he were to have fetched the ladle and the coal-pan first, he would have offered them after his second coming forth from the Holy of Holies.

(6) Lev. XVI, 23. Raba does not endeavor to answer the question propounded by R. Zera, he endeavors to explain the Baraita, which would emend the Scriptural account by having the order of the service interrupted as above.

(7) That was thus the second stripping off of the garments. Hence there must have been a change of garments between the service of the day and the fetching of the censer and coal-pan, whence it follows that this verse refers to the second stripping off of garments, and comes after the offering up of the two rams by the high priest.

(8) Lev. XVI, 25.

(9) Ibid. v. 27.

(10) Because the burning and the reading took place at the same time, which is when the priest is still wearing the white garments, in which as the Mishnah states he reads.

(11) I.e., at the third immersion when he offers the two rams, i.e., after changing into the golden garments (v. Mishnah supra 70a). This clearly contradicts the order of Biblical verses.

(12) Read, instead of 'except this verse', 'except from this verse on', when the Scriptural verses no more take into account the actual order.

(13) Why don't you rather emend the Mishnah and say that the burning of bullock and he-goat did not take place at the time the high priest read the portion from the Torah, but after the portions of the sin-offering had been smoked, as the Scriptural verses have it.

(14) Lev. XVI, 26 and 28.

(15) Scripture here uses the same participial form in referring to him that letteth go and to him that burneth. That implies a certain analogy. In both passages follows the statement: And the fat of the sin-offering shall he make smoke on the altar. (Ibid. v. 25.) Now the sending away of the he-goat for Azazel preceded that, as v. 21 reads: And he shall send him away by the hand of an appointed man into the wilderness. Of necessity 'He that letteth go' refers to previous passages, as to say: With reference to the letting go of which you were commanded before, i.e., before the smoking of the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering (he that letteth go defiles the garments). The above-mentioned analogy justifies the inference that 'he that burneth' similarly refers to the burning done before.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(16) I.e., after the smoking of his sacrificial portions.

(17) One could also argue just to the contrary, for the analogy could be made in either way: just as the burning takes place after the sacrificial pieces of the sin-offering have been smoked, thus is the reference to him that letteth go, for now. The statement in v. 21 'And he shall send it away' then means, now that the time for this has arrived.

(18) As explained in n. 3.

(19) Lev. XVI, 10: alive, to make atonement for him.

(20) Hence it could not be maintained that the he-goat was to be sent away after the portions of the sacrifice were smoked. That disposes of the last question.

(21) Ps, CXVI, 9.

(22) Markets may be lands of life, because there is much life in them, or because they furnish 'a living' to many.

(23) Prov. III, 2.

(24) When sunshine comes again, the memory of evil days is so obliterated that they do not seem to have been experienced, lived at all.

(25) Prov. VIII, 4.

(26) Study makes them weak, like women. But in the fields of Halachah they are mighty heroes. This maxim is included here, because the word 'ish' (Sir high priest) recalls a homiletical interpretation of the same word elsewhere.

(27) Connecting Ishim with Ishe, fire-offerings.

Yoma 71b

yet through the scent of water it will bud, and put forth boughs like a plant.¹

AND A FESTIVE DAY HE WOULD ARRANGE FOR HIS FRIENDS: Our Rabbis taught: It happened with a high priest that as he came forth from the Sanctuary, all the people² followed him, but when they saw Shemayah³ and Abtalion, they forsook him and went after Shemayah and Abtalion. Eventually Shemayah and Abtalion visited him, to take their leave of the high priest. He said to them: May the descendants of the heathen come in peace!⁴ —

They answered him: May the descendants of the heathen, who do the work of Aaron, arrive in peace, but the descendant of Aaron, who does not do the work of Aaron, he shall not come in peace!⁵

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST PERFORMS THE SERVICE IN EIGHT PIECES OF GARMENTS, AND THE COMMON PRIEST IN FOUR: IN TUNIC, DRAWERS, MITER, AND GIRDLE. THE HIGH PRIEST ADDS THERETO THE BREASTPLATE, THE APRON, THE ROBE AND THE FRONTLET. IN THESE WERE THE URIM AND THUMMIM⁶ INQUIRED OF. BUT THEY WERE NOT INQUIRED OF EXCEPT FOR THE KING, FOR THE AB BETH DIN⁷ OR FOR ONE WHOM THE COMMUNITY NEEDS.⁸

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [All] things, in connection with which the word Shesh ['fine linen'] is said, had their threads six-fold: 'twined' [denotes] eightfold [threads]; the robe [had its threads] twelve-fold; the curtain,⁹ twenty-four-fold; the breastplate and apron twenty-eight-fold. Whence do we know that they had their threads six-fold? —

Scripture said: And they made the tunics of fine linen, the Miter of fine linen and the goodly head-tires of fine linen, and the linen breeches of fine twined linen.¹⁰ Here are five Scriptural references: One is necessary for the subject itself, that they must be made of flax; one, that their thread shall be six-fold; one to indicate that they must be twisted; one, that this applies also to other garments in connection with which the term 'Shesh' is not used, and once, that it is indispensable. What indicates that the word 'Shesh' means flax? — R. Jose b. Hanina said: Scripture says: Bad [linen] i.e., whatever comes out of the soil singly.¹¹ But say, perhaps, it is wool? — Wool splits off.¹² But flax also splits? Flax splits into branches through beating.¹³ Rabina said: [I infer it] from this. They shall have linen tires upon their heads, and shall have linen breeches upon their loins.¹⁴

Said R. Ashi to him: But whence did they know that before Ezekiel came? — But, according to your argument, what of R. Hisda's statement: This matter¹⁵ we have learnt not from the Torah of Moses, but from the words of Ezekiel b. Buzi: No alien,

YOMA - 62a-88a

uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary?¹⁶ Who taught this before Ezekiel came? Rather must you say that it was traditionally handed down and when Ezekiel came he strengthened it by attaching it to Scripture; in our case [here] too it was a traditional teaching and Ezekiel strengthened it by attaching it to Scripture. Whence do we know that ‘twined’ [denotes] eightfold [threads]? —

Scripture says: And they made upon the skirts of the robe pomegranates of blue, and purple, and scarlet, twined.¹⁷ One may infer from the analogy of ‘twined’ used in connection with the curtain: just as there [each twined thread] was twenty-four-fold,¹⁸ so also here was it twenty-four-fold, the thread of each kind of material being eightfold.¹⁹ — But one should infer from breast-plate and apron: just as there it was twenty-eightfold, so also here twenty-eightfold?²⁰ —

One may infer a thing in connection with which gold is not mentioned from another thing, in connection with which gold is not mentioned;²¹ that excludes the breast-plate and apron in connection with which gold is mentioned. On the contrary! One should, rather, infer concerning one garment from another garment, which would exclude the curtain, because that [in a sense] is a tent! —

Rather, if it is inferred from the girdle,²² thus inferring concerning a garment, in connection with which gold is not mentioned from another garment, in connection with which gold is not mentioned; but not inferring concerning anything, in connection with which gold is mentioned from something in connection with which gold is mentioned.

R. Mari said: Scripture said: Thou shalt make it,²³ i.e., only, nothing else.²⁴ R. Ashi said: And thou shalt make,²⁵ i.e., all the work in connection therewith must be the same. Now how is that possible? If he were to make the three kinds tenfold each, there would be

thirty [threads]. And if one made two nine-fold and one tenfold, but Scripture said: ‘And thou shalt make’, i.e., all the work in connection therewith must be alike. Whence do we know that the robe [had its threads] twelve-fold? Because Scripture said: And thou shalt make the robe of the ephod

(1) Job XIV, 8, 9. The Torah is compared to water. Such fragrant water the children of the disciples of the wise will bring with them into the new home.

(2) Lit., ‘world’.

(3) They were the famous teachers of Hillel and Shammai of the Mishnah, v. Aboth I. Descendants of non-Jews, according to one tradition (Git. 57b), scions of Sennacherib's.

(4) In this manner this graceless high priest gave vent to his jealous anger at the honor which the people had bestowed upon these masters of the Law.

(5) Aaron pursued peace; his disciples, too, were very peaceful. So were Shemayah and Abtalion increasing peace in the world, but this high priest, whose arrogance caused strife, was not a worthy descendant of Aaron.

(6) v. Ex. XXVIII, 30.

(7) Lit., ‘Father of the Court’. V. Glos.

(8) v. Mak. 11b.

(9) V. Ex. XXVI, 31.

(10) Ex. XXXIX, 27-8.

(11) Bad from Badad means single, single stalk. Bad also means linen; hence the interpretation using both homonyms.

Similarly, Shesh means both ‘fine linen’ and ‘six’, whence support for the teaching that it must be six-fold. Flax has no branches, but leaves, the flax coming from the middle stem.

(12) On the sheep; does not grow in single threads like stalks.

(13) Whilst normally it grows in single stalks.

(14) Ezek. XLIV, 18, whilst in the Pentateuch these tires are prescribed to be of Shesh which proves Shesh to be flax.

(15) That an uncircumcised priest (no matter whether uncircumcised because of disobedience to the Torah, which would render him also uncircumcised in heart, whose actions ‘alienate’ him from the Lord, or because his brethren had died as the result of circumcision, which circumstances would free him from the obligation of the circumcised) may not enter the Sanctuary.

(16) Ezek. XLIV, 9.

(17) Ex. XXXIX, 24.

(18) [The curtain had four kinds of material, each having its thread six-fold, since the word Shesh is mentioned in connection therewith, v. Ex. XXVI,

31. Thus each twined thread which consisted of the four materials was twenty-fourfold].

(19) I.e., with the robe where only three kinds of materials were used, the threads of each strand had to be eightfold to make each twined thread of all the material twenty-eightfold].

(20) As shown *infra*.

(21) I.e., the robe from the curtain neither of which had gold.

(22) [Which also had four kinds of material each of six-fold threads, since *Shesh* is written in connection therewith, v. Ex. XXXIX, 29].

(23) Ex. XXVIII,15 is with reference to the breast-plate.

(24) Only breast-plate and apron, 'it', hence no precedence for any other garment, taking 'it' to indicate 'it' exclusively.

(25) Ex. XXVIII, 33, repeated in connection with the pomegranates, indicates that all the material used there must have been made alike. Hence it is impossible for the twined thread in the robe to be of a twenty-eightfold, as he goes on to explain.

Yoma 72a

plaited of blue.¹ And one may infer from the analogy of 'blue', used also in connection with the curtain, just as there [each of the materials had its threads]² six-fold, so also six-fold here.³ But let us infer from the skirt and the pomegranates, just as there it was eightfold thus also here eightfold? — One may infer for one garment from another, but one may not infer for a garment from an adornment to a garment. On the contrary! One may infer concerning a matter from the matter itself,⁴ but one may not infer for a thing from something outside thereof. For that reason we said:⁵ One, to inform us concerning other garments in connection with which '*Shesh*' is not used. The curtain twenty-fourfold. Four [strands of material] each of six-fold [threads], there being here neither controversy nor decision.⁶ Whence do we know that [each twined thread of] breast-plate and apron was twenty-eightfold?

Because it is written: And thou shalt make a breast-plate of judgment, the work of the skillful workman; like the work of the ephod thou shalt make it; of gold, of blue and purple, and scarlet and fine twined linen⁷ — four kinds of material, each six-fold, amount

to twenty-four threads, and of the gold, one thread to each of the six-fold threads of the four materials, four [threads], together twenty-eightfold [twine]. Perhaps the gold too was six-fold? —

R. Aha b. Jacob said: Scripture said: And they [did beat the gold into thin plates and] cut it into threads — that means four.⁸ R. Ashi said: Scripture states: To work it in the blue and in the purple.⁹ How should that be done? Shall one make [the gold] four times in twofold, that would amount to eight [fold gold threads]! Shall one make it twice twofold and twice a one single thread? — Surely the word 'make' indicates that all the work in connection therewith must be alike!

Rehaba said in the name of R. Judah: One who makes a tear in priestly garments is to be punished with lashes, for Scripture said: That it be not rent.¹⁰

R. Aha b. Jacob demurred to this: Perhaps this is what the Divine Law Says: Make a hem lest it be torn?¹¹ — But is it written: Lest it be torn?

R. Eleazar said: One who removes the breast-plate from the apron, or who removes the staves of the ark receives the punishment of lashes, because it was said: That it be not loosed from the ephod,¹² and [the staves] they shall not be removed from it.¹³ —

To this R. Aha b. Jacob demurred: But perhaps this is what the Divine Law says: Fasten them and arrange them properly [by forcing the chords through the ring], so that they 'be not loosed', or that they 'be not removed'? — Is it written: 'that they be not loosed' or 'that they be not removed'?

R. Jose b. Hanina pointed out a contradiction. It is written: The staves shall be in the rings of the ark: they shall not be taken from it,¹² and it is also written: The staves thereof shall be put into the rings.¹⁴ How is that possible? They were movable,

YOMA - 62a-88a

but could not slip off.¹⁵ Thus also was it taught: 'The staves shall be in the rings of the ark'. One might have assumed that they could not be moved from their place. Therefore the text reads: 'And the staves thereof shall be put into the rings'. If I had this verse [to go by] one might have assumed that they could be taken out and put in again. Therefore the text says: 'the staves shall be in the rings of the ark'. How that now? They were movable but could not slip off.

R. Hama b. Hanina said: What is the meaning of the verse: [Thou shalt make the boards of the tabernacle] of acacia wood, standing up,¹⁶ i.e., they should stand up, even as they grow.¹⁷ Another interpretation: 'Standing up — i.e., they kept up [the gold] they were overlaid with.¹⁸ Another interpretation: 'Standing up' — one might assume; Their hope [of restoration] is gone,¹⁹ their expectation is frustrated, therefore the text says: 'Standing up, i.e., standing up for ever and ever.

Rabbi Hama b. Hanina said: What is the meaning of the text: The plaited

- (1) E.V. 'all of blue', *ibid.* 31.
- (2) V. *supra* p. 341, n. 8.
- (3) [And the term plaited' implies at least another strand of six threads, hence twelve-fold].
- (4) Skirt and pomegranates are part of the upper garment, hence an inference from them appears more legitimate.
- (5) V. *supra* p. 340.
- (6) That is too simple for any dispute, requires no case, and no judge to sit upon it.
- (7) Ex. XXVIII, 15.
- (8) *Ibid.* XXXIX, 3. Threads being plural means at least two. When these are cut, at least, or-since there is no qualifying suggestion-four.
- (9) *Ibid.* [This implies that there must be an admixture of gold with every kind of material].
- (10) *Ibid.* XXVIII, 32. Since a precaution is prescribed to prevent a rent, obviously the rending thereof is prohibited and transgressions as with any other not otherwise specified offense, incur punishment of lashes.
- (11) It is a precautionary command but its significance is not that of a prohibition, the transgression of which implies punishment by lashing.
- (12) Ex. XXVIII, 28.

- (13) *Ibid.* XXV, 15.
- (14) *Ibid.* XXVII, 7. (Rashi quotes *Ibid.* XXV, 14). The first passage indicated immovability, the other adjustment, which implies contradiction.
- (15) The staves at their ends were thicker than the rings, hence could be moved, but not removed entirely.
- (16) *Ibid.* XXVI, 15.
- (17) The top on top.
- (18) [I.e., without the need of nails. V. D.S. a.l.].
- (19) The hope for restoration is found buttressed by the implication of the text.

Yoma 72b

garments for ministering in the holy place.¹ But for the priestly garments, there would not have remained of the haters² of Israel one to remain or to escape.³

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: In the school of R. Simeon it was taught: [They were] webs which they cut off the looms in the shape required, leaving a small portion of the unwoven thread.⁴ What was that? —

Resh Lakish said: It was needle-work.⁵ An objection was raised:⁶ 'All priestly garments must not be made by needle-work, but by weaving', as it is said: woven work!⁷ —

Abaye said: This applies only to their sleeves, as it was taught: The sleeves of the priestly garments were woven apparently and then attached to the garment.⁸ They reached up to the wrist.

Rehaba said in the name of Rab Judah: Three arks did Bezalel make: the middle one of wood, nine [handbreadths] high; the inner one of gold, eight high, the outer one of gold,⁹ a little more than ten high. But it was taught: A little more than eleven [high]? — That is no contradiction: the one opinion agrees with the view that the thickness thereof¹⁰ was one handbreadth, the other was in accord with the view that the thickness thereof was not one handbreadth.¹¹ And what purpose served the 'little more'?¹² — It is the space of the crown.¹³

YOMA - 62a-88a

R. Johanan said: There were three crowns: that of the altar, that of the ark, and that of the table. The one of the altar Aaron deserved and he received it. The one of the ark, David deserved and received. The one of the ark is still lying and whosoever wants to take it, may come and take it.¹⁴ Perhaps you might think it is of little account, therefore the text reads: By me kings reign.¹⁵

R. Johanan pointed out a contradiction. It is written: Zar [alien] and we read it: Zir? i.e., [crown] — If he deserves it, it becomes a wreath unto him; if not it remains alien to him.¹⁶

R. Johanan pointed out another contradiction. It is written: Make thee an ark of wood,¹⁷ and it is also written: And they shall make an ark of acacia wood?¹⁸ Hence one learns that the inhabitants of his city are obliged to do the work of the scholar for him. Within and without shalt thou overlay it.¹⁹

Raba said: Any scholar whose inside is not like his outside, is no scholar.²⁰

Abaye, or, as some say, Rabbah b. Ulla said: He is called abominable, as it is said: How much less one that is abominable and impure, man who drinketh iniquity like water.²¹

R. Samuel b. Nahmani, in the name of R. Jonathan: What is the meaning of the scriptural statement: Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool, to buy wisdom, seeing he hath no understanding,²² i.e., woe unto the enemies of the scholars,²³ who occupy themselves with the Torah, but have no fear of heaven!

R. Jannai proclaimed: Woe unto him who has no court, but makes a gateway for his court!²⁴

Raba said to the Sages: I beseech you, do not inherit a double Gehinnom!²⁵

R. Joshua b. Levi said: What is the meaning of the Scriptural verse: And this is the law which Moses set [before the children of Israel]?²⁶ — If he is meritorious it becomes for him a medicine of life, if not, a deadly poison. That is what Raba [meant when he] said: If he uses it the right way it is a medicine of life unto him; he who does not use it the right way, it is a deadly poison.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: R. Jonathan pointed out the following contradiction: it is written: The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart,²⁷ but it is also written: The word of the Lord is tried?²⁸ If he is meritorious, it rejoices him; if not, it tries him.²⁹

Resh Lakish said: From the body of the same passage this can be derived: If he is meritorious, it tests him unto life; if not, it tests him unto death.³⁰ The fear of the Lord is pure, enduring forever.³¹

R. Hanina said: This refers to one who studies the Torah in purity. What does that mean? — He marries a woman and afterwards studies the Torah.³² The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.³³

R. Hiyya b. Abba said: It [the Torah] may be entrusted to testify as to those who study it. 'The work of the skillful workman³⁴... the work of the skillful embroiderer.³⁵

R. Eleazar said: Those embroidered over what they had traced. It was taught in the name of R. Nehemiah: The embroiderer's is needle-work, therefore it has only one [visible] figure. The designer's is weaving work, therefore it has two different figures.³⁶

IN THESE WERE THE URIM AND THUMMIM INQUIRED OF. When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said: In the garments wherein the high priest officiates, the [priest] Anointed for Battle officiates, as it is said: And the holy garments of Aaron

YOMA - 62a-88a

shall be for his sons after him,³⁷ i.e., for him who comes after him in greatness [of office]. R. Adda b. Ahabah, some say Kadi, raised an objection: One might have assumed that the son of the Anointed for Battle succeeds him in service, even as the son of the high priest succeeds him in service,

- (1) Ex. XXXV, 19.
- (2) Euphemistic for Israel — a calamity is foreshadowed only in indirect fashion.
- (3) The root Sarad (to plant) also means 'leaving over', hence the interpretation: the garments of escape, because they brought atonement for Israel, thereby preventing their extinction.
- (4) Here the term is explained as the garments, one part of which was left over unwoven, or unmade.
- (5) [This is difficult, nor is the text apparently quite in order. According to Rashi the meaning is, what is done with the unwoven remnant? And the answer is that it is cut off, woven separately and then sewn on to the main garment].
- (6) Zeb. 88a.
- (7) Ex. XXVIII, 32.
- (8) According to Resh Lakish, then, the unwoven remnant would be used in connection with the sleeves.
- (9) Reading with Bah.
- (10) Of the outer ark.
- (11) [In order to understand the distinction thus drawn, it is well to remember that the three arks were open at the top; consequently if the thickness of the outer one was less than one handbreadth, a height of ten handbreadths and a little more would suffice: nine handbreadths corresponding to the height of the middle ark (when measured from without) and a fraction of a handbreadth to allow for the thickness of the outer ark at the bottom, while one extra handbreadth was necessary for the mercy seat which was inserted between the two side boards of the outer ark to rest upon the thickness of the sides of the two smaller arks. If, however, the thickness of the outer ark was one handbreadth, its height, measured from outside would then have to be at least ten handbreadths whilst for the purpose of the mercy seat an extra handbreadth would be necessary, making a total of eleven. As to the need of the 'little more' this will be explained soon. V. Rashi].
- (12) Mentioned in the Baraitha, v. supra n. 1.
- (13) [V. Ex. XXV, 11. The side boards of the outer ark projected beyond the mercy seat that was inserted between them (cf. n. 1), a kind of rim (crown)].
- (14) Aaron, the first high priest, obtained the crown of priesthood, symbolized by the altar;

David, the crown of kingdom; but there is no hereditary crown of learning, it must be acquired by each individual. The aspirants, however, are not many, hence it is still lying unclaimed.

- (15) Prov. VIII, 15. Wisdom is identified with Torah, through which it is acquired.
- (16) The Hebrew spelling of wreath may include the letter 'Yod', without it the word might be read 'Zar', stranger, hence the illustrative suggestion.
- (17) Deut. X, 1.
- (18) Ex. XXV, 10.
- (19) Ibid. II.
- (20) Inside and outside there should be the same golden character.
- (21) Job XV, 16; rendered, one who drinketh the water of the Torah and yet has iniquity in him.
- (22) Prov. XVII, 16. Wisdom is knowledge of the Torah, understanding is moral rightness, based on fear of heaven. Hence this interpretation.
- (23) Euphemism for 'scholars'.
- (24) Fear of the Lord is the court, the goal. Learning should lead to it. Learning (the gateway) without reverence (the goal) is wasteful, sinful.
- (25) The Mishnah, Aboth VI, indicates that acquisition of the Torah depends upon a frugal way of living, a reduction of the margin of joy to a minimum. The reward is to come in after-life. Such reward depends upon reaching the goal of study; fear of heaven. One who now engages in Torah-study without possessing fear of heaven, suffers in this world, wherein he denies himself pleasure for the sake of his study, as well as in the other world, where because he had no fear of heaven, reward will be denied, punishment inflicted.
- (26) Deut. IV, 44.
- (27) Ps. XIX, 9.
- (28) Ibid. XVIII, 31.
- (29) Here the part. passive is interpreted as active, 'tested' becomes 'testing'.
- (30) It tries and refines him, so that he lives a finer life. It tries him by suffering, which ultimately destroys him.
- (31) Ps. XIX, 10.
- (32) So that he is undisturbed by impure thoughts.
- (33) Ibid. 8.
- (34) Ex. XXVI, 31.
- (35) Ibid. v. 1.
- (36) On the two sides of the cloth.
- (37) Ibid. XXIX, 29.

Yoma 73a

therefore the text reads: Seven days shall the son that is priest in his stead put them on, even he who cometh into the tent of meeting [etc.],¹ i.e., he who is worthy of entering the tent of meeting. Now if this were the case,²

YOMA - 62a-88a

then he too would be fit [to enter the tent of meeting]? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: This is what it means: Whosoever was mainly anointed for the [purpose of] the tent of meeting, that excludes him who was anointed mainly for Battle.

The following objection was raised: The Anointed for Battle officiates neither in four garments, like a common priest, nor in eight like a high priest? — Abaye said: Would you render him then a common man?³ Rather: Neither like a high priest, for the sake of preventing ill-feeling;⁴ nor like a common priest, because one promotes to a higher degree of sanctity, but one must not degrade'.

R. Adda b. Ahabah said to Raba: But there is a Tanna who pays no attention to the prevention of ill-feeling, yet according to him, he does not officiate?⁵ For it was taught:⁶ In the following points a high priest differs from a common priest: the bullock of the priest anointed;⁷ and the bullock due in case of [unwitting] transgression of any commandment;⁸ the bullock of the Day of Atonement; the tenth of the ephah;⁹ he does not unbind his hair, nor rend his clothes.¹⁰ But he [the high priest] tears his garments from below, and the common priest tears his from above; he must not defile himself for his [deceased] relatives;¹¹ he is under obligation to marry only a virgin;¹² is prohibited from marrying a widow;¹³ causes the slayer to return;¹⁴ as Onen [mourner]¹⁵ he may offer up a sacrifice but may not eat or take a share thereof; he receives his portion first and takes first part in the offering [of the sacrifice]; he officiates in eight garments; is exempt¹⁶ [from a sacrifice] for [an unwitting transgression of] defilement relating to the Sanctuary and its hallowed thing, and the whole service of the Day of Atonement is legitimate only when performed by him.

All these [laws] apply also to priests consecrated by a larger number of official garments, with the exception of the bullock to be offered up for the transgression of any

commandment. All these apply to the high priest who has passed from his high priesthood,¹⁷ with the exception of the bullock of the Day of Atonement and the tenth of the Ephah.

All these things do not apply to the priest Anointed for Battle, with the exception of five matters mentioned in that portion of the section: he does not unbind his hair, nor rend his clothes; nor defile himself with any [deceased] relative; is obliged to marry a virgin; forbidden to marry a widow; and causes the slayer to return — according to R. Judah; whereas, according to the Sages, he does not cause him to return.¹⁸ Whence does he [the Tanna] consider [the question of] enmity [to arise]? Only with regard to one of similar rank.¹⁹ But with one of inferior rank he does consider it.²⁰

R. Abbahu was sitting and reporting this teaching in the name of R. Johanan, whereupon R. Ammi and R. Assi averted their faces.²¹ (Some say it was R. Hiyya b. Abba who reported this teaching, whereupon R. Ammi and R. Assi averted their faces).

To this R. Papa demurred: Granted [that they could not say anything against] R. Abbahu, because of the high regard the Imperial house had for him, but as for R. Hiyya b. Abba, they should have told him explicitly that R. Johanan had not said so!

When Rabin came, he said: This²² was stated with reference to the time when he is consulted.²³ Thus also was it taught: The garments which the high priest wears when he officiates the Anointed for Battle wears when he is consulted.

Our Rabbis taught: How were [the Urim and Thummim] inquired of? — The inquirer had his face directed to him who was consulted, and the latter directed himself to the Divine Presence. The inquirer said: Shall I pursue after this troop?²⁴ He who was consulted

YOMA - 62a-88a

answered: 'Thus saith the Lord: Go up and succeed'!

R. Judah said: He need not say, 'This saith the Lord' but only 'Go up and succeed' — One does not inquire in a loud voice, as it is said: Who shall inquire for him;²⁵ neither shall one but think thereof in one's heart, as it is said: 'Who shall inquire for him';²⁵ but rather in the manner in which Hannah spoke in her prayer, as it is said: Now Hannah, she spoke in her heart.²⁶ One should not put two questions at the same time; if one has done so, only one [question] is answered; and only the first [question] is answered, as it is said: Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? Will Saul come down,²⁷ etc.... and the Lord said.' He will come down.²⁷ But you said: Only the first [question] is answered? — David had asked

- (1) I.e., on the Day of Atonement. Ibid. v. 30.
- (2) That the Anointed for Battle officiates in eight garments.
- (3) I.e., a non-priest.
- (4) It is only Rabbinic enactment that interferes therewith, because of the desire of the Sages to prevent ill-feeling. By the law of the Torah, the Anointed for Battle could officiate.
- (5) In the eight garments.
- (6) Mishnah Hor. III, 4,5.
- (7) Rashi and others omit, as this is the same as the item that follows.
- (8) V. Lev. IV, 3.
- (9) Ibid. VI, 13: This is the offering of Aaron and his sons... in the day when he is anointed: the tenth part of an Ephah of fine flour for a meal-offering.
- (10) In the case of mourning.
- (11) Lev. XXI, 11. These relatives include father, mother, wife, son and daughter, brother or sister.
- (12) Ibid. v. 13.
- (13) Ibid. v. 14.
- (14) When the priest dies, the slayer without intent returns from the city of refuge. Num. XXXV, 10ff.
- (15) For (Lev. XXI, 12): Neither shall he go out of the Sanctuary. He is called 'Onen', whilst his dead lie unburied on the day of death.
- (16) V. Hor. 12b.
- (17) Who acted as substitute for the high priest, v. supra 12b.
- (18) Though this Tanna does not consider here the question of ill-feeling, since he rules that the high priest who passed from his high priesthood continues to officiate with eight garments, and yet

the Anointed for Battle he permits the use only of four garments.

(19) The substitute enjoyed the same rank as the high priest.

(20) The Anointed for Battle is of inferior rank to the high priest, and the donning of eight garments would arouse ill-feeling in the high priest.

(21) Refusing to accept the report that R. Johanan had said this.

(22) The statement that the Anointed for Battle wears the same eight garments which are the high priest's official garb.

(23) By means of the Urim and Thummim.

(24) I Sam. XXX, 8.

(25) Num. XXVII, 21.

(26) I Sam. I, 13.

(27) Ibid. XXIII, 11.

Yoma 73b

in wrong order and received his answer in right order.¹ And as soon as he knew that he had asked in wrong order, he asked again in right order, as it is said: Will the men of Keilah deliver up me and my men in to the hand of Saul? And the Lord said.' They will deliver thee up.² But if the occasion required both questions, both were answered, as it is said: And David inquired of the Lord, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Shall I overtake them? And He answered him: pursue; for thou shalt surely overtake them and shalt without fail recover all.³ And although the decree of a prophet could be revoked, the decree of the 'Urim and Thummim' could not be revoked, as it is said: By the judgment of the Urim. Why were they called 'Urim and Thummim'? 'Urim' because they made their words enlightening.⁴ 'Thummim' because they fulfill their words.

And if you should ask: Why did they not fulfill their words in Gibeah Benjamin?⁵ It is because they did not inquire⁶ [whether the result would be] victory or defeat.⁷ But at last, when conquered, they [the Urim and Thummim] approved their action, as it is said: And Phineas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: 'Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I cease?' and the Lord said: Go up,

YOMA - 62a-88a

for tomorrow I will deliver him into thy hand.⁸ How was it effected? —

R. Johanan said: [The letters] stood forth.⁹ Resh Lakish said: They joined each other. But the 'Zade' was missing?¹⁰ R. Samuel b. Isaac said: They contained also the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But the 'Teth', too, was missing? — R. Aha b. Jacob said: They contained also the words: The 'tribes'¹¹ of Jeshurun.

An objection was raised: No priest was inquired of who does not speak by means of the Holy Spirit and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest, for Zadok inquired and succeeded, whilst Abiathar inquired and failed, as it is said: But Abiathar went up until all the people had done passing out of the city?¹² — He helped along.¹³

AND ONE INQUIRED ONLY FOR A KING. Whence do we know these things? — R. Abbahu said: Scripture said, And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim;¹⁴ 'he' i.e., the king, 'and all the children of Israel with him', i.e., the [priest] Anointed for Battle, 'even all the congregation', that is the Sanhedrin.

CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IT IS FORBIDDEN TO EAT, TO DRINK, TO WASH, TO ANOINT ONESELF, TO PUT ON SANDALS,¹⁵ OR TO HAVE MARITAL INTERCOURSE.¹⁶ A KING OR BRIDE¹⁷ MAY WASH THE FACE, AND A WOMAN AFTER CHILDBIRTH¹⁸ MAY PUT ON SANDALS. THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER. THE SAGES, HOWEVER, FORBID IT. IF ONE EATS THE BULK OF A LARGE DATE, THE LIKE THEREOF, WITH ITS STONE INCLUDED, OR IF HE DRANK A MOUTHFUL, HE IS CULPABLE.¹⁹ ANY FOODS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING UP THE BULK OF A DATE, AND ALL THE LIQUIDS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING

UP A MOUTHFUL, BUT WHAT A MAN EATS AND DRINKS DOES NOT GO TOGETHER.²⁰

GEMARA. [Merely] FORBIDDEN? But surely punished with extirpation?²¹ — R. Ela, or as some say, R. Jeremiah, said: This refers only to less than the legal quantity.²² That will be right according to the view that even less than legal quantity is for — bidden by the law of the Torah, but what can be said according to the view that less than the legal quantity is permitted by the law of the Torah? For it was said: As for less than the legal quantity, R. Johanan holds it forbidden by the law of the Torah, but Resh Lakish considers it permitted by the law of the Torah. Now [the above answer] would be right according to R. Johanan, but what can be said according to Resh Lakish? —

Resh Lakish would agree that [less than the legal quantity] is forbidden by [decree of] the Rabbis.²³ If that be the case, one should not be liable on account thereof to offer a sacrifice for an oath,²⁴ why then did we learn:²⁵ [If one had sworn] an oath not to eat carrion, Trefah things,²⁶ abominable²⁷ or creeping things, and then had eaten thereof, he is culpable?

R. Simeon holds him not culpable. And we raised the point in connection therewith: Why should he be culpable? Surely he stands committed to the oath²⁸ from Mount Sinai on! [And] Rab, Samuel and R. Johanan [in reply] said [it is a case] when he includes things permitted in the oath touching foods forbidden,²⁹ whereas Resh Lakish said: This cannot be explained except where he either expressly refers to less than the legal quantity, and that in accord with the view of the Sages,³⁰ or that he made a general statement

(1) He should have asked first: Will Saul come down? Then, Will they deliver me up?

(2) I Sam. XXIII, 12.

(3) Ibid. XXX, 8.

(4) Etym. 'Urim'- lights. 'Thummim'-tam-to be complete, perfect; here true, fulfilled.

(5) Judg. XX.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(6) [The text of cur. edd. is not clear and the rendering follows the reading of MS.M. Rashi, on the basis of the present text, explains: They (the Urim and Thummim) did not state clearly, etc.].

(7) The single question was who should lead them.

(8) Judg. XX, 28.

(9) The names of the twelve sons of Jacob were inscribed on the Urim and Thummim. The answer always came through the letters which stood in relief.

(10) The names of the twelve sons did not include that letter.

(11) The Hebrew of which includes a Teth.

(12) II Sam. XV, 24. [This is explained, that he retired from the priesthood because he received no reply from the Urim and Thummim. This in turn would indicate that it is the Holy Spirit resting on the priest that gives that reply and not the letters of the Oracle].

(13) By the priests' merit the oracle came forth.

(14) Num. XXVII, 21.

(15) Or any shoes of leather. Tosef. Yoma IV: 'Even cloth-shoes'.

(16) The term literally means 'use of the bed'.

(17) Within the first month after the wedding.

(18) Lit., 'one reconvalescing', whose health is still delicate and to whom a cold may prove dangerous. Leather shoes will protect her against such contingency.

(19) V. Lev. XXIII, 29.

(20) To make up the culpable quantity.

(21) The term forbidden may mean: either unlawful but, de facto, unpunished; or normally: punished with lashes. But transgression by eating would be punished with extirpation, Kareth (v. Glos.).

(22) Lit., 'half the standard'. The usual legal quantity of forbidden foods is the bulk of an olive; on the Day of Atonement, the bulk of a big date. Any less than that, though the eating thereof does not involve one in the prescribed punishment, nevertheless constitutes a transgression. That is what the Mishnah indicates by the term 'forbidden' i.e., in any quantity.

(23) Even though less than the legal minimum does not involve punishment according to Biblical law, or indeed, may not be forbidden at all, Rabbinical law, as a fence around the laws of the Torah, may declare less than a minimum forbidden, or punishable, too. The dispute between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish would hinge on the question as to whether forbidden foods are so considered in any quantity, however small, or whether the term 'eating', etc. implies a definite minimum below which no transgression at all can be said to have taken place.

(24) I.e., if someone has sworn that he would not eat less than the legal quantity of a forbidden food. Since that food is forbidden, he has, as it were,

already sworn on Mount Sinai, not to eat it; the present oath, therefore, has no force, for the transgression of which no sin-offering is necessary (v. Shebu. 27a).

(25) Shebu. 21a.

(26) The word Trefah. lit., 'torn', means any kind of abnormal, irregular, ritually inadmissible food. Nebelah 'carrion' refers to the flesh of animals which had died a natural death, or in connection with the ritual slaughtering of which a basic mistake or irregularity had been committed.

(27) Lev. XI, 11, 31, 42, 46.

(28) Israel swore their allegiance to the Torah, and that oath binds every Israelite.

(29) Had he sworn not to eat forbidden things, such oaths would imply his non-culpability in case of transgression, i.e., as far as the oath is concerned. But, by including things permitted, he swears an oath, the effect of which is to prohibit for him the eating of otherwise permissible foods. Hence the transgression implies the obligation of sacrifice.

(30) The Sages hold that an oath 'I will not eat a certain thing' implies 'I will not eat as much as the legal minimum', hence he could be guilty in the case of having eaten less than that only if he had expressly stated: I shall not eat anything at all of that food, his special declaration investing his oath with validity in the case of an infinitesimal amount of the food now forbidden to himself.

Yoma 74a

and in accord with R. Akiba, who said that a man may prohibit to himself anything in any quantity,¹ however small.² And if you would say that since it is permitted by the Torah, [the law relating to the] sacrifice for an oath is operative,³ surely we learned: An 'oath of testimony'⁴ applies only to those qualified to bear witness;⁵ and we raised the point: what does that mean to exclude, whereupon R. Papa said: This excludes a king, and R. Aha b. Jacob said: This excludes a professional dice-gambler.⁶ Now a dice-player, as far as Biblical law is concerned, is qualified to bear witness and only the Rabbis declared him unfit, and yet an oath does not apply to him?⁷ There it is different, for Scripture said: If he do not utter it,⁸ and this man cannot make a [valid] utterance.⁹ Now would you say that wherever the punishment is extirpation the term 'forbidden' is not used?¹⁰ Surely it was taught: Although the term 'forbidden' was

YOMA - 62a-88a

used in connection with all of them,¹¹ the punishment of extirpation applies only to him who eats or drinks, or engages in labor? —

This is what is said: When the term ‘forbidden’ is used, it is applied but to less than the legal minimum, but where the legal minimum has been transgressed the punishment involved is extirpation; and also extirpation is the penalty, that is the case only with him who eats or drinks or engages in labor. Or, if you like, say: When [the Mishnah] uses the term ‘forbidden’, it refers to the rest [of the transgressions],¹² for Rabbah and R. Joseph taught in the other books of the School of Rab:¹³ Whence do we know that it is forbidden on the Day of Atonement to anoint oneself, to wash, to put on shoes, and to have marital intercourse? Therefore the text reads: [It] is a Sabbath of solemn rest [unto you].¹⁴ [To turn to] the main text: As for the matter of less than the legal minimum, R. Johanan said: It is forbidden by Biblical law, whilst Resh Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law.

R. Johanan said, It is forbidden by Biblical law; since it could be joined [to form a minimum] it is forbidden food that he is eating. Resh Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law, for the Divine Law speaks of eating and this is not [eating].¹⁵ —

R. Johanan raised the following objection against Resh Lakish: I know only that whatsoever involves punishment is subject to a prohibition; but in the case of the Koy,¹⁶ and what is less than the legal minimum, since they do not involve punishment, I might say that they are not subject to a prohibition either, therefore the text reads: No fat.¹⁷ — This is only Rabbinical and the text [adduced] is but a mere support. And that is also logical. For if one should assume that the prohibition is Biblical, surely [the status of] the Koy is doubtful and no Scriptural text is necessary to cover a doubtful¹⁸ case! — Were it only for this there would be no argument, they would hold

(1) R. Akiba, on the other hand, holds that a legal minimum exists only in the case of foods, etc. forbidden by the Torah, whereas a man who forbids himself by oath any kind of permitted food, implies that he would not partake of any quantity, however small, thereof.

(2) Now, if Resh Lakish held that even less than the legal minimum is forbidden by Rabbinical decree, then how could he endeavor to explain the case of the man taking the oath as applying to one eating less than the legal minimum? For, since he is interdicted to eat by the law of Deut. XVII, 11: According to the law which they shall teach thee ... thou shalt do... thou shalt not turn aside... to the right hand or to the left, from eating food Rabbinically forbidden, his oath is inoperative, hence does not oblige him to offer a sacrifice for his transgression thereof.

(3) Shebu. 30a. The answer of Resh Lakish would endeavor to make a distinction between things forbidden by the Torah, the oath re-forbidding the same to oneself would be considered inoperative and would free the swearer, in the case of transgression, from the obligation to offer up a sacrifice — and things permitted by the Torah, to which the oath could apply, so that if one swore not to eat less than the legal minimum which, because below the legal quantity, would be permitted by the law of the Torah and forbidden only by Rabbinic decree, the oath would operate, and in the case of transgression he would have to bring a sacrifice.

(4) Lev. V, 1f.

(5) V. Shebu. 30a.

(6) The king can neither testify, nor be testified against, because of his exalted position; the gambler cannot testify, because his profession renders him, hence his statements or pledges, untrustworthy.

(7) By Biblical law one is considered a robber only if one actually robs from one's hand, as in II Sam. XXIII, 21 where the technical term ‘Gazal’, rob, is used: He (plucked — lit., ‘robbed’) the spear out of his hand; v. also B.K. 79b. So that, if the oath does not apply to a gambler, although by Biblical law, he is not prevented from testifying, the proposed distinction is unjustified.

(8) Lev. V, 1.

(9) It means: One whose utterance not merely means speech, but words of meaning, words to be trusted, whereas this gambler's words, since he is untrustworthy, are, legally speaking, no utterance at all.

(10) As insufficient, hence misleading; this being the reason for the first question here in the Gemara.

(11) All the things forbidden, as enumerated in our Mishnah.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(12) Not eating and drinking.

(13) From the School of Rab emanated Halachical commentaries not only on Leviticus, but on Numbers and Deuteronomy as well.

(14) Lev. XVI,31 interpreted here as solemn rest not only from work, but from the usual occupations, such as eating, drinking, washing, anointing and having marital intercourse. Just as the term 'solemn day of rest' in connection with the Sabbath is, by the Sages, interpreted as including all manner of work, even not employed in connection with the building of the Sanctuary, so does that term here imply affliction by rest, as above.

(15) Since below the minimum it may be nibbling, but it is eating that is forbidden.

(16) A kind of bearded deer or antelope (Jast.). It is left undecided as to whether it belongs to the genus of cattle, the tallow of which is forbidden, or to beasts of chase, the tallow of which is permitted.

(17) Lev. VII, 23. This proves that less than a legal minimum is prohibited by the Torah.

(18) Since there is no doubt before the Divine Lawgiver, no Scriptural text would be necessary to cover a doubtful situation.

Yoma 74b

the Koy is a creature by itself. For if you were not to say so, how could R. Idi b. Abin say: 'Also all' includes the Koy,¹ since the Koy is a doubtful case and surely no Scriptural text is necessary to cover doubtful cases. Hence [what you must say is] a 'creature by itself' is a different case, thus also here [say] 'a creature by itself' is a different case.

Our Rabbis taught: Ye shall afflict your souls.² One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold in order to afflict oneself, therefore the text reads: And ye shall do no manner of work;² just as the [prohibition of] labor [means]: sit and do nothing, so does [the enjoinder of] affliction [signify]: sit and do nothing.³ But say perhaps: If one sit in the sun and is warm, one may not say unto him: rise and sit in the shade; or, when he sits in the shade and is cool, one may not tell him: rise and sit in the sun?⁴ — It is as with labor: Just as you have made no distinction with regard to labor, so in connection with the [prescribed] afflictions⁵ is no distinction to be made.

Another [Baraita] taught: 'Ye shall afflict your souls'. One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold to afflict oneself, therefore Scripture said: 'And ye shall do no manner of work'. Just as in connection with work [the reference is to] something for which one may become culpable also in another connection,⁶ so with affliction it is to something for which one might become culpable in another connection, and what is that? 'An abhorred thing',⁷ or that which remaineth.⁸ I shall then include only 'the abhorred thing' or that which remaineth, because the penalty there is extirpation but not include Tebel,⁹ since the penalty involved therein is not extirpation, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls',¹⁰ which is inclusive. I might then include Tebel, the punishment in connection with which is death,¹¹ but not include carrion, the penalty for eating which is not death, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include the [eating of] carrion, which involves a [transgression of a] prohibition, but not profane food, [the eating of] which is not prohibited at all, therefore Scripture said: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include profane food, the eating of which is not commanded, but exclude Terumah,¹² the eating of which is commanded, therefore Scripture said: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include Terumah, which is not subject to the law concerning remaining over, but exclude holy sacrifices, in connection with which the law concerning remaining over applies, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. And if you should have any remark [in objection thereto], [I can reply], Behold Scripture said: And I will destroy that soul,¹³ i.e., an affliction which causes a destruction of life, and what is that but [the denial of] eating and drinking? What is [meant by]: And if you should have any remark [in objection thereto]? —

YOMA - 62a-88a

One might have said Scripture speaks here of marital intercourse,¹⁴ therefore the text reads: 'And I will destroy that soul', i.e., an affliction which causes the destruction of life, and that is [the abstention from] eating and drinking.

The School of R. Ishmael taught: Here the phrase 'affliction' is used, and there¹⁵ the term 'affliction' is used; just as there an affliction through hunger is meant, so is here an affliction through hunger meant. But let us infer from: 'If thou shalt afflict my daughters'?¹⁶ — One should infer concerning the affliction of a community from another affliction of a community, but not for the affliction of a community from the affliction of an individual. But let us infer it from the 'affliction' in Egypt, as it is said: And [the Lord] saw our affliction,¹⁷ and in connection with which we said: This is the enforced abstinence from marital intercourse? —

Rather [answer thus]: One infers for a heavenly affliction from another heavenly affliction, but one should not infer concerning a heavenly affliction from an affliction through human beings.¹⁸ Who fed thee in the wilderness with manna... that He might afflict thee.¹⁹

R. Ammi and R. Assi [are disputing], one said, You cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has none,²⁰ the other said: You cannot compare one who sees what he eats with one who does not see what he is eating.²¹ R. Joseph said: This is an allusion to [the reason] why blind people eat on without becoming satisfied. Abaye said: Therefore let him who has a meal eat only in daylight. R. Zera said: What Scriptural verse intimates that? Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire.²² Resh Lakish said: Better is the pleasure of looking at a woman than the act itself as it is said: 'Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire'. When it giveth its

color in the cup, when it glideth down smoothly.²³

R. Ammi and R. Assi [dispute concerning it], one said: Whosoever fixes

(1) V. Hul. 21a with reference to the blood of the Koy.

(2) Lev. XVI, 29.

(3) The affliction enjoined is negative; deny to yourself certain things, abstain from them. It does not demand self-affliction by specific activity, such as sitting in the sun on a hot day.

(4) In this case affliction would take the negative form of abstaining from comfort, in accord with the proposition suggested.

(5) Labor, in any form, is prohibited. Just as one is not obliged to engage in positive work of affliction, the negative form of abstention from getting comfort. Hence, just as one need not go out of comfortable shade into the sun for the purpose of afflicting oneself, so need one not abstain from a change into shade in order to be afflicted in the sun.

(6) Namely on the Sabbath.

(7) A sacrifice rejected in consequence of an improper intention in the mind of the sacrificing priest, v. Lev. VII, 18.

(8) Portions of sacrifices left over beyond the legal time.

(9) Produce forbidden until the priestly gifts have been separated.

(10) Lev. XVI, 31.

(11) At the hands of heaven.

(12) The priest's share of the crop, one fiftieth of the dough, Num. XVIII, 8, 25.

(13) Lev. XXIII, 30.

(14) The term 'affliction' is used for the abstention therefrom, as well as for rape, in the Talmud (infra 77a) as well as in the Bible, Deut. XXII, 24 and elsewhere.

(15) Ibid. VIII, 3.

(16) Gen. XXXI, 50.

(17) Deut. XXVI, 7.

(18) It was God who afflicted Israel in the wilderness, Who bids them afflict themselves — thus may be said to afflict them Himself- on the Day of Atonement, whereas in Egypt it was Pharaoh who afflicted them.

(19) Deut. VIII, 16.

(20) V. Supra 18b.

(21) The taste of the manna according to tradition varied according to one's liking (v. infra), so that he who ate it did not see actually the thing which he was tasting].

(22) Eccl. VI, 9.

(23) Prov. XXIII, 31.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 75a

his eye in the cup,¹ all incestual intercourse appears to him like a plain;² the other said: One who indulges in his cup, the entire world appears to him like a plain.³ Care in the heart, boweth it down.⁴

R. Ammi and R. Assi [explained it differently], one said: One should force it down,⁵ the other said: One should tell thereof to others.⁵ And dust shall be the serpent's food.⁶

R. Ammi and R. Assi [disputed its meaning], one said: Even if the serpent were to eat all the delicacies of the world, he would feel therein but the taste of dust; the other said: Even though he ate all the delicacies of the world, his mind would not be at ease until he had eaten dust.

It was taught: R. Jose said, Come and see how different the action of human beings is from that of the Holy One, blessed be He. If one of flesh and blood is angry with his neighbor he persecutes him as far as depriving him of his livelihood, but it is different with the Holy One, blessed be He. Although He cursed the serpent, yet when he goes up to the roof, there is his food; if he goes down, there is his food. He cursed Canaan;⁷ yet he eats what his master eats, drinks what his master drinks. He cursed the woman,⁸ all are running after her. He cursed the earth,⁹ all are feeding from it. We remember the fish which we were wont to eat in Egypt for nought.¹⁰

Rab and Samuel [were disputing its meaning], one said: [Fish here means] real fish; the other said: Illicit intercourse.¹¹ One who said it means real fish [explains it so because of] 'which we were wont to eat'; the other who interprets it as 'illicit intercourse', does so because the term 'for naught' is used.¹² But according to him who said it means 'intercourse', does not Scripture read: 'Which we were wont to eat'? —

Scripture uses an euphemism, as it is written: She eateth and wipeth her mouth and saith: I have done no wickedness.¹³ What does 'for naught' mean according to him who says they were real fish? — They were brought to them from public property, for a Master taught: When the Israelites were drawing water, the Holy One, blessed be He, prepared for them in the water little fish for their pitchers. According to him who said 'real fish', but with regard to illicit intercourse [he holds] they were not dissolute, it will be quite right that Scripture said: A garden shut up is my sister, etc.¹⁴ but according to the view that fishes mean 'illicit intercourse', what 'fountain sealed' is here? —

They were not dissolute with regard to forbidden relations.¹⁵ It will be right according to him who interprets it as 'illicit intercourse', hence Scripture said: And Moses heard the people weeping for their families,¹⁶ i.e., because of the families [relations] with whom they were forbidden to have intercourse; but according to him who interprets it as 'fish', what does 'weeping for their families' mean? — Both¹⁷ are implied. The cucumbers and the melons.¹⁸

R. Ammi and R. Assi [were disputing its meaning], one said: They found in the manna the taste of every kind of food, but not the taste of these five;¹⁹ the other said: Of all kinds of food they felt both taste and substance, but of these the taste only without the substance. Now the manna was like gad [coriander] seed.²⁰ R. Assi said [it was] round like a seed [of coriander] and white like a pearl.

Our Rabbis taught: 'Gad' i.e., the manna resembled the seed of flax in its capsules. Others say: 'Gad' i.e., it was like a tale, which draws the heart of man, even like water.²¹ Another [Baraita] taught: 'Gad', because it revealed to Israel whether the child was one of nine months' pregnancy from the first husband, or of seven months'

YOMA - 62a-88a

[pregnancy] from the second.²² 'White',²³ because it makes white [cleanses] the sins of Israel.

It was taught: R. Jose said: Even as the prophet would tell Israel what is to be found in clefts or holes so would the manna reveal to Israel what is to 'be found in clefts or holes'. How that? If, e.g., two men came before Moses with a law-suit, one saying: You have stolen my servant, the other saying: You have sold him to me, Moses would say to them: To-morrow judgment will be pronounced. To-morrow, then: If his [the slave's] 'Omer was found in the house of his first master, it was evidence that the other one had stolen him; if it was found in the house of his second master, that was proof that the former had sold him to the latter. Similarly, if a man and a woman came before Moses with a suit, he saying: She acted offensively against me, and she asserting: He acted offensively against me, Moses would say to them: To-morrow judgment will be pronounced. On the morrow: If her 'Omer was found in her husband's house, that was proof that she had acted offensively, but if it was found in her father's house, that was evidence that he had acted offensively towards her.²⁴ It is written: And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, the manna fell upon it,²⁵ and it is also written: And the people shall go out and gather,²⁶ and it is written too: The people went about and gathered it.²⁷ How all that?²⁸ —

Unto the righteous it fell in front of their homes; the average folk went out and gathered, whereas the wicked ones had to go about to gather it. It is written: 'bread',²⁶ and it is written, [dough of] 'cakes',²⁹ and it is written, 'they ground it'.²⁹ How that? —

The righteous received it as bread, the average Israelites as [dough of] cakes, and the wicked ones had to grind it in the hand-mill. Or beat it in mortars.³⁰ Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, or as some say, R. Hama b. Hanina: That teaches that there came

down to Israel with the manna the cosmetics for women, i.e., a thing that is ground in a mortar. And seethed it in pots.³⁰ R. Hama said: This intimates that with the manna there came down to Israel the ingredients for pudding. And they brought yet unto him freewill-offerings every morning.³¹ What does 'every morning' mean? —

R. Samuel b. Nahmani, in the name of R. Jonathan said: [This:] Of those things which came down every morning intimates that, together with the manna, there came down to Israel precious stones and pearls, as it is said: And Hanesi'im brought the onyx stones;³² [and] it was taught: [Nesi'im here means]: clouds literally, as it is said also: As clouds [Nesi'im] and winds, without rain.³³ And the taste of it was as the taste of a cake baked with oil.³⁰

R. Abbuha said: [Do not read le-shad (cake), but shad (breast)]³⁴ viz: Just as the infant finds very many a flavor in the breast, so also did Israel find many a taste in the manna as long as they were eating it. Some there are who say: ['Le-shad' means] a real demon; even as the demon changes into many colors, so did the manna change into many tastes.³⁵ And Moses said: This shall be when the Lord shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to the full.³⁶

A Tanna [taught] in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: The flesh for which they asked improperly was given to them at an improper time;³⁷

(1) The Talmud takes the passage in this sense: When he puts his eye i.e., devotes his attention to the cup, when he is drunk.

(2) 'Mesharim' ('smoothly') is connected with Meshor, 'a plain'.

(3) In his drunken state the man overlooks all handicaps to his desire, be they directed against illicit intercourse or against his neighbor's property.

(4) Prov. XII, 25.

(5) One connects the word Yashhenna (boweth it down) with the Hebrew Nassah, 'to remove'; the other with the Hebrew Suh, 'to speak'.

(6) Isa. LXV, 25.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(7) Gen. IX, 26. God did not really curse him, it was Noah who did so. But by decreeing that Canaan be a slave, He seems to confirm Noah's curse.

(8) Here, too, God did not really curse the woman, unless the punishment He meted out to her may imply a curse. All the passages here adduced are connected either by the fact that R. Ammi and R. Assi discussed them or by association of ideas.

(9) Gen. III, 17.

(10) Num. XI, 5.

(11) [I.e., they chafed under the new restrictions in matters of intercourse that had been imposed on them.]

(12) The suggestion is that whereas regular marriage implied widowhood (Kethubah), before that Mohar (dowry, Ex. XXII, 16), no such financial responsibility is necessary in the case of illicit intercourse.

(13) Prov. XXX, 20, referring to an unchaste woman.

(14) Cant. IV, 12.

(15) [I.e., those that had been already forbidden to the sons of Noah, v. Sanh. 57b].

(16) Num. XI, 10: E.V. 'family by family'; because of its families, family affairs, prohibitions of family life.

(17) The one (fish) is obvious, the other (illicit intercourse) is suggested.

(18) V. p. 361, n. 4.

(19) The Israelites remembered sadly these foods, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, garlic, which they had enjoyed in Egypt and which they now missed. Evidently the manna substituted for all other foods, but these five. The latter were 'absent' because these foods do not agree with women in pregnancy.

(20) Num. XI, 7.

(21) Connecting it with rt. Negad, draw, pull, attract.

(22) The 'Omer per head in each household (v. Ex. XVI, 16) being arranged miraculously in accord with the true state of affairs, would be found in the house of the true father and thus would reveal whose child the infant was. Gad is thus connected with the causative of Nagad, meaning to 'reveal', 'tell'.

(23) Being dependent for their daily food on God's bounty, the children of Israel would reflect on their conduct and continually improve it in order to deserve God's food.

(24) In either situation the 'Omer would be found in the home of him who deserved it. The master of the slave would have an additional 'Omer bestowed upon himself; the husband whom his wife had offended would have the measure in his house, where she belonged; if the husband had ill-treated her, so that her father's house was a legitimate refuge, her 'Omer would be found

there. Thus would the gad (to which the manna was compared) reveal the true state of affairs. In the case of the slave he would be restored, on the evidence of the 'Omer, to his master; in the case of the wife, either the husband would have to pay her her marriage settlement (Kethubah) or, if she had been guilty, she would forfeit it.

(25) Num. XI, 9.

(26) Ex. XVI, 4.

(27) Num. XI, 8.

(28) These three statements seem incompatible with one another; according to Num. XI, 9 the manna fell into the camp; according to Ex. XVI, 4 outside thereof, whereas according to Num. XI, 8 it was so far away from the camp that the people had to go far to find it.

(29) עוגות, Num. XI, 8; this denotes cakes while yet unbaked (Rashi).

(30) Num. XI, 8.

(31) Ex. XXXVI, 3.

(32) The word Nesi'im, from the root Nasa, 'to lift up'; thus things lifted up, elevated, may mean either princes or clouds.

(33) Prov. XXV, 14.

(34) Supplemented from Bah.

(35) The word le-shad may mean cake, as the simple text has it. It may also be connected with shad, 'breast', or with shed, 'demon'. Thus the two following interpretations. The different tastes of the milk depend on the food the mother has eaten.

(36) Ex. XVI, 8.

(37) They had enough cattle to feed their lust for flesh, their importune prayers for flesh, hence, were improper, and they would in punishment receive the flesh at night when, because of the need for preparation, it came too late, 'at an improper time', because usable only the next day.

Yoma 75b

whereas the bread for which they asked properly was given to them in its proper time.¹ Here the Torah intimates a matter of good form; that one should eat meat but at night. But surely Abaye said: One who has a meal should eat it only during the day? —

We mean: as in day-light.² R. Aha b. Jacob said: At first Israel were like hens picking in the dunghill, until Moses came and fixed for them a definite meal-time.³ While the flesh was yet between their teeth,⁴ yet it is also written: But a whole month,⁵ how is that? — The average people [died] at once, the wicked

YOMA - 62a-88a

ones continued to suffer a whole month. And they spread them all abroad.⁶

Resh Lakish said: Do not read 'Wayishte'u' [they spread abroad], but 'Wa-yishahtu' [they were slaughtered], which [reading] intimates that the enemies of Israel had incurred the punishment of being slaughtered.⁷ 'Spread abroad'; it was taught in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: Do not read 'Shatoah', but 'Shahut' [ritually killed], which would intimate that there came down to Israel together with the manna something requiring ritual killing.⁸

Rabbi replied: So must you infer it from here. Was it not stated before: He caused flesh also to rain upon them as the dust, and winged fowl as the sand of the sea?⁹ And was it not taught: Rabbi said, Then thou shalt kill [of thy herd and of thy flock]. . . as I have commanded thee.¹⁰ This teaches that Moses received commandments concerning the gullet, and the windpipe, and concerning the larger part of one [organ] in the case of a fowl, and the larger part of two in the case of cattle?¹¹ What then does 'Shatoah' [read, Shahut] intimate? — That they [the quails] came down so as to form layers. It is written: 'bread', but it is also written, 'oil' and it is also written, 'honey'?¹² —

R. Jose b. Hanina said: Bread for the youths, oil for the aged, honey for the infants. It is written 'Shlaw' and we read: slaw?¹³ —

R. Hanina said: The righteous eat it at ease,¹⁴ whereas when the wicked eat it, it is unto them like thorns.¹⁵

R. Hanan b. Abba said: There are four kinds of slaw [quails]: thrush, partridge, pheasant and quail proper; the best of all is the thrush, the worst of all is the quail proper, which is like a small bird. [One stuffs it],¹⁶ places it in the oven, and it swells up, and becomes so big that it fills the oven. Thereupon one places it on top of twelve loaves of bread, and [even] the lowest one of them cannot be eaten

without [some other food] in combination.¹⁷ Rab Judah would find them among his jars; R. Hisda among the twigs. Unto Raba his field laborer used to bring them from the meadow¹⁸ every day. One day he did not bring them. He wondered: Why this? He went up to the roof and heard a child which read: When I heard, my inward parts trembled.¹⁹ Thereupon he said: One knows from this that R. Hisda is dead.²⁰ It is for this reason that people say: By the merit of his master eats the pupil. It is written: And when the layer of dew was gone up,²¹ but it is also written: And when the dew fell?²² —

R. Jose b. Hanina said: There was dew above, and dew below it; it resembled something placed in a box. A fine scale-like thing [Mehuspas];²³ Resh Lakish said: It is something that melts on the wrist [palm] of the hand.²³

R. Johanan said: [It means] something which is absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts [of the human body].²⁴ But [the numerical value] of Mehuspas is much more?²⁵ — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The word is written defective.

Our Rabbis taught: Man did eat the bread of the mighty,²⁶ i.e., bread which ministering angels eat. This was the interpretation of R. Akiba. When these words were reported to R. Ishmael he said to them: Go forth and tell Akiba: Akiba, thou hast erred. For do, indeed, the ministering angels eat bread? Was it not said long ago: I did neither eat bread, nor drink water?²⁷ How, then, do I interpret 'the bread Abbirum [of the mighty]'? I.e., bread which was absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts [Ebarim]. Then how do I apply: And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons?²⁸ That refers to what [foods] the foreign merchants were selling unto them.

R. Eleazar b. Perata said: Even of the foodstuff which merchants of other nations sold them, the manna would counteract the

YOMA - 62a-88a

effect. What then is the meaning of ‘And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons’? — That applied to the time after their offense.²⁹ The Holy One, blessed be He, said: I thought they shall be like ministering angels, but now I shall burden them with the walk of three parasangs³⁰ as it is written: And they pitched by the Jordan, from Beth-Jeshimoth even unto Abel-shittim.³¹

And Rabbah b. Hana had said: I have seen this place, it is three parasangs in extension.³² And furthermore it was taught when they went to relieve nature they went neither forward, nor sideways, but rearwards.³³ But now our soul is dried away: there is nothing at all.³⁴ They said: This manna will swell up their bowels, for is there one born of woman who absorbs food without eliminating it too? But when these words were reported before R. Ishmael he said to them: Do not read *Abbirim* [mighty] but *Ebarim* [parts of the body], i.e., something which is absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts. But how do I then interpret: ‘And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons’? —

That refers to food that came to them from the distant parts.³⁵ Another interpretation of: Man did eat the bread of the mighty:

- (1) Nobody can live without bread, hence that prayer was proper.
- (2) By the light of torch, or candle.
- (3) Morning and evening, the manna and the quails respectively.
- (4) Num. XI, 33.
- (5) Ibid. v. 20.
- (6) Ibid. v. 32. This suggestion, although Aggadic, is not ungrammatical, metathesis being frequent, as in *Kesseb*, *Kebess* (sheep).
- (7) Perhaps because of their unrighteous clamor for flesh, when they had cattle of their own. ‘Enemies of Israel’ is an euphemism for ‘Israel’.
- (8) Hence we infer that quails were of a species that require ritual killing.
- (9) Ps. LXXVIII, 27. ‘Before’ means, before this indirect inference there was a clear test to convey this teaching.
- (10) Deut. XII, 21.
- (11) The windpipe and the gullet, one in the case of fowl, both in the case of cattle, must be cut according to the ritual. There is no commandment

anywhere in the Pentateuch as to the details of ritual slaughtering of animals or birds, called *Shechitah*. Hence ‘as I have commanded thee’ must needs refer to another source of law: the unwritten or oral one.

(12) In reference to the manna. Ex. XVI, 29, 31 and Num. XI, 8. Three different tastes are ascribed to this food.

(13) The spelling is ψ , the pronunciation υ . The deviation indicates another aspect.

(14) The Hebrew word (with ψ) may be traced to a root meaning ‘ease’. Thus the homiletical interpretation.

(15) The Aramaic equivalent of the reading means ‘thorn’, hence the suggestion that slaw in addition to the simple text meaning, has also other implications.

(16) Supplemented from Bah.

(17) It is so greasy that without some other dry food added it would be indigestible.

(18) Bah.

(19) Hab. III, 16.

(20) This story is very satisfactorily explained in Schatzkes’ *Mafteah I*, Warsaw, 1866. R. Hisda, in spite of his great riches, was very frugal in his habits and so economical that he would not entrust even the management of wood to any servant, but himself every day handed wood to the cooks (Git. 56a). Although he would find the quails among his twigs, he would prevent anyone from laying his hands upon these delicacies. His son-in-law Raba, therefore, arranged with a tenant-farmer to bring them. His failure to bring them one day Raba rightly attributed to the thought that something had happened which rendered such service unnecessary. To this inference he added, according to widespread custom, the additional reliance on the implications of a text the first child he met would be studying. When that text suggested evil news the ‘evidence was complete’.

(21) Ex. XVI, 14.

(22) Num. XI, 9. The passage in Ex. suggests that the dew covered the manna, whereas the verse in Num. indicates that the dew was below the manna.

(23) There is a play on ‘Mah’, ‘melt’, and ‘pas’, ‘palm’.

(24) The numerical value of ‘Mehuspas’: Mem = 40, Heth = 8, Samek = 60, Pe = 80 and Samek = 60, together 248. V. Mak., Sonc. ed., p. 169, n. 5.

(25) The part. pass. is usually spelt with a waw, which makes its numerical value plus 6 = 254; whereas the reading is plene, the text is without the waw $\psi\psi\psi\psi\psi$, hence 248; and the inference as to the 248 parts of the body is supported.

(26) Ps. LXXVIII, 25.

(27) Deut. IX, 18.

(28) Ibid. XXIII, 14. The paddle is to serve thus: And it shall be, when thou sittest down abroad,

YOMA - 62a-88a

thou shalt dig therewith, and shalt turn back, and cover that which cometh from thee. But, if the manna was completely absorbed, there was nothing 'coming from the Israelite', hence no need for the paddle.

(29) In complaining of the manna as Num. XXI, 5; Our soul loatheth this light bread.

(30) To get outside the confines of the camp for the call of nature.

(31) Num. XXXIII, 49.

(32) 'Er. 55b.

(33) None would turn backwards, therefore there was no offense against common decency involved.

(34) Num. XI, 6.

(35) Lit., 'province of the sea'.

Yoma 76a

That is Joshua for whom manna [specially] fell down as it did to¹ all Israel, [for] it is written: here, 'man',² and also there it is written: Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is spirit.³ But perhaps it is Moses, of whom it is said: Now the man Moses was very meek?⁴ — One may infer ish from ish, but not ish from we-ha-ish.⁵

R. Simon b. Yohai was asked by his disciples: Why did not the manna come down unto Israel once annually? He replied: I shall give a parable: This thing may be compared to a king of flesh and blood who had one son, whom he provided with maintenance once a year, so that he would visit his father once a year only. Thereupon he provided for his maintenance every day, so that he called on him every day. The same with Israel. One who had four or five children would worry, saying: Perhaps no manna will come down to-morrow, and all will die of hunger. Thus they were found to turn their attention to their Father in Heaven. Another interpretation: They ate it whilst it was yet warm.⁶ Another interpretation: Because of the burden of the way.⁷

And it long ago happened that R. Tarfon, R. Ishmael and the Elders were seated and occupied with the portion referring to the manna, and also R. Eleazar of Modi'im was seated among them. R. Eleazar of Modim commenced [to expound] and said: The

manna which came down unto Israel was sixty cubits high! R. Tarfon said to him: Modite! How long will you rake words together and bring them up against us?⁸ — He answered: My master! I am expounding a Scriptural verse. Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered.⁹ Were there indeed fifteen cubits [high] in the valley, [fifteen cubits in the lowlands],¹⁰ fifteen cubits on the mountains?¹¹ Were the waters standing like a series of walls? And, furthermore, how could the ark come to the top [of the mountains]? Rather, all the fountains of the great deep came up first until the water was even with the mountains, then the water rose fifteen more cubits. Now which measure is larger, that of reward or punishment? You must needs agree that the measure of goodness [reward] is larger. Now with the measure of punishment it is written: The windows of heaven were opened,¹² with the measure of goodness, however, it is said: And he commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven; and caused manna to rain upon them for food, and gave them of the corn of heaven.¹³ [And a Tanna taught]:¹⁴ Now how many windows has a door? Four; hence 'doors' [imply] eight.¹⁵ Thus it is found that the manna which fell upon Israel was sixty cubits.

It was taught: Issi b. Judah says: The manna which fell down for Israel rose so high that all the kings of the east and the west could see it, as it is said: [Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies. . .] my cup runneth over.¹⁶ (Abaye said: It is evident from this that the cup of King David in the future world will hold two hundred and twenty-one logs, as it is said: My cup is Rewayah [overflowing], and this is the numerical value of Rewayah).¹⁷ But there is no comparison: there it took forty days, here only one hour;¹⁸ or there for all the world, here for Israel alone;¹⁹ and it should have been higher still! — [Rather]: R. Eleazar of Modim infers it from the analogy of 'opened', 'opened'.²⁰

YOMA - 62a-88a

[ON YOM KIPPUR] EATING IS FORBIDDEN. To what do the five afflictions correspond? — R. Hisda said: To the five afflictions mentioned in the Torah: And on the tenth day;²¹ howbeit on the tenth day;²² a Sabbath of solemn rest;²³ it is a Sabbath of solemn rest,²⁴ and it shall be unto you.²⁵ But these are only five, whereas [in our Mishnah] we learned of six [afflictions]? — Drinking is included in eating.

For Resh Lakish said: When do we know that drinking is included in eating? Because Scripture said: And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God... the tithe of thy corn, of thy [Tirosh] wine, and of thine oil;²⁶ 'Tirosh' is wine and yet Scripture reads: 'And thou shalt eat'. Whence this proof? Perhaps it means that he used it as all admixture to elaiogarum?²⁷ For Rabbah b. Samuel said: Elaiogarum contains the juice of beets; oxygarum the sauce of all kinds of boiled vegetables? —

Rather, said R. Aha b. Jacob, is that inferred from here: And thou shalt bestow thy money for whatever thy soul desireth, for oxen, for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink.²⁸ [To] wine and strong drink [applies the term] drinking and yet the Divine Law reads: 'And thou shalt eat'. How is that [conclusive]? — Perhaps here, too, the implication is that he uses it as an admixture to elaiogarum? — Scripture says 'Strong drink', i.e., something which intoxicates.²⁹ But perhaps the reference here is to preserved figs from Keilah, for it was taught: If one [a priest] ate preserved figs from Keilah,³⁰ and drank honey and milk, and thus entered the Sanctuary

(1) Corresponding to.

(2) Num. XXVII, 18.

(3) Ex. XXIV, 13. Joshua went up with Moses to Mount Sinai, Moses did not eat, but Joshua did, hence the manna must have come to him there.

(4) Num. XII, 3.

(5) Analogy should be built upon exact similarity, almost identity, not on relative similarity of expression; according to this rigid rule no analogy

from 'ish' to 'ha-ish' or vice versa could be argued.

(6) Its taste or flavor was preserved, but if gathered once for the whole year, it would become stale, cold, tasteless.

(7) It would greatly hamper them on their journeys.

(8) Try to impress us with unsubstantiated statements.

(9) Gen. VII, 20.

(10) [Var. lec. rightly omit as unnecessary repetition].

(11) The phrase fifteen cubits upward surely could not be taken to mean that the fifteen cubits were measured from different levels.

(12) Ibid. v. 11.

(13) Ps. LXXVIII, 23, 24.

(14) Supplied from MS.M. V. also Rashi.

(15) At least two are implied in 'doors' hence at least eight windows. But the measure of goodness surpasses the measure of punishment (as e.g., Ex. II, 6, 7). There were at least two 'windows' of heaven at the flood, as implied in 'windows' which poured forth fifteen cubits of rain; the eight windows (of the two doors of heaven) must have produced at least no less, i.e., sixty cubits of manna, since the measure of goodness is surely no smaller than that of punishment. So that 'sixty' here is to be taken as minimum.

(16) Ps. XXIII, 5, 6. This reckoning is stimulated by the preceding one.

(17) The psalm is taken as prophetic of restoration — either in this world (then 'in the future' at the time of the Messiah) or in the world to come (usual interpretation).

(18) Between the flood and manna.

(19) Here the argument is in favor of a higher measure for the manna. For since the space wherein it fell was limited, whilst the windows of heaven presumably were capable of pouring out the same quantity, the manna confined to a small area should have risen very much higher than the waters, which covered all the earth.

(20) Gen. VII, 11 and Ps. LXXVIII, 23; he does not employ the argument of a greater measure in store for reward than for punishment; but merely from the fact that in each case two windows produced a height of fifteen cubits — whether of manna or water.

(21) Num. XXIX, 7.

(22) Lev. XXIII, 27.

(23) Ibid. 32.

(24) Ibid. XVI, 31.

(25) Ibid. v. 29.

(26) Deut. XIV, 23.

(27) Greek; a sauce of oil and garum, to which wine is sometimes added.

(28) Deut. XIV, 26.

(29) And no intoxication results from eating.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(30) A town in the lowlands of Judea, cf. Josh. XV, 44; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 481, n. 6.

Yoma 76b

he is culpable?¹ —

Rather, he infers it by analogy of ‘strong drink’ from the Nazirite.² Just as there it means wine, so here too is wine involved. But is ‘Tirosh’ wine? Was it not taught: One who takes a vow to abstain from ‘Tirosh’ is forbidden to use any sweet drink but may use wine? — But is [‘Tirosh’] not wine? Surely it is written: And Tirosh makes the maids flourish!³ The thing which is derived from ‘Tirosh’ makes maids flourish.⁴ But it is written: And thy vats shall overflow with tirosh?⁵ — Thy vats shall overflow with what is derived from ‘Tirosh’. But it is written: Harlotry, wine and Tirosh take away the heart?⁶ — Rather, everybody agrees that ‘Tirosh’ is wine, but with regard to vows we go after common parlance.⁷ Why is it [wine] called ‘Yayin’ and ‘Tirosh’? — It is called ‘Yayin’ because it brings lamentation into the world, and ‘Tirosh’ ‘because he who indulges in it becomes poor.’⁸

R. Kahana pointed out a contradiction: It is written ‘Tirash’ and we read ‘Tirosh’! — If he is meritorious he becomes a head [Rosh] through it; if not, he becomes poor [rash] through it.⁹ Raba pointed out this contradiction: The text reads, ‘Yeshammah’, whilst we read ‘yesammah’?¹⁰ — If he is meritorious it makes him happy, if not, it makes him desolate. That is why Raba said: Wine and odorous spices made me wise.¹¹ Whence do we know that [abstention from] bathing and from anointing oneself is considered an affliction? — Because it is written: I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all.¹² What does ‘I ate no pleasant bread’ mean? —

Rab Judah, in the name of R. Samuel b. Shilath said: He ate not even bread made of pure wheat. Whence do we know that [the

abstention from anointing] was considered an affliction? Because it is written: Then he said unto me: Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to afflict¹³ thyself before thy God, thy words were heard; and I am come because of thy words.¹⁴ We have found it now with regard to [abstention from] anointing oneself. Whence do we know it about [abstention from] washing? —

R. Zutra, son of R. Tobiah said: Scripture reads: And it is come into his inward parts like water, and like oil into his bones.¹⁵ But perhaps that applies to drinking it? — It is compared to oil; just as the oil is applied externally, so also the water [is such as is applied] externally. But a Tanna teaches just the reverse, for we learned: Whence do we know that anointing oneself is like drinking on the Day of Atonement? Although there is no conclusive evidence for this, there is some intimation, for it is said: ‘And it is come into his inward parts like water, and like oil into his bones’?¹⁶ —

Rather, said R. Ashi: [That abstention from] washing [is considered an affliction] is evident from the verse itself, for it is written: ‘Neither did I anoint myself at all’.¹⁷ What does: ‘And I am come because of thy words’ mean?¹⁸ — It is written: And there stood before them seventy men of the elders of the House of Israel, and in the midst of them stood Jazaniah, the son of Shapan, every man with his censer in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up.¹⁹ [Furthermore]: And the form of a hand was put forth, and I was taken by a lock of my head; and a spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me into the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the gate of the inner court that looketh toward the north; where

(1) Lev. X, 9.

(2) Num. VI, 3.

(3) Zech. IX, 17.

(4) The argument is not too obvious. According to Rashi the point under consideration is whether ‘Tirosh’ is the name for wine (new wine) or for the

YOMA - 62a-88a

grapes themselves. If the latter is accepted wine is 'that which is derived from Tirosh (berries)'.

(5) Prov. III, 10 and into vats the wine is poured, not the berries!

(6) Hos. IV, II. Surely grapes would not fit into this context.

(7) And in common parlance 'Tirosh' and 'Yayin' are separated.

(8) The first is a play on 'Ya, Ya' exclamation of woe, the second on the second syllable of 'Tirosh', which is connected with 'rash', to become poor, as if 'Tirosh' meant, You will become poor.

(9) The text connected with the root meaning 'poor', the reading with the noun 'Rosh', head.

(10) Ps. CIV, 15. Again a difference between text and pronunciation with a significance attached to both; Samah means 'rejoicing', 'Shammah' is connected with 'Shammah', desolation, the 'he' and 'Heth' interchanging.

(11) Stimulated my intellect.

(12) Dan. X, 3.

(13) E.V. 'to humble'.

(14) Ibid. V. 12.

(15) Ps. CIX, 18.

(16) Here water in the verse is taken to refer to 'drinking' from which 'anointing' is derived, contrary to the conclusion just arrived at whereby the meaning of 'water' is derived from its juxtaposition to 'oil'.

(17) Lit., '(as to) anointing I did not anoint myself at all'. 'At all' means, not even washing, which may be preparatory.

(18) When was he driven out, so that he had to re-enter? The reference is to 'the man clothed in linen', (v. ibid. verse 5)

identified infra with Gabriel.

(19) Ezek. VIII, 11.

themselves and committed a nuisance toward that which is below.³

The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Michael:⁴ Michael, your nation has committed sin. Michael answered: Lord of the Universe! Let the good ones among them be considered sufficient! He replied: I shall burn both them and the good ones among them! Immediately then: And he spoke unto the man clothed in linen, and said: Go in between the wheelwork, even under the cherub, and fill both thy hands with coals of fire from between the cherubim, and dash them against the city. And he went in my sight.⁵ Thereupon: And the cherub stretched forth his hand between the cherubim unto the fire that was between the cherubim, and took thereof and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen, who took it and went out.⁶

R. Hana b. Bizna said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious: Were it not for the fact that the coals of the hand of the cherub became cold [in the process of coming] into the hands of Gabriel,⁷ there would not have been left over from the 'enemies of Israel'⁸ one to remain or one to escape, for it is written: And behold the man clothed in linen, who had the inkhorn on his side, reported, saying: 'I have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me'.⁹

Yoma 77a

there was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy.¹ [Furthermore]: And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshipped the sun toward the east.² Now from the implication of the text: 'And their faces toward the east', do I not know that their backs were toward the temple of the Lord? Why then does the text state: 'With their backs toward the temple of the Lord'? It teaches that they uncovered

R. Johanan¹⁰ said: In that hour Gabriel was led out behind the curtain and received forty fiery strokes, he being told: If you had not executed the command at all, well, you simply would not have executed it.¹¹ But since you did execute it, why did you not do as you were commanded?¹² Furthermore: Don't you know that:¹³ 'One brings no report about mischief'?¹⁴ Thereupon Dubiel,¹⁵ the guardian angel of the Persians, was brought in and placed in his stead, and he officiated for twenty-one days. This is what is written: But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to

YOMA - 62a-88a

help me; and I was left over there beside the kings of Persia.¹⁶ Twenty-one provinces and the port of Mashmahig¹⁷ were given to him. Thereupon he said: Put down for me Israel for the poll-tax! They did so. Put down the Sages for the poll-tax! They did so. When they were about to sign, Gabriel came forth from behind the curtain and said: It is vain for you that ye rise early, and sit up late, ye that eat the bread of toil; so He giveth unto His beloved in sleep.¹⁸ (What does 'So He giveth unto His beloved in sleep' signify?

R. Isaac said: This refers to the wives of the scholars who deny themselves sleep in this world, and acquire the world to come).¹⁹ No attention was paid to him. He said before Him: Lord of the Universe, if all the wise men of other nations were in one scale of the balance, and Daniel, the man of pleasant parts, in the other, would he not be found to outweigh them all? —

The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Who is it that pleads the merit of my children? They replied: Lord of the Universe, it is Gabriel. He said: Let him come in, as it is written: 'And I am come [in] because of thy words'. Having commanded that they bring him in, they brought him in. He noticed that Dubiel held the document in his hand, and he wanted to take it from him, but the former swallowed it. Some say: [The document] was written out, but not signed. Others say: It was also signed, but as he swallowed it, the signature was blotted out. Hence there are some people in the kingdom of Persia who are obliged to pay poll-tax, while others are free from it. And when I go forth, lo, the prince of Greece shall come.²⁰ He cried and cried and none minded him. Or, if you like, that [abstention from] washing is considered an affliction is deducible from here. For it is written: And unto Abiathar the priest said the king: 'Get thee to Anatoth, unto thine own fields; for thou art deserving of death; but I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou didst bear the ark of the Lord God before David my father, and because

thou wast afflicted in all wherein my father was afflicted'.²¹ And concerning David it is written: For they said: 'The people is hungry, and faint and thirsty in the wilderness'.²² 'Hungry' because of no bread; 'thirsty' because of no water; 'faint' because of what? Would you not say: Because of no washing?²³ — But perhaps 'faint' [means] because of no sandals? —

Rather said R. Isaac, [it is to be deducted] from this: As cold water to a faint soul.²⁴ But perhaps it means: [Faint] from [lack of] drink? — Does Scripture read: 'Into a faint soul'? Upon a faint soul is written! And whence is to be inferred that [abstention from wearing] sandals [is considered an affliction]? Because it is written: And David went up by the ascent of the Mount of Olives and wept as he went up; and he had his head covered, and went bare.²⁵ 'Bare' of what? Obviously 'of shoes'. Perhaps it means bare because without horse and whip? —

Rather, said R. Nahman b. Isaac, the inference comes from: Go and loose the sackcloth from off thy loins, and put thy shoe from off thy foot,²⁶ and it is written: And he did so, walking naked and bare.²⁶ 'Bare' of what? Obviously bare of sandals. But perhaps [it means he went] in patched shoes. For, if you were not to interpret thus, 'naked' would also have to be explained as stark naked? Rather, must you here too explain: [naked] i.e. in shabby garments, thus also 'bare' in patched sandals! —

Rather, said R. Nahman b. Isaac: [It is derived] from here: Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst,²⁷ i.e., withhold thyself from sin lest thy foot become unshod; withhold thy tongue from idle speech, lest thy throat become dry [faint with thirst]. Whence do we know that [abstention from] marital intercourse is considered an affliction? — Because it is written: If thou shalt afflict my daughters, and if thou shalt take wives beside my daughters,²⁸ [i.e.]

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 77b

- (1) Ibid. v. 3.
- (2) Ibid. v. 16.
- (3) A euphemism for heaven.
- (4) Who is the guardian angel of Israel.
- (5) Ezek. X, 2.
- (6) Ibid. 7.
- (7) Alluded to in 'the man clothed in linen'.
- (8) Euphemistic for Israel.
- (9) Ibid. IX, 11.
- (10) Var. lec. remove the whole account that follows from here.
- (11) He may have assumed that God's mercy would postpone or suspend punishment.
- (12) You were commanded to fetch the coals yourself, you sinned in appointing someone else to do so.
- (13) Meg. 15a. For the same reason one need not report to children the death even of their parents.
- (14) With reference to his reporting back, 'I have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me'.
- (15) Lit., 'bear-god'. In Daniel VII, 5 Persia appears as 'a bear', hence their angel is bear-god. V. Kid. 72a. A.Z. 2a.
- (16) Dan. X, 13. This verse is ingeniously used to build up the present Aggadah.
- (17) A place on an island of the Persian Gulf, famous for pearl fisheries. V. R. H., Sonc. ed., p. 99, n. 5. V. D. S. as to the MSS. which omit this whole passage.
- (18) Ps. CXXVII, 2.
- (19) The nations of the world should not be able to subdue or tax these, for they are the beloved of the Lord, and their own wives, in denying sleep to themselves in this world (taking 'Yedid' ad hoc as if derived from 'Nadad', flee, avoid i.e., sleep) earn eternal salvation. God thus protects them. When this argument proved unavailing, they made another attempt by comparing Daniel with all non-Jewish scholars, and this was accepted by the Lord.
- (20) Dan. X, 20. Gabriel's protest was of no avail against the time when Greece was given rule over Israel.
- (21) I Kings II, 26.
- (22) II Sam. XVII, 29.
- (23) Thus would abstention from bathing be proved to be considered an affliction.
- (24) Prov. XXV, 25.
- (25) II Sam. XV, 30.
- (26) Isa. XX, 2.
- (27) Jer. II, 25.
- (28) Gen. XXXI, 50.

'if thou shalt afflict' by denying conjugal duty, 'if thou shalt take' refers to rivals. But say [perhaps]: Both [afflictions due] to rival women? — Does Scripture say: 'If thou shalt take',¹ it reads: 'And if thou shalt take'. But perhaps both refer to affliction through rivals; one through rivalries among them, the other through rivalries of new wives, so that ['if thou shalt afflict'] would be the same as 'if thou shalt take'.² Does Scripture say: 'If thou wilt take and afflict'? It reads: If thou shalt afflict and thou shalt take.³

R. Papa said to Abaye: But intercourse in itself is described as affliction, for it is written: And he lay with her and afflicted her?⁴ He answered: He afflicted her through other [forms of] intercourse.

Our Rabbis taught: It is forbidden to wash part of the body [on the Day of Atonement], as [it is forbidden to wash] the whole body. But if one was soiled with mud or excrement, he may wash in his usual way without any fear.⁵ It is forbidden to anoint part of the body [as it is forbidden to anoint] the whole body. If, however, one was sick or had scabs on his head, he may anoint himself in his usual way without any fear.

The School of R. Menasseh taught: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: A woman may wash one of her hands in water to give bread to an infant without any fear. It was reported about the older Shammai⁶ that he would not [hand food] to be eaten even with one hand, whereupon the Rabbis decreed that he must do so with both hands.⁷ Why that? Abaye said: Because of Shibta.⁸

Our Rabbis taught: One who goes to visit his father or his teacher, or his superior,⁹ may walk through water up to his neck without any fear. They asked: How about a master who visits his disciple? —

YOMA - 62a-88a

Come and hear: For R. Isaac b. Bar Hana said: I saw Ze'iri who went to R. Ashi, his disciple. R. Ashi said: That was R. Hiyya b. Ashi, who went to Ze'iri, his master. Raba permitted the people of 'Ibar Jemina¹⁰ to walk through water for the purpose of guarding [fruits] the crop.¹¹

Abaye said to Raba: I know a teaching that supports you [your decision]: Those who guard the crop may walk up to the neck through water without any fear. R. Joseph permitted the people of Be Tarbu¹² to walk through the water in order to go to the lecture [of the Day of Atonement] but he did not permit them to return [in the same fashion].

Abaye said to him: If so, you will put a stumbling-block in their way for the future.¹³ Some say: He permitted them to go and to return [through water], whereupon Abaye said: Quite right [to permit them] to do so on the way to the lecture, but why the permission on their return? — Lest you put a stumbling-block in their way for the future.

Rab Judah and R. Samuel son of R. Judah were standing at the bank of Nehar Papa,¹⁴ at the ford of Hazdad, and Rami b. Papa was standing on the other bank. He shouted across: How about going over to you to inquire about a decision of the Law? Rab Judah answered; Rab and Samuel both agree: One may come over, provided one take not one's hand out of the bosom of his shirt.¹⁵ Some say: It was R. Samuel, son of Rab Judah who said: We were taught, He may come over, provided he take not his hand out of the bosom of his shirt.

R. Joseph demurred: But, even on a weekday is such action permitted?¹⁶ Does not Scripture say: He measured a thousand cubits and he caused me to pass through the waters, waters that were to the ankles;¹⁷ hence we infer that it is permitted to pass through water up to the ankles. Again he measured a thousand, and caused me to pass

through the waters, waters that were up to the knees;¹⁸ hence we learn that it is permitted to pass through waters up to the knees. Again he measured a thousand, and caused me to pass through waters that were to the loins;¹⁸ hence we know that it is permissible to pass through water up to the loins. Henceforth: Afterward he measured a thousand, and it was a river that I would not pass through.¹⁹

Abaye said: It is different with a river whose waters run rapidly.²⁰ One might have assumed that it is permissible to swim across such a river, therefore the text reads: For the waters were risen, waters to swim in.¹⁹ What does 'Sahu' mean? — 'Swim', for a swimmer is called 'Sayaha'. One might have assumed that it is permissible to pass through such [river] in a small Liburnian boat, therefore the text reads: Wherein, shall go no galley with oars.²¹ One might have assumed that one may cross it in a big Liburnian ship, therefore Scripture says: Neither shall gallant ship pass thereby.²⁰ How does that follow from the text? — As R. Joseph interprets it: No fisher's boat goes thereon, no big boat traverses it.²²

R. Judah b. Pazzi said: Even the Angel of Death has no permission to cross it, for here it is said: 'Wherein shall go no galley with oars [Shayit].'²³ and there it reads: From going [shut] to and fro in the earth.²³

R. Phineas in the name of R. Huna of Sepphoris said: The spring that issues from the Holy of Holies in its beginning resembles the antennae of locusts; as it reaches the entrance to the Sanctuary it becomes as the thread of the warp; as it reaches the Ulam,²⁴ it becomes as the thread of the woof; as it reaches the entrance to the [Temple] court, it becomes as large as the mouth of a small flask, that is meant by what we learned: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: [Hence] go forth the waters

(1) So that the second part of the verse would state explicitly what the first implies.

YOMA - 62a-88a

- (2) Thus the question as to the meaning of 'and' would be disposed of.
- (3) The lesser evil would be mentioned first, whereas the marrying of Jacob of other additional women would constitute the larger wrong.
- (4) Gen. XXXIV, 2.
- (5) Of transgressing the prohibition of washing on the Day of Atonement.
- (6) The colleague of Hillel in the Sanhedrin under King Herod.
- (7) Shammai did not wish to allow himself the concession made by the Rabbis, since he always took the severer view for himself, when two interpretations of ritual obligations were involved. But the Rabbis decided that their permission to wash one's hand was a matter of safeguarding the child's health, and Shammai's unwillingness to accept their rule was unjustified. To emphasize that they imposed upon him the obligation to wash both his hands before handing food to his infant.
- (8) An evil spirit, or odor, that endangers the health of those that eat food touched with unwashed hands.
- (9) On the day of Atonement and in order to reach him must wade through a river. 'His superior' is one to whom one owes obeisance either by Biblical or Rabbinic law or by the exigencies of political situation.
- (10) [Lit., 'the right (= south) side', the district south of Mahoza on the Tigris, where lay the orchards of Mahoza and which could not be reached except across some canal, v. Obermeyer p. 181.]
- (11) [Apparently the people of Ibar Jemina came up to Mahoza for the service of the Day of Atonement and Raba permitted them to return home by wading through water in order to guard their produce, v. loc. cit.]
- (12) [Near Pumbeditha, v. Obermeyer. p. 230].
- (13) They will abstain from attending the lecture on future occasions because of the discomfort involved in having to wait until the end of the Day of Atonement for their return home.
- (14) [A canal that passed through Pumbeditha, v. Obermeyer. p. 227].
- (15) I.e., to throw his cloak over his shoulder, it would look as if he were carrying it, rather than wearing it.
- (16) To walk through water up to one's neck.
- (17) Ezek. XLVII, 3.
- (18) Ibid. 4.
- (19) Ibid. v. 5.
- (20) As with the river, coming from the Holy of Holies; but this is no precedent.
- (21) Isa. XXXIII, 21.
- (22) V. Targum on Prophets a.l.
- (23) Job I, 7. The argument is based on the analogy of expression. The conditions attaching to the 'Shayit' in Isaiah inferred from Ezekiel apply

also to shut in Job. Hence, just as there it is forbidden, by inference, to cross the river, so may the Angel of Death, as another Shayit not do so either.

(24) The Main Hall leading into the interior of the Sanctuary.

Yoma 78a

which will bubble forth from under the threshold of the Sanctuary.¹ From there onwards it becomes bigger, rising higher and higher, until it reaches the entrance to the House of David.² As soon as it reaches the entrance to the house of David, it becomes even as a swiftly running brook, in which men and women afflicted with gonorrhoea, menstruating women, and women after childbirth bathe, as it is said: In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for purification and for sprinkling.³

Said R. Joseph: Hence there is an intimation that a menstruating woman [at her purification] must sit in water [that reaches in height] up to the neck. But the law is not in accord with him. (That will be right on the Day of Atonement, on which no sandal is worn). But what about the Sabbath on which sandals are worn?⁴ —

R. Nehemiah, the son-in-law of the Prince,⁵ said: I saw R. Ammi and R. Assi who reached a pool of water and crossed it dressed.⁶ That is all right in shoes, but what can be said in the case of sandals?⁷ R. Rihumi said: I saw Rabina, who crossed it in sandals. R. Ashi said: One must not do so at the outset in sandals.

The Exilarch once came to Hagronia to the house of R. Nathan. Rafram and all the Rabbis attended his lecture, Rabina did not. Next day Rafram wanted to remove Rabina from the mind of the Exilarch,⁸ so he said to him: 'Why did you not come to the lecture, Sir'? He answered: 'My foot hurt me'. 'You should have put shoes on!' 'It was the back of the foot'. 'You should have put sandals on'.

YOMA - 62a-88a

He answered: 'A pool of water was in the way'. 'You should have crossed it in them'. He replied: 'Don't you hold, Sir, the view of R. Ashi, that one must not at the outset do so in sandals'!

Judah b. Gerogeroth taught: It is forbidden to sit on moist muddy ground on the Day of Atonement. R. Joshua b. Levi said: This refers to mud which makes wet [those sitting on it]. Abaye said: If it is moist enough to moisten other subjects.

Rab Judah said: It is permitted to cool off [by sitting] on fruit on the Day of Atonement. Rab Judah would cool off through squash, Raba through fresh twigs, Rabbah through a silver cup.

R. Papa said:⁹ On a silver vessel one may not cool oneself if it is full; it is permissible only when it is not full. On an earthen vessel it is forbidden in either case, because [the unglazed vessel] lets the moisture ooze through. R. Papa¹⁰ said: A silver vessel, if not full, is also forbidden for use as a cooler-off, because it may be upset.¹¹

Ze'iri b. Hama was the host of R. Ammi and R. Assi, and R. Joshua b. Levi, and of all the Rabbis of Caesarea. He said to R. Joseph the son of R. Joshua b. Levi: O, son of a great man,¹² come and let me tell you a fine custom that your father had. He had a towel from the eve of the Day of Atonement, which he soaked in water, made it into a kind of dry vessel, and on the morrow would wipe his face, hands and feet with it. On the eve of the ninth of Ab he would soak it in water and on the morrow he would stroke his eyes with it.

Similarly¹³ when Rabbah b. Mari came he reported: On the eve of the ninth of Ab a towel was brought to him, he soaked it in water, and put it under his head. On the morrow he would therewith wipe his face, hands and feet. On the eve of the Day of Atonement one brought him a towel, which he soaked in water and made it into a kind of

dry vessel, and on the morrow he stroked his eyes with it. Said R. Jacob to R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa: You had told us the matter in just the opposite fashion and we refuted you by reference to prohibition of wringing out.¹⁴

R. Menashiah b. Tahlifa, in the name of R. Amram, on the authority of Rabbah b. Bar Hannah said: The following question was propounded to R. Eleazar: Must a scholar, who is a member of an Academy, obtain special permission to declare a firstborn animal allowed,¹⁵ or does he not need that special permission? What was it that appeared doubtful to them? — This is what they wanted to know: In accord with the statement of R. Idi b. Abin that 'this matter was left in the hands of the Prince as a special distinction for himself', the question is: Must [the elder] receive permission or since he is an elder and a member of an Academy, he need not?

R. Zadok b. Haloka thereupon stood up and said: I saw R. Jose b. Zimra who was both an elder and a member of an Academy, and indeed was superior to the grandfather of this our Prince,¹⁶ yet obtained permission to declare firstborn animals for profane use! —

R. Abba replied to him: It was not like this, but rather, this was the fact: R. Jose b. Zimra was a priest, and this was his problem: Is the Halachah in accord with R. Meir, who said: One who is suspected concerning a matter¹⁷ may neither judge nor offer testimony in connection therewith; or is the Halachah in accord with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel who said: Such a one would be trustworthy in a case concerning his neighbor, but not in a case concerning himself? The answer given was: The Halachah is in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Furthermore did they ask [R. Eleazar]: How about

(1) Mid. III, 6. A play on Pakh (pitcher) as if derived from Pakhakh (to bubble forth).

(2) I.e., Zion, outside Jerusalem, the fortress in the wall of the Holy City.

(3) All of which need a ritual immersion to regain their purity. Zech. XIII, 1.

(4) Some commentators, among them Rashi, omit the bracketed portion. The question taken up again is: Whether, as apart from the prohibition to wear shoes, which applies on the Day of Atonement as a form of affliction, on a Sabbath such crossing would be permissible, since the possibility of their falling off, and being carried, should involve a preventive prohibition of such crossing. They might slide off easily, and thus lead the wearer to carrying them.

(5) Perhaps R. Judah II.

(6) I.e., with their feet dressed in shoes.

(7) The difference between the two lies in this: that shoes, as a rule, are laced or worn tight, whence the danger of their falling off is minimized. Therefore the Rabbis above were seen wearing shoes. But sandals which are but lightly attached, might slide off.

(8) I.e., to find out from Rabina the reason for his absence and thereby remove the suspicion of deliberate negligence in his friend's part from the mind of the Exilarch.

(9) Asheri: Rab.

(10) Alfasi and Asheri: R. Ashi.

(11) The silver vessel, being smooth, may be upset and the liquid spilt, thus offering unlawful flow.

(12) Lit., 'son of a lion'.

(13) [Wilna Gaon Glosses deletes 'Similarly'].

(14) Wringing out is forbidden on the Day of Atonement; the towel had therefore to be dried on the eve of the Day of Atonement. Abba Mari was wrong and rejected this important detail, hence the version reported by R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa.

(15) According to Sanh. 5a no Sage was permitted to declare a firstborn animal free, i.e., defective and hence permitted for profane use, unless he had received special authorization from the Prince in Palestine. The question here posed is whether a member of an Academy may be considered a privileged person in this respect or not. This problem is not germane to the present discussion and is introduced only because it leads to another (the next) question, touching the Day of Atonement, which was submitted at the same time.

(16) [R. Judah II, whose grandfather was R. Judah I, the Prince].

(17) Since the destruction of the Temple a firstborn animal must be left to pasture under priestly control until it acquired a blemish. To avoid such inconvenience many a priest felt tempted to discover a blemish before its actual appearance, hence the priests were suspected of undue laxity in this matter. V. Bek. 35a.

Yoma 78b

going forth [on the Day of Atonement] in sandals of bamboo? — Thereupon R. Isaac b. Nahmani stood up and said: I saw myself R. Joshua b. Levi going forth in sandals of bamboo on the Day of Atonement. I asked him: How about [on public rain] fast?¹ He answered: There is no difference.

Rabbah b. Bar Hannah said: I saw R. Eleazar of Niniveh² who was going forth in sandals of bamboo on a public [rain] fast, and I asked him: How about the Day of Atonement? He answered: There is no difference. Rab Judah went forth in [sandals made of] reeds; Abaye in [such made] of palm-branches; Raba in [such made of] twisted reeds; Rabbah b. Bar Hannah tied a piece of cloth around his legs and went thus forth.

Rami b. Hama raised an objection: 'A cripple may go forth with his artificial foot', according to R. Meir, whilst R. Jose forbids it. Both agree, however, that he must not go forth with it on the Day of Atonement.³ Said Abaye: There, the reference is where it [the wooden leg] has pads, and [the prohibition to go out with them on the Day of Atonement is] due to the comfort [they bring]. Said Raba to him: But if it be no object of wear [without them], would the pads make it one? And, furthermore, is any comfort not coming from shoes forbidden on the Day of Atonement? Did not Rabbah b. Bar Hannah tie a cloth around his legs and thus go forth? Furthermore, since the conclusion [of that teaching] reads: 'If it [the artificial leg] has a receptacle made of pads, it is capable of acquiring ritual uncleanness',⁴ it follows that the first portion deals with a wooden leg without such pads? —

Rather, said Raba: In truth, all agree that an artificial leg is not considered a shoe, but in the case of the Sabbath they differ on the following point: One Master holds, We

YOMA - 62a-88a

decree [the prohibition for fear] it may fall off and cause him to carry it four cubits in a public thoroughfare;⁵ whereas the other Master holds, We do not decree [any prohibition because of such fear].

Our Rabbis taught: Children are permitted all these [matters],⁶ with the exception of the putting on of shoes. Wherein is the putting on of shoes different? [Presumably] because people might say: Adults made them [wear them]. In all other cases, too, they might say: Adults made them for them? Bathing and anointing can be performed on the preceding day. But sandals, too, may be assumed to have been put on yesterday? It is impossible for sandals to have been put on yesterday, for Samuel said: Let one who would experience a taste of death put on shoes and sleep in them! But it is stated that [the other matters] are permitted [implying] for them at the very outset? —

Rather, those things which have nothing to do with their natural growth,⁷ the Rabbis have interdicted, these however, which are needed for their health,⁸ the Rabbis have not forbidden. For Abaye said: Mothers⁹ told me the proper treatment for a child consists in [bathing in] warm water and [rubbing with] oil. If he has grown a bit, in egg with Kutah;¹⁰ if he grows up still more, the breaking of clay vessels.¹¹ Thus did Rabbah buy clay vessels in damaged condition for his children who would break them.¹²

THE KING AND THE BRIDE MAY WASH THEIR FACES. According to whom is our Mishnah? According to R. Hananiah b. Tradion. For it was taught: [Even] the king and the bride may not wash their faces. R. Hananiah b. Tradion said in the name of R. Eliezer: The king and the bride may wash their faces. The woman after childbirth may not put on a sandal. R. Hananiah b. Tradion said in the name of R. Eliezer: A woman after childbirth may put on a sandal. Why [may] a king [wash his face]? — Because Scripture said: Thine eyes shall see the king in his

beauty.¹³ Why [may] a bride [wash her face]?—

Lest she become unattractive to her husband. Rab said to R. Hiyya: How long [does] a bride [enjoy this privilege]? He replied: As it was taught: One must not withhold her adornment from the bride during the full thirty days [after the wedding].¹⁴ The woman after childbirth may put on shoes to avoid a cold. Samuel said: If there is danger of a scorpion it is permitted [for all to wear shoes].

ONE WHO EATS AS MUCH AS THE BULK OF A BIG DATE. R. Papa asked:

- (1) V. Ta'an. 12b.
- (2) [Probably Nawa in the Golan Province (Transjordan). V. Klein JQR (NS) II, 550ff]
- (3) Shab. 65b. It is assumed at present that although the artificial leg is not considered a shoe, it is yet forbidden to walk out with it on the Day of Atonement. Hence sandals of bamboo should also be forbidden on that day.
- (4) V. loc. cit.
- (5) The minimum constituting a transgression of the prohibition to carry anything in a public thoroughfare. No minimum is necessary for transferring an object from a private to public thoroughfare and vice versa.
- (6) Prohibited in our Mishnah on the Day of Atonement.
- (7) As wearing shoes.
- (8) As washing and anointing.
- (9) V. Kid. 31b.
- (10) A preserve consisting of sour milk, bread-crusts and salt.
- (11) The breaking of the glass is not a concession to their youthful fury, but an excellent outlet for emotional surplus energies, cheaper than anything else on which they might wreak themselves.
- (12) V. Kid. 31b.
- (13) Isa. XXXIII, 17.
- (14) The bride or young matron retains her privilege for thirty days, even if she becomes a mourner after father or mother, her ornaments would be left to her (v. Keth. 4a). Similar consideration is lawful for the weak mother after childbirth, and for any person in danger of contracting a disease. Hence the 'menace of a scorpion' applies to all, even healthy persons.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 79a

Does the [size of] the date spoken of include the kernel or does it not?¹ R. Ashi asked: Does 'a bone as big as a barley-corn' include the husk or does it not?² [Is the reference to] a moist one or to a dry one? —

R. Ashi did not ask the question posed by R. Papa: For 'a big date' was said, which means a date in its complete size.³ R. Papa did not ask the question propounded by R. Ashi, because a moist one would be called 'Shiboleth' and one without its husk 'ushla'.⁴ Rabbah said in the name of Rab Judah: The big date spoken of is bigger than an egg, and our Rabbis had established the fact that with such a quantity [a hungry person] becomes satisfied,⁵ but with less than that he does not become satisfied.

An objection was raised: Once they brought to R. Johanan b. Zakkai a dish to taste and to Rabban Gamaliel two dates and a bucket of water, whereupon they said: Take them up to the Sukkah.⁶ (In connection therewith it was taught:)⁷ [They ordered so], not because that was the legal decision, but because they desired to take a severer view for themselves. And⁸ when someone gave R. Zadok a piece of food smaller than an egg, he would take it with a towel, eat it outside the Sukkah, and pronounce no blessing after it.⁹

(1) The Mishnaic text 'Kamoha u-Kegarinatha' may mean either, date and its kernel; or, date or its kernel (Rashi). Cf. Ex. XXI, 6 where the word 'o' also means 'either' and/or 'or'. V. Mecklenburg, ha-Kethab we-Hakabbalah a.l. [The question is nevertheless not clear. Var. lec., however, read: Does the size of the date (spoken of) with its kernel (refer to) a dry or moist one, v. D. S. a. l. Cf. the next question].

(2) Ber. 41a. The reference is to a bone as small as a barley-corn, of a corpse which renders him who touches it ritually unclean.

(3) I.e., including the kernel.

(4) And not 'Se'orah'.

(5) Comes to himself.

(6) This happened on a Sukkoth day, when meals are to be taken in the booth (Sukkah).

(7) The bracketed portion is omitted in some texts.

(8) Hul. 107a.

(9) R. Zadok showed a less severe attitude in three things: (a) He did not wash his hands but would take the food with a towel — only because of his fastidiousness. (b) He ate it outside the Sukkah. (c) He did not pronounce the customary blessing after it (Rashi).

Yoma 79b

This [implies that] if it were as big as an egg it would require [to be eaten] in the Sukkah, and if the thought should occur to you that the big date referred to is larger in size than an egg — now if two dates¹ without kernels are not even as large as one egg, how could a large date with its kernel be bigger in size than an egg? —

R. Jeremiah said: Yes, two dates without their kernel are not as large as an egg, but a large date with its kernel is bigger than an egg. R. Papa said: Therefore do people say: Two Kabs of dates contain as much as one Kab of kernels, with a bit left over.² Raba said: The reason there was that they were fruits, and fruits do not require [to be eaten in] a Sukkah.³ An objection was raised: Rabbi said, 'When we were studying the Torah with R. Eleazar b. Shammua,' figs and wine-berries were brought before us and we ate them outside the Sukkah as an incidental meal'. That means only as an incidental meal [is it permitted to eat fruit] outside the Sukkah, but as a proper meal not?⁴ —

Say: 'We ate them as [if we had partaken of] an incidental meal outside the Sukkah'.⁵ Or, if you like say: 'We ate them for a regular meal and we ate bread with them outside the Sukkah [in a quantity small enough to be considered only for] an incidental meal'. Shall we say that the following supports his view: 'Therefore if he made up the number [of meals] by means of delicacies, he has done his duty'.⁶ Now if you should think that fruits must be eaten in the Sukkah, he should have stated 'fruits' [instead of 'delicacies']? What does he mean by 'delicacies'? 'Fruits'. Or, if you like, say: [The reference is to] a place wherein fruits are not to be found.

YOMA - 62a-88a

R. Zebid said: The big date whereof they spoke is smaller in size than an egg, for we learned: Beth Shammai say: 'Of leaven as much as an olive, or leavened bread as much as a date'.⁷ And thereon we were debating; what is the reason of Beth Shammai? [And were given this]: Let the Divine Law write about Hamez [leavened bread] alone, without needing a reference to leaven, and I would say: If the eating of an olive-size of Hamez the leaven whereof is not so intensive is forbidden, how much more is such size forbidden in the case of leaven which is so much more leaven!

But since the Divine Law nevertheless mentioned them separately, it teaches you that the minimum size of the one is not the same as of the other, viz., in the case of leaven it is that of an olive, in the case of Hamez that of a date. Now if you should think that the big date mentioned is bigger than an egg, since Beth Shammai are looking for a quantity bigger than an olive, let them teach that of an egg; and even if the two be of the same size let them teach 'that of an egg'. Hence one must infer therefrom that the date spoken of is smaller than an egg! How does that follow?

In truth I may say to you, perhaps, that the big date referred to is bigger than an egg, but the normal one is as big as an egg, and (even though they be of the same size)⁸ Beth Shammai just mentions one of the two! Rather, may one infer it⁹ from here: 'How much must one have eaten to be obliged to make an appointment for common [saying of] grace [after meals]?'

The size of an olive, according to R. Meir. According to R. Judah: The size of an egg'.¹⁰ [And in connection therewith it was said:] Wherein are they differing? R. Meir holds: And thou shalt eat,¹¹ refers to eating. 'And be satisfied',¹¹ refers to drinking. And the minimum of 'eating' is the size of an olive whereas R. Judah holds: 'And thou shalt eat

and be satisfied', i.e., an eating which brings satisfaction, and that is [at least as much] as an egg. And if you should think that the big date referred to is bigger than an egg — how if the quantity of an egg even satisfied one, would it not help one to come to? Thence the inference is proper that the big date referred to is smaller than an egg: the quantity of an egg will satisfy one, the size of a big date will help one to come to.

It was taught: Rabbi says,

- (1) Which R. Gamaliel had eaten in the Sukkah and in connection with which it was stated 'not that the law required it', which means they were less than the legal minimum — one egg.
- (2) Because the kernels are larger in bulk than the dates.
- (3) The argument from the Sukkah is misleading, because fruits, no matter what their quantity, are not required to be eaten in the Sukkah.
- (4) Which would signify, as against R. Papa, that fruits in proper quantity would have to be eaten in the Sukkah.
- (5) Because they were fruits, no matter how many of them, they would be considered a mere incidental meal, permissible to be had outside the Sukkah.
- (6) V. Suk. 28a. R. Eliezer holds fourteen to be the required minimum number of meals that must be taken in the Sukkah during the feast of Tabernacles. If someone now made up the number of prescribed meals by means of delicacies, etc.
- (7) The minimum, the possession of which during Passover causes one to transgress the prohibition. Ex. XII, 19: Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses, and XIII, 7: And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee, in all thy borders. V. Bez. 2a.
- (8) [The bracketed words are best left out with var. lec.].
- (9) That the big date spoken of is less than an egg.
- (10) Ber. 45a.
- (11) Deut. VIII, 10.

Yoma 80a

All the legal standards [for foods] are the size of an olive, with the exception of that of the ritual defilement of foods, because there Scripture has used a different expression and the Sages accordingly have altered the standard. The proof for this view is furnished

YOMA - 62a-88a

by the Day of Atonement.¹ What is the change in the usual expression in connection therewith? — [It follows] from: [For whatsoever soul it be that] shall not be afflicted.² And what is the change in the usual quantity the Sages have decreed here? — ‘As much as a date’. And what constitutes the proof from the Day of Atonement?³ One could have replied: Here it is the usual Scriptural expression.⁴ Whence do we know that the minimum for the ritual uncleanness of foods is the size of an egg? —

Said R. Abbahu in the name of R. Eleazar: Scripture says, All food therein which may be eaten,⁵ i.e., food⁶ derived from food, and that is an egg of a hen. But say it is a kid? That still requires slaughtering.⁷ But say it is an animal taken alive out of the slaughtered mother's womb?⁸ — That still requires cutting open.⁹ Then say: the egg of bar-yokani?¹⁰ — If you take hold of too large a thing, you may lose your hold, but if you take hold of the lesser thing, you will retain your hold'.¹¹ But say: the egg of a little bird, that is very small? — R. Abbahu said in his own name: ‘All food there in which may be eaten’, i.e., food which you may eat in one swallowing; and the Sages measured that the esophagus cannot hold more than the size of a hen's egg.

R. Eleazar said: If one has eaten tallow in these times,¹² he must put down [make a note of] the quantity, because another Rabbinical Court may come and increase the measures.¹³ What does increase the measures mean? Would say you that they would declare one obliged to bring a sin-offering for having eaten the size of a small olive, but it was taught: When a ruler sinneth, and doeth through error any one of all the things [which the Lord his God hath commanded] not to be done, and is guilty.¹⁴ i.e., only he who repents when he finds out his transgression must bring a sacrifice, because of his error, but he who does not repent when he finds out his transgression, does not bring a sacrifice for his error.¹⁵

Rather, therefore, must [‘increase the measures’] signify that they would declare a sacrifice obligatory only when he had eaten a quantity as large as a large olive. But according to the first view, viz., that they could impose a sacrifice even for the quantity of a small olive, what does ‘increase the measure’ mean? — It might mean increase the number of sacrifices’ required because of the reduced minimum of the quantities. R. Johanan said: Standard measures and penalties are fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. But the penalties are written out in Scripture? —

Rather: The minimum required for penalties is fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. It was also taught thus: The minima required for penalties are fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. Others say: The Court of Jabetz¹⁶ fixed them. But Scripture said: These are the commandments,¹⁷ which means that no prophet is permitted to introduce any new law from then on? — Rather: They were forgotten and then they established them anew.

OR IF HE DRANK A MOUTHFUL. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: Not really a mouthful, but so much that if he moves it to one side it looks like a mouthful. But we learned: A MOUTHFUL. — Say: ‘As much as A MOUTHFUL’!

An objection was raised: ‘How much must one have drunk to become culpable? Beth Shammai say: One fourth [of a log], Beth Hillel say: One mouthful. R. Judah in the name of R. Eliezer says: As much as a mouthful. R. Judah b. Bathyra says: As much as can be swallowed at a time! Is this one better than our Mishnah which we explained as meaning: ‘That it look like a mouthful’, and this, too, we can explain: That it look like a mouthful. But if so, it is the same opinion as that of R. Eliezer? — There is a difference in the case of an exact mouthful.¹⁸

R. Hoshaiah demurred to this: If so, there would be a [another] case in which Beth Shammai took the more lenient view, and Beth Hillel the severer one?¹⁹ — He replied to him:

(1) Where a change in expression on the part of the Bible involved a change in the fixed minimum standard.

(2) Lev. XXIII, 29. The usual expression would be: Whosoever eateth on the day. The Rabbis, then, would have applied the normal measure, the olive, the legal minimum with every forbidden food.

(3) There seems to be no difference between the law touching ritual impurity of foods and that covering the prohibition of food on the Day of Atonement. In both cases change in expression is responsible for change in measure. Wherein, then, lies the reason for the Day of Atonement text being chosen as a proof?

(4) In the text relating to the uncleanness of foods the expression 'All foods therein which may be eaten' (which is the change in the usual expression alluded to, v. infra) would not appear an unusual expression. But 'that shall not be afflicted' for 'that shall eat' is indeed, unusual and thus accounts best for the change in measure determined by the Rabbis.

(5) Lev. XI, 34.

(6) Interpreted: that (coming) from food, which is also eatable.

(7) Before it can be designated food.

(8) Lit., 'the young one of an animal which is ripped open'. Such a young animal, where the mother in whose womb it still was, was slaughtered in accord with the rite, is considered ready food, since it does not require ritual slaughtering.

(9) It is not considered ready food since it requires not, indeed, the ritual slaughter, but cutting open and removal of the blood.

(10) A bird of fabulous size, the eggs of which are very large, v. Bek. 57b.

(11) A proverb: v. R.H. 4b. In the case of two possible interpretations, always choose the smaller as the more likely one.

(12) I.e., when the Temple is no longer in existence.

(13) R. Eleazar suggested that if the Sanctuary be rebuilt in his days and a new Rabbinical Court were in session, they might render such decision. Hence one who is conscious of having eaten tallow may well take the precaution of putting down the exact quantity so as to be sure that his transgression does, or does not, involve the obligation of a sin-offering, in accord with the new enactment of the revived court.

(14) Lev. IV, 22.

(15) As he became conscious of his transgression, the new enactment was still unknown, the quantity of a small olive to him, hence, was below the minimum required for a transgression to be constituted, hence he has not 'found out his transgression', and is not required to offer up a sacrifice in atonement of his sin.

(16) Identified with Othniel, the son of Kenaz; after the death of Moses he revived the forgotten portions of the law, v. Tem. 16a.

(17) Lev. XXVII, 34: These are the laws, i.e., no others may ever be offered.

(18) According to the Hillelites who insist: a mouthful, it is enough if it looks like a generous mouthful when moved to one cheek; according to R. Eliezer the appearance of an exact mouthful is required.

(19) In the fourth chapter of 'Ed. all cases are enumerated in which, as against the usual norm, Beth Shammai take the more lenient, and Beth Hillel the more severe, view. If our text were right it should have been enumerated as an additional exception, because here too the usual attitudes of these two conflicting schools of learning are reversed, since Beth Hillel make him liable for what appears like a mouthful, which is less than the minimum required by Beth Shammai.

Yoma 80b

When this came up for discussion, it came up in connection with 'Og, king of Bashan',¹ so that Beth Shammai will be found to take the severer view. —

R. Zera asked a strong question: To what difference is it due that, with regard to eating, the minimum of a date was fixed for every one, whereas in the case of drinking each has [his minimum] in accord with his own [mouthful]? — Abaye replied to him: Regarding² food the Rabbis established that with [the quantity of] a date a person may come to, but with a smaller quantity he will not come to; but with regard to drinking [they have found] that a man will come to with the quantity of his own [mouthful], but not with less than that. —

R. Zera then asked another strong question: 'All the world' with a date and Og, the king of Bashan, also with a date? — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that

YOMA - 62a-88a

[touching food] the quantity [of a date] helps one to come to, but with a smaller quantity he will not come to; but, whereas all the world [can come to] more so, Og, king of Bashan, [only] somewhat so.

R. Zera again asked another strong question: Fat meat in the quantity of one date and wine-branches also in the quantity of one date? — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that one comes to with so much, but not with less; with [this quantity of] fat meat one becomes, however, more satisfied, whilst with the same quantity of wine-branches one becomes less so.

Raba asked a strong question: The quantity of an olive, during the time one could eat a peras,³ — and the quantity of a date during the time required for eating a peras!⁴ — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that if it [the eating of the quantity of a date] takes so long [as one could eat a Peras] a person will come to, but if longer he will not come to.

Raba asked another strong question: The quantity of a date, during the time required for the eating of a Peras, and half a Peras during the time required for the eating of a peras?⁵ —

R. Papa answered: Leave alone the uncleanness of the body, which is not determined by Biblical law.⁶ But could R. Papa have answered thus? Is it not written: Neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby.⁷ and R. Papa said that from here is derived the Biblical origin of the [laws concerning] the body's becoming defiled [through unclean foods]? — It is really Rabbinical, and Scripture is quoted only as mere [mnemotechnical] aid.⁸

ALL FOODS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING UP THE BULK OF A DATE. R. Papa said: If one ate a piece of raw meat with salt, they are joined;⁹ and

although [salt] in itself is no food, since people eat [the two] together, they are joined. Resh Lakish said: The juice on the green [vegetables] joins so as to make up [with the vegetable] the [quantity of a] date in connection with the Day of Atonement. But that is self-evident? You might have said: It is drink,¹⁰ therefore he informs us that whatever is used for seasoning food is considered as food.

Resh Lakish said: If one eats an excessive meal on the Day of Atonement, he is free from punishment. Why? Scripture said: That shall not be afflicted,¹¹ and that excludes whatever causes harm.¹²

R. Jeremiah said in the name of Resh Lakish: If a non-priest eats excessively of Terumah,¹³ he need pay but the principal, but not the [fine of the] additional fifth, for Scripture says: And if a man eat,¹⁴ which excluded one causing harm.¹⁵

R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Johanan: A non-priest

(1) I.e., this teaching refers to the case of men as gigantic as Og, king of Bashan (Ber. 54b); in such cases Beth Shammai will be found to have taken, as usual, the severer view. For according to that school the minimum incurring penalty for any man is a fourth of a log, whereas according to the Hillelites it is for each according to his mouthful. According to Beth Shammai, therefore, an 'Og, king of Bashan' would become culpable on drinking, what to him would be less than a drop, whereas according to Beth Hillel he would incur penalty only when drinking the generous measure of his own mouthful.

(2) Corrected according to Bah.

(3) Peras, lit., 'a piece (of bread)' is in the Tosef. Neg. VII, 10 defined as half a loaf, three of which make a Kab. The time it takes to eat such a quantity is the maximum within which morsels of food smaller than the minimum measure are considered to join in order to make up the minimum incurring penalty.

(4) Ought not a longer period to be allowed for the quantity of a date?

(5) If one has eaten half a Peras of ritually unclean food during the time it takes to eat a Peras of food, one is considered unclean and may not partake of sacred foods. Half a Peras is ('Er. 83a) as two

YOMA - 62a-88a

‘friendly’ (generous sized) eggs, equal in size to three ordinary eggs.

(6) And consequently is not governed by such strict standards.

(7) Lev. XI, 43.

(8) As far as Biblical law is concerned, a person could become defiled by food only by swallowing the meat of a ritually clean fowl that has died a natural death. The reference to this verse is used by R. Papa only to lend support to the more severe rabbinic law.

(9) To make up together the legally required minimum of the big date.

(10) And, according to the Mishnah, foods and drinks do not combine to make up the required minimum.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 29.

(12) The man causes harm to himself by excessive eating and thus is also afflicting himself, or at least not enjoying himself. Rashi suggests that since Jews eat lavishly on the eve of the Day of Atonement, a meal taken immediately thereupon, i.e. after the incidence of the fast, would constitute excessive eating.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) Lev, XXII, 14.

(15) The offense here was committed in error, whence the capital and the fifth as fine is to be repaid by the offender. Such fine would be dispensed with in case this food was taken as an excessive meal, where the eating is but sheer waste of the Terumah.

Yoma 81a

who chews¹ barley-corns of Terumah must pay the principal, but not the additional fifth, for Scripture said: ‘If a man eat’, that excludes one causing harm. R. Shezbi said in the name of R. Johanan: If a non-priest swallowed jujubes of Terumah, and spat them out, and another one ate them, then the first pays the principal, and the fifth, whereas the second does not pay more than their wood [fuel] value.²

BUT WHAT A MAN EATS AND DRINKS DOES NOT GO TOGETHER. Who is the Tanna [of this part of the Mishnah]? — R. Hisda said: This has been taught under a controversy of opinion, and it is in accord with R. Joshua, for we learned: R. Joshua pronounced with principle: All foods are equal regarding the [duration of] their uncleanness and the quantity of them

[required to convey uncleanness] combine; if they be equal only concerning the [duration of] their uncleanness, but not concerning the quantity of them [required to convey uncleanness]; or only regarding quantity, but not in the duration of uncleanness; or if they be equal neither in respect of [duration of] uncleanness nor quantity, they do not combine [to make up the minimum quantity which constitutes the transgression].³

R. Nahman said: You may even say that [this part of our Mishnah is] in accord with the Rabbis. For the Rabbis [opposing R. Joshua] hold their view only touching uncleanness, because all are designated as ‘uncleanness’, but here the point involved is ‘coming to’, and this⁴ does not enable one to come to. Thus also did Resh Lakish say: This has been taught under the controversy of an opinion and our Mishnah is in accord with R. Joshua, for we were taught: R. Joshua pronounced a principle, etc. but R. Johanan said: You may even say that our Mishnah is in accord with the Rabbis: There the Rabbis present their view only in connection with uncleanness, but here ‘coming to’ is the point, and this⁴ does not enable one to come to.

MISHNAH. IF A MAN ATE AND DRANK IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS, HE IS NOT OBLIGED TO BRING MORE THAN ONE⁵ SIN-OFFERING, BUT IF HE ATE AND PERFORMED LABOR WHILE IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS HE⁶ MUST OFFER UP TWO SIN-OFFERINGS. IF HE ATE FOODS UNFIT FOR FOOD, OR DRANK LIQUIDS UNFIT FOR DRINKING, OR DRANK BRINE OR FISH-BRINE, HE IS NOT CULPABLE.

GEMARA. Resh Lakish said: Why is no explicit warning⁷ mentioned in connection with the commandment to afflict oneself? — Because it is impossible. For how shall the Divine Law word it? Were the Divine Law to write: ‘He shall not eat’? But ‘eating’ implies [the minimum size of] an olive.⁸ Shall the Divine Law write: ‘He shall not afflict himself’?⁹ That would mean: Go and eat! —

YOMA - 62a-88a

R. Hoshaiah asked a strong question: Let the Divine Law write: 'Take heed, lest thou dost not afflict thyself!' — That would mean several prohibitions.¹⁰ To this R. Bibi b. Abaye demurred: Let the Divine Law write: Take heed concerning the commandment of affliction! 'Take heed' implies a command, if attached to a command, and a prohibition, if attached to a prohibition.¹¹

R. Ashi asked a strong question: Let the Divine Law write: Do not depart from affliction! — This is a difficulty.

The following Tanna derives it [the prohibition relating to affliction] from here: And ye shall afflict your souls: ye shall do no manner of work.¹² One might have assumed that the punishment¹³ [of extirpation] is involved for one who disregarded the addition¹⁴ by doing a labor, therefore Scripture said: For whatsoever soul it be that doeth any manner of work in that same day he shall be cut off,¹⁵ i.e., only for the [disregard of] that day itself is one punished with extirpation, but for labor performed during the additional time one is not punished with extirpation. One might have assumed that one does not incur punishment of extirpation by doing labor during the additional time, but that one does incur punishment of extirpation for failure to afflict oneself during the additional time, therefore the text reads: For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day he shall be cut off;¹⁶ that means for [failure of] afflicting [oneself on] the day itself does the penalty of extirpation come, but the penalty of extirpation does not result from failure to afflict oneself during the additional time.

One might have assumed that one is not included in the penalty, but that one is under a warning against performing work during the additional time, therefore the text reads: And ye shall do no manner of work in that same day,¹⁷ i.e., one is warned concerning the

day itself but not concerning [work done] during the additional time.

One might have assumed that one is not under a warning concerning labor performed during the additional time, but one is under a warning concerning [failure of] affliction during the additional time; but a logical inference cancels that. For if in the case of labor, the prohibition of which applies on Sabbath and festival days, one is not under a warning [concerning additional time] then with regard to [the commandment of] affliction, which does not apply on Sabbath and festival days, how much more should one not be under a warning against it [during the additional time]! But we have not learnt [so far] of any explicit warning with regard to the [obligation to] affliction on the day itself, whence then do we derive [that required 'warning']?

[From the following]: There was no necessity for stating the penalty resulting from the performance of labor, for that is inferable from the [commandment of] affliction. If [for failure of] affliction, which is not commanded on the Sabbath and festival days, one is punished with extirpation, then for the performance of labor [the prohibition of] which does apply on Sabbath and festival days, how much more shall [one be punished with extirpation]! Why then was [the penalty] stated?

It is free¹⁸ for interpretation, hence it serves for comparison, to derive thence an inference from analogy of expression: the penalty is stated in connection with [the commandment of] affliction, and the penalty is stated in connection with the [prohibition of] labor, hence just as the performance of labor was punished only after warning,¹⁹ so also is [failure of] affliction punished only after warning. But against this it may be objected:²⁰ The specific condition with affliction [which attaches a penalty to it] lies in the fact that no exception against the general rule was made here; but would you

YOMA - 62a-88a

apply [the same] to the performance of labor seeing that in its case exceptions from the general rule were made?²¹

Rather [argue thus]: Let Scripture not mention any penalty in connection with [failure of] affliction, inferring it from the [prohibition of] labor. If [the performance of] labor, from the general prohibition of which some exceptions were made, involves the penalty of extirpation, how much more must [failure of] affliction, from the general prohibition of which no exception was made, involve such penalty?

Then why does Scripture mention it? It is free for interpretation, hence it serves for comparison, to derive thence an inference from analogy of expression: the penalty is mentioned in connection with [failure of] affliction, and the same penalty is mentioned in connection with [the performance of] labor, hence just as [performance of] labor is punished only after warning, so is [the failure of] affliction punished only after warning.

Against this may be objected: There is a specific condition in connection with labor [to which a penalty is attached] in that it is forbidden on Sabbath and festival days, but would you apply the same to [the commandment of] affliction seeing that does not apply on Sabbath and festival days?

Rabina said: This Tanna infers it from the word 'self-same'.²² Now it must be free,²³ for if it were not free, the objection as above could be raised against it. Hence it indeed must be free. [Consider] there are²⁴ five Scriptural verses written in connection with labor:²⁵ one indicating the prohibition for the day, one the prohibition for the night, one the warning for the day, one the warning for the night, one remains free for inference from [the prohibition of] labor for [the commandment of] affliction, touching both day and night.

The School of R. Ishmael taught: Here the word 'affliction' is used and there the word 'affliction'²⁶ is used; hence just as there the penalty is incurred only after warning, so here too the penalty is incurred only after warning.

R. Aha b. Jacob said: One can infer that from the phrase 'Shabbath Shabbathon' ['solemn day of rest']²⁷ which occurs in connection with the ordinary Sabbath,²⁸ and just as there penalty is incurred only after warning, so here too, penalty is incurred only after warning.

R. Papa said:

(1) 'Chewing' which is the term. techn. for irregular eating.

(2) The first, having eaten them, must pay both principal and fine, a complete offense having been committed by him; but not the second, who ate something which could have been used only as fuel.

(3) Two half olives from two corpses, or two pieces of the size each of one half of a lentil, coming from a dead creeping thing, share the duration of uncleanness and the minimum quantity; a creeping thing and the carcass of an animal that died a natural death, are alike with regard to duration of the uncleanness they cause (in each case up to the evening of the day), but differ as to the minimum quantity which causes defilement; the former has the standard of an olive, the latter that of a lentil. A human corpse and the carcass of an animal again are alike in the minimum required for defiling a person, viz., an olive, but are different with regard to the duration of the uncleanness caused: the former causing one lasting seven days, the latter one lasting up to the evening only; v. Me'il. 17a.

(4) The quantity of a big date, composed of food and drink does not enable one to come to, whereas food alone of that quantity would. The only matter in connection with the minimum required on the Day of Atonement is that it enables one to come to, hence the Rabbis could agree here, whilst disputing R. Joshua in the matter of the combination of various unclean foods.

(5) He did not know all the time that it was the Day of Atonement. Because whereas two offenses took place, both belong to one head: eating includes drinking.

(6) But eating and working are two different forms of activities prohibited on the Day of

YOMA - 62a-88a

Atonement, derived from two Scriptural verses, Num. XXIX, 7 and Lev. XXIII, 29.

(7) The usual form of which is: 'Thou shalt not'.

(8) The usual minimum (to render one culpable of having eaten forbidden food) is the quantity of an olive. Had the Torah therefore used the phrase 'He shall not eat', the inference would have been that one who ate the quantity of an olive had thereby transgressed the law; whereas the quantity on the Day of Atonement is dependent on one's coming to, which is the result of having eaten as much as the size of a big date.

(9) The form would be negative, but the meaning just the opposite of what is required!

(10) 'Take heed' and 'lest' are phrases each implying a separate negative command, v. 'Er. 96a.

(11) Deut. XXIV, 8: 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy' implies the prohibition of cutting off the bright spot (Lev. XIII, 2) whereas 'Take heed that you do a certain thing', i.e., not neglect it, has affirmative exhortatory meaning. The phrase here would therefore imply a positive command.

(12) Num. XXIX, 7.

(13) Reading with Bah.

(14) The prohibitions and positive commandments in connection with the Day of Atonement become valid some time before the actual commencement of the day — before the night of the tenth of Tishri, and extend for some minutes after the end of the Day of Atonement — the night of the eleventh day. The validity for this additional time of the laws governing the Day of Atonement is Biblical, v. infra 81b.

(15) Lev. XXIII, 30.

(16) Lev. XXIII, 29.

(17) Ibid. v. 28.

(18) Lit., 'being free', or 'vacated', here unnecessary for the context, hence available for hermeneutical purposes.

(19) Lev. XXIII, 28.

(20) The comparison is superficial, because in spite of similarity of expression, basic difference of prevailing conditions render the comparison unjustified, and but for an explicit statement of penalty in the case of 'labor' one would not be able to derive it from 'affliction'.

(21) None is exempted from the affliction, whereas as regards labor the priests in the Sanctuary were permitted to perform all work in connection with the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement.

(22) This word occurs both with the prohibition of labor in Lev. XXIII, 30 and with the commandment of affliction in v. 29 *ibid.*, hence appears available for inference from analogy of expression.

(23) V. p. 397. n. 3.

(24) So Bah.

(25) Lev. XVI, 29; XXIII, 28, 29, 30 and Num. XXIX, 7.

(26) In connection with the rape of a betrothed maiden, Deut. XXII, 24.

(27) Lev. XXIII, 32.

(28) Lit., 'with the Sabbath of creation', i.e., the Sabbath, the observance of which is due to the first Sabbath, a tech. term. for any ordinary seventh day Sabbath, as against other days of rest, viz., the Holy Days.

Yoma 81b

This day itself is also called Sabbath, for Scripture said: [In the ninth day of the month, from even to even], shall ye keep your Sabbath. R. Papa did not [well] interpret as R. Aha b. Jacob, because it is preferable to use a Scriptural text mentioned in connection with the subject itself. But why did not R. Aha b. Jacob expound as R. Papa did? —

That¹ is necessary for the following teaching: And ye shall afflict your souls, in the ninth day of the month. One might have assumed that such affliction commences on the ninth of the month already. Therefore the text reads: 'At even'. If from 'at even', one might have inferred that one must afflict oneself only after it gets dark, therefore the text reads: 'In the ninth'. How is [this to be explained]? He should commence to afflict himself whilst it is yet day. From here we learn that we add from the profane time to the sacred one. Thus I know it only at its beginning. Whence do I know it at its end? Therefore Scripture said: 'From even unto even'. Thus I know it only for the Days of Atonement, whence do I learn the same for the Sabbath days? Therefore the text reads: 'Your Sabbath'. How is that? Wherever the word 'Shebuth' [rest] is mentioned, we add from the profane time to the sacred one. How does the Tanna who infers from the word-analogy of 'self-same',² 'self-same' interpret the words: 'In the ninth of the month'? —

He uses it in accord with what Hiyya, the son of Rab, of Difti taught, for Hiyya, the son of Rab, of Difti learned: 'And you shall afflict your souls in the ninth [day of the month]'.

YOMA - 62a-88a

But is one fasting on the ninth? Do we not fast on the tenth? Rather, it comes to indicate that, if one eats and drinks on the ninth, Scripture accounts it to him as if he had fasted on the ninth and the tenth.³

IF HE ATE FOODS UNFIT FOR FOOD.
Raba said: If one chewed pepper on the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable. If one chewed ginger on the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable.

An objection was raised: R. Meir used to say: By mere implication from the text: Then you shall count the fruit thereof as forbidden.⁴ I could understand that fruit trees are meant. Why then does Scripture say: ‘trees for food’? It means a tree the taste of whose wood and fruit are alike. Say: This is pepper. That teaches you that the plant of pepper is subject to the law of ‘orlah,⁵ and that the land of Israel lacks nothing, as it is said: Thou shalt not lack anything in it.⁶ — That is no difficulty; The one case deals with green pepper, the other with dry pepper.⁶

Rabina said to Meremar: But R. Nahman has said that preserved ginger coming from India is permitted,⁷ and the blessing... Who createst the fruit of the ground’ is obligatory [before eating it].⁷ — This is no difficulty: The one case deals with fresh one, the other with dry one.

Our Rabbis have taught: If one ate the leaves of calamus, he is culpable. If he ate the leaves of vine, he is culpable. What vines are meant here? — R. Isaac of Magdala said: Such as sprouted forth between New Year and the Day of Atonement.⁸ R. Kahana said: During the first thirty days,⁹ it was taught in accord with R. Isaac of Magdala: If one ate the leaves of calamus, he is not culpable. If he ate the leaves of vines, he is culpable. The vines meant here are those that sprouted forth between New Year and the Day of Atonement.

IF HE DRANK BRINE OR FISH-BRINE HE IS NOT CULPABLE. But [if he drank] vinegar, he is culpable — according to whom is our Mishnah? — According to Rabbi. For it was taught: Rabbi said, Vinegar restores the soul.¹⁰ R. Giddal b. Menasseh of Bari of Naresh¹¹ reported that the Halachah is not in accord with Rabbi, whereupon in the following year all went forth to drink [on the Day of Atonement] vinegar [mixed with water]. When R. Giddal heard that he became angry and said: I spoke only of a de facto case, did I say at all that one may do so at the outset? I referred only to a small quantity, did I speak at all of a large one? I spoke only of raw vinegar, did I refer at all to [vinegar] mixed [with water]?

- (1) The Scriptural text adduced by R. Papa.
- (2) Who infers the additional time from the words of the text, which are free for interpretation (v. supra). To him the words ‘And ye shall afflict yourself on the ninth’, which to us suggest the additional time, must convey a different meaning.
- (3) The feasting on the ninth of Tishri helps to emphasize the solemnity and the self-affliction due on the morrow, indeed, starting at the eve of the same day. The more feasting on the eve of the Day of Atonement, the more pronounced the affliction on the day itself.
- (4) Lev. XIX, 23.
- (5) Which forbids for the first three years the fruit of trees, v. ibid.
- (6) Deut. VIII, 9. Hence pepper is considered fruit, and as such should involve the eater thereof on the Day of Atonement in the penalty of extirpation, whereas Raba had taught that one who ate thereof is not culpable. R. Meir speaks of green pepper which can be eaten, hence subject to the law of ‘Orlah, whereas Raba speaks of dry pepper, which cannot be considered a food, hence one who has eaten thereof, in the best case has not partaken of eatables, in the worst case has harmed himself, in either case is not culpable.
- (7) Preserved ginger therefore is considered a food. The blessing due emphasizes that it is considered such.
- (8) But if they sprouted forth before the New Year, they are considered stale and ‘even as wood’, i.e., no food.
- (9) The same principle, though in different terms.
- (10) I.e., has the effect of satisfying one, of helping one to come to, on the Day of Atonement.
- (11) I.e., Bari, which was near Naresh, north of Sura. V. Obermeyer, p.308.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 82a

MISHNAH. ONE SHOULD NOT AFFLICT¹ CHILDREN AT ALL ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT. BUT ONE TRAINS THEM A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE² IN ORDER THAT THEY BECOME USED TO RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES.

GEMARA. Since [the Mishnah has taught already that] two years before [their attaining majority] they must be trained, is it necessary to state that one must do so a year before that time? R. Hisda said: This is no difficulty: the one refers to a healthy³ child, the other to a sickly one. R. Huna said: At the age of eight and nine years one trains them by hours,⁴ at the age of ten and eleven they must fast to the end of the day, by Rabbinic ordinance. At the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to girls.

R. Nahman said: At the age of nine and ten one trains them by hours, at the age of eleven and twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Rabbinic ordinance, at the age of thirteen they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to boys. R. Johanan said: There is no Rabbinic ordinance about the obligation of children to fast to the end of the day. But, at the age of ten and eleven one trains them by hours, at the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law.

We learned: ONE SHOULD NOT AFFLICT THE CHILDREN AT ALL ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, BUT ONE TRAINS THEM A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE. That will be right according to R. Huna and R. Nahman: A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE [means] a year before, according to Rabbinic law, or two years before, according to Biblical law.⁵ But according to R. Johanan, there is a difficulty!⁶ R. Johanan will tell you: 'One or two years before means: before their reaching maturity.'⁷

Come and hear: For Rabbah b. Samuel taught: One does not afflict children on the Day of Atonement, but one trains them a year, or two, before their attaining maturity. That will be right according to R. Johanan, but according to R. Huna and R. Nahman this presents a difficulty. — [These] Rabbis will tell you: 'Training' here means 'fasting to the end of the day'. But has 'training' the meaning of 'fasting to the end of the day'? Was it not taught: What is training? If he was accustomed to eat at the second hour [eight o'clock],⁸ one feeds him now at the third hour [nine o'clock]; if he was accustomed to eat at the third hour, one feeds him now at the fourth.⁹ Raba b. 'Ulla said, There are two kinds of training.¹⁰

MISHNAH. IF A WOMAN WITH CHILD SMELT,¹¹ SHE MUST BE GIVEN TO EAT UNTIL SHE FEELS RESTORED. A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS.¹² AND IF NO EXPERTS ARE THERE, ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH UNTIL HE SAYS: ENOUGH.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If a woman with child smelt the flesh of holy flesh, or of pork, we put for her a reed into the juice and place it upon her mouth. If thereupon she feels that her craving has been satisfied, it is well. If not, one feeds her with the juice itself. If thereupon her craving is satisfied it is well; if not one feeds her with the fat meat itself, for there is nothing that can stand before [the duty of] saving life, with the exception of idolatry, incest¹³ and bloodshed [which are prohibited in all situations]. Whence do we know that about idolatry?

For it was taught: R. Eliezer said: Since it is said, With all thy soul,¹⁴ why is it said: With all thy might?¹⁴ And since it is said: 'With all thy might', why is it said: 'With all thy soul'? [It but comes to tell you that]¹⁵ if there be a man whose life is more cherished by him than his money, for him it is said: 'With all thy soul'; and if there be a person to whom his money is dearer than his life, for him it is

YOMA - 62a-88a

said: 'With all thy might'.¹⁶ Whence do we know it about incest and bloodshed? —

Because it was taught: Rabbi said, For as when a man rises against his neighbor, and slayeth him, even so is this matter.¹⁷ What matter do we infer for [the rape of] a betrothed maiden from a murderer? —

Rather: What was meant to teach, learns itself:¹⁸ Just as in the case of a betrothed maiden it is lawful to save her at the expense of his [the would-be raper's] life, thus also in the case of a murderer. And just as in the case of [an order to] shed blood one should rather be killed oneself than transgress [the prohibition of murder], thus also in the case of a [command to rape a] betrothed maiden, one should rather be killed than transgress [the prohibition of violating her].

(1) To make them fast, to deny them food. Concerning other afflictions, v. supra 78b.

(2) The connotation of this is discussed in the Gemara.

(3) With a healthy child the training may be started at an earlier year than with a sick or sickly one.

(4) Extending the hours of fasting from one hour to another.

(5) So Rashi, v. Bah; v. next note. Cur. edd. according to rabbinic law. On interpretation of this reading v. Wilna Gaon, Glosses.

(6) Whereas R. Huna and R. Nahman could explain 'BEFORE' as meaning 'before they are obliged by Rabbinic law' to fast to the end of the day. R. Johanan holds there is no Rabbinic ordinance compelling children to fast to the end of the day, and would be unable to account for this text.

(7) His answer is simple; 'before' means 'before maturity', when yet the obligation to fast to the end of the day does not apply.

(8) According to the Jewish calculation for ritual purposes, every day, summer and winter, has twelve hours, every night twelve hours. The hours, however, vary in duration. In December an hour may consist of forty minutes, in June of ninety minutes. In Tishri (usually September) an hour would have about sixty minutes. The first hour of the day would be from six to seven, the second from seven to eight. 'At the second hour' would thus correspond to 'about eight o'clock'.

(9) This indicates, at any rate, that 'training' means 'training by the extension of hours', not 'fasting to the end of the day'.

(10) Raba replies that the term 'training' is being used in both senses.

(11) Smelt a dish on the Day of Atonement and has a morbid desire for it.

(12) Physicians.

(13) Including adultery.

(14) Deut. VI, 5. The word 'Meod', usually translated as 'might', is here interpreted as 'economic might', money.

(15) Life is more important than 'money' or 'might'. Why then the mention of both? If one is commanded to love the Lord even with all one's soul, viz., so that one would surrender life in the service of Him, it is self-evident and therefore superfluous to mention the obligation to love Him with all one's money, viz., to be willing to surrender one's possessions to Him.

(16) Scripture takes account of people's idiosyncrasies, the Lord, Who gave the Torah to Moses, knoweth the heart of man.

(17) Deut. XXII, 26 referring to the rape of a betrothed maiden.

(18) Lit., 'Behold this one comes to teach and turns out a learner'. This passage is intended to throw light on another one, whereas it receives light therefrom.

Yoma 82b

But whence do we know that this principle applies in the case of a murder? — This is reasonable.

For there was a man who came before Raba and said to him: The lord of my village told me: Kill so-and-so, and if you will not, I shall kill you! — He [Raba] answered: Let him kill you, but do not kill! What makes you see that your blood is redder than his? Perhaps the blood of that man is redder than yours?¹

There was a woman with child who had smelt [a dish]. People came before Rabbi [questioning him what should be done]. He said to them: Go and whisper to her that it is the Day of Atonement. They whispered to her and she accepted the whispered suggestion, whereupon he [Rabbi] cited about her the verse: Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee.² From her came forth R. Johanan.

YOMA - 62a-88a

[Again] there was a woman with child who smelt [a dish]. The people came to R. Hanina, who said to them: Whisper to her [that it is the Day of Atonement]. She did not accept the whispered suggestion. He cited with regard to her:

(1) The Lord wants you to save your own life, because the life of any one of His children is clear to Him. But your neighbor's life is as clear to Him as your own; and no blood is 'redder than the other'. Hence you must not kill someone else, in order to save life. But if someone comes to murder you, self-defense is not only permissible, but mandatory.

(2) Jer. I, 5.

Yoma 83a

The wicked are estranged from the womb.¹ From her came forth Shabbatai, the hoarder of provisions² [for speculation].

A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS. R. Jannai said: If the patient says, I need [food], whilst the physician says: He does not need it, we hearken to the patient. What is the reason? The heart knoweth its own bitterness.³ But that is self-evident? You might have said: The physician's knowledge is more established; therefore the information [that we prefer the patient's opinion]. If the physician says: He needs it, whilst the patient says that he does not need it, we listen to the physician. Why? Stupor seized him.⁴

We learned: **A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS.** [That implies]: Only upon the order of experts, but not upon his own order? [Further it implies]: Only upon the order of 'experts,' but not upon the order of a single expert?⁵ — This refers to the case that he says: I do not need it. But one should feed him upon the order of one expert? — This refers to the case when someone else is present who agrees that he does not need it. [If so, wherefore state that he] is **FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS.** Surely that is self-evident, for it is a possibility of danger to human life and 'in the

case of the possibility of danger to human life we take a more lenient view'⁶ —

It refers to a case in which two more people are present who say that he does not need it.⁷ And although R. Safra said that 'Two are as a hundred and a hundred are as two'⁸ applies only to witnesses, but with regard to opinion we go according to the number of opinions, all that applies only to opinions concerning money matters, but here it is a case where there is a possibility of danger to human life. But since in the second part [of the Mishnah] it states: **AND IF NO EXPERTS ARE THERE, ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH,** it is to be inferred that in the first part we deal with the case that he said he needed it? There is something missing [in the Mishnah] and this is how it reads: These things are said only for the case that he says: I do not need it; but if he says: I need it, then if two experts are not there, but one who says: He does not need it, then **ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH.**

Mar son of R. Ashi said: Whenever he says, 'I need [food]', even if there be a hundred who say, 'He does not need it', we accept his statement, as it is said: 'The heart knoweth its own bitterness'.

We learned in the Mishnah: If no experts are there one feeds him at his own wish. That means only if no experts are there, but not if such experts were there? — This is what is meant: These things are said only for the case that he says, 'I do not need it', but if he says, 'I need it', then there are no experts⁹ there at all, [and] one feeds him at his own wish, as it is said: 'The heart knoweth its own bitterness'.

MISHNAH. IF ONE IS SEIZED BY A RAVENOUS HUNGER,¹⁰ HE MAY BE GIVEN TO EAT EVEN UNCLEAN THINGS UNTIL HIS EYES ARE ENLIGHTENED.¹¹ IF ONE WAS BIT BY A MAD DOG, HE MAY NOT GIVE HIM TO EAT THE LOBE OF ITS LIVER, BUT R. MATTHIA B. HERESH PERMITS IT.¹²

YOMA - 62a-88a

FURTHERMORE DID R. MATTHIA B. HERESH SAY: IF ONE HAS PAIN IN HIS THROAT, HE MAY POUR MEDICINE INTO HIS MOUTH ON THE SABBATH,¹³ BECAUSE IT IS A POSSIBILITY OF DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE AND EVERY DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE SUSPENDS THE [LAWS OF THE] SABBATH. IF DEBRIS FALL ON SOMEONE, AND IT IS DOUBTFUL WHETHER OR NOT HE IS THERE, OR WHETHER HE IS ALIVE OR DEAD, OR WHETHER HE BE AN ISRAELITE OR A HEATHEN, ONE SHOULD OPEN [EVEN ON SABBATH] THE HEAP OF DEBRIS FOR HIS SAKE. IF ONE FINDS HIM ALIVE ONE SHOULD REMOVE THE DEBRIS, AND IF HE BE DEAD ONE SHOULD LEAVE HIM THERE [UNTIL THE SABBATH DAY IS OVER].

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: How did they know that his eyes are enlightened again? When he distinguishes between good and bad [food]. — Abaye said: In the taste thereof. Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized by a ravenous hunger, one feeds him with the less forbidden things first; as between Tebel [untithed food] and carrion,¹⁴ one should feed him carrion first; between Tebel and fruit of the seventh year, one should give him the fruit of the seventh year first.¹⁵ As between Terumah¹⁶ and Tebel, Tannaim are of divided opinion. For it was taught: One should feed him Tebel, but not Terumah.

Ben Tema holds: Terumah, but not Tebel. Rabbah said: If it is possible [to feed him] with common food,¹⁷ there is general agreement that one should prepare it¹⁸ for him and feed him with it; the dispute concerns the case when it is not possible [to feed him] with common food; one holds that [the prohibition of] Tebel is more severe, the other assuming that the prohibition¹⁹ of Terumah is the more severe. The one holds that [the prohibition of] eating Tebel is more severe because Terumah is permissible to priests. the other holding [the prohibition of] Terumah more severe, whereas Tebel may be rendered right [by tithing].

(1) Ps. LVIII, 4.

(2) The suggestion throughout the page of a woman with child who smells a dish and develops a morbid longing for it, is that it is the embryo, and not the mother, who has the desire. If the mother accepted the whispered suggestion, it was due to the noble piety of the unborn child, hence, R. Johanan as the child of the first woman. None is more contemptible than the speculator in foodstuffs who corners the markets for his sordid gain and who causes great affliction among the poor. Such a person, even in the embryonic stage, would not be influenced by the information that it is the Day of Atonement. He would crave his food, unresponsive to any law or sentiment.

(3) Prov. XIV, 10.

(4) So that he does not feel the lack of food.

(5) Which refutes R. Jannai.

(6) V. Shab. 129a.

(7) Two witnesses are considered sufficient evidence (Deut. XIX, 15) and no increase of their number either strengthens, or if they were counter-witnesses, by reason of superior numbers, weakens their original testimony.

(8) And yet on the strength of the two experts who say 'he needs it', he is fed.

(9) Such experts, opposing the patient's own view, would be ignored: 'They are not present at all'.

(10) **, bulimy, ox-hunger.

(11) Cf. I Sam. XIV, 27. Such ravenous hunger renders the eyes dull.

(12) That was considered a cure: a fore-runner of modern homeopathics. The Tanna who forbids it denies its curative value, hence its use is forbidden. Matthia b. Heresh believed in this cure, hence permitted it.

(13) The dispute here concerns not the principle, but the efficacy, of the proposed medicines.

(14) Whenever the permitted and forbidden food alone are insufficient to restore the patient, one should proceed by eliminating as far as possible the more forbidden foods. Untithed food involves punishment of death by divine hand, whereas the eating of carrion involves only the castigation by stripes.

(15) Similarly is the fruit of the seventh year less 'forbidden', its eating implies much less penalty than the eating of untithed food, because there only the transgression of a positive commandment is involved.

(16) V. Glos.

(17) [Probably it means that the hungry person can wait for the priestly dues to be duly set aside, v. D.S. a.l. p. 50].

(18) By setting aside the prescribed dues.

(19) In each case that food which is considered less forbidden, or involving less of a penalty, would be given first.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Yoma 83b

'If it be possible with common food [etc.]'. Surely it is self-evident?—This refers to the case [that it would have to be done] on the Sabbath.¹ But on the Sabbath, too, It is self-evident, because moving is forbidden only by Rabbinic decree?² — We deal here with a pot without a hole, the obligation³ on which, too' is only Rabbinic.⁴ ('One holds [the prohibition of] Tebel is more severe, the other holding [the prohibition of] Terumah more severe).⁵ Shall we say that Tannaim have been disputing this matter already?⁶ For it was taught: If one was bitten by a snake, one may call for him a physician from one place into another,⁷ or tear open a hen for him, or cut leak from the ground for him, give it to him to eat, without having separated the tithe thereof; this is the view of Rabbi.

R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said: He must not eat until tithe has been separated. Shall we say that it is in accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, and not with Rabbi?⁸ — You may even say that it is in accord with Rabbi's view. Rabbi [one may say] makes his statement only here because the tithe of vegetables is in question and that is due but Rabbinically, but in the case of the tithe of corn, which is obligatory by Biblical law, even, Rabbi would agree that if you permit him to eat without [due tithing] in the case of a pot without a hole, he would come to eat likewise even in the case of a pot with a hole.⁹

Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized with a ravenous hunger, he is given to eat honey and all kinds of sweet things, for honey and very sweet food enlighten the eyes of man. And although there is no proof for the matter, there is an intimation in this respect: See, I pray you how mine eyes are brightened, because I tasted a little of this honey.¹⁰ What does 'although there is no proof for the matter' mean? Because there no ravenous hunger has seized him.

Abaye said: This applies only after a meal, but before the meal, it even increases one's appetite, as it is written: And they found an Egyptian in the field, and brought him, to David, and gave him, bread, and he did eat,' and they gave him water to drink,' and they gave him a piece of cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins,' and when he had eaten, his spirit came back to him,' for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights.¹¹

R. Nahman said in the name of Samuel: If one was seized by a ravenous hunger, one should give him to eat a tail with honey. R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua said: Also pure flour with honey. R. Papa said: Even barley-flour with honey [is effective]. R. Johanan said: Once I was seized by a ravenous hunger, whereupon I ran to the eastern side of a fig-tree, thus making true in my own case: Wisdom preserveth the life of him who hath it,¹² for R. Joseph learned: One who would taste the [full] taste of a fig, turns to its eastern side, as it is said: And for the precious things of the fruits of the sun.¹³

R. Judah and R. Jose were walking together when a ravenous hunger seized R. Judah. He seized a shepherd and devoured his bread. R. Jose said to him: You have robbed the shepherd! As they entered the city, a ravenous hunger seized R. Jose. They brought him all sorts of foods and dishes. Whereupon R. Judah said to him: I may have deprived the shepherd, but you have deprived a whole town.

Also, R. Meir and R. Judah and R. Jose were on a journey together. (R. Meir always paid close attention to people's names, whereas R. Judah and R. Jose paid no such attention to them). Once as they came to a certain place, they looked for a lodging, and as they were given it, they said to him [the innkeeper]: What is your name? — He replied: Kidor. Then he [R. Meir] said: Therefrom it is evident that he is a wicked man, for it is said:

YOMA - 62a-88a

For a generation [Ki-dor] very forward are they.¹⁴

R. Judah and R. Jose entrusted their purses to him;¹⁵ R. Meir did not entrust his purse to him, but went and placed it on the grave of that man's father. Thereupon the man had a vision in his dream [saying]: Go, take the purse lying at the head of this man! In the morning he [the innkeeper] told them [the Rabbis] about it, saying: This is what appeared to me in my dream. They replied to him: There is no substance in the dream of the Sabbath night¹⁶.

R. Meir went, waited there all day, and then took the purse with him. In the morning they [the Rabbis] said to him,: 'Give us our purses'. He said: There never was such a thing!¹⁷ R. Meir then said to them: Why don't you pay attention to people's names? They said: Why have you not told this [before]. Sir? He answered: consider this¹⁸ but a suspicion. I would not consider that a definite presumption! Thereupon they took him [the host] into a shop [and gave him wine to drink].¹⁹ Then they saw lentils on his moustache. They went to his wife and gave her that as a sign, and thus²⁰ obtained their purses and took them back. Whereupon he went and killed his wife.

It is with regard to this that it was taught:²¹ [Failure to observe the custom of] the first water²² caused one to eat the meat of pig, [failure to use] the second water slew a person. At the end they, too, paid close attention to people's names. And when they called to a house whose [owner's] name was Balah, they would not enter, saying: He seems to be a wicked man, as it is written: Then said I of her that was [Balah] worn out by adulteries.²³

IF SOMEONE WAS BITTEN BY A MAD DOG. Our Rabbis taught: Five things were mentioned in connection with a mad dog. Its mouth is open, its saliva dripping, its ears flap, its tail is hanging between its thighs, it

walks on the edge of the road. Some say, Also it barks without its voice being heard. Where does it²⁴ come from? — Rab said: Witches are having their fun with it. Samuel said: An evil spirit rests upon it. What is the practical difference between these two views? — This is the difference

(1) On the Sabbath it is not usually permitted to separate the Terumah.

(2) [The prohibition to set aside on Sabbath any of the priestly dues is of Rabbinical origin, in the same category as moving about on the Sabbath articles that are unfit for use (cf. Bez. 36b)].

(3) To tithe the fruit grown therein.

(4) [I.e., the Tebel under consideration grew in a pot without a hole, and consequently not subject biblically to priestly dues. Nevertheless where it can be rendered right by setting aside the dues, we are told one should rather override the Shebuth (v. Glos.) involved than feed him with what is regarded as Tebel only Rabbinically (Rashi)].

(5) [On the interpretation of Rashi which is followed in these notes, the bracketed passage is best omitted, as it is in various MSS. V. D.S.]

(6) [I.e., Rabbah's principle that we override the Shebuth rather than to feed him, with produce which is Tebel only Rabbinically, v. p. 408, n. 10].

(7) On the Sabbath, as a rule, that would not be permitted, but in the case of a possible danger to human life, that restriction would be inoperative.

(8) [I.e., Rabbah's principle is in agreement with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, who likewise holds that the vegetables must be first tithed even on Sabbath, although they are subject to tithes only Rabbinically].

(9) In which case the obligation is Biblical, which involves the penalty of death by divine decree. [MS.M. has an entirely different reading of the whole passage. v. D.S. a. l.]

(10) I Sam. XIV, 29.

(11) I Sam. XXX, 11, 12.

(12) Eccl. VII, 12.

(13) Deut. XXXIII, 14.

(14) Ibid. XXXII, 20. The name 'Kidor' suggested to R. Meir one who does not deserve confidence. That, as he later explained, was an idiosyncrasy of his own, amounting at best to an intuitive caution.

(15) It was on the eve of the Sabbath,

(16) The Sabbath rest gives rise to idle thoughts which are then reflected in dreams.

(17) Lit., 'these things never happened'.

(18) The suggestion conveyed by the sound of a man's name.

(19) Supplemented from Bah.

(20) Telling him the husband had sent them for the purses and giving her as a proof the fact that lentils had been the last meal in her house.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(21) Corrected in accord with marginal gloss.

(22) The washing of hands before meals implies 'the first water', as against the latter water-washing of the hands after meals, to remove any fat, grease, crumbs, from the meal. The one precedes the blessing before the meal, the other the grace after meals. Failure to wash his hands before meals caused one to eat pork. A certain innkeeper, who served both Jews and heathens, guided himself by the attitude of the guests as to 'first waters'. Once a non-conforming Jew entered, asked for a meal, without washing his hands; the innkeeper taking him for a heathen, placed pork before him (Rashi). In our case, had Kidor washed his hands after meals, and as is usual in such a case, wiped his upper lip, the traces of his repast would not have been visible, the Rabbis would have had no clue as to how to restore their purses to themselves, and the enraged thief would not have killed his wife.

(23) Ezek. XXIII, 43. A play on 'Balah', viz., one worn out by wrong living.

(24) The madness of the dog.

Yoma 84a

as to killing it by throwing¹ something at it. It was taught in accordance with Samuel: When one kills it, one does so only with something thrown against it. One against whom it rubs itself is endangered; one whom it bites, dies. 'One against whom it rubs itself is endangered'. What is the remedy? — Let him cast off his clothing, and run. As happened with R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua, against whom one mad dog rubbed itself in the market-place: he stripped off his garments and ran, saying: I fulfilled in myself. 'Wisdom preserveth the life of him who hath it'.² 'One whom it bites, dies'. What is the remedy? —

Abaye said: Let him take the skin of a male hyena.³ and write upon it: I, So-and-so, the son of that-and-that woman, write upon the skin of a male Hyena: Hami, Kanti, Kloros. God, God, Lord of Hosts, Amen, Amen, Selah,⁴ Then let him strip off his clothes, and bury then, in a grave [at cross-roads],⁵ for twelve months of a year. Then he should take them out and burn them in an oven, and scatter the ashes. During these twelve months, if he drinks water, he shall not drink

it but out of a copper tube, lest he see the shadow⁶ of the demon and be endangered. Thus the mother of Abba b. Martha, who is Abba b. Minyumi, made for him a tube of gold [for drinking purposes].

FURTHERMORE DID R. MATTHIA SAY. R. Johanan suffered from scurvy. He went to a matron, who prepared something for him on Thursday and Friday. He said to her: How shall I do it on the Sabbath? She answered him,: Then you will not need it [any more]. He said: But if I should need it, what then,? She replied: 'Swear unto me by the God of Israel⁷ that you will not reveal it' [to others]; whereupon he swore: 'To the God of Israel I shall not reveal it'. She revealed it to him, and he went forth and expounded it in his lecture. But he had sworn to her? — [He swore]: 'To the God of Israel I shall not reveal it' [which implies] but to His people I shall reveal it! But this is a profanation of the Name?⁸ — It was so that he had explained it [the meaning of his oath] to her from the very beginning. What did she give to him? R. Aha, the son of R. Ammi said: The water of leaven, olive oil and salt. R. Yemar said: Leaven itself, olive oil and salt. R. Ashi said: The fat of a goose-wing.

Abaye said: I tried everything without achieving a cure for myself, until an Arab recommended: 'Take the stones of olives which have not become ripe one third, burn them in fire upon a new rake, and stick them into the inside of the gums'.⁹ I did so and was cured. Whence does [scurvy] come? — From [eating] very hot wheat [-en bread], and from the [overnight] remnants of a pie of fish-hash and flour. What is its symptom? — If he puts anything between his teeth, his gums will bleed.

When R. Johanan suffered from scurvy, he applied this [remedy] on the Sabbath and was healed. How could R. Johanan do that?¹⁰ — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is different with scurvy, because whereas it starts in the mouth, it ends in the intestines. R. Hiyya b.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Abba said to R. Johanan: According to whom is it? According to R. Matthia b. Heresh who said that if one has pains in his throat one may pour medicine into his mouth on the Sabbath?¹¹ —

I say: In this case, but in no other.¹² Shall we say that the following [teaching] supports his view? If one is attacked by jaundice one may give him to eat the flesh of a donkey; if one was bitten by a mad dog, one may give him to eat the lobe of its liver; and to one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath — this is the view of R. Matthia b. Heresh; but the Sages say: These are not considered cures — Now what does ‘these’ mean to exclude? Won't you say it is meant to exclude medicine?¹³ No, it is meant to exclude blood-letting in case of asphyxia.¹⁴ Thus also does it seem logical.

For it was taught: R. Ishmael son of R. Jose reported three things in the name of R. Matthia b. Heresh: One may let blood in the case of asphyxia on the Sabbath, and one whom a mad dog has bitten may be given to eat the lobe of its liver, and one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath, whereas the Sages hold: These are not considered cures. Now what does ‘these’ exclude? Would you not say ‘these’ excludes the two latter one, and not the first one?¹⁵ — No, it means to exclude the first two ones, and not the last one.

(1) If it were killed by something held in one's hand the contact with the dog's body might cause the evil spirit to attack the dog's assailant. If madness is the result of witches' fun, no such danger would seem to inhere.

(2) Eccl. VII, 12.

(3) Or, leopard.

(4) V. Blau, *Altjud. Zauberesen*, p. 80f

(5) Supplemented from Bah.

(6) Which might have jumped over from the dog, and would endanger him.

(7) The Hebrew proposition ‘l’ may be interpreted as ‘by’ (the God of Israel), as the matron meant it; or, ‘to’ the God of Israel, as the Rabbi took it: I swear that ‘to the God of Israel I shall not reveal it’.

(8) If a scholar deceives a non-Jew he profanes the Name of the Lord, Who is associated with the Torah and Israel, much more than when an ordinary Jew does so although it is a grave offense in any case.

(9) Lit., ‘inside the row of teeth’.

(10) Since that does not seem to be a dangerous disease, justifying the application of medicine on the Sabbath day. By Rabbinic ordinance that is forbidden, as a fence around the law (Aboth I, 1) to prevent its leading to the grinding of spices for medicinal purposes, grinding being one of the thirty-nine kinds of labor prohibited by Biblical law on the Sabbath.

(11) But the Sages oppose R. Matthia, hence he remains in the minority and his permission is invalid.

(12) Here the Sages will agree with him, because of the ultimately dangerous character of the disease.

(13) As being permissible owing to their curative properties.

(14) Which is permitted.

(15) Which the Rabbis consider a cure. Which proves that the Sages, while they regard bloodletting as a cure for asphyxia and permissible on Sabbath, do not extend this sanction to medicine in general.

Yoma 84b

Come and hear: For Rabbah b. Samuel learned: If a woman with child has smelt [food], one feeds her until she is restored; and one who was bitten by a mad dog is given to eat from the lobe of its liver, and one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath — these are the words of R. Eleazar b. Jose in the name of R. Matthia b. Heresh. But the Sages say: In this case, but not in another. Now what does ‘in this case refer to? Would you say to the woman with child? That is self-evident; for is there anyone to say that in the case of a woman with child it would not be permitted? — Hence it must refer to the medicine.¹ This is conclusive.²

R. Ashi said: Our Mishnah too justifies this inference. R. MATTHIA B. HERESH SAID FURTHERMORE: IF ONE HAS PAINS IN HIS MOUTH ONE MAY GIVE HIM MEDICINE ON THE SABBATH.³ And herein the Rabbis⁴ do not dispute him. For if it were that the Rabbis dispute him, he

YOMA - 62a-88a

should teach these together,⁵ and afterwards mention that the Rabbis dispute it. This is conclusive evidence.

BECAUSE IT IS A POSSIBILITY OF DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE. Why was it necessary to add ‘AND WHEREVER THERE IS DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE, THE LAWS OF THE SABBATH ARE SUSPENDED? — Rab Judah in the name of Rab said: Not only in the case of a danger [to human life] on this Sabbath, but even in the case of a danger on the following Sabbath.⁶ How that? If e.g. the [diagnosis] estimates an eight-day [crisis] the first day of which falls on the Sabbath. You might have said, let them wait until the evening, so that the Sabbaths may not be profaned because of him, therefore he informs us [that we do not consider that]. Thus also was it taught: One may warm water for a sick person on the Sabbath, both for the purpose of giving him a drink or of refreshing him, and not only for [this] one Sabbath did they rule thus, but also for the following one. Nor do we say: Let us wait, because perchance he will get well, but we warm the water for him immediately, because the possibility of danger to human life renders inoperative the laws of the Sabbath, not only in case of such possibility on this one Sabbath, but also in case of such possibility on another Sabbath. Nor are these things to be done by Gentiles or minors,⁷ but by Jewish adults.⁷ Nor do we say in this connection: We do not rely in such matters on the opinions of women, or of Samaritans, but we join their opinion to that of others.⁸

Our Rabbis taught: One must remove debris to save a life on the Sabbath, and the more eager one is, the more praiseworthy is one; and one need not obtain permission from the Beth din. How so? If one saw a child falling into the sea, he spreads a net and brings it up — the faster the better, and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din though he thereby catches fish [in his net]. If he saw a child fall into a pit, he breaks loose one segment [of the entrenchment] and pulls it up

— the faster the better; and he need not obtain permission of the Beth din, even though he is thereby making a step [stairs]. If he saw a door closing upon an infant,⁹ he may break it, so as to get the child out — the faster the better; and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din, though he thereby consciously makes chips of wood.

One may extinguish and isolate [the fire] in the case of a conflagration — the sooner the better, and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din, even though he subdues the flames.¹⁰ Now all these cases must be mentioned separately. For if only the case of the [infant falling into] the sea had been mentioned [one would have said, it is permitted there] because meantime¹¹ the child might be swept away by the water, but that does not apply in the case [of its falling into] the pit, because since it remains [stays] therein, one might have thought, one may not [save it before obtaining permission], therefore it is necessary to refer to that. And if the teaching had confined itself to the case of the pit, [one would have thought, there no permission is required] because the child is terrified but in the case of a door closing upon it, one might sit outside and [amuse the child] by making a noise with nuts, therefore it was necessary [to include that too]. For what purposes is the ‘extinguishing’ and ‘isolating’ necessary? — Even for the benefit of another [neighboring] court.

R. Joseph said on the authority of Rab Judah, in the name of Samuel: In the case of danger to human life one pays no attention to majority. How is that? Would you say [in the case of] nine Israelites and one heathen among them? But then the majority consists of Israelites! Or, even if there were half and half, in the case of danger to human life, we take the more lenient view? Again, if you say that it is a case of nine heathens and one Israelite, that too is self-evident, because it is stationary and whatever is stationary is considered¹² half and half? —

YOMA - 62a-88a

No, it refers to a case in which [one has]¹³ gone off into another court.¹⁴ You might have said: Whosoever has gone off, has gone off from the majority which consisted of heathens, therefore the information that in case of danger to human life, we are not concerned with question of majorities which consisted of heathens. But that is not so, for R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: In the case of nine heathens and one Israelite, [if a building collapsed upon them while they were all] in that court, one must remove debris, but not if [a building collapsed] in another court?¹⁵ —

This is no contradiction: In the one case all had gone off, in the other only a few had gone off.¹⁶ But could Samuel have said that? Have we not learnt: If one finds therein¹⁷ a child abandoned, if the majority of the inhabitants are heathens, it is to be considered a heathen; if the majority are Israelites, it is to be considered an Israelite; in the case of half and half it is to be also considered an Israelite.¹⁸ And in connection therewith Rab said: This was taught only in relation to sustaining it,¹⁹ but not for the purpose of legitimizing²⁰ it;

(1) V. p. 414, n. 3.

(2) That the Rabbis agree that this may be given on Sabbath.

(3) [The text here differs from the one given in the Mishnah, but agrees with the reading in the Mishnah of MS.M].

(4) The authorities of the first view given anonymously in the Mishnah.

(5) With the other case, wherein the Sages oppose his view.

(6) As is soon explained.

(7) So MS.M.; cur. edd. Cutheans (Samaritans). If the original 'Cutheans is preferred, then 'Gedole Yisrael' (rendered here 'adult Jews') means 'even prominent Jews' — shall profane the Sabbath to save life.

(8) If e.g., two say it is necessary, three say it was not, and a woman or a non-Jew assert it is necessary, the opinion of the latter is joined to that of the others, who are in the affirmative, thus presenting a divided opinion, in which case, since danger to human life is involved, the more lenient view is adopted.

(9) The infant may be frightened, or within the room, endangered.

(10) And produces a coal-fire, which may be utilized. For other readings v. D.S. a.I.

(11) Until such permission is obtained.

(12) Kabua'. For a full explanation of this principle v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 531, n. 4.

(13) [So Asheri].

(14) And in that court he became buried in the debris.

(15) Whereto one of the group had repaired.

(16) [In the former case, since they all had left the former court, the principle of Kabua' no longer operates, and consequently the majority decides, but in the latter case, since there still remains a number of them in the former court, we apply the principle of Kabua' and the debris have to be removed. So Asheri; Rashi explains differently].

(17) In a town wherein Israelites and Gentiles live.

(18) V. Keth. 15a.

(19) Jews are in duty bound to support their own poor.

(20) If the child found exposed were a girl, she could not marry a priest, who is obliged to marry a native-born Israelite, not a proselyte.

Yoma 85a

whereas Samuel said: [It was taught] with reference to removing the debris for its sake?¹ — The words of Samuel refer to the first clause, 'If the majority are heathens, it is considered a heathen'. It is in connection therewith that Samuel said that it did not apply to the saving of life.² 'If the majority are heathens, it is considered a heathen'. For what practical law [is this taught]? —

Said R. Papa: To give it to eat carrion.³ 'If the majority are Israelites, it is considered an Israelite' — For what practical purpose [is this taught]? To restore to it lost property.⁴ 'In the case of half and half, it is considered an Israelite'. For what practical purpose [is this taught]? Resh Lakish said: With regard to damages⁵ How that? Shall we say that one ox of ours gored one of his?⁶ Let him bring proof and collect!⁷ — No, It is necessary for the case that an ox of his had gored one of ours; then he must pay one half, and concerning the other he can say: Prove that I am not an Israelite and collect!⁸

IF DEBRIS HAD FALLEN UPON SOMEONE [etc.]. What does he teach

YOMA - 62a-88a

herewith?⁹ — It states a case of ‘not only’.¹⁰ Not only must one remove the debris in the case of doubt as to whether he is there or not, as long as one knows that he is alive if he is there; but, even though it be doubtful whether he is alive or not he must be freed from the debris. Also, not only if it is doubtful whether he be alive or dead, as long as it is definite that he is an Israelite; but even if it is doubtful whether he is an Israelite or a heathen, one must, for his sake, remove the debris.

IF ONE FINDS HIM ALIVE, ONES SHOULD REMOVE THE DEBRIS. But that is self-evident if one finds him alive? — No, the statement is necessary for the case that he has only a short while to live.

AND IF HE BE DEAD, ONE SHOULD LEAVE HIM THERE. But that, too, is self-evident? — It is necessary because of the teaching of R. Judah b. Lakish. for it was taught: One may not save a dead person out of a fire.¹¹

R. Judah b. Lakish said: I heard that one may save a dead person out of a fire. Now even R. Judah b. Lakish says that only because¹² ‘a person is upset about a dead relative’ and if you will not permit him [to save his dead] he will ultimately come to extinguish the fire, but here, if you do not permit it, what can he do?¹³

Our Rabbis taught: How far does one search?¹⁴ Until [one reaches] his nose. Some say: Up to his heart. If one searches and finds those above to be dead, one must not assume those below are surely dead. Once it happened that those above were dead and those below were found to be alive. Are we to say that these Tannaim dispute the same as the following Tannaim? For it was taught: From where does the formation of the embryo commence? From its head, as it is said: Thou art he that took me [Gozi] out of my mother's womb,¹⁵ and it is also said: Cut off [Gozi] thy hair and cast it away.¹⁶

Abba Saul said: From the navel which sends its roots into every direction!¹⁷ You may even say that [the first view is in agreement with] Abba Saul, inasmuch as Abba Saul holds his view only touching the first formation, because ‘everything develops from its core [middle]’, but regarding the saving of life he would agree that life manifests itself through the nose especially, as it is written: In whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life.¹⁸

R. Papa said: The dispute arises only as to from below upwards,¹⁹ but if from above downwards, one had searched up to the nose, one need not search any further, as it is said: ‘In whose nostrils was the breath of life’.

R. Ishmael, R. Akiba and R. Eleazar b. Azariah were once on a journey, with Levi ha-Saddar²⁰ and R. Ishmael son of R. Eleazar b. Azariah following them. Then this question was asked of them: Whence do we know that in the case of danger to human life the laws of the Sabbath are suspended? —

R. Ishmael answered and said: If a thief be found breaking in.²¹ Now if in the case of this one it is doubtful whether he has come to take money or life; and although the shedding of blood pollutes the land, so that the Shechinah departs from Israel, yet it is lawful to save oneself at the cost of his life — how much more may one suspend the laws of the Sabbath to save human life!

R. Akiba answered and said: If a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, etc. thou shalt take him from My altar, that he may die.²² I.e., only off the altar, but not down from the altar.²³ And in connection therewith Rabbah b. Bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan: That was taught only when one's life is to be forfeited,

(1) Which seems to indicate that even in the case of saving human life it is the majority which decides the legal attitude.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(2) Samuel holds that even in that case life must be saved, majority or minority not influencing such a duty.

(3) I.e., the flesh of an animal that either died a natural death, or in the course of the ritual slaughter in which some irregularity occurred. An Israelite bound by the ritual could not partake thereof, whereas a non-Israelite could eat it.

(4) V. B.M., Sonc. ed., p. 149, n. 6.

(5) V. B.K., Sonc. ed., p. 211, n. 6. The Jewish owner of an ox which has gored an ox owned by a heathen, is not obliged to pay damages, whereas the heathen would have to pay full damage, whether the owner had been forewarned or not. The Jewish owner of an ox who has gored an ox owned by a fellow-Jew, if not forewarned must pay half of the damage; if forewarned, full damage.

(6) I.e., the abandoned child. The suggestion is that we would make him pay damage.

(7) The damages due to you.

(8) He pays one half, as any Jew not forewarned would if his ox gored the ox of a fellow-Jew. The owner in this case would wait to collect full damages, claiming the owner of the goring ox to be a heathen, hence obliged to repay full damages, even if not forewarned. The latter would say: One half I have paid because I am a Jew. If you wish to collect the other half, it is upon you to adduce evidence that I am not a Jew. Only thus could you collect.

(9) What is the value of all these hypothetical cases, doubtful savings of life, that he adduces.

(10) Lit., 'it is not required'.

(11) On the Sabbath, which may be profaned to save life, but not to save a dead person from being burnt.

(12) Shab. 43b.

(13) There is no Biblical law he can transgress; he will but wait for the end of the Sabbath day to do this work.

(14) If the person buried under the debris gives no sign of life at the point at which debris have been removed from him.

(15) Ps. LXXI, 6.

(16) Jer. VII, 29.

(17) Hence the dispute of these Tannaim looks exactly the same as those mentioned above.

(18) Gen. VII, 22.

(19) If the person under the debris has his feet up and his head down. According to one view, one must examine the core, i.e., the heart; according to the other, even though the heart seems to have suspended action, the definitive diagnosis depends on the action or failure of the function of the nose.

(20) Perhaps the systematizer: one who arranged traditions systematically, as opposed to one who excels in dialectics. [Aruch: ha-Sarad: the netmaker].

(21) Ex. XXII, 1, in which case, in spite of all the other considerations, it is lawful to kill him.

(22) Ex. XXI, 14.

(23) If he came as priest to do his service, one may take him off the altar, but if he had commenced on it, one may not take him down.

Yoma 85b

but to save life¹ one may take one down even from the altar. Now if in the case of this one, where it is doubtful whether there is any substance in his words or not, yet [he interrupts] the service in the Temple [which is important enough to] suspend the Sabbath, how much more should the saving of human life suspend the Sabbath laws!

R. Eleazar answered and said: If circumcision, which attaches to one only of the two hundred and forty-eight members of the human body, suspends the Sabbath,² how much more shall [the saving of] the whole body suspend the Sabbath!

R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Only ye shall keep My Sabbaths,³ one might assume under all circumstances, therefore the text reads: 'Only' viz, allowing for exceptions.⁴ R. Jonathan b. Joseph said: For it is holy unto you;⁵ I.e., it [the Sabbath] is committed to your hands, not you to its hands.

R. Simeon b. Menassia said: And the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath.⁶ The Torah said: Profane for his sake one Sabbath, so that he may keep many Sabbaths. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: If I had been there, I should have told them something better than what they said: He shall live by them,⁷ but he shall not die because of them. Raba said: [The exposition] of all of them could be refuted, except that of Samuel, which cannot be refuted.

That of R. Ishmael — perhaps that is to be taken as Raba did, for Raba said: What is the reason for the [permission to kill the] burglar? No man controls himself when his money is at stake, and since [the burglar]

YOMA - 62a-88a

knows that he [the owner] will oppose him, he thinks: If he resists me I shall kill him, therefore the Torah says: If a man has come to kill you. anticipate him by killing him! Hence we know it [only] of a certain case; [but] whence would we know it of a doubtful one?

That of R. Akiba's, there too [there may be a refutation]. Perhaps we should do as Abaye suggests, for Abaye said: We give him a couple of scholars, so as to find out whether there is any substance in his words. Again we know that only in the case of certain death, [but] whence would we know it of a doubtful case? [And similarly with the exposition of] all of them we know it only of a certain case; whence do we know of a doubtful case? But of Samuel, as to that there is no refutation. Rabina, or R. Nahman b. Isaac said: 'Better is one corn of pepper than a whole basket full of pumpkins.⁹

MISHNAH. THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING [FOR THE] UNDOUBTED COMMISSION OF CERTAIN OFFENSES:¹⁰ PROCURE ATONEMENT, DEATH AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURE ATONEMENT TOGETHER WITH PENITENCE.¹¹ PENITENCE PROCURES ATONEMENT FOR LIGHTER TRANSGRESSIONS: [THE TRANSGRESSION OF] POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS. IN THE CASE OF SEVERER TRANSGRESSIONS IT [PENITENCE] SUSPENDS [THE DIVINE PUNISHMENT], UNTIL THE DAY OF ATONEMENT COMES TO PROCURE ATONEMENT. IF ONE SAYS: I SHALL SIN AND REPENT, SIN AND REPENT, NO OPPORTUNITY WILL BE GIVEN TO HIM TO REPENT.¹² [IF ONE SAYS]: I SHALL SIN AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT WILL PROCURE ATONEMENT FOR ME, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES FOR HIM NO ATONEMENT. FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES ATONEMENT, BUT FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND HIS FELLOW THE

DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ANY ATONEMENT, UNTIL HE HAS PACIFIED HIS FELLOW.

THIS WAS EXPOUNDED BY R. ELEAZAR B. ALARIAH: FROM ALL YOUR SINS BEFORE THE LORD SHALL YE BE CLEAN,¹³ I.E., FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES ATONEMENT, BUT FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND HIS FELLOW THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ATONEMENT UNTIL HE HAS PACIFIED HIS FELLOW.¹⁴

R. AKIBA SAID: HAPPY ARE YOU, ISRAEL! WHO IS IT BEFORE WHOM YOU BECOME CLEAN? AND WHO IS IT THAT MAKES YOU CLEAN? YOUR FATHER WHICH IS IN HEAVEN, AS IT IS SAID: AND I WILL SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER UPON YOU AND YE SHALL BE CLEAN.¹⁵ AND IT FURTHER SAYS: THOU HOPE OF ISRAEL, THE LORD!¹⁶ JUST AS THE FOUNTAIN RENDERS CLEAN THE UNCLEAR, SO DOES THE HOLY ONE, BLESSED BE HE, RENDER CLEAN ISRAEL.

GEMARA. Only the undoubted guilt-offering [atones], but not the suspensive one? But is not the word 'forgiveness' written with regard to it too?¹⁷ — These [others] procure complete atonement, the suspensive guilt-offering does not procure complete atonement. Or else, As for these [others]¹⁸ another can effect their atonement, whereas in the case of the suspensive guilt-offering nothing else can effect their atonement. For it was taught: If those who were liable to sin-offerings, or guilt-offerings [for the] undoubted [commission of offenses] permitted the Day of Atonement to pass, they are still obliged to offer then, up; but in the case of those who were liable to suspensive guilt-offerings, they are exempt.¹⁹

DEATH AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURE ATONEMENT TOGETHER WITH PENITENCE. Only TOGETHER

WITH PENITENCE, but not in themselves!
— Shall we say that this teaching is not in accord with, Rabbi? For it was taught: Rabbi said, For all transgressions [of commands of] the Torah, whether one had repented or not, does the Day of Atonement procure atonement, except in the case of one who throws off the yoke²⁰ [of the Torah], interprets the Torah unlawfully,²¹ or breaks the covenant of Abraham our father.²² In these cases, if he repented, the Day of Atonement procures atonement, if not, not!
— You might even say that this is in accord with Rabbi: Repentance needs the Day of Atonement, but the Day of Atonement does not need repentance.

PENITENCE PROCURES ATONEMENT FOR LIGHTER TRANSGRESSIONS: [THE TRANSGRESSION OF] POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS. If it procures atonement for the transgression of negative commandments, is it necessary [to state that it procures it for the transgression of] positive ones?²³ — Rab Judah said: This is what he means, [It procures atonement] for [the transgression of] a positive commandment, of a negative commandment that is to be remedied into a positive one.²⁴ But not [for the transgression] of an actual negative commandment? Against this the following contradiction is to be raised: These are light transgressions [for which penitence procures atonement: transgression of] positive commandments and negative commandments

(1) If one had been sentenced to death, there is ample provision for a revision, if even at the last moment someone claims to have found evidence of the accused's innocence. If a priest has such evidence, or is only believed to have it, he would be taken down from the altar even after he had commenced, and before having completed, his service.

(2) The circumcision must take place on the eighth day, even if that day falls on the Sabbath, suspending the law of the Sabbath, which prohibits operation, as well as preparations leading to it.

(3) Ex. XXXI, 13.

(4) Lit., 'divides', 'makes a distinction'. The word 'Rak' here translated 'only' (E.V. 'verily') is interpreted as 'only under certain, i.e., not all conditions',

(5) Ibid. 14.

(6) Ibid., 16.

(7) Lev. XVIII, 5.

(8) To the priest who thinks he has relevant testimony in favor of the accused, because of which he may be taken down from the altar in the midst of the service.

(9) A commentary on Samuel's irrefutable simple interpretation, as against the more involved and less perfect interpretations of the other Rabbis.

(10) Cf. Lev. V, 15 and VI, 6, as opposed to the suspensive guilt-offering, due in the case of doubtful commission of sin, which postpones punishment until that doubt is removed, when a sin-offering is due to procure atonement. Among the guilt-offerings due for undoubted commission of certain offenses are: one for illegal appropriation of private property, after reparation has been made; one for misappropriation of sacred property; one for carnal connection with a bondwoman betrothed to another man; the offering of a Nazirite who had interrupted the days of his avowed Naziriteship by Levitical impurity.

(11) Penitence is essential; it consists of genuine regret, and determination to improve one's conduct. In the case of any offering (sin or guilt) such penitence is taken for granted, for without it no sacrifice has any meaning or value.

(12) Because this statement indicates that he never experienced genuine regret.

(13) Lev. XVI, 30.

(14) The verse is thus taken to mean 'From all your sins before the Lord', (i.e., as between man and his Creator) will the Day the Atonement procure you forgiveness; but not for those which are committed not 'before the Lord', and 'before man', viz., sins committed against our fellow-man.

(15) Ezek. XXXVI, 25.

(16) Jer. XVII, 13. The word 'Mikweh' is a homonym meaning both 'fountain' thus ritual bath, and 'hope'.

(17) V. Lev. V, 18 with reference to a suspensive guilt-offering; v. also supra p. 422, n. 4.

(18) The sin-offering and certain guilt-offerings.

(19) Ker. 25a.

(20) I.e., denies the existence of God.

(21) Lit., 'reveals an aspect of the Torah (not in accordance with the correct interpretation)'; or, 'acts in a bare-faced manner against the Torah'. For a full discussion of the phrase v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 99.

(22) Circumcision; v. loc. cit.

(23) A sin of omission is not as serious as one of commission.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(24) A prohibitive law, the transgression of which must be repaired by a positive act, as e.g., Lev. XIX, 13: Thou shalt not rob, and V, 23: He shall make restitution.

Yoma 86a

with the exceptions of: Thou shalt not take [in vain]¹ — ‘Thou shalt not take’ and others of the same kind.²

Come and hear: R. Judah said: For everything from ‘Thou shalt not take’ and down repentance procures atonement, for everything from ‘Thou shalt take’ and up.³ penitence procures suspension [of punishment] and the Day of Atonement procures atonement? — ‘Thou shalt not take’ and others of the same kind.

Come and hear: Since in connection with Horeb⁴ penitence and forgiveness are stated,⁵ one might assume, that includes the [transgression of] ‘Thou shalt not take’, therefore it says: He will not clear the guilty.⁶ Then I might have assumed that with all others guilty of having transgressed negative commandments the same is the case, therefore the text reads: ‘[Will not clear the guilt of him who taketh] His name [in vain].⁷ i.e., He does not clear the guilt in [the taking in vain of] His name, but He clears the guilt in the transgression of other negative commandments?⁸ —

This is indeed a point of dispute between Tannam; for it was taught: For what transgression does penitence procure atonement? For that of a positive commandment. And in what case does repentance suspend punishment and the Day of Atonement procure atonement? In such as involve extirpation, death-penalty through the Beth din and in actual negative commandments.

The Master said: In connection with Horeb [penitence and]⁹ forgiveness is stated. Whence do we know that? Because it was taught: R. Eleazar said: It is impossible to

say. ‘He will not clear the guilt’¹⁰ Since it says: ‘He will clear the guilt’; nor is it possible to say: ‘He will not clear the guilt’ since it is said: ‘He will clear the guilt’; how is that to be explained? ‘He clears the guilt’ of those who repent, and does not ‘clear the guilt’ of those who do not repent.

R. Matthia b. Heresh asked R. Eleazar b. Azariah in Rome: have you heard about the four kinds of sins, concerning which R. Ishmael has lectured? He answered: They are three, and with each is repentance connected — If one transgressed a positive commandment, and repented, then he is forgiven, before he has moved from his place; as it is said: Return, O backsliding children.¹¹ If he has transgressed a prohibition and repented, then repentance suspends [the punishment] and the Day of Atonement procures atonement, as it is said: For on this day shall atonement be made for you ... from all your sins.¹² If he has committed [a sin to be punished with] extirpation or death through the Beth din, and repented, then repentance and the Day of Atonement suspend [the punishment thereon], and suffering finishes the atonement,¹³ as it is said: Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with strokes.¹⁴ But if he has been guilty of the profanation of the Name, then penitence has no power to suspend punishment, nor the Day of Atonement to procure atonement, nor suffering to finish it, but all of them together suspend the punishment and only death finishes it, as it is said: And the Lord of hosts revealed Himself in my ears; surely this iniquity shall not be expiated by you till ye die.¹⁵ What constitutes profanation of the Name? —

Rab said: If, e.g., I take meat for the butcher and do not pay him at once.¹⁶ Abaye said: That we have learnt [to regard as profanation] only in a place wherein one does not go out to collect payment, but in a place where one does not go out to collect, there is no harm in it [not paying at once]. Rabina

YOMA - 62a-88a

said: And Matha Mehasia¹⁷ is a place where one goes out collecting payments due.

Whenever Abaye bought meat from two partners, he paid money to each of them, afterwards bringing them, together and squaring accounts with both. R. Johanan said: In my case [it is a profanation if] I walk four cubits without [uttering words of] Torah or [wearing] Tefillin.¹⁸ Isaac, of the School of R. Jannai. said: If one's colleagues are ashamed of his reputation, that constitutes a profanation of the Name. R. Nahman b. Isaac commented: E.g. if people say, May the Lord forgive So-and-so.

Abaye explained: As it was taught: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God,¹⁹ i.e., that the Name of Heaven be beloved because of you. if someone studies Scripture and Mishnah, and attends on the disciples of the wise, is honest in business,²⁰ and speaks pleasantly to persons, what do people then say concerning him? 'Happy the father who taught him Torah, happy the teacher who taught him Torah; woe unto people who have not studied the Torah; for this man has studied the Torah look how fine his ways are, how righteous his deeds! Of him does Scripture say: And He said unto me: Thou art My servant, Israel, in, whom I will be glorified.²¹

But if someone studies Scripture and Mishnah, attends on the disciples of the wise, but is dishonest in business, and discourteous in his relations with people, what do people say about him? 'Woe unto him who studied the Torah, woe unto his father who taught him Torah; woe unto his teacher who taught him Torah!' This man studied the Torah: Look, how corrupt are his deeds, how ugly his ways; of him Scripture says: In that men said of them,: These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land.²²

R. Hama b. Hanina said: Great is penitence, for it brings healing to the world, as it is said: I will heal their backsliding, I will love them, freely.²³ R. Hama b. Hanina pointed out a

contradiction: It is written : Return, ye backsliding children,²⁴ I.e., you who were formerly backsliding; and it is written: I will heal your backsliding?²⁵ This is no difficulty: in the one case the reference is where they return out of love, in the other, out of fear.²⁶

Rab Judah pointed out this contradiction: It is written: 'Return ye backsliding children , I will heal your backsliding', but it is also written: For I am a lord unto you. and I will take you one of a city and two of a family?²⁷ This is no contradiction: The one verse speaks [of a return] out of love or fear; the other, when it comes as a result of suffering.

R. Levi said: Great is repentance, for it reaches up to the Throne of Glory, as it is said: Return, O Israel, unto the Lord thy God.²⁸

- (1) Ex. XX, 7; viz., the Name of God. [This proves that other negative commands are included in the lighter transgression for which penitence procures atonement].
- (2) I.e., all actual negative commandments.
- (3) 'Up and down', i.e., before and after.
- (4) After the sin of the golden calf as Moses besought the Lord's forgiveness.
- (5) As explained infra.
- (6) Ex. XX, 7.
- (7) Interpreting the phrase as if it were divided into two parts.
- (8) [This proves that for the transgression of other negative commandments penitence effects atonement].
- (9) Supplemented from Bah.
- (10) Ex. XXXIV, 7.
- (11) Jer. III, 14.
- (12) Lev. XVI, 30.
- (13) Lit., 'cleanses (from sin)'.²⁴
- (14) Ps. LXXXIX, 33.
- (15) Isa. XXII, 14.
- (16) He would learn from my bad example to treat debts dishonestly by delaying and ultimately ignoring the payment.
- (17) A suburb of Sura, the place of Rabina.
- (18) People would not know that I am weak, they would profit by my 'example' to neglect the study of the Torah, v. D.S. a.I.
- (19) Deut. VI, 5.
- (20) Supplemented from Bah.
- (21) Isa. XLIX, 3.
- (22) Ezek. XXXVI, 20.
- (23) Hos. XIV, 5.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(24) Jer. III, 22.

(25) [The contradiction is not clear. Apparently the first part of the verse implies that having repented they are perfect as children, whereas the second part, which speaks of 'healing', implies that they still retain a taint of their former backsliding, v. Rashi].

(26) [Where the penitence is motivated by love, the return is complete leaving no trace of any taint, which is not the case where it is motivated by fear].

(27) Jer. III, 14.

(28) Hos. XIV, 2.

Yoma 86b

R. Johanan said: Great is repentance. for it overrides a prohibition of the Torah, as it is said:... saying: If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, may he return unto her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted? But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; and wouldest thou yet return to Me? Saith the Lord.¹

R. Jonathan said: Great is repentance, because it brings about redemption, as it is said And a redeemer will come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob,² i.e., why will a redeemer come to Zion? Because of those that turn from transgression in Jacob.

Resh Lakish said: Great is repentance, for because of it premeditated sins are accounted as errors, as it is said: Return, O Israel, unto the Lord, thy God,' for thou hast stumbled in thy iniquity.³ 'Iniquity' is premeditated, and yet he calls it 'stumbling' But that is not so!

For Resh Lakish said that repentance is so great that premeditated sins are accounted as though they were merits, as it is said: And when the wicked turneth from his wickedness, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby!⁴ That is no contradiction: One refers to a case [of repentance] derived from love, the other to one due to fear.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: Great is repentance, because it prolongs the [days and] ⁵ years of man, as it is said: 'And when the wicked turneth from his wickedness... he shall live thereby'.

R. Isaac said: In the West [Palestine] they said in the name of Rabbah b. Mari: Come and see how different from the character of one of flesh and blood is the action of the Holy One, blessed be He. As to the character of one of flesh and blood, if one angers his fellow,⁶ it is doubtful whether he [the latter] will be pacified or not by him. And even if you would say, he can be pacified, it is doubtful whether he will be pacified by mere words. But with the Holy One, blessed be He, if a man commits a sin in secret, He is pacified by mere words, as it is said: Take with you words, and return unto the Lord.⁷ Still more: He even accounts it to him as a good deed, as it is said: And accept that which is good.⁷ Still more: Scripture accounts it to him as if he had offered up bullocks, as it is said : So will we render for bullocks the offerings of our lips.⁷ Perhaps you will say [the reference is to] obligatory bullocks. Therefore it is said: I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely.⁸

It was taught: R Meir used to say, Great is repentance. for on account of an individual who repents, the sins of all the world are forgiven, as it is said: I will heal their backsliding. I will love them freely, for mine anger is turned away from him.⁸ 'From them' it is not said, but 'from him,'. How is one proved a repentant sinner? — Rab Judah said: If the object which caused his original transgression comes before him on two occasions, and he keeps away from it. Rab Judah indicated: With the same woman, at the same time, in the same place.

Rab Judah said: Rab pointed out the following contradictions. It is written: Happy is he whose transgression is covered,⁹ whose sin is pardoned;¹⁰ and it is also written: He that covereth his 'transgression shall not

YOMA - 62a-88a

prosper?¹¹ This is no difficulty, one speaks of sins that have become known [to the public], the other of such as did not become known.¹² R. Zutra b. Tobiah in the name of R. Nahman said: Here we speak of sins committed by a man against his fellow, there of sins committed by man against the Omnipresent.¹³

It was taught: R. Jose b. Judah said: If a man commits a transgression, the first, second and third time he is forgiven, the fourth time he is not forgiven, as it is said: Thus saith the Lord.' For three transgressions of Israel, Yea for four, I will not reverse it;¹⁴ and furthermore it says: Lo, all these things does God work, twice, yea, thrice, with a man.¹⁵ What does 'furthermore' serve for? — One might have assumed that applies only to a community, but not to an individual, therefore: Come and hear [the additional verse]: 'Lo, all these things does God work, twice, yea, thrice with a man'.

Our Rabbis taught: As for the sins which one has confessed on one Day of Atonement, he should not confess them on another Day of Atonement; but if he repeated them, then he should confess them, on another Day of Atonement — And if he had not committed them again, yet confessed them again, then it is with regard to him that Scripture says: As a dog that returneth to his vomit, so is a fool that repeateth his folly.¹⁶ R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: He is the more praiseworthy, as it is said: For I know my transgressions, and my sin is even before me.¹⁷ How then do I [explain]. 'As a dog that returneth to his vomit, etc.'? In accord with R. Huna; for R. Huna said: Once a man has committed a sin once and twice, it is permitted to him. 'Permitted'? How could that occur to you?—

Rather, it appears to him as if it were permitted.¹⁸ It is obligatory to confess the sin in detail [explicitly], as it is said: This people have sinned a great sin, and have made them a god of gold.¹⁹ These are the words of R. Judah b. Baba. R. Akiba said: [This is not

necessary],²⁰ as it is said: 'Happy is he whose transgression is covered, whose sin is pardoned.²¹ Then why did Moses say: 'And have made them a god of gold'? That is [to be explained] in accord with R. Jannai, for R. Jannai said:²² Moses said before the Holy One, blessed be He: The silver and gold which Thou hast increased unto Israel until they said 'enough !'²³ has caused them to make golden gods. Two good administrators arose unto Israel, Moses and David. Moses begged: let my sin be written down, as it is said: Because ye believed not in me to sanctify me.²⁴

David begged that his sin be not written down, as it is said; 'Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is pardoned'. This case of Moses and Aaron may be compared to the case of two women who received in court the punishment of stripes; one had committed an indecent act, the other had eaten the unripe figs of the seventh year.²⁵ Whereupon the woman who had eaten unripe figs of the seventh year said: I beg of you, make known for what offense I²⁶ have been punished with stripes, lest people say: The one woman was punished for the same sin that the other was punished for. They brought unripe fruits of the seventh year, and hanged them on her neck, and they were calling out before her: This woman was punished with stripes because she ate the unripe figs of the seventh year.

One should expose hypocrites to prevent²⁷ the profanation of the Name,²⁸ as it is said: Again, when a righteous man doth turn from righteousness. and commit iniquity, I will lay a stumbling-block before him.²⁹ The repentance of the confirmed sinner delays punishment, even though the decree of punishment for him had been signed already. The careless ease of the wicked ends in calamity. Power buries those who wield it. Naked did man come into the world, naked he leaves it. Would that his coming forth be like his coming in.³⁰ Whenever Rab went to the court, he used to say thus: Out of his own

YOMA - 62a-88a

will he goes³¹ towards death, the wishes of his household he is unable to fulfill, for he returns empty to his home. Would that the coming forth be like the going in.³² (Whenever Raba went to the court he used to say thus:

- (1) Jer. III, 1.
- (2) Isa. LIX, 20.
- (3) Hos. XIV, 2.
- (4) Ezek. XXXIII, 19.
- (5) Supplemented from Bah.
- (6) So MS.M.; cur. edd. add 'with words'.
- (7) Hos. XIV, 3.
- (8) Ibid. 5.
- (9) E.V. 'forgiven'.
- (10) Ps. XXXII, 1.
- (11) Prov. XXVIII, 13. The phrase 'covering of sin' is understood in the sense of hiding it, not making it public by confession.
- (12) Certain sins, such as have become notorious, one ought to confess publicly; secret sins one need confess to none but God.
- (13) Social sins one ought to make known to others so that they might intercede on his behalf unto the person he offended; ritual transgressions one need reveal but to God.
- (14) Amos II, 6.
- (15) Job XXXIII, 29.
- (16) Prov. XXVI, 11.
- (17) Ps. LI, 5.
- (18) In that respect he becomes like a dog, returning to his vomit.
- (19) Ex. XXXII, 31.
- (20) Supplemented from Bah.
- (21) V. supra p. 430, n. 3.
- (22) V. Ber. 32a.
- (23) A play on the name of a place 'Di Zahab' (Deut. I, 1) which is read 'Dai Zahab' viz., 'enough of gold'.
- (24) Num. XX, 12.
- (25) Unripe figs of the Sabbatical year, which must not be eaten, as Sabbatical produce must not be wasted.
- (26) Lit., 'she'.
- (27) Lit., 'on account of'.
- (28) People should not imitate their conduct.
- (29) Ezek. III, 20.
- (30) That he leave life as innocent as he entered it.
- (31) Referring to himself.
- (32) The responsibility involved in rendering decision appeared to him as momentous as if the ethical dangers involved were physical ones. The stipend was insufficient to meet the needs of his household, the only fruit was the fear that he may leave the court less righteous than he entered it. There were no salaries for the judges in antiquity. Like the office of the Rabbi, it was a post of honor.

But every scholar who spent his time exclusively in the study of the Torah was freed from taxes and received public and private privileges.

Yoma 87a

Out of his own will he goes towards death, the wishes of his household he is unable to fulfill, for he returned empty to his house. Would that the coming forth be like the going in).¹ And when he [Rab]² saw a crowd escorting him, he would say: Though his excellency mount up to heaven, and his head reach unto the clouds, yet shall he perish forever like his own dung, they that have seen him shall say: 'Where is he?'³

When R. Zutra was carried shoulder-high⁴ on the Sabbath before the Pilgrimage festivals,⁵ he would say: For riches are not forever; and doth the crown endure unto all generations?⁶ It is not good to respect the person of the wicked.⁷ It is not good for the wicked that they are being favored [by the Holy One, blessed be He] in this world. It was not good for Ahab that he was favored in this world, as it is said: Because he humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the evil in his days.⁸ So as to turn aside the righteous in judgments⁹ — it is good for the righteous that they are not favored in this world. It was good for Moses that he was not favored in this world, as it is said: Because ye believed not in Me, to sanctify Me [etc.]. But had you believed in Me your time to depart this world would not yet have come.

Happy are the righteous! Not only do they acquire merit, but they bestow merit upon their children and children's children to the end of all generations, for Aaron had several sons who deserved to be burnt like Nadab and Abihu, as it is said: 'That were left';¹⁰ but the merit of their father helped them. Woe unto the wicked! Not alone that they render themselves guilty, but they bestow guilt upon their children and children's children unto the end of all generations.

YOMA - 62a-88a

Many sons did Canaan have, who were worthy to be ordained¹¹ like Tabi, the slave of R. Gamaliel, but the guilt of their ancestor caused them [to lose their chance].

Whosoever causes a community to do good, no sin will come through him, and whosoever causes the community to sin, no opportunity will be granted him to become repentant. Whosoever causes a community to do good, no sin will come through him'. Why? Lest he be in Gehinnom, and his disciples in Gan Eden [Paradise], as it is said: For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the nether world, neither wilt Thou suffer thy godly one to see the pit.¹² 'And whosoever causes the community to sin, no opportunity will be granted him for repentance', lest he be in Gan Eden and his disciples in Gehinnom, as it is said: A man, that is laden with the blood of any person shall hasten his steps unto the pit; none will help him.¹³

IF ONE SAYS: I SHALL SIN, AND REPENT, SIN AND REPENT. Why is it necessary to state I SHALL SIN AND I SHALL REPENT twice? — That is in accord with what R. Huna said in the name of Rab; for R. Huna said in the name of Rab: Once a man has committed a transgression once or twice, it becomes permitted to him. 'Permitted' — How could that come into your mind — Rather, it appears to him like something permitted.

I SHALL SIN AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT SHALL PROCURE ATONEMENT; THEN THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ATONEMENT. Shall we say that our Mishnah is not in accord with Rabbi, for Rabbi said: It was taught, For all transgressions of Biblical commandments, whether he repented or not, whether positive or negative, does the Day of Atonement procure atonement? — You may even say it will be in agreement with Rabbi. It is different when he relies on it.¹⁴

FOR TRANSGRESSIONS COMMITTED BY MAN AGAINST THE OMNIPRESENT. R. Joseph b. Helbe pointed out to R. Abbahu the following contradiction: [We learned]:¹⁵ FOR TRANSGRESSIONS COMMITTED BY MAN AGAINST HIS FELLOWMAN THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES NO ATONEMENT, but it is written: If one man sin against his fellow-man, God [Elohim] will pacify him?¹⁶ 'Elohim' here means 'the Judge'. But how then is the second half of the clause to be understood, 'But if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him'? — This is what he means to say: 'If a man sins against his fellow-man, the judge will judge him, he [his fellow] will forgive him';¹⁷ 'but if a man sins against the Lord God, who shall entreat for him'? Only repentance and good deeds.

R. Isaac said: Whosoever offends his neighbor, and he does it only through words, must pacify him, as it is written: My son, if thou art become surety for thy neighbor, If thou hast struck thy hands for a stranger — , thou art snared by the words of thy mouth. . . do this, now, my son, and deliver thyself, seeing thou art come into the hand of thy neighbor; go, humble thyself, and urge thy neighbor.¹⁸ If he has a claim of money upon you, open the palm of your hand to him,¹⁹ and if not, send many friends to him.²⁰ R. Hisda said: He should endeavor to pacify him through three groups of three people each, as it is said: He cometh before me and saith: I have sinned and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not.²¹

R. Jose b. Hanina said: One who asks pardon of his neighbor need do so no more than three times, as it is said: Forgive. I pray thee now... and now we pray thee.²² And if he [against whom he had sinned] had died, he should bring ten persons and make them stand by his grave and say: I have sinned against the Lord, the God of Israel, and against this one, whom I have hurt.

YOMA - 62a-88a

R. Abba had a complaint against R. Jeremiah. He [R. Jeremiah] went and sat down at the door of R. Abba and as the maid poured out water, some drops fell upon his head. Then he said: They have made a dung-heap of me, and he cited this passage about himself: He raiseth up the poor out of the dust.²³ R. Abba heard that and came out towards him, saying: Now, I must come forth to appease you, as it is written: 'Go, humble thyself and urge thy neighbor'.

When R. Zera had any complaint against any man, he would repeatedly pass by him,²⁴ showing himself to him, so that he may come forth to [pacify] him.

Rab once had a complaint against a certain butcher, and when on the eve of the Day of Atonement he [the butcher] did not come to him,²⁵ he said: I shall go to him to pacify him. R. Huna met him and asked: Whither are you going, Sir? He said, To pacify So-and-so. He thought: Abba²⁶ is about to cause one's death.²⁷ He went there and remained standing before him [the butcher], who was sitting and chopping an [animal's] head. He raised his eyes and saw him [Rab], then said: You are Abba, go away. I will have nothing to do with you. Whilst he was chopping the head, a bone flew off, struck his throat, and killed him.

Once Rab was expounding portions of the Bible²⁸ before Rabbis, and there entered

- (1) [This bracketed passage is left out in MS.M.].
- (2) V. Sanh. 7b.
- (3) Job XX, 6-7.
- (4) He was advanced in age and unable to walk quickly, and thus he was carried so that the audience should not have to wait long for his arrival.
- (5) When he would preach on the Festival laws.
- (6) Prov. XXVII, 24.
- (7) Ibid. XVIII, 5.
- (8) I Kings XXI, 29.
- (9) Prov. XVIII, 5.
- (10) Lev. X, 12, the suggestion being 'they were left to survive', having also deserved the punishment suffered by their two brethren.

(11) The official ordination, lit., 'laying hands' on the scholar,

(12) Ps. XVI, 9.

(13) Prov. XXVIII, 17.

(14) Lit., 'by the way of'. Since he relies upon the capacity of the Day of Atonement to forgive, for sinning, such forgiveness is not procured by that day.

(15) Supplemented from Bah.

(16) I Sam. II, 25. E.V. 'shall judge him', Elohim may mean either 'God' or 'judge,' and so the Hebrew verb 'Pallel' may mean either 'judge' or 'pray', thus 'pacify', 'forgive'. The two meanings of the words are represented in the two suggestions here.

(17) [An instance of aposiopesis, in which part of the sentence is suppressed, cf. Giesenius Kautzsch, ** 159dd and which part of the sentence is suppressed, cf. Gesenius Kautzsch, 159dd and 162. V. Maharsha. Rashi explains differently].

(18) Prov. VI 1-3.

(19) So Bah. I.e., pay him. The Hebrew is a play on the word התרפס 'humble thyself'.

(20) The Hebrew is a play on רהב רעיד 'urge thy neighbor'.

(21) Job XXXIII, 27. The root for 'right' — 'Yashar' is interpreted as if derived from 'Shur', from which the noun 'Shurah', 'row', 'group' is derived.

(22) Gen. L, 17. The brethren, in their appeal to Joseph to forgive the wrong they had done to him, use the term 'Na' (O, pray) three times.

(23) I Sam. II, 8.

(24) To, make it easier for him to endeavor reconciliation.

(25) To pacify him.

(26) Because the butcher had neglected to make his effort to reconcile Rab. Abba was the real name of Rab.

(27) As he knew that the butcher was a hard man and would not take advantage of Rab's offer at reconciliation.

(28) פסיק סדרא V. Shab., Sonc. ed., p. 572, n. 1.

Yoma 87b

R. Hiyya, whereupon Rab started again from the beginning; as Bar Kappara entered, he started again from the beginning; as R. Simeon, the son of Rabbi entered, he started again from the beginning. But when R. Hanina b. Hama entered, he said: So often shall I go back? And he did not go over it again. R. Hanina took that amiss.

Rab went to him on thirteen eves of the Day of Atonement, but he would not be pacified.

YOMA - 62a-88a

But how could he do so, did not R. Jose b. Hanina Say: One who asks pardon of his neighbor need not do so more than three times?¹ — It is different with Rab.² But how could R. Hanina act so [unforgivingly]? Had not Raba said that if one passes over his rights, all his transgressions are passed over [forgiven]? —

Rather: R. Hanina had seen in a dream that Rab was being hanged on a palm tree, and since the tradition is that one who in a dream is hanged on a palm tree will become head [of an Academy] he concluded that authority will be given to him, and so he would not be pacified, to the end that he departed to teach Torah in Babylon.³

Our Rabbis taught: The obligation of confession of sins comes on the eve of the Day of Atonement, as it grows dark. But the Sages said: Let one confess before one has eaten and drunk, lest one become upset⁴ in the course of the meal. And although one has confessed before eating and drinking, he should confess again after having eaten and drunk, because perchance some wrong has happened in the course of the meal, And although he has confessed during the evening prayer, he should confess again during the morning prayer; [and although he has confessed] during the morning prayer, he should do so again during the Musaf [additional prayer]. And although he had confessed during the Musaf, he should do so again during the afternoon prayer; and although he had done so in the afternoon prayer, he should confess again in the Ne'ilah [concluding prayer]. And when shall he say [the confession]? The individual after his 'Amidah Prayer',⁵ the public reader in the middle thereof. What is it [the confession]? —

Rab said: 'Thou knowest the secrets of eternity'.⁶ Samuel said: From the depths of the heart.⁷ Levi said: And in thy Torah it is said...⁸ R. Johanan said: Lord of the Universe, [etc.].⁹ Rab Judah: 'Our iniquities are too many to count, and our sins too

numerous to be counted'. R. Hamnuna said: 'My God, before I was formed, I was of no worth, and now that I have been formed, it is as if I had not been formed. I am dust in my life, how much more in my death. Behold I am before Thee like a vessel full of shame and reproach. May it be thy will that I sin no more, and what I have sinned wipe away in Thy mercy, but not through suffering'.¹⁰ That was the confession [of sins] used by Rab all the year round, and by R. Hamnuna the younger, on the Day of Atonement.

Mar Zutra said: All that [is necessary only] when he did not say: 'Truly, we have sinned'.¹¹ but if he had said: 'Truly, we have sinned', no more is necessary, for Bar Hamdudi said: Once I stood before Samuel, who was sitting, and when the public reader came up and said: 'Truly, we have sinned', he rose. Hence he inferred that this was the main confession. We learned elsewhere: On three occasions of the year the priests raise their hands [in benediction] four times during the day; at the morning prayer, at Musaf, at Minhah [afternoon prayer] and at the closing of the [Temple] gates. Viz., on fast days, at the Ma'amads and on the Day of Atonement.¹²

What [is the prayer at] 'the closing of the [Temple] gates'? — Rab said: An extra prayer.¹³ Samuel said: 'Who are we, what is our life, etc.'?¹⁴

The following objection was raised: On the evening of the Day of Atonement one reads seven [benedictions]¹⁵ and then makes the confession, in the morning prayer one reads seven [benedictions] and makes confession, at Musaf one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession, at Minhah one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession, and at Ne'ilah one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession?¹⁶ [And further was]¹⁷ it taught: On the Day of Atonement as it becomes dark one reads the seven benedictions and makes confession, and concludes with the confession¹⁸ — that is the

YOMA - 62a-88a

view of R. Meir, whereas the Sages say: He should read the seven [benedictions], and if he wishes to conclude with the confession, he may do so. That would be a refutation of Samuel?¹⁹ — It is a refutation.

‘Ulla b. Rab came down [to the reader's desk] before Raba, commencing the Ne'ilah prayer with ‘Thou hast chosen us and concluding with ‘What are we, what is our life’, and he praised him. R. Huna b. Nathan said: The individual should say it²⁰ after his prayer.

Rab said: The concluding prayer exempts from evening prayer [to follow]. Rab goes according to his idea that it is all extra prayer, and since one has said it already [at dusk] it is not required any more. But did Rab say so? Did not Rab say: The Halachah is according to the view that the evening Prayer is not obligatory?²¹ He said this on the view that it is obligatory.²²

An objection was raised: On the evening of the Day of Atonement he should read seven [benedictions] and make confession, in the morning also seven and make confession, at Musaf also seven and make confession, at Minhah also seven and make confession,²³ at Ne'ilah also seven and make confession, at the evening Prayer he reads seven benedictions [the seventh consisting of] the substance of the eighteen benedictions.²⁴

R. Hanina b. Gamaliel said in the name of his ancestors: One must read the complete prayer of eighteen benedictions,

(1) V. supra p. 435.

(2) He goes beyond what the law requires, his humility and kindness refuse to recognize limits in such matters.

(3) After the death of Raba, R. Hanina became head of the Academy (v. Keth. 103b) and he interpreted the dream to mean that he would die soon, to make place for Rab. In order to allow for another interpretation, with less fatal results to himself of that vision, he refused to become reconciled to Rab, forcing the latter to go to Babylon, where in accord with that dream he did become before long head of the School of Sura.

(4) Through drink.

(5) The ‘Amidah, the prayer par excellence.

(6) V. P.B., p. 259.

(7) [Probably the same as the prayer mentioned by Rab, except that Samuel substitutes ‘The depths of the Heart’ for ‘secrets of the eternity’ V. D.S. a.l.].

(8) [For us this day He shall make atonement for you (Rashi); v. P. B., p. 257].

(9) V. P.B., p. 7.

(10) V. P.B., p. 263.

(11) V. P.B., p. 258.

(12) For notes v. Ta'an., Sonc. ed., p. 136.

(13) I.e., an extra Amidah consisting of the usual seven benedictions like all the other Amidahs of Festivals.

(14) V. P.B., p. 267.

(15) I.e., the Amidah, cf. n. 2.

(16) This contradicts Samuel's opinion.

(17) [So emended by Ronsburg, v. Marginal Glosses; cur. edd. This is a point of dispute between Tannas, v. note 8].

(18) [I.e., he ends the middle benedictions of the ‘Amidah with the usual formula, Blessed art Thou O Lord... Who forgivest (Rashi).]

(19) [Here at any rate all agree that at the concluding service there is an Amidah in contradiction to Samuel. MS.M. deletes this and reads in the Baraitha. But the Sages say he need not read the seven (benedictions), which would be in support of Samuel. Thus the view of Samuel is ‘a point of’ dispute among Tannas’. V. n. 6; cur. edd. present a conflated text].

(20) I.e., What are we, etc.

(21) In which case there is no point in his present ruling.

(22) Not arguing for himself, but for the scholar of the opposite view.

(23) So MS.M..

(24) V. Ber. 29a.

Yoma 88a

because one must make mention of Habdalah¹ in the benediction [commencing with] ‘Thou favorest’.² That is a dispute of Tannaim, for it was taught in a Baraitha: All those obliged to immerse themselves may do so in their usual manner on the Day of Atonement, the menstruating woman, and the woman after childbirth immerse themselves in their usual manner on the evening of the Day of Atonement. One who had a pollution may do so until the afternoon prayer.³

YOMA - 62a-88a

R. Jose said: He may do so throughout the day. But the following contradiction is to be pointed out: A man or woman afflicted with gonorrhoea, or with leprosy, one who had had intercourse with a menstruant, or one rendered unclean by contact with a dead person, may immerse themselves in their usual manner on the Day of Atonement.

A menstruating woman, and a woman after childbirth may immerse themselves in their usual manner on the night before the Day of Atonement. One who had experienced a pollution may immerse himself throughout the day.⁴ R. Jose said: From the Minhah onwards, he may not immerse himself? — This is no difficulty: The one refers to the case that he had read the Ne'ilah prayer,⁵ the other that he had not read the Ne'ilah. If he had prayed, what is the reason for the view of the Rabbis?⁶ —

The Rabbis hold: It is obligatory to take the ritual bath at the proper times.⁷ This implies that R. Jose would not hold this not to be obligatory, but surely it was taught: If he has had the name [of God] inscribed on his body he must not bathe, nor anoint himself, nor stand in an unclean place; if it happens that he is obliged to immerse himself, he should tie some reed around, go down and immerse himself, R. Jose said: He may go down and immerse himself in the usual manner, provided he does not rub it off. And we know that they are disputing the principle as to whether it is obligatory to take the ritual bath at its definite time!⁸ [The Tanna of] that [former Baraitha]⁹ is R. Jose b. Judah, for it was taught: R. Jose b. Judah said: The [one] immersion at the end suffices for her.¹⁰

Our Rabbis taught: One who experiences a pollution on the Day of Atonement should go down and immerse himself and in the evening he should rub himself off properly. 'In the evening'? What is passed, is it not passed?¹¹ Rather say: He should rub himself off on the eve before!¹² He holds it is obligatory to rub oneself off.

A Tanna¹³ recited before R. Nahman: To one who experienced a pollution on the Day of Atonement, all sins will be forgiven. But it was taught: All his sins will be arranged before him? — What does 'arranged' mean? Arranged to be forgiven.

In the School of R. Ishmael it was taught: One who experienced a [night-] pollution on the Day of Atonement, let him be anxious throughout the year, and if he survives the year, he is assured of being a child of the world to come.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: You may know it [from the fact that] all the world is hungry, and he is satisfied.

When R. Dimi came, he said: He will live long, thrive and beget many children.¹⁴

(1) Lit., 'division'. The reference to the distinction between holy and profane recited in the Amidah on the termination of the Sabbath and Festivals.

(2) V. P.B., p. 46.

(3) That means, if he had experienced pollution before then, he may immerse himself until Minhah, so that he may pray the afternoon prayer. But if it happened after the afternoon prayer, he should not immerse himself, but await until dark therewith. The Sages hold that the Ne'ilah is to be said at night, and therefore in agreement with Rab's teaching, renders exempt the evening prayer; whereas R. Jose, who holds that the man who had experienced pollution may immerse himself throughout the day, so that even if he had experienced after the afternoon prayer, he may immerse himself in order that he might pray the concluding prayer, is of the opinion that the Ne'ilah prayer is not said at night, and therefore does not exempt the evening service.

(4) V. supra 6b.

(5) Before he experienced the pollution, and therefore R. Jose holds that he may not immerse himself after the Minhah.

(6) In the second Baraitha, allowing immersion after Minhah.

(7) And since the time of the immersion of those who experienced pollution is during the day, they may do so even after Minhah.

(8) V. supra 8a.

(9) Who does not permit immersion after Minhah because he does not regard it as an obligation to immerse at the proper time.

YOMA - 62a-88a

(10) V. Shab., Sonc. ed., p. 598, n. 11.

(11) How can a later action influence something completed before?

(12) So that his body be sufficiently clean, and in the case of a pollution the immersion will touch every part of his body. An immersion is ritually effective only if the waters reach unimpeded the whole surface of the body.

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

(14) His experience indicates that his seed will multiply.