

VI

BAVLI TRACTATE YOMA CHAPTER SIX

FOLIOS 62A-68B

6:1

- A. The two goats of the Day of Atonement —
 - B. the religious requirement concerning them is that the two of them be equivalent in appearance, height, and value,
 - C. and that they be purchased simultaneously.
 - D. But even though they are not equivalent [in these regards], they are valid.
 - E. [If] one purchased one this day and the other the next, they are valid.
 - F. [If] one of them died, if before the casting of the lots it died, let [the priest] purchase a mate for the survivor
 - G. But if after the casting of the lots it died, let one get another mate and cast lots for them as at the outset.
 - H. And he says, “If the one belonging to the Lord died, then this one upon which the lot, ‘For the Lord’ has come up is to stand in its stead.
 - I. “And if the one which was for Azazel has died, this one upon which the lot, ‘For Azazel,’ has come up will stand in its stead.”
 - J. And the second one is to be put out to pasture until it is blemished, and then it is sold, and the money received for it is to fall to a freewill offering.
 - K. For a sin offering of the community is not left to die.
 - L. R. Judah says, “It is left to die.”
 - M. And further did R. Judah say, “[If] its blood is poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die.
 - N. “[If] the one which is to be sent forth died, let its [the other’s] blood be poured out.”
- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. “And he shall take...two he-goats” (Lev. 16: 5) —
 - C. the smallest number of the plural is two, so why does Scripture find it necessary to say, “two”?
 - D. To indicate that they should be equivalent.

- E. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that **even though they are not equivalent [in these regards], they are valid?**
- F. Scripture refers to “he-goat” two times, [at Lev. 16: 9, 10], which serves to encompass [even those that are not equivalent].
- G. *So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has used encompassing language. Then it must follow that if Scripture had not used encompassing language, they would have been invalid. So how do we know that equivalence would have been indispensable had Scripture not made its contrary point?*
- H. *It might have entered your mind to suppose, “two” is written three times [to indicate that equivalence is indispensable]. But now that it has written “he-goat” two times, serving as an encompassing formulation [to allow for differences in traits of the two he-goats], what is the purpose of the “two” that is written three times?*
- I. **one covers appearance, one covers height, and one covers value.**
 - J. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - K. **“He will take [two] male lambs” (Lev. 14:10) – The smallest plural number of lambs is two.**
 - L. **If so, why is “two” said? That they should be equal to one another.**
 - M. **How do we know that, even though they are not equal, they are suitable?**
 - N. **Scripture says, “lamb” (Lev. 14:12), “lamb” (Lev. 14:13) —**
 - O. **as an inclusionary clause [Sifra CLI:I.8].**
 - P. *So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has used encompassing language. Then it must follow that if Scripture had not used encompassing language, they would have been invalid. So how do we know that equivalence would have been indispensable had Scripture not made its contrary point?*
 - Q. *It might have entered your mind to suppose, “This shall be the law” (Lev. 14: 2) [without deviation].*
 - R. When the All Merciful says, “lamb...lamb...,” what purpose can be served by the language, “...shall be...”? It refers to the other aspects of the condition of the one afflicted by the skin ailment.
 - S. *Along these same lines it has been taught on Tannaite authority with respect to the two birds that are presented by the person healed of the skin ailment, as follows:*
 - T. **“And he will purchase [two] birds” (Lev. 14: 4) – the smallest number of birds is two.**
 - U. **If so, why has “two” been said (Lev. 14: 4: “two birds”)?**
 - V. **That they should be equal [to one another].**
 - W. **And how do we know that even though they are not equivalent to one another, they are suitable?**
 - X. **Scripture says, “bird...bird...” (Lev. 14: 5, 14: 6) – as an inclusionary clause [Sifra CXLVIII:I.11].**

- Y. *So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has used encompassing language. Then it must follow that if Scripture had not used encompassing language, they would have been invalid. So how do we know that equivalence would have been indispensable had Scripture not made its contrary point?*
- Z. *It might have entered your mind to suppose, “This shall be the law” (Lev. 14: 2) [without deviation].*
- AA. When the All Merciful says, “birds” what purpose can be served by the language, “...shall be...”? It refers to the other aspects of the condition of the one afflicted by the skin ailment.
- BB. *If that is the rule, then in the instance of the daily whole offerings, we should make the same point, along the following lines:*
- CC. “...lambs...lambs...” (Num. 28: 3) — the smallest number of lambs is two, so why does Scripture find it necessary to say “two” (Num. 28: 4)?
- DD. It is to indicate that they should be equivalent to one another.
- EE. And how do we know that even though they are not equivalent to one another, they are still valid?
- FF. Scripture states, “lamb...,” “lamb,” as a mode of using inclusionary language.
- GG. *But so far as the performance of the religious duty in the optimum manner, nonetheless, is it indeed required that the lambs be equivalent to one another at all [when that is never even indicated]?*
- HH. *The pertinent language is required in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- II. “Two per day” (Num. 28: 3). [Each is to be slaughtered] in the direction at which the day commences.
- JJ. You maintain that it is to be done in the direction at which the day commences [northeastward]. But perhaps the meaning of the passage pertains to the obligation that occurs day by day.
- KK. When Scripture says, “Prepare the one lamb in the morning and the other lamb in the evening” (Num. 28: 4) — lo, Scripture thereby specifies the rule governing the obligatory daily offering. Then what am I to derive from the phrase, “two per day”? I derive from that phrase the lesson that they are to be slaughtered in the direction at which the day commences.”
- LL. How so? **And that [daily whole offering] of the dawn was slaughtered at the northwestern corner, at the second ring. That [daily whole offering] of twilight was slaughtered at the northeastern corner [of the altar], at the second ring.**
- MM. But the additional offerings presented on the Sabbath certainly must be equivalent to one another.

II.1 A. [Supply: **If one of them died, if before the casting of the lots it died, let the priest purchase a mate for the survivor But if after the casting of the lots it**

died, let one get another mate and cast lots for them as at the outset:] *our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. In the case of the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement that the high priest slaughtered outside of the Temple court before the lots were cast, he is liable on account of both of them. If the lot had been cast, he is liable [re Lev. 16: 3-4] on account of the one that got the lot “for the Lord” but exempt from liability on account of the one that has gotten the lot “for Azazel” [Jung: the he-goat destined for Azazel would in any case be killed outside the sanctuary, so he has done nothing illegitimate in slaughtering it outside of the sanctuary].
- C. In the case of the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement that the high priest slaughtered outside of the Temple court before the lots were cast, he is liable on account of both of them — *but what were they then good for [that any liability should be incurred for slaughtering them outside of the Temple courtyard]?*
- D. Said R. Hisda, “Since each is fit to be presented as the he-goat that is offered outside of the Holy of Holies, so (Num. 29:11).”
- E. *But how come it cannot be offered up as the he-goat that is presented inside the Holy of Holies? Surely it is because the lot has not yet been cast on it? But then it ought to be unfit for use as the he goat that is presented outside of the Holy of Holies, since anyhow it still has not received the other rites of the Day* [Jung: the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock and he goat, the taking and offering of handfuls of incense, all of which must take place before the additional sacrifice is presented].
- F. *R. Hisda has the theory*, The prohibition of something not offered at the proper time does not pertain to what is presented on the selfsame day. [Cashdan, *Menahot* to 5A in that context: the prohibition of that the time of which has not yet arrived when the matter may be offered upon the altar does not apply where this same matter will be permitted later on the very day to all Israel; here after the offering of the new barley, the new harvest will be permitted to everybody. Jung in this context: the absence of the ministrations of the day 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 that consequently renders it unfit for use within.]
- G. *Said Rabina, “Now that R. Hisda has said, ‘The failure to cast lots is comparable to the failure to form a detail of the rite,’ [so that it is unfit for use in the Temple], lo, let us turn to that which R. Judah said Samuel said, ‘Peace offerings that one slaughtered as sacrifices prior to the opening of the doors of the sanctum are invalid, for it is said, ‘And he shall kill it at the door of the tent of meeting...,’ meaning, when it is open, but not when it is closed,’ [63A] if he slaughtered them outside prior to the opening of the gates of the courtyard, he is exempt. How come? Because the failure to open the doors is comparable to the failure to form a detail of the rite.”*
- H. *But does R. Hisda take the position that since..., meaning, if this, then that?* Didn’t R. Hisda say, “As to an animal designated as a Passover that was

slaughtered outside of the Temple on the other days of the year, for the purpose of the Passover, he is exempt; if it was not for the purpose of the Passover [in which case it serves as Peace offerings], he is liable. *So the operative consideration is that it was not for the purpose of Passover, lo, if it had been left undesignated as to its purpose, he would have been exempt. But why should this be the case? Should we not say, "since...", namely, since it was suitable, if offered not for the sake of a Passover, to be presented inside [he is liable]?*

- I. *But how are the cases comparable? In that case, it was necessary to remove the beast [at the time of the slaughtering from its original purpose as a Passover and declaring it for use as a peace offering, so long as no such act of transference has taken place, it cannot be fit for use within the Temple], but in this case, there is no necessity of transference. [Compare B. Pes. 62A: But does R. Hisda accept an argument based on an argument from "since"? And hasn't it been stated: One who baked [bread] on a festival day for use on a [following] weekday — R. Hisda says, "He receives stripes." Rabbah says, "He does not receive stripes." Rabbah said, "He does not receive stripes. [For] we do invoke the argument, Since, if [visitors dropped by, he may use the bread for them, therefore, even though no visitors came, he may use the bread on a festival day and is not culpable for baking it]."* R. Hisda says, "He [is deemed a transgressor and] receives stripes. [This is because] we do not invoke the argument: since, if visitors dropped by, [the bread] would be permitted for him [to serve to them on the festival day itself, therefore], even though [he does not have visitors, the bread] is permitted for use by him." For Rabbah there is no problem, he is consistent: here, with respect to circumcision, a concrete action is required [circumcision, then he will be fit, and we do not regard his potential action as an actual one], and there, no concrete action that the man can take is required. But for R. Hisda, isn't there a problem of self contradiction? Say: when R. Hisda does not invoke the argument from "since...", it is where it would produce a lenient ruling, but where it would produce a strict ruling, he does invoke such an argument!]
- J. *Rabbah bar Shimi repeated these statements of R. Hisda as deriving from Rabbah, and then he contrasted one statement of Rabbah with another statement of Rabbah, solving the problem in the way that we have said. When R. Dimi came, he said R. Jeremiah said R. Yohanan said, "An animal that was designated for use as a Passover that was slaughtered outside of the Temple courtyard on the other days of the year [not on the fourteenth of Nisan, the eve of Passover], whether this was for the designated purpose of a Passover or not for the designated purpose of the Passover — the one who slaughtered it is exempt."*
- K. *Said R. Dimi, "I stated this tradition before R. Jeremiah [with the following exposition:] now there is no problem understanding the rule governing doing so for the designated purpose, in which case one is exempt because the beast at that time for that purpose is not suitable [and hence the act is null]. But for doing so not for the designated purpose, why is the person who does so exempt? Lo, it is suitable to be offered not for its designated purpose within the Temple courtyard [where the act of sacrifice should have been carried out, in consequence of which the act*

should be culpable]? And he said to me, ‘Transferring the sacrifice for such a designation to an act done outside of the courtyard is not classified as a valid act of transference’” [Jung: although the 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 designation and purpose and consequently involves no guilt for one’s slaughtering it outside.]

- L. When Rabin came, he said R. Jeremiah said R. Yohanan said, “An animal that was designated for use as a Passover that was slaughtered outside of the Temple courtyard on the other days of the year [not on the fourteenth of Nisan, the eve of Passover], whether this was for the designated purpose of a Passover or not for the designated purpose of the Passover — the one who slaughtered it is culpable.”
- M. *But have we not learned in the Mishnah: [An animal] whose time had not yet come — whether in itself or in respect to its owner. What is an offering whose time had not yet come in respect to its owner? The Zab, and the Zabah, and the woman who has given birth, and the person afflicted with the skin ailment, who [during their time of counting clean days] offered their sin offering and [solely in the case of the person afflicted with the skin ailment of Lev. 13] — their guilt offering outside are free [since the offerings serve neither to fulfill an obligation nor to be counted as a thank offering]. [If they offered] their burnt offerings and [in the case of the Nazirite] their peace offering outside, they are liable [M. Zeb. 14:3A-D]? And Said R. Hilqiah b. R. Tobi, “The rule [that if a person afflicted by the skin ailment offers his guilt offering before the proper time, but outside of the Temple, he is not culpable] speaks of a case in which he made the offering under the classification of a guilt offering. But if he made it under a different classification, he is liable, since under a different classification if it were offered inside of the Temple, it would be eligible for offering.” Now, in any event, he is exempt? But why should that be the case? Let us say, Since it is suitable to be offered not for its designated purpose within the Temple courtyard [where the act of sacrifice should have been carried out, in consequence of which the act should be culpable]?*
- N. *But how are the cases comparable in any event? In that other case, an act of transference is required, but here, the animal designated as a Passover may serve as a peace offering on all the other days of the year in any event.*
- O. [Commenting on Rabin’s statement, L,] *R. Ashi repeated as the Tannaite ruling, “The owner is liable,” just as we said above.*
- P. *R. Jeremiah of Difti repeated as the Tannaite ruling, “The owner is exempt,” for he takes the position that act of transference is required the animal designated as a Passover, and transference outside of the Temple is not classified as an act of transference. In that matter he differs from R. Hilqiah b. Tobi [who maintains that it is an act of transference].*

- II.2.** A. The master has said, In the case of the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement that the high priest slaughtered outside of the Temple court before the lots were cast, he is liable on account of both of them. If the lot had been cast, he is liable [re Lev. 16: 3-4] on account of the one that got the lot “for the Lord” but exempt from liability on account of the one that has gotten the lot “for Azazel.”
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **“Whatever man there is of the house of Israel who kills an ox or a lamb or a goat in the camp or kills it outside of the camp and has not brought it to the entrance of the tent of meeting to present it as an offering to the Lord” (Lev. 17: 3-4):**
- D. **[63B] Since the language of “offering” is used, is it possible that one is liable in connection with what has been sanctified for the upkeep of the house?**
- E. **Scripture says, “and does not bring it to the door of the tent of meeting, to offer it as a gift to the Lord,”**
- F. **excluding what has been sanctified for the upkeep of the house, which is not presented at the door of the tent of meeting.** [Sifra lacks:] Whatever is suitable to be brought to the tent of meeting, if offered up outside, entails guilt, but whatever is not fit to be brought to entrance of the tent of meeting, if offered outside, does not involve guilt.]
- G. **Then I shall exclude from the rule at hand what is sanctified for the upkeep of the house, which is not fit to be presented at the door of the tent of meeting.**
- H. **But I shall not exclude [Bavli lacks:] a beast that has committed an act of sexual relations with a human being, or one on which an act of bestiality has been performed, a beast that has been designated for idolatry, one that has been actually used for idolatry, the fee of a whore or the price of a “dog,” a hybrid beast, a torn beast, a beast born by caesarean section, pigeons the time for offering of which has passed, animals bearing permanent blemishes [and all other beasts that in any event cannot be used on the altar]?**
- I. [Bavli lacks:] **Scripture says, “to offer”:**
- J. [Bavli lacks:] **those that are valid for offering are at issue, excluding then those that are not valid for offerings.**
- K. **Or perhaps I should exclude these, which are not valid for offering, but I should not exclude the cow designated for burning for preparation of the ashes for purification [Num. 19: 1ff.] and the goat that is sent forth?**
- L. **Scripture says, “for the Lord,”**
- M. **meaning, what is designated in particular for the Lord,**
- N. **excluding these, which are not designated in particular for the Lord.**
- O. [Bavli lacks:] **Or perhaps I should exclude these, which are not designated in particular for the Lord.**
- P. [Bavli lacks:] **But I should not exclude a beast designated as a burnt-offering that is not yet old enough [it has to be eight days old], a beast designated as a sin-offering that is not yet old enough or the owner of which has not yet completed the period of purification [e.g., a person afflicted with the skin disease, who has not yet completed the clean days that he has to count out]**

and turtledoves that are not yet old enough and animals that bear a transient blemish?

- Q.** [Bavli lacks:] **Scripture says, “before the tabernacle of the Lord,”**
- R.** [Bavli lacks:] **meaning those that are valid to be offered at this particular time,**
- S.** [Bavli lacks:] **excluding these, which are not valid to be offered not but only later on.**
- T.** [Bavli lacks:] **R. Simeon says, “Since they will be valid later on, one is liable on their account on the count of violating a negative commandment” [Sifra CLXXXVII.II.6-9].**
- U.** *And by way of contrast: do the words “Unto the Lord” imply exclusion? Then consider, “It may be accepted for an offering made by fire to the Lord” (Lev. 22:27) — this refers to offerings made by fire. How then do we know that one should not sanctify for the altar a beast that has not yet reached its proper age for serving as an offering? Scripture states, “As an offering.”*
- V.** *“Unto the Lord” then includes the goat that is to be sent away” [so “unto the Lord” implies inclusion (Jung)].*
- W.** *Said Raba, “In the one passage we follow the sense of the context. Since the verse concerning slaughtering outside the Temple court, ‘to the door of the tent of meeting’ serves to encompass [all unblemished animals, slaughtering any of which outside brings sanction], so the text ‘unto the Lord’ in that connection excludes [the cases of the scapegoat and the red cow, and these are to be slaughtered outside of the temple]. Here, the verse, ‘by fire,’ excludes [only in respect to an offering that is burned is there liability for dedicating a blemished animal, but an offering that is not burned but dedicated in its blemished state will not bring in its wake a sanction. But what about the scapegoat?] [As to the scapegoat], ‘unto the Lord’ used in that connection excludes [the scapegoat; if one dedicates it in its blemished condition he violates the law, ‘You shall not offer...].”*
- X.** *So the reason that the blemished animal may not be brought is that Scripture says, “unto the Lord.” But if Scripture had not covered that case by the specific statement, “unto the Lord,” I might have concluded that it is permitted to present a blemished animal as a scapegoat. But take note: it is only casting the lot that designates the beast that is fit to be offered for the Lord. [For the rite of the Day of Atonement, two animals must be available, and these must be unblemished. The reason is that at the outset we do not know which one will be the scapegoat “for Azazel,” so both must be suitable “for the Lord.” Only the casting of the lot determines the classification of the beast. That reason, and not Scripture, should have sufficed.]*
- Y.** *Said R. Joseph, “Whom does this exegesis represent? It is Hanan the Egyptian, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Hanan the Egyptian says, ‘Even if there was already blood in the cup*

[deriving from the goat designated for the Lord, the goat having been slaughtered, but the blood had not yet been tossed on the altar, and the scapegoat was lost or blemished,] one still can bring another goat [for a scapegoat] to pair with [the goat that has been slaughtered, and that is done without casting lots, since the animal for the Lord has already been slaughtered. Miller: just as according to Hanan, one can bring a second animal for the scapegoat without casting lots, so he can bring it in blemished condition. The proof-text, ‘unto the Lord’ then tells us that that is not permitted, since, as we see, otherwise it can have been done that way.]”

- Z. *Granted that one can assign such a view to Hanan the Egyptian, who holds that there can be no rejection [even though the goat for the Lord has already been slaughtered, we can select another animal for the scapegoat. But the contrary position is that the blood is discarded, since the rite has been interrupted], does that mean that it is not necessary to cast lots? Perhaps he brings another set of goats and casts lots [Miller: in the following manner: he brings two fresh animals and casts lots as to which shall be for the Lord and which for Azazel. The animal designated for the Lord is left to pasture until blemished; the other one, for Azazel, is paired with the slaughtered goat. Since he has to cast lots, the second animal, to become a scapegoat, must be unblemished]?*
- AA. *Rather, said R. Joseph, “Whom does this exegesis represent? It is R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority as follows:”*
- BB. *“If one of the goats died, one brings the other without casting lots [Miller: I might have thought since lots are not required, there is no need that the scapegoat should be unblemished. The verse, “unto the Lord” teaches us that that is not so],’ the words of R. Simeon.”*
- CC. *Rabina said, “The verse, ‘unto the Lord,’ is required only to cover the case in which the scapegoat became blemished on that day [after the lots had been cast], and one had redeemed the beast for another animal. [B. Tem. adds: You might have thought that to begin with, we do not know which one of them is going to be designated ‘for the Lord,’ while here, since the animal that is designated ‘for the Lord’ has already been discerned, there is no question of a flogging for violating the law, ‘you shall not offer,’ if the scapegoat is dedicated in a blemished condition. The words, ‘for the Lord’ tells us that that is not the case and even here there is a penalty for violating the law and bringing a blemished beast].”*
- DD. *And on what basis will you maintain that a blemish invalidates the scapegoat?*
- EE. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- FF. *[Bavli lacks:] “Blind or broken or maimed you shall not offer unto the Lord” (Lev. 22:22) —*

- GG. [Bavli lacks:] What is the sense of Scripture here? If it is that such animals are not to be consecrated to begin with, lo, this has already been stated earlier [at Lev. 22:20].
- HH. [Bavli lacks:] Then what is the meaning of Scripture when it says, “you shall not offer unto the Lord” (Lev. 22:22)? It means you shall not slaughter such a beast as a sacrifice.
- II. “nor make an offering of them” [meaning, of blemished animals for the altar, Lev. 22:20] — this refers to offerings made by fire on the altar.
- JJ. I know only that that is the rule for the whole of the beast. How do I know the rule for only part of the beast? Scripture says, “of them.”
- KK. How do I know the rule covering the sprinkling of the blood [of blemished animals]?
- LL. Scripture states, “on the altar.”
- MM. “Unto the Lord” serves to encompass the case of the scapegoat. [One who consecrates a blemished beast to serve as scapegoat violates the prohibition at hand.]
- NN. *And it was necessary for Scripture to make reference to the blemished beast, and it was necessary for Scripture also to make reference to a priest that had not reached the proper age for use in the cult. For if the All-Merciful had made reference to the beast who had not reached the proper age, that might have been because his time had not come, but as to a blemished beast, whose time had come, I might have said that to that classification of beasts the law does not apply. And if the All-Merciful had made reference to the blemished beast, I might have supposed that that is because such a beast is repulsive, but as to a beast that has not reached the proper age, which is not repulsive, I might have said that to a beast of that classification, the law does not apply. So it was necessary to make reference to both classes and provide a proof covering each individually.*
- OO. [With reference to the verse disqualifying the scapegoat that was premature in age,] **[64A]** Raba said, “That proof was required to apply to the case in which the one who provided the beasts had a sick person in his household, and for the sick person he killed the mother of the beast on the Day of Atonement [which is permissible for saving the life of the sick person, should he require meat].” [Lev. 22:28 forbids killing the animal and its young in the same day, so after the lot was cast the he-goat would be an animal that had not reached the proper time for being offered up on the Day of Atonement (Jung).]

- PP. *But in such a case does the prohibition apply in any event? Scripture has said, “You shall not kill it” (Lev. 22:28) — and this is not an act of slaughter.*
- QQ. *Lo, in the West they say, “The act of pushing the goat down into the rugged valley constitutes the proper act of slaughter of such a beast.”*

- III.1 A.** **And he says, “If the one belonging to the Lord died, then this one upon which the lot, ‘For the Lord’ has come up is to stand in its stead [And if the one which was for Azazel has died, this one upon which the lot, ‘For Azazel,’ has come up will stand in its stead.” And the second one is to be put out to pasture until it is blemished, and then it is sold, and the money received for it is to fall to a freewill offering. For a sin offering of the community is not left to die. R. Judah says, “It is left to die.”]:”**
- B. Said Rab, “The second goat of the first pair is offered up, the second goat of the second pair is let out to pasture [until blemished].”
- C. R. Yohanan said, “The second goat in the first pair is put out to pasture, and the second goat in the second pair is offered up.”
- D. *What is at issue here? Rab takes the view that animals that have been designated for sacrifices are not removed forever from sacred use. R. Yohanan takes the view that animals that have been designated for sacrifices are removed forever from sacred use [even if they do not have a blemish, and when one makes atonement, it is through the second animal of the second pair].*
- E. *What is the operative consideration behind the view of Rab?*
- F. *He derives the rule by analogy from the case of the animal that has not yet reached the age for use on the altar. An animal that is not yet old enough to be used on the altar, though it is not yet fit, later on will become fit and will be acceptable on the altar. The same is the rule here.*
- G. *But are the cases truly parallel? In that case the animal is not suitable in any way shape or form, but in this case, it was suitable and has been removed from sacred use. Rather, this is the operative consideration behind Rab’s ruling: he draws an analogy from the case of a beast that is blemished with a transitory blemish. The beast that is blemished with a transitory blemish, even though it is not now suitable for use on the altar, may well go and become suitable for use on the altar. So too here, there is no difference.*
- H. *And how on the case of the beast that suffers from a transitory blemish do we know the rule on the foundations of Scripture?*
- I. “Because their corruption is in them, there is a blemish in them” (Lev. 22:25) — It is when there is a blemish in them that they are not wanted, lo, when their blemish has gone away, they will be wanted.
- J. And R. Yohanan?
- K. The All-Merciful has used exclusionary language when it says, “in them,” meaning, only these are acceptable after the blemish has gone away, but all other animals that have been rejected by reason of unfitness that is transitory once rejected remain so.
- L. And Rab?

- M. *That reference to “in them” mean, only so long as they are in their nature form are they not acceptable. But when they are mixed up with others, they are accepted, as we have learned in the Mishnah: **Limbs [of burnt offerings] which were mixed with the limbs of blemished beasts [which are not offered] — R. Eliezer says, “If the head of one of them was [inadvertently] offered, let all the heads be offered [in the assumption that the one which already has been offered is the one that was blemished]. [If] the leg of one of them [had been offered], let all the legs be offered [in the same assumption].” And sages say, “[Even if all of them except one had inadvertently] been offered, let it go forth to the place of burning [since that one may be the blemished one]” [M. Zeb. 8:5A-C].***
- N. *And the other party [Yohanan]?*
- O. *He derives that fact from the use of “in them” in a full, rather than an abbreviated, spelling.*
- P. *And the other party [Rab]?*
- Q. *He derives no information from the use of “in them” in a full, rather than an abbreviated, spelling.*
- R. *Now, from Rab’s perspective, granting that animals are not permanently removed from the altar, let it be the rule that, if the priest wants, he may offer this one, and if he wants, he may offer the other one!*
- S. *Said Raba, “Rab takes the view of the matter in accord with the position of R. Yosé, who has said, ‘The commandment applies in particular to the first.’”*
- T. *Which saying of R. Yosé? Should I say that it is the statement of R. Yosé in connection with the baskets, as we have learned in the Mishnah: [R. Yosé says,] “**With three baskets, each holding three seahs, they take up the heave offering of the [coins collected in the] [sheqel] chamber, And written on them are the Hebrew letters alef, bet, gimel**” [M. Sheq. 3:2A-B]? And it has been taught on Tannaite authority, said R. Yosé, “Why is it that it is **written on them are the Hebrew letters alef, bet, gimel**? It is to know which of them was taken up first out of the chamber, so that it is to be used first — for the actual performance of the commandment properly applies to the first”? But maybe the operative consideration is that when the first of the baskets is ready to be used, the others are not yet ready to be used. [Jung: 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 fitting to be sent away first].*
- U. *So it must be the ruling of R. Yosé in connection with Passover, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “He who designated a beast to serve as his Passover and it got lost, and then he designated another in its stead, and then the first was found so that lo, both of them are present and accounted for, which of them he prefers he offers up,” the words of sages. R. Yosé says, “The religious duty should be performed with the first of the two, [64B] but if the second was preferable than it, then he presents the latter.”*

- V. *Said Raba, "A close reading of our Mishnah yields the position of Rab, for it has been taught as the Tannaite formulation: **If the one belonging to the Lord died, then this one upon which the lot, 'For the Lord' has come up is to stand in its stead.** The one that remains remains as is [sanctified, not rejected].*
- W. *"...and a close reading of the external Tannaite ruling yields the position of R. Yohanan, for it has been taught as the Tannaite formulation: As to the second, I don't know whether that is the second of the first pair, or the second of the second pair. When Scripture says, "shall be set alive" (Lev. 16:10) [thus: not one that had been set alive again, a second time], it means, but not one the pair of which has died.*
- X. *Quite how does that follow?*
- Y. *"shall be set alive" (Lev. 16:10) — and not one that has already been set alive before [Jung: but whose pair has died].*
- AA. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **And further did R. Judah say, "If its blood is poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die. If the one which is to be sent forth died, let the other's blood be poured out."***
- BB. *Now from the perspective of R. Yohanan, who has said, animals that have been designated for sacrifices are removed forever from sacred use, that is the reason that the one that to be sent away is left to die. But from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, animals that have been designated for sacrifices are not removed forever from sacred use, why is the one that to be sent away left to die?*
- CC. *Rab will say to you, "I did not make my statement within the framework of the position of R. Judah. When I made my statement, it was in the context of the positions of rabbis."*
- DD. *Now there is no problem for Rab, since this is what is at stake between R. Judah and rabbis. But from R. Yohanan's perspective, what is the point of the dispute between them?*
- EE. *Said Raba, "That's the very point that we made earlier, namely, a close reading of our Mishnah yields the position of Rab."*
- FF. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **For a sin offering of the community is not left to die.** That means further, one that belongs to an individual in this situation is left to die.*
- GG. *Now there is no problem for R. Yohanan, in line with what R. Abba said in the name of Rab. For said R. Abba said Rab, [65A] "All parties concur [Miller to Temurah 23B: even rabbis, who hold that a sin offering that was lost and found after another had been set aside in its place but before the latter was offered is condemned to pasture] that if the farmer selected one [of the two animals designated as sin offering, the one that had been lost and its replacement] and offered it, the second is left to die. [Miller: even if it was the animal designated as a sin offering that had never been lost, since the farmer thus showed deliberately that he was not concerned with it. For rabbis dispute only where the owner comes to consult the court, showing that he is seeking a remedy, e.g., where he set aside a sin offering and it was lost, and then the first was found, and he comes to court to consult on what to do. According to Rabbi, we instruct him, 'Obtain atonement through the sin offering that was never lost,' and the lost sin offering is condemned*

to die. According to rabbis, the instruction is, ‘Obtain atonement through the lost sin offering,’ and the other is condemned to pasture.]”

- HH. *But for Rab, surely you have a case parallel to one in which one designated two animals to serve as sin offerings, bearing responsibility to make them up if they are lost, and said R. Oshaia, “He who designates two animals for use as a sin-offering [that he has to bring], [doing so] for the sake of security [to make sure that at least one of them will be available for meeting his obligation] is to attain atonement through one of them, and the other is put out to pasture [until blemished, and the proceeds for the sale of this beast are assigned for the purchase of a freewill-offering].”*
- II. *Since Raba said that Rab concurs with the position of R. Yosé, who has said that the religious duty is carried out with the first, to begin with the farmer is in the position of one who has designated a beast [in substitution] for one that was lost.”*
- JJ. *We have learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, “It is left to die.”*
- KK. *Now there is no problem for R. Yohanan, who has said, “The second animal in the first pair is put out to pasture” [according to the position of rabbis,] and this is the one which, in R. Judah’s opinion, is left to die, so that the man obtains atonement through the second animal of the second pair. But from Rab’s perspective, who has said, “The second beast in the second pair is put out to pasture,” in R. Judah’s opinion that one is left to die, so from R. Judah’s perspective, how is the man going to achieve atonement?*
- LL. *Do you suppose that R. Judah makes reference her to the second animal in the second pair of goats? R. Judah speaks of the second goat in the first pair of goats. [Jung: in the view of Rab, Judah differs from rabbis also on the question of the fitness of the second of the first pair for sacrifice, while rabbis hold that it is offered, Judah has it left to die.]*
- MM. *There are others who formulate the question against Rab [above, BB] in the following way: And further did R. Judah say, “If its blood is poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die. If the one which is to be sent forth died, let the other’s blood be poured out.” Now from the perspective of Rab, in the first part of the passage at issue is the sin offering belonging to the community, in the latter part at issue is the rejection of living beasts from the altar. [Jung: Rabbis concur that the second in the first pair remains rejected.] But according to R. Yohanan, what can further possibly mean?*
- NN. *That’s a valid question.*

IV.1 A. And further did R. Judah say, “If its blood is poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die. If the one which is to be sent forth died, let the other’s blood be poured out:”

- B. *Now there is no problem understanding the rule, If its blood is poured out, let the one who is to be sent forth be left to die, for still the religious duty involving it has not yet been performed. But if the scapegoat died, then why should the blood be poured out? Lo, the religious duty has been carried out with it!*

- C. *The household of R. Yannai say, “Said Scripture, ‘The goat shall be set alive before the Lord to make atonement’ (Lev. 16:10). So how long must it remain alive? Until the time that its fellow’s blood has been tossed on the altar.”*
- IV.2.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: Townsfolk who sent their sheqels, which were stolen or lost — if the heave offering already had been taken up, the [townsfolk] take an oath to the Temple revenueurs. And if not, they take an oath before the [other] townsfolk, and the [other] townsfolk pay the sheqel in their stead. [If the sheqels] were found, or the robbers returned them, both these [coins, paid by the other townsfolk] and those [coins, originally put forth] are in the status of sheqels. And they do not go to their credit for the coming year [M. Sheq. 2:1]. R. Judah says, “They do go to their credit for the coming year.”*
- B. *What is the basis for the position of R. Judah?*
- C. *Said Raba, “R. Judah takes the view that obligations for a given year may be offered up in the year afterward.”*
- D. *Objected Abbaye, “If on the day of atonement animals designated to serve as the bullock and the goat offered on the inner altar were lost and others designated in their place, and also the goats to atone for idolatry were lost, with others designated in their stead, [and which turned up after others had been sacrificed], all are left to die,” the words of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “They are put out to pasture until they are blemished, then are sold, and the proceeds go for the purchase of animals for free will offerings, for an animal designated as a sin offering for the community is never left to die” [cf. T. Kip. 3:9].” [The bullock of the Day of Atonement is a community offering but it is left to die and not saved for the next year.]*
- E. *He said to him, [65B] “You introduce the matter of public offerings? But public offerings are exceptional, in line with what R. Tabi said R. Josiah said, for said R. Tabi said R. Josiah, ‘Said Scripture, “This is the burnt offering of every new moon throughout the months of the year” (Num. 28:14). The Torah has said, “Renew the matter and present to me an offering deriving from the coins taken up afresh for that purpose.””*
- F. *Well, that poses no problems as to the he-goat [which is a public offering], but as to the bullock [presented by the high priest out of his own resources], what is to be said?*
- G. *It is an ad hoc enactment covering the bullock on account of the he-goat?*
- H. *Sure, sure, and because of an ad hoc enactment, are the beasts left to die [and not merely to pasture until blemished]? And, moreover, that which R. Tabi said R. Josiah said itself speaks merely of performing matters in the optimum manner required for a religious duty, for said R. Judah said Samuel, “As to offerings in behalf of the community that are presented on the first day of Nisan [the new year for cultic purposes], performing matters in the optimum manner required for a religious duty instructs that they derive from funds of the new year, but if one presented them out of funds deriving from the prior year, one has still carried out his obligation, even though one has left incomplete the consideration of performing matters in the optimum manner required for a religious duty.”*

- I. Rather, said R. Zira, "[The real consideration behind the ruling that they cannot be offered in the following year is,] the casting of the lot does not effect the classification of beasts from one year to the next."
- J. *So why not just go and cast lots again?*
- K. It is a precautionary decree lest, observing the practice, people come to the conclusion that the casting of the lot does effect the classification of beasts from one year to the next.
- L. *Well, that poses no problems in explaining the disposition of the he-goat [which after all is subject to the casting of lots], but what is to be said about the high priest's bullock?*
- M. *It is an ad hoc enactment covering the bullock on account of the he-goat?*
- N. *Sure, sure, and because of an ad hoc enactment, are the beasts left to die?*
- O. *Rabbis before Abbaye said, "It is a precautionary decree on account of the sin offering the owner of which has died." [Jung: 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.]*
- P. *Well, that poses no problems in explaining the disposition of the bullock, but what is to be said about the he-goat?*
- Q. *It is an ad hoc enactment covering the he-goat on account of the bullock.*
- R. *Sure, sure, and because of an ad hoc enactment, are the beasts left to die?*
- S. Rather, it is a precautionary decree on account of the sin offering that has become superannuated?
- T. A precautionary decree? The beast itself is a sin offering that has become superannuated?
- U. *But that's no problem. The answer accords with the position of Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- V. "A full year" (Lev. 25:30).
- W. Rabbi says, "One counts three hundred sixty five days, that is, the number of days in the solar year."
- X. And sages say, "One counts twelve months, from day to day, [66A] and if the year is intercalated, it is intercalated to the seller's advantage." [Jung: 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 offering need not necessarily have passed its first year by the next Day of Atonement.]
- Y. *Well, that solves the problem of the he-goat, but as to the bullock, what is there to say?*
- Z. *It is an ad hoc enactment covering the bullock on account of the he-goat?*
- AA. *Sure, sure, and because of an ad hoc enactment, are the beasts left to die? And, moreover, a beast designated as a sin-offering that became superannuated is left to pasture [not to die], according to R. Simeon b. Laqish, who said, "In the case of a beast designated as a sin offering that became superannuated, [wherever it is located] it is regarded as though it were standing in a cemetery [into which a priest*

cannot enter, by reason of not contracting cultic uncleanness, so he cannot slaughter the animal] and it is left to pasture.”

BB. Rather, said Raba, “It is a precautionary decree on account of the possibility of confusion. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

CC. In this age people do not sanctify anything, nor do they take vows of valuation, nor do they declare anything herem, and if one has consecrated something, taken a vow of valuation, or declared something to be herem, in the case of a beast, it is to be disposed of; in the case of produce, clothing, and utensils, they are to be left to rot; in the case of coins and metal utensils, they are to be brought to the Dead Sea. And what is meant by “to be disposed of”? One locks the beast away and it dies on its own of starvation.

DD. *What sort of confusion is subject to concern here? If it is confusion with respect to offering up the beast, then the same consideration should pertain to the matter of pasturing animals as well [Jung: if the confusion lies in the possibility that it may be offered up instead of being left to pasture until blemished, the same apprehension would be justified with regard to any other animal that is ruled to be left to pasture.] If it is confusion as to shearing or working the beast, then the same consideration should pertain to the matter of pasturing animals as well.*

EE. *In point of fact, the confusion that is subject to concern involves offering up. As to these others, since they are not candidates for actual sacrifice on the altar, one will not be concerned with them, while with this one, since it is to be offered up on the altar, one would be preoccupied.*

FF. *But as to the question itself of whether or not we take account the possibility of confusion, there is a Tannaite dispute. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority in one formulation: An animal designated as a Passover that was not offered up on the first Passover may be offered up on the second; if it was designated for use on the second Passover, it may be offered up in the following year. And it has been taught on Tannaite authority in another formulation: ...it may not be offered up.*

GG. *Is the conflict not over the matter of whether we take account of the possibility of confusion?*

HH. *No, all parties concur that we do not take account of the possibility of confusion, but here, what is at stake is the conflict between Rabbi and rabbis [cited earlier on the status of the solar calendar as against the utilization of exactly twelve months], and there is no conflict between the Tannaite formulations since one is formulated in accord with Rabbi, the other in accord with sages [since from Rabbi’s perspective, the animal will certainly have completed its first year and become superannuated].*

II. *But does the Tannaite formulation not state, And the same is the rule for money [designated for purchase of the lamb for Passover, and here superannuation is no issue]?*

JJ. *So it must follow that subject to dispute is the possibility of confusion.*

KK. *That proves the point.*

I:1, II:1-2 present valuable Tannaite complements. III:1 and IV:1 remains well within the range of Mishnah-commentary. IV:2 is a perfect composition working

out its own problem; it intersects with the Mishnah-rule before us, but in no way has taken shape for the purpose of Mishnah-exegesis in the present context, as the form itself indicates. Since there is no Bavli for the tractate that is dealt with, we see that even the work of Mishnah-exegesis was undertaken without the governing aim of forming a Mishnah-commentary such as the Talmud-tractates provide.

6:2-4B

6:2

- A. He comes to the goat which is to be sent forth and lays his two hands on it and makes the confession.
- B. And thus did he say, “O Lord, your people, the house of Israel, has committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before you. Forgive, O Lord, I pray, the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which your people, the house of Israel, have committed, transgressed, and sinned before you,
- C. “as it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant, For on this day shall atonement be made for you to clean you. From all your sins shall you be clean before the Lord (Lev. 16:30).”
- D. And the priests and people standing in the courtyard, when they would hear the Expressed Name [of the Lord] come out of the mouth of the high priest, would kneel and bow down and fall on their faces and say, “Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever.”

6:3

- A. He gave [the scapegoat] over to the one who was to lead it out.
- B. All are valid to lead it out.
- C. But high priests made it a practice of not letting Israelites lead it out.
- D. Said R. Yosé, “M’S H W: Arsela led it out, and he was an Israelite.”

6:4A-B

- A. They made a ramp for it, on account of the Babylonians,
- B. who would pull out its hair and say, “Take and go, take and go.”
- I.1** A. [Supply: He comes to the goat which is to be sent forth and lays his two hands on it and makes the confession. And thus did he say, “O Lord, your people the house of Israel has committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before you. Forgive, Lord, I pray, the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which your people the house of Israel have committed, transgressed, and sinned before you:] *But he does not make reference to “the children of Aaron, your holy people.” Now who is responsible for this formulation of matters?*
- B. Said R. Jeremiah, “It is not in accord with R. Judah. For it cannot be in accord with R. Judah, who has said, ‘[The children of Aaron] also get atonement from the scapegoat.’”
- C. *Abbayye said, “You may even maintain that it does accord with R. Judah, for do not the priests fall into the category of ‘your people Israel’?”*

II.1 A. He gave the scapegoat over to the one who was to lead it out:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- C. “And he shall send it [the scape-goat] away by the hand of an appointed man” (Lev. 16:12) — “man” serves to validate for participation in the rite even a non-priest, [66B] and “appointed,” means, even one who is subject to uncleanness, and even if it is done on the Sabbath; “appointed” also means, “designated for the task.”
- D. *That [this is done by a non-priest] is obvious!*
- E. *What might you otherwise have thought? Scripture imputes to the rite the matter of atonement [which only priests effect]. So we are informed to the contrary.*
- F. and “appointed,” means...even if it is done on the Sabbath — *for what purpose is this rule given?*
- G. Said R. Sheshet, “It is to say that if the beast was sick, he carries it on his shoulder.”
- H. *In accord with what authority is this ruling? It is not in accord with R. Nathan, for said R. Nathan, “A living creature is deemed to carry itself.”*
- I. *You may even take the position that it represents the opinion of R. Nathan. For a sick creature is exceptional.*
- J. [With regard to the phrase, “even if it is done on the Sabbath,”] said Rafram, ““That is to say, the considerations of establishing a symbolic linking of property within a boundary and the consideration of taking thing from one domain to another pertain to the Sabbath but not to the Day of Atonement.”
- K. “...and “appointed,” means, even one who is subject to uncleanness:” — *for what purpose is this rule given?*
- L. Said R. Sheshet, “It is to say, if the one who is to carry it away contracted uncleanness, nonetheless he may go into the Temple court in a condition of uncleanness so as to carry the beast away.”

II.2. A. They asked R. Eliezer, “Lo, if the goat which is to be sent fell sick, what is the law as to carrying it?”

- B. He said to them, “Can he carry others?”
- C. “[If] the one who sends him fell sick, what is the law as to sending him with someone else?”
- D. He said to them, “Thus may you and I be in peace.”
- E. “[If] he pushed it down and it did not die, what is the law as to going down after it and killing it?”
- F. He said to them, “Thus be the fate of the enemies of the Omnipresent.”
- G. And sages say, “[If] it fell ill, he carries it.
- H. “[If] the one who sends it fell ill, one sends it with someone else.”
- I. “[If] one pushed it down and it did not die, one should go down after it and kill it” [T. **Kip. 3:14**].

II.3. A. [In Tosefta’s wording:] They asked R. Eliezer, “Does a *mamzer* inherit?”

- B. He said to them, “Does he undergo a rite of *halisah* [with his deceased childless brother’s widow] [M. **Yeb. 2:5**]?”
- C. “Does he undergo a rite of *halisah*?”
- D. He said to them, “Does he inherit?”

- E. Does he inherit?"
- F. He said to them, "Does one plaster his house [as a sign of his status as a *mamzer*]?"
- G. "Does one plaster his grave?"
- H. "Does one plaster his grave?"
- I. He said to them, "May one raise dogs?"
- J. "May one raise dogs?"
- K. He said to them, "May one raise pigs?"
- L. "May one raise pigs?"
- M. He said to them, "May one raise chickens?"
- N. "May one raise chickens?"
- O. He said to them, "May one raise small cattle?"
- P. "May one raise small cattle?"
- Q. He said to them, "May one rescue a shepherd from a wolf?"
- R. "May one rescue a shepherd from a wolf?"
- S. He said to them, "It appears to me that you have asked only about a female-sheep."
- T. "And what is the law as to saving the female-sheep?"
- U. He said to them, "It appears to me that you have asked only about the shepherd."
- V. "What is the fate of Mr. So-and-so as to the world to come? What is the fate of Mr. Such-and-such as to the world to come?"
- W. He said to them, "It appears to me that you have asked only about Mr. So-and-so."
- X. "And what is the fate of Mr. So-and-so as to the world to come?"
- Y. And it was not that R. Eliezer meant to put them off, but the reason is that he never in his entire life stated a rule which he had not heard [T. **Yeb. 3:1**].
- II.4.** A. A sagacious woman asked R. Eliezer, "Since with respect to the sin with the golden calf, all were equally subject to the guilt, how come the death penalty pertaining to them was not everywhere the same [so Exo. 32:20, 27, 35]?"
- B. He said to her, "The only form of wisdom a woman ever attains concerns the distaff. This is what Scripture says, 'And all the women that were wise-hearted spun with their hands' (Exo. 35:25)."
- C. *It has been stated:*
- D. Rab and Levi —
- E. *one said*, "Those who sacrifice and burned incense died by the sword, those who embraced and kissed the calf died by death at the hands of heaven [the plague], and whoever was happy in his heart died by dropsy."
- F. *The other said*, "The ones who were found guilty on the testimony of witnesses and after a proper admonition were put to death with the sword, those who were subjected to testimony by witnesses but not given a proper admonition were put to death by the hands of Heaven, and those who were

subject neither to proper testimony nor to admonition we put to death through dropsy.”

II.5. A. Said R. Judah, “The tribe of Levi did not sin by idolatry on that occasion: ‘Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp’ (Exo. 32:26) [to which the Levites collected in support of his opposition].”

B. *In session Rabina reported this tradition. The sons of R. Pappa bar Abba objected to Rabina by citing this verse: “Who said of his father and of his mother, I have not seen him” (Deu. 33: 9) [which can have included Levites] —*

C. [He replied to them,] “‘his father’ refers to the father of his mother, an Israelite; ‘brother’ refers to the brother of his mother, an Israelite; ‘sons’ refers to the sons of his daughter by an Israelite.”

III.1 A. They made a ramp for it, on account of the Babylonians, who would pull out its hair:

B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hana, “They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because they so despise the Babylonians, they would call them by their name.”

C. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. R. Judah says, “They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because they so despise the Babylonians, they would call them by their name.”

E. Said to him R. Yosé, “May your mind be set at rest even as you have set my mind at rest.”

IV.1 A. and say, “Take and go, take and go:”

B. *A Tannaite statement:*

C. *What’s keeping this goat here, and the sins of the generation are so many! [So be off with you!]*

Apart from the secondary accretions in unit II, the Talmud forms a systematic exegesis of the Mishnah.

6:4C-E, 6:5, 6:6

6:4C-E

C. The eminent people of Jerusalem used to accompany him to the first booth.

D. There were ten booths from Jerusalem to the ravine, [67A] a distance of ninety ris —

E. seven and a half to a mile.

6:5

A. At each booth they say to him, “Lo, here is food, here is wafer.”

B. And they accompany him from one booth to the next,

C. except for [the man in] the last [tabernacle] among them,

D. who does not go along with him to the ravine.

E. But he stands from a distance and observes what he does.

- A. Now what did he do?
 - B. He divided the crimson thread.
 - C. Half of it he tied to a rock, and half of it he tied between its horns.
 - D. He then pushed it over backward, and it rolled down the ravine.
 - E. And it did not reach halfway down the mountain before it broke into pieces.
 - F. He came and sat himself down under the last tabernacle until it got dark.
 - G. At what time does the one who takes the goat impart uncleanness to garments [Lev. 16:26]? Once he has gone forth from the wall of Jerusalem.
 - H. R. Simeon says, "Once he has pushed it into the ravine."
- I.1** A. There were ten booths from Jerusalem to the ravine, a distance of ninety ris — seven and a half to a mile:
- B. *Our rabbis have Tannaite on Tannaite authority:*
 - C. "There were ten tabernacles within a distance of twelve miles," the words of R. Meir.
 - D. R. Judah says, "There were nine tabernacles in a distance of ten miles."
 - E. R. Yosé says, "There were five tabernacles in a distance of ten miles. And they share an 'erub [commingling the boundaries for the Sabbath] with one to the other [so that they in the tabernacles may accompany the man]."
 - F. Said R. Yosé, son of R. Judah, [Bavli: My son, Eleazar, said to me,] "With an erub, I can make it so that two tabernacles would serve even for ten mils" [T. Kip. 3:13E-I].
 - G. *In accord with which authority is the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority: except for [the man in] the last [tabernacle] among them, who does not go along with him to the ravine. But he stands from a distance and observes what he does?*
 - H. That accords with R. Meir [Jung: according to Yosé and Judah even the last reaches the ravine.]
- II.1** A. At each booth they say to him, "Lo, here is food, here is water:"
- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
 - C. No man ever required [the food or water, its being the Day of Atonement], but one who has a loaf of bread in his basket is not the same as one who does not.
- III.1** A. Now what did he do? He divided the crimson thread. Half of it he tied to a rock, and half of it he tied between its horns. He then pushed it over backward, and it rolled down the ravine:"
- B. *Why not tie the whole thread to the rock?*
 - C. *Since the religious task is to complete the entire rite with the he-goat, one has to take account of the possibility that the thread might turn white prematurely, and he would be satisfied [and not push the goat down into the ravine].*
 - D. *Then why not tie the whole of it between the horns of the he-goat?*
 - E. *Sometimes when the goat fell, its head might be bent, and the messenger would not pay attention [to see the change in color].*

III.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. At first they would tie the crimson thread onto the entrance of the hall [that led to the interior of the sanctuary (Jung)] at the outer side. If it turned white, they were happy, if it did not turn white, they were sad and filled with shame. They made the ordinance that they should tie it onto the entrance of the hall on the inside. But still people would peak in, and if it turned white, they were happy, if it did not turn white, they were sad and filled with shame. So they made the ordinance to tie half of it to a rock and half of it between the goat's horns.
- C. Said R. Nahum bar Pappa in the name of R. Eleazar Haqqappar, "At first they would tie the crimson thread onto the entrance of the hall at the inner side. And when the goat would reach the wilderness, it would turn white, so they knew that the religious duty connected with the goat had been carried out, as it is said, 'If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white wool' (Isa. 1:18)."

IV.1 A. **And it did not reach halfway down the mountain before it broke into pieces:**

- B. *The question was raised:* as to those limbs of the goat that broke off, what is their status as to deriving benefit from them [e.g., by selling them for profit or giving them as a gift]?
- C. Rab and Samuel —
- D. *One said*, "They are available for benefit."
- E. *And the other said*, "They are forbidden."
- F. *As to the one who said*, "They are available for benefit," [67B] *that is because it is written*, "...in the wilderness" (Lev. 16:22) [just as the wilderness belongs to everybody, so the he goat is free for all].
- G. *And as to the other who said*, "They are forbidden," *that is because it is written*, "...cut off..." (Lev. 16:22) [meaning, forbidden].
- H. *And as to the other who said*, "They are forbidden," *how does he interpret this clause*, "...in the wilderness" (Lev. 16:22)?
- I. *He requires it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. The words "in the wilderness," "to the wilderness," "in the wilderness" (Lev. 16:10, 21, 22) serve to encompass Nob, Gibeon, and Shiloh, as well as the eternal house [all of which are subject to the same law].
- K. *And how does the other interpret the reference to* "...cut off..." (Lev. 16:22)?
- L. *He requires it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. "cut off" — the term "cut off" in this context refers only to something that is radically disjoined [thus cut off as in the case of a steep ravine, not a slope].
- N. Another matter: the term "cut off" refers only to something that breaks up as it goes down.
- O. Another matter: "cut off" — you might say that this rite is vacuous, so the text states, "I am the Lord," meaning, I have made a decree [using the same word as is translated "cut off"] concerning this rite, and you have no right to meditate too deeply about it.

- P. Said Raba, "It stands to reason that the law accords with him who has said, 'They are available for benefit,' since the Torah has not said, 'send it away,' only to create the occasion for confusion."

IV.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "Azazel" —
- C. it should be a terrain that is rough and tough [the word for rough using the same letters as the opening clause of the word, azazel].
- D. Might one suppose that it is to be sent to a settled area? Scripture reads, "in the wilderness."
- E. And how do we know that it is to be a ravine?
- F. The text says, "cut off."
- G. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. "Azazel" —
- I. it should be the roughest of mountains, in line with the verse, "And the mighty of the land he took away" (Eze. 17:13).
- J. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael:*
- K. "'Azazel' — so-called because it atones for the affair of Uza and Azael [Jung: a reference to Gen. 6: 4, the fallen angels].

IV.3. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "My ordinances you shall perform" (Lev. 18: 4) — this refers to such matters that, were they not written in the Torah, it would be a matter of compelling logic that they be written, and these are they: the prohibitions against idolatry, fornication, bloodshed, robbery, and blasphemy.
- C. "...and my statutes you shall keep" (Lev. 18: 4) — this refers to such matters against which Satan brings objections, and these are they: the prohibition against eating pork, the prohibition against wearing mixed fabrics [linen and wool], the rite of removing the shoe to sever the relationship of a deceased childless brother's wife to a surviving brother, the purification of the person afflicted with the skin-ailment, and the rite of sending away the he-goat.
- D. Might you imagine that these rites are empty rituals?
- E. Scripture states, "I am the Lord" — I have made the decree, and you have no right to meditate too deeply about it.

V.1 A. **From what time does the one who takes the goat impart uncleanness to garments? Once he has gone forth from the wall of Jerusalem. R. Simeon says, "Once he has pushed it into the ravine:"**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* **"And he who lets the goat go to Azazel shall wash his clothes and bathe his body in water, and afterward he may come into the camp. And the bull for the sin-offering and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall be carried forth outside the camp; their skin and their flesh and their dung shall be burned with fire. And he who burns them shall wash his clothes and bathe his body in water, and afterward he may come into the camp:"**

- C. but not the one who sends out the one who lets the goat go [for that one is not unclean].
- D. “And he who lets the goat go to Azazel shall wash his clothes”:
- E. Might one suppose that at the moment that he goes forth from the wall of the courtyard, he imparts uncleanness to his clothing?
- F. Scripture says, “...to Azazel shall wash his clothes.”
- G. If “...to Azazel shall wash his clothes,” might one suppose that he should not impart uncleanness until he comes to the ravine?
- H. Scripture says, “And he who lets the goat go to Azazel shall wash his clothes.”
- I. How so?
- J. “Once it has gone forth beyond the wall of Jerusalem it imparts uncleanness to his clothing,” the words of R. Judah [T.:Meir].
- K. R. Yosé says, “‘...to Azazel shall wash his clothes’: it imparts to uncleanness only when it reaches the ravine” [T.: Judah].
- L. R. Simeon says, “‘And he who lets the goat go to Azazel shall wash his clothes;’ the one who throws it down into the ravine imparts uncleanness to clothing” [Sifra CLXXXIV:I1-2; T. [Yoma 3:15E-H](#)].

The entire Talmud to this Mishnah-paragraph consists of well-formed comments, most of them Tannaite complements of one kind or another. Here we have Talmud at its best.

6:7

- A. [Meanwhile, the high priest] came to the bullock and goat which are to be burned.
 - B. He tore them open and removed their innards.
 - C. He put them onto a dish and burned them up on the altar.
 - D. He then twisted [the limbs of the beasts] on poles, and they carried them out to the place of burning.
 - E. And when do they impart uncleanness to clothing [who carry out the limbs of the goat and bullock]?
 - F. Once they have gone past the wall of the courtyard.
 - G. R. Simeon says, “Once the fire has taken hold of the greater part of [the beasts’ carcasses].
- I.1** A. [Supply: He put them onto a dish and burned them up on the altar] Did he then burn them up?
- B. *How could you suppose so [since that rite comes much later in the sequence]! Rather, say, to burn them on the altar.*
- II.1** A. He then twisted the limbs of the beasts on poles, and they carried them out to the place of burning:
- B. Said R. Yohanan, “It was twisted in the form of net-work.”
- II.2.** A. *A Tannaite statement:*
- B. He did not cut them up in the way one cuts up the meat of a burnt offering, for he left the hide on the meat.

- C. *Now on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*
- D. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. Rabbi says, "Here [with reference to the bullock and he goat of the Day of Atonement] we find a reference to 'hide and meat and dung,' and elsewhere, we find a reference to hide and meat and dung [in connection with the bullock of the anointed priest]. **[68A]** Just as there, the beast was burned only after being cut up, but without flaying the hide, so here too the beast was burned only after being cut up, but without flaying the hide." [Thus the result of one such argument is transferred to another case by another such argument (Freedman to *Zebahim* 50A)].
- F. *And as to the latter fact, how on the basis of Scripture do we know it?*
- G. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. "And its innards and its dung, even the whole bullock shall he carry forth outside of the camp" (Lev. 4:11) — this teaches that they carry it out whole.
- K. "Might one suppose that they burn it whole?"
- L. "Here we find a reference to "its head and its legs," and elsewhere [Lev. 1:8-9, 12-13] we find reference also to "its head and its legs." Just as in that other case, this is done only after cutting up the beast, so here too it means only after cutting up the beast.
- M. "If so, then just as there this is after flaying the hide, so here too is it to be after flaying the hide? Scripture states, "and its innards and its dung."""
- N. *What conclusion is supposed to be drawn here?*
- O. Said R. Pappa, "Just as its dung is kept within the innards, so the meat must be held within the hide."

III.1 A. And when do they impart uncleanness to clothing who carry out the limbs of the goat and bullock? Once they have gone past the wall of the courtyard:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Elsewhere [in the case of the bullock brought by the anointed priest or when the whole congregation sins inadvertently, which is burned outside the camp, so Lev. 4:12, 21,] Scripture states, "three camps," [are at issue], while here [in connection to the Day of atonement, Scripture implies at Lev. 16:27 that the bullock of the sin offering and goat of the sin offering are burned as soon as they leave the first camp, but all are subject to the same rule, since Lev. 12:21 pertains to the bullock of the day of atonement], so, surprisingly, "one camp" is required. This is to teach you, as soon as it has gone forth from the first camp, the carcass imparts uncleanness to the clothing of those who burn it; but the carcass itself is burned only when it has been taken beyond all three camps.
- D. *And how do we know [that elsewhere the burning takes place outside all three camps]?*
- E. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. "Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth outside the camp" (Lev. 4:12) — outside all three camps.
- G. You maintain that it is outside all three camps. But perhaps it is only outside of one camp?

- H. When Scripture states, “outside of the camp” in connection with the bullock offered in behalf of the community, that is superfluous, since it is explicitly stated, “as he had burned the first bullock” (Lev. 4:21), which means, outside of the camp, meaning, a second camp. When it further says, “outside of the camp” in the context of the ashes, that too is superfluous, since it has already said, “where the ashes are poured out it shall be burned” (Lev. 4:12), so the upshot is that it is to be burned outside of the third camp.

IV.1 A. R. Simeon says, “Once the fire has taken hold of the greater part of the beasts’ carcasses:”

- B. *Then how does R. Simeon deal with the language, “outside the camp”?* [Freedman: since he maintains that the garments are made unclean only when the fire has caught hold of the carcass.]
- C. *He requires it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. R. Eliezer says, “Here we find the language, ‘outside of the camp,’ and elsewhere [Num. 19: 3, in burning the red cow to produce purification-ashes] we find the language, ‘outside of the camp.’ Just as here, it means, outside the three camps, so elsewhere it means, outside of the three camps. Just as in that other context, it is to take place to the east of Jerusalem, so here it is to take place to the east of Jerusalem.”
- E. *Now according to rabbis [who have used the proof-text for another purpose, as we have just seen,] where were they to be burned?*
- F. *The answer is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. Where were they burned? **[68B]** At the north of Jerusalem, outside of the three camps.
- H. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “In the place of ashes they were burned.”
- I. *Said Raba, “What Tannaite authority differs from R. Yosé the Galilean? It is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:”*
- J. “Where the ashes are poured out, it shall be burned” — the ashes must be there first.
- K. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “The ground must slope down [so the pouring out is natural].”
- L. *Said Abayye to [Raba], “Perhaps they differ only on the issue of whether or not the ground must be sloping down?”*

IV.2. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. He who burns the bullocks imparts uncleanness to his clothing, but he who lights the fire does not impart uncleanness to his clothing, and he who arranges the wood pile does not impart uncleanness to his clothing.
- C. And who is the one who burns the bullocks imparts uncleanness to his clothing?
- D. It is any one who assists at the moment at which the burning takes place.
- E. Might one suppose that also once the bullocks have been turned into ashes, the clothing still would be made unclean?
- F. To the contrary, Scripture states, “And he who burns them shall wash his clothes” (Lev. 16:28) — when he burns them they impart uncleanness to clothing, but not when they have already turned into ashes.

- G. R. Simeon says, “ he burns them they impart uncleanness to his clothing, but when the meat has disintegrated, they do not impart uncleanness to the clothing.”
- H. *What is at issue between the two positions?*
- I. *Said Raba, “At issue between them is a case in which the meat is completely charred [but not yet ashes].”* [Freedman: In Simeon’s view someone who assists at the burning at this stage does not impart uncleanness to his clothing, and in the opinion of rabbis, he does.]

The entire composite serves the Mishnah-sentences, item by item; once more, a rich heritage of Tannaite amplification nourishes the Talmud.

6:8

- A. **They said to the high priest, “The goat has reached the wilderness.”**
- B. **Now how did they know that the goat had come to the wilderness?**
- C. **They made sentinel posts, and waved flags, so they might know that the goat had reached the wilderness.**
- D. **Said R. Judah, “Now did they not have a more impressive sign than that? From Jerusalem to Bet Hiddudo is three miles. They can walk a mile, come back a mile, and wait sufficient time to walk a mile, and so they will know that the goat has reached the wilderness.”**
- E. **R. Ishmael says, “Now did they not have another sign? There was a crimson thread tied to the door of the sanctuary. When the goat had reached the wilderness, the thread would turn white,**
- F. **“as it says, ‘Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow’ (Isa. 1:18).”**
- I.1 A. [Said R. Judah, “Now did they not have a more impressive sign than that? From Jerusalem to Bet Hiddudo is three miles. They can walk a mile, come back a mile, and wait sufficient time to walk a mile, and so they will know that the goat has reached the wilderness:”] said Abbaye, “That yields the inference that Bet Hiddudo is located in the wilderness, and this is what the Tannaite authority wishes us to infer: R. Judah maintains that as soon as the he-goat has reached the wilderness, the religious duty concerning the beast has been carried out.”**

The gloss is minor and episodic.