

IX

THE STRUCTURE AND SYSTEM OF BABYLONIAN TALMUD YOMA

Whether or not the Talmud of Babylonia is carefully organized in large-scale, recurrent structures and guided by a program that we may call systematic forms the principal question addressed by an academic commentary. The preceding chapters therefore have pointed toward the presentation set forth here. At the outset, let me say, I have studied tractate Yoma, beginning to end, at a number of points in my life, in the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Talmud of the Land of Israel, as well as the Talmud of Babylonia, and have studied the Bavli-tractate Yoma perhaps five or six times whole. Among the Bavli's tractates, I have always found it truly exceptional; but that impression now requires explanation and articulation in data. So here I answer the question, what makes Bavli Yoma a truly remarkable re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate and its topic, even when measured against the numerous other tractates of the Bavli that lay claim to our admiration. I take up this question at the end of my account of the structure and system of the document.

By "structure" I mean, a clearly-articulated pattern that governs the location of fully-spelled out statements. By "system," I mean, a well-crafted and coherent set of ideas that explain the social order of the community addressed by the writers of a document, a social philosophy, a theory of the way of life, world view, and character of the social entity formed by a given social group. I see a collective, anonymous, and political document, such as the one before us, as a statement to, and about, the way in which people should organize their lives and govern their actions. At issue then in any document such as the remarkable one before us is simple: does this piece of writing present information or a program, facts to whom it may concern, or a philosophically and aesthetically cogent statement about how things should be?

The connection between structure and system is plain to see. From the way in which people consistently frame their thoughts, we move to the world that, in saying things one way rather than in some other, they wish to imagine the world in which they wish to live, to which they address these thoughts. For if the document exhibits structure and sets forth a system, then it is accessible to questions of rationality. We may ask about the statement that its framers or compilers wished to make by putting the document together as they did. But if we discern no structure and perceive no systematic inquiry or governing points of analysis, then all we find here is inert and miscellaneous information, facts but no propositions, arguments, viewpoints.

Now the Talmud commonly finds itself represented as lacking organization and exhibiting a certain episodic and notional character. That view moreover characterizes the reading

and representation of the document by learned and experienced scholars, who have devoted their entire lives to Talmud study and exegesis. It must follow that upon the advocate of the contrary view — the one implicit in the representation of the document for academic analysis — rests the burden of proof. I set forth the allegation that the Talmud exhibits a structure and follows a system and therefore exhibits a commonly-intelligible rationality. The claim to write an academic commentary explicitly states that proposition. For the tractate before us, I have therefore to adduce evidence and argument.

I maintain that through the normal procedures of reasoned analysis we may discern in the tractate a well-crafted structure. I hold that the structure made manifest, we may further identify the purpose and perspective, the governing system of thought and argument, of those who collected and arranged the tractate's composites and put them together in the way in which we now have them. By "structure" I mean, how is a document organized? and by "system," what do the compilers of the document propose to accomplish in producing this complete, organized piece of writing? The answers to both questions derive from a simple outline of the tractate as a whole, underscoring the types of compositions and composites of which it is comprised. Such an outline tells us what is principal and what subordinate, and how each unit — composition formed into composites, composites formed into a complete statement — holds together and also fits with other units, fore and aft. The purpose of the outline then is to identify the character of each component of the whole, and to specify its purpose or statement. The former information permits us to describe the document's structure, the latter, its system.

While the idea of simply outlining a Talmud-tractate beginning to end may seem obvious, I have never made such an outline before, nor has anyone else.* Yet, as we shall now see, the character of the outline dictates all further analytical initiatives. Specifically, when we follow the layout of the whole, we readily see the principles of organization that govern. These same guidelines on organizing discourse point also to the character of what is organized: complete units of thought, with a beginning, middle, and end, often made up of smaller, equally complete units of thought. The former we know as composites, the latter as compositions.

*I have provided complete outlines for the Mishnah and for the Tosefta in relationship to the Mishnah, and, not always in outline form, for the Midrash-compilations of late antiquity as well.

Identifying and classifying the components of the tractate — the composites, the compositions of which they are made up — we see clearly how the document coheres: the plan and program worked out from beginning to end. When we define that plan and program, we identify the facts of a pattern that permit us to say in a specific and concrete way precisely what the compilers of the tractate intended to accomplish. The structure realizes the system, the program of analysis and thought that takes the form of the presentation we have before us. From what people do, meaning, the way in which they formulate their ideas and organized them into cogent statements, we discern what they proposed to do, meaning, the intellectual goals that they set for themselves.

These goals — the received document they wished to examine, the questions that they brought to that document — realized in the layout and construction of their writing, dictate the points of uniformity and persistence that throughout come to the surface. How people lay out their ideas guides us into what they wished to find out and set forth in their writing, and that constitutes the system that defined the work they set out to accomplish.

We move from how people speak to the system that the mode of discourse means to express, in the theory that modes of speech or writing convey modes of thought and inquiry.

We move from the act of thought and its written result backward to the theory of thinking, which is, by definition, an act of social consequence. We therefore turn to the matter of intention that provokes reflection and produces a system of inquiry. That statement does not mean to imply I begin with the premise of order, which sustains the thesis of a prior system that defines the order. To the contrary, the possibility of forming a coherent outline out of the data we have examined defines the first test of whether or not the document exhibits a structure and realizes a system. So everything depends upon the possibility of outlining the writing, from which all else flows. If we can see the order and demonstrate that the allegation of order rests on ample evidence, then we may proceed to describe the structure that gives expression to the order, and the system that the structure sustains.

The present work undertakes the exegesis of exegesis, for the Talmud of Babylonia, like its counterpart in the Land of Israel, is laid out as a commentary to the Mishnah. That obvious fact defined the character of my academic commentary, since we have already faced the reality that our Bavli-tractate is something other than a commentary, though it surely encompasses one. The problems that captured my attention derived from the deeper question of how people make connections and draw conclusions. To ask about how people make connections means that we identify a problem — otherwise we should not have to ask — and what precipitated the problem here has been how a composition or a composite fits into its context, when the context is defined by the tasks of Mishnah-commentary, and the composition or composite clearly does not comment on the Mishnah-passage that is subjected to comment.

The experience of analyzing the document with the question of cogency and coherence in mind therefore yields a simple recognition. Viewed whole, the tractate contains no gibberish but only completed units of thought, sentences formed into intelligible thought and self-contained in that we require no further information to understand those sentences, beginning to end. The tractate organizes these statements as commentary to the Mishnah. But large tracts of the writing do not comment on the Mishnah in the way in which other, still larger tracts do. Then how the former fit together with the latter frames the single most urgent question of structure and system that I can identify.

Since we have already examined enormous composites that find their cogency in an other than exegetical program, alongside composites that hold together by appeal to a common, prior, coherent statement — the Mishnah-sentences at hand — what justifies my insistence that an outline of the document, resting on the premise that we deal with a Mishnah-commentary, govern all further description? To begin with, the very possibility of outlining Babylonian Talmud tractate Yoma derives from the simple fact that the framers have given to their document the form of a commentary to the Mishnah. It is in the structure of the Mishnah-tractate that they locate everything together that they wished to compile. We know that is the fact because the Mishnah-tractate defines the order of topics and the sequence of problems.

Relationships to the Mishnah are readily discerned; a paragraph stands at the head of a unit of thought; even without the full citation of the paragraph, we should find our way

back to the Mishnah because at the head of numerous compositions, laid out in sequence one to the next, clauses of the Mishnah-paragraph are cited in so many words or alluded to in an unmistakable way. So without printing the entire Mishnah-paragraph at the head, we should know that the received code formed the fundamental structure because so many compositions cite and gloss sentences of the Mishnah-paragraph and are set forth in sequence dictated by the order of sentences of said Mishnah-paragraph. Internal evidence alone suffices, then, to demonstrate that the structure of the tractate rests upon the Mishnah-tractate cited and discussed here. Not only so, but the sentences of the Mishnah-paragraphs of our tractate are discussed in no other place in the entire Talmud of Babylonia in the sequence and systematic exegetical framework in which they are set forth here; elsewhere we may find bits or pieces, but only here, the entirety of the tractate.

That statement requires one qualification, and that further leads us to the analytical task of our outline. While the entire Mishnah-tractate of Yoma is cited in the Talmud, the framers of the Talmud by no means find themselves required to say something about every word, every sentence, every paragraph. On the contrary, they discuss only what they choose to discuss, and glide without comment by large stretches of the tractate. A process of selectivity, which requires description and analysis, has told the compilers of the Talmud's composites and the authors of its compositions* what demands attention, and what does not. Our outline has therefore to signal not only what passage of the Mishnah-tractate is discussed, but also what is not discussed, and we require a general theory to explain the principles of selection ("making connections, drawing conclusions" meaning, to begin with, making selections). For that purpose, in the outline, I reproduce the entirety of a Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of a Talmudic composite, and I underscore those sentences that are addressed, so highlighting also those that are not.

*This statement requires refinement. I do not know that all available compositions have been reproduced, and that the work of authors of compositions of Mishnah-exegesis intended for a talmud is fully exposed in the document as we have it. That is not only something we cannot demonstrate — we do not have compositions that were not used, only the ones that were — but something that we must regard as unlikely on the face of matters. All we may say is positive: the character of the compositions that address Mishnah-exegesis tells us about the concerns of the writers of those compositions, but we cannot claim to outline all of their concerns, on the one side, or to explain why they chose not to work on other Mishnah-sentences besides the ones treated here. But as to the program of the compositors, that is another matter: from the choices that they made (out of a corpus we cannot begin to imagine or invent for ourselves) we may describe with great accuracy the kinds of materials they wished to include and the shape and structure they set forth out of those materials. We know what they did, and that permits us to investigate why they did what they did. What we cannot know is what they did not do, or why they chose not to do what they did not do. People familiar with the character of speculation and criticism in Talmudic studies will understand why I have to spell out these rather commonplace observations. I lay out an argument based on evidence, not on the silences of evidence, or on the absence of evidence — that alone.

It follows that the same evidence that justifies identifying the Mishnah-tractate as the structure (therefore also the foundation of the system) of the Talmud-tractate before us also presents puzzles for considerable reflection. The exegesis of Mishnah-exegesis is only one of these. Another concerns the purpose of introducing into the document enormous compositions and composites that clearly hold together around a shared topic or proposition, e.g., my appendix on one theme or another, my elaborate footnote providing information that is not required but merely useful, and the like. My earlier characterization

of composites as appendices and footnotes signalled the fact that the framers of the document chose a not-entirely satisfactory way of setting out the materials they wished to include here, for large components of the tractate do not contribute to Mishnah-exegesis in any way at all. If these intrusions of other-than-exegetical compositions were proportionately modest, or of topical composites negligible in size, we might dismiss them as appendages, not structural components that bear much of the weight of the edifice as a whole. Indeed, the language that I chose for identifying and defining these composites — footnotes, appendices, and the like — bore the implication that what is not Mishnah-commentary also is extrinsic to the Talmud's structure and system.

But that language served only for the occasion. In fact, the outline before us will show that the compositions are large and ambitious, the composites formidable and defining. Any description of the tractate's structure that dismisses as mere accretions or intrusions so large a proportion of the whole misleads. Any notion that "footnotes" and "appendices" impede exposition and disrupt thought, contribute extraneous information or form tacked-on appendages — any such notion begs the question: then why fill up so much space with such purposeless information? The right way is to ask whether the document's topical composites play a role in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the compilers of the Talmud. We have therefore to test two hypotheses:

1 the topical composites ("appendices," "footnotes") do belong and serve the compilers' purpose, or

2 the topical composites do not participate in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud and do not belong because they add nothing and change nothing.

The two hypotheses may be tested against the evidence framed in response to a single question: is this topical composite necessary? The answer to that question lies in our asking, what happens to the reading of the Mishnah-tractate in light of the topical composites that would not happen were we to read the same tractate without them? The outline that follows systematically raises that question, with results specified in due course. It suffices here to state the simple result of our reading of the tractate, start to finish: the question of structure, therefore also that of system, rests upon the position we identify for that massive component of the tractate that comprises not Mishnah-commentary but free-standing compositions and composites of compositions formed for a purpose other than Mishnah-commentary.

The principal rubrics are given in small caps. The outline takes as its principal rubrics two large-scale organizing principles.

The first is the divisions of the Mishnah-tractate to which the Talmud-tractate serves as a commentary. That simple fact validates the claim that the tractate exhibits a fully-articulated structure. But the outline must also underscore that the Mishnah-tractate provides both more and less than the paramount outline of the Talmud-tractate. It is more because sentences in the Mishnah-tractate are not analyzed at all. These untreated Mishnah-sentences are given in bold face lower case caps, like the rest of the Mishnah, but then are specified by underlining and enclosure in square brackets.

Second, it is less because the structure of the tractate accommodates large composites that address topics not defined by the Mishnah-tractate. That brings us to the second of the two large-scale modes of holding together both sustained analytical exercises and also large sets of compositions formed into cogent composites. These are treated also as major

units and are indicated by Roman numerals, alongside the Mishnah-paragraphs themselves; they are also signified in small caps. But the principal rubrics that do not focus on Mishnah-commentary but on free-standing topics or propositions or problems are not given in boldface type. Consequently, for the purposes of a coherent outline we have to identify as autonomous entries in our outline those important composites that treat themes or topics not contributed by the Mishnah-tractate.

I. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:1

A. SEVEN DAYS BEFORE THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THEY SET APART THE HIGH PRIEST FROM HIS HOUSE TO THE COUNCILLORS' CHAMBER.

A SYSTEMATIC COMPARISON OF THE RULES GOVERNING THE RITE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND THOSE GOVERNING THE RITE OF BURNING THE RED COW

1. I:1: Counterpart rule for the rite of burning the red cow for purification.

a. I:2: Gloss on the foregoing.

b. I:3: As above.

c. I:4: As above.

2. I:5: How do we know that for the rite of burning the red cow and for the rites of atonement on the Day of Atonement, it is required to set apart the officiating priest for a period of time?

B. HOW DO WE KNOW THAT THE REQUIREMENT TO SEPARATE THE PRIEST FROM HIS HOUSEHOLD APPLIES ONLY TO THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND TO NO OTHER CULTIC OCCASION? COMPARISON OF THE RULES GOVERNING THE RITE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND THOSE GOVERNING THE CONSECRATION OF THE TENT OF MEETING.

3. I:6: Gloss of foregoing: "...and the words 'to make atonement for you' speak of the rites of the Day of Atonement." But might one say that reference is made here to the atonement that derives from a sacrifice in general, in behalf of individuals, so that all priests must be set apart for an equivalent period prior to performing the everyday rites?

3. I:7: Continuation of I:5-6.

4. I:8: As above.

5. I:9: As above.

6. I:10: As above.

7. I:11: As above.

8. I:12: Reversion to the proof of I.5.

a. I:13: Continuation and secondary development of foregoing.

9. I:14: Continuation of I:12.

10. I:15: As above.

a. I:16: Gloss on the foregoing.

i. I:17: Topical appendix pertinent to the foregoing.

ii. I:18: As above.

11. I:19: Continuation of I:12.

12. I:20: Continuation of I:19: what is the practical issue subject to dispute here?

13. I:21: Continuation of I:20.

14. I:22: Continuation of I:21.

15. I:23: Continuation of I:22.

a. I:24: Appendix to I:23.

16. I:25: Continuation of I:23.

17. I:26: As above.

a. I:27: gloss of the foregoing.

C. ...THEY SET APART THE HIGH PRIEST FROM HIS HOUSE:

1. II:1: Why do they separate him? Lest he have sexual relations with his wife and she turn out possibly to have been in her menstrual period.

2. II:2: Secondary discussion of this reason: According to which authority has this statement been made? It is in accord with R. Aqiba.

a. II:3: The inference contained in a detail of the foregoing.

3. II:4: Now instead of merely separating the high priest from the uncleanness that may attach to his household, surely you should separate himself from the possibility of corpse-uncleanness! Why not?

a. II:5: Continuation of the dispute consequent upon answering the question at II:4.

I. II:6: Gloss on a detail of a secondary demonstration in the foregoing.

II. II:7: Continuation of the foregoing demonstration.

D. ...TO THE COUNCILLORS' CHAMBER:

1. III:1: But was it the chamber of the counsellors? Wasn't it the chamber of the senators? But to begin with they called it the chamber of the senators, but since they had the habit of paying for the position of the high priest, so the high priests changed every twelve month, just like counsellors, who are changed every twelve month, they came to call it, the councillor's chamber.

a. III:2: Explanation of the word for "councillor's chamber."

E. THE CORRUPTION OF THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD AND THE CONSEQUENT FALL OF THE TEMPLE

1. III:3: "The fear of the Lord prolongs days" — this refers to the first sanctuary, which stood for four hundred and ten years, and yet in which served only eighteen high priests. "...but the years of the wicked shall be shortened" refers to the second sanctuary, which stood for four hundred and twenty years, and in which more than three hundred high priests served.

2. III:4: How come Shiloh was destroyed? Because in it were practiced two vices, fornication and slovenly disposition of Holy Things.

3. III:5: Why was the first sanctuary destroyed? Because in it were practiced three vices: idolatry, fornication, and murder. But as to the second sanctuary, in which the people were engaged in Torah and practice of the commandments and acts of loving kindness, on what account was it destroyed? It was because of gratuitous hatred.

a. III:6: Gloss on the foregoing.

4. III:7: The comparison of the sins of the earlier and the later generations, carrying forward the contrast between the first and second Temple periods. The ancients, whose sin was made known, also had their destiny made known. But the moderns, whose sin was not made known, also did not have their destiny made known.

5. III:8: As above. The little finger nail of the ancients is better than the big belly of the moderns.

6. III:9: Continuation of the foregoing.

7. III:10: The failure of the Babylonian Jews to cooperate in building the Second Temple: If you had made yourselves like a wall and come up, all of you, in the time of Ezra, you would have been comparable to silver — which rot does not rule. Now that you have immigrated, it is like doors in several pieces, not all at once, you are comparable to cedar, which rot does rule.

a. III:11: Gloss on the foregoing.

b. III:12: As above.

8. III:13: Continuation of III:10.

a. III:14: Gloss of the foregoing.

I. III:15: Topical appendix to the foregoing.

II. III:16: Topical appendix to the foregoing.

b. III:17: Continuing III.13.

c. III:18: As above.

d. III:19: As above.

e. III:20: As above.

9. III:21: Rome is destined to fall by the hand of Persia.

10. III:22: Rome which destroyed the second Temple is destined to fall by the hand of Persia which permitted the building of the second Temple.

11. III:23: Persia is destined to fall at the hand of Rome.

F. ...THE COUNCILLORS' CHAMBER:

1. IV:1: All the chambers that were located in the sanctuary had no mezuzah except for the counsellor's chamber, for in that chamber was the dwelling place of the high priest.

a. IV:2: Secondary analysis consequent on the foregoing.

G. THE REQUIREMENT OF THE MEZUZAH: A TOPICAL APPENDIX

1. IV:3: All the same is the rule that governs the gates of houses, courts, provinces, cities — all are subject to the commandment of fixing a mezuzah for the Omnipresent, since it is said, “And you shall write them upon the doorposts of your house and upon your gates” (Deu. 6: 9).

a. IV:4: Said Abbaye to R. Safra, “As to the city gates of Mahoza, what is the reason that our rabbis have not provided for them a mezuzah?”

2. IV:5: A storage house for straw, the stable, the wood shed, and the storehouse are exempt from the obligation of a mezuzah, because women derive benefit from them.

3. IV:6: Six gates are exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah: a straw shed, stable, wood shed, storehouse, Median gate, a gate without beams, and a gate that is lower than ten handbreadths in height.

4. IV:7: A synagogue, a harem, and a house owned by partners are liable to a mezuzah.

a. IV:8: complement to the foregoing.

b. IV:9: as above.

c. IV:10: as above.

G. AND THEY ALSO APPOINT ANOTHER PRIEST AS HIS SUBSTITUTE, LEST SOME CAUSE OF INVALIDATION SHOULD OVERTAKE HIM:

1. V:1: It is obvious that if a cause of invalidation overtook him prior to the daily whole offering of the dawn that they initiate the other priest through the daily whole offering of the dawn. If the cause of invalidation takes place after the daily whole offering of the dawn, however, how is the initiate to take place?

a. V:2: Amplification of the foregoing.

b. V:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

H. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ALSO: THEY APPOINT ANOTHER WOMAN AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR HIS WIFE, LEST HIS WIFE DIE, SINCE IT SAYS, ‘AND HE SHALL MAKE ATONEMENT FOR HIMSELF AND FOR HIS HOUSE’ (LEV. 16: 6). ‘HIS HOUSE’ — THIS REFERS TO HIS WIFE:”

1. VI:1: But don’t rabbis also consider the same possibility of the need for another priest?

I. THEY SAID TO HIM, “IF SO, THE MATTER IS WITHOUT LIMIT:”

1. VII:1: They certainly gave a good answer to R. Judah! Then what about R. Judah?

2. VII:2: And is such an arrangement involving a substitute wife really adequate to the purpose? “His house” (Lev. 16: 6) is what the All-Merciful has said, and this one is not “his house” if she is not yet married to him at the moment that the first wife dies!

3. VII:3: A high priest makes an offering while he is in the status of one who has yet to bury his dead, though he may not eat the priestly portion while in that status.

II. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:2

A. ALL SEVEN DAYS HE TOSSES THE BLOOD:

1. I:1: Who is the Tannaite authority responsible for this rule?

B. ...OFFERS UP THE INCENSE, TRIMS THE LAMP, AND OFFERS UP THE HEAD AND HIND LEG OF THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING:

1. II:1: It follows that the offering of the incense comes first, and trimming the lamps afterward. And by contrast: Those who had won the right to remove the ashes of the inner altar and of the candlestick would go first as at M. **Tam. 3:6A**; He who won the right to offer the incense did take the spoon as at M. **Tam. 5:4A**.

a. II:2: Gloss on a detail of the foregoing.

b. II:3: Continuing the gloss begun in the foregoing.

c. II:4: As above.

d. II:5: As above.

e. II:6: As above,

f. II:7: Contrast of two rulings in the Mishnah on the arrangement of rooms in the Temple, continuing the exegesis begun at II:2 of a ruling of the Mishnah in the present regard.

l. II:8: Further discussion of the layout and dimensions of the Temple: the cell of the lambs, to which reference is made at II:7.

C. BUT ON ALL OTHER DAYS, IF HE WANTED TO OFFER IT UP HE OFFERS IT UP. FOR A HIGH PRIEST OFFERS UP A PORTION AT THE HEAD AND TAKES A PORTION AT THE HEAD OF THE OTHER PRIESTS.

1. III:1: Tannaite complement: How does the high priest take a portion at the head of the other priests as at M. **Yoma 1:2C**? He says, “This sin-offering is mine,” “This guilt-offering is mine,” “One loaf of the two loaves, four or five loaves of the Show Bread are mine.”

a. III:2: Analysis of internal contradictions in the foregoing.

III. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:3-4

A. THEY HANDED OVER TO HIM ELDERS BELONGING TO THE COURT, AND THEY READ FOR HIM THE PRESCRIBED RITE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

AND THEY SAY TO HIM, “MY LORD, HIGH PRIEST, YOU READ IT WITH YOUR OWN LIPS, LEST YOU HAVE FORGOTTEN — OR NEVER EVEN LEARNED IT TO BEGIN WITH.”

1. I:1: “lest you have forgotten — or never even learned it to begin with.” There is no difficulty with the consideration, lest you have forgotten . But as to the consideration, or never even learned it to begin with — would such a person ever have been appointed to begin with?

B. ON THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AT DAWN THEY SET HIM UP AT THE EASTERN GATE AND BRING BEFORE HIM BULLOCKS, RAMS, AND SHEEP, SO THAT HE WILL BE INFORMED AND FAMILIAR WITH THE SERVICE.

1. II:1: Also the he-goats. Then how come our Tannaite authority did not formulate matters to include the he-goats?

C. ALL SEVEN DAYS THEY DID NOT HOLD BACK FOOD OR DRINK FROM HIM. BUT ON THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AT DUSK THEY DID NOT LET HIM EAT MUCH, FOR FOOD BRINGS ON SLEEP.

1. III:1: R. Judah b. Neqosa says, "They feed him cakes of fine flour and eggs, so as to induce defecation."

2. III:2: Sumkhos said in the name of R. Meir, "They don't feed him citron, eggs, or wine." And some say, "Citron, eggs, or fat meat or vintage wine." And some say, "Also not white wine."

a. III:3: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

I. III:4: Topical appendix tacked on to a detail of the foregoing.

II. III:5: Continuation of the foregoing.

b. III:6: A guest should not eat eggs or sleep in the clothing of his host.

IV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:5-6

A. THE ELDERS OF THE COURT HANDED HIM OVER TO THE ELDERS OF THE PRIESTHOOD, WHO BROUGHT HIM UP TO THE UPPER CHAMBER OF ABTINAS:

1. I:1: It was to teach him how to take a handful of incense.

2. I:2: The high priest had two rooms, one, the chamber of the counsellors, the other, the chamber of the household of Abtinias, one at the north, the other at the south.

B. AND THEY IMPOSED AN OATH ON HIM AND TOOK THEIR LEAVE AND WENT ALONG. THIS IS WHAT THEY SAID TO HIM, "MY LORD, HIGH PRIEST:

WE ARE AGENTS OF THE COURT, AND YOU ARE OUR AGENT AND AGENT OF THE COURT.

"WE ABJURE YOU BY HIM WHO CAUSED HIS NAME TO REST UPON THIS HOUSE, THAT YOU WILL NOT VARY IN ANY WAY FROM ALL WHICH WE HAVE INSTRUCTED YOU."

1. II:1: May we say that this represents a refutation of the position of R. Huna b. R. Joshua, for R. Huna b. R. Joshua said, namely: "The priests serve as the agents the All-Merciful," for if it should enter your mind that they are our slaves, is there something that we could not do, but they have the power to do in our behalf?"

C. HE TURNS ASIDE AND WEEPS. AND THEY TURN ASIDE AND WEEP:

1. III:1: He turns aside and weeps: because they suspected him of being a Sadducee. And they turn aside and weep: for said R. Joshua b. Levi, "He who casts suspicion on genuinely good people in the end will be smitten in his own body on that account."

2. III:2: And what was the point of all of this? It was so that he would not arrange the outside and bring it inside in the manner of the Sadducees. Tannaite amplification of what was at stake.

D. IF HE WAS A SAGE, HE EXPOUNDS THE RELEVANT SCRIPTURES. AND IF NOT, DISCIPLES OF SAGES EXPOUND FOR HIM. IF HE WAS USED TO READING SCRIPTURES, HE READ. AND IF NOT, THEY READ FOR HIM. AND WHAT DO THEY READ FOR HIM? IN JOB, EZRA, AND CHRONICLES.

R. ZEKHARIAH B. QEBUTAL SAYS, “MANY TIMES I READ FOR HIM IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.”

1. IV:1: R. Hanan b. Raba repeated as a Tannaite statement to Hiyya bar Rab in the presence of Rab, “Said R. Zekhariah b. Qeputal...,” and Rab gestured to him with his hand that ut is Qebutal.

a. IV:2: Secondary expansion of a subsidiary point in the foregoing.

V. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:7

A. IF HE TRIED TO DOZE OFF, YOUNG PRIESTS SNAP THEIR MIDDLE FINGERS BEFORE HIM

1. I:1: what is the meaning of the word used for “middle finger”?

B. ...AND SAY TO HIM, “MY LORD, HIGH PRIEST: STAND UP AND DRIVE OFF SLEEP BY WALKING ON THE COLD STONES.”

1. II:1: Said R. Isaac, “Show us something new. And what was it? They said to him,¹ ‘Show us the way in which the prostration is done.’”

C. AND THEY WOULD KEEP HIM BUSY UNTIL THE TIME FOR THE SLAUGHTER HAD COME.

1. III:1: They kept him busy neither with a harp nor with a lyre, but by singing. And what did they sing? ‘Unless the Lord builds the house, they work in vain that build it’ (Psa. 127: 1).”

2. III:2: Abba Saul said, “Even in the provinces they would do the same as a memorial to the Temple, but in doing so, they sinned.”

VI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 1:8

A. EVERY DAY THEY TAKE UP THE ASHES FROM THE ALTAR AT THE COCK’S CROW OR NEAR WHETHER BEFORE OR AFTER IT. AT THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FROM MIDNIGHT, AND ON FESTIVALS AT THE END OF THE FIRST WATCH THEY DO SO.

1. I:1: An intersecting Mishnah-rule is adduced to explain this Mishnah-paragraph’s broader context. That is, every day it is sufficient to do so from cockcrow. But on the Day of Atonement, it is done at midnight, on account of the consideration of the exhaustion of the High Priest. On festivals, when there were many sacrifices, so Israelites came very early, it was done at the first watch, as the continuation shows, and before cockcrow the Temple court was full of Israelites.

2. I:2: What is the definition of the cock crow?

a. I:3: Story illustrating the foregoing dispute.

b. I:4: Tannaite formulations of matters in accord with each of the foregoing.

B. AND NEVER DID THE COCK CROW BEFORE THE COURTYARD WAS FILLED WITH MASSES OF ISRAELITES:

1. I:1: When the Israelites come up for the festivals, they stand jammed together. But when they prostrated themselves, but they prostrate themselves with wide spaces between them all; and they extend eleven cubits behind the back wall of the Holy of Holies. That is one of the ten miracles that were done in the Temple.

a. I:2: Gloss on an item in the foregoing catalogue.

l. I:3: Gloss on an item in the foregoing.

b. I:4: Topical appendix. there are six kinds of fire: fire that eats but does not drink, fire that drinks but does not eat, fire that eats and drinks, fire that consumes what is dry as well as what is wet, fire that pushes fire away, fire that eats fire.

c. I:5: Topical appendix: And as to the fire on the wood pile on the altar, even all of the winds in the world cannot stir it up from its place.

l. I:6: Gloss of foregoing.

VII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 2:1-2

A. AT FIRST WHOEVER WANTS TO TAKE UP THE ASHES FROM THE ALTAR DOES SO.

1. I:1: But lo, how come to begin with our rabbis did not ordain drawing by lot? They had the theory that, since it is a rite that is performed by night, it would not be so highly esteemed, so many priests would not come to perform it. But when they realized that a great many did show up and turned out to endanger themselves, they ordained the drawing by lots.

2. I:2: A different reason for the same fact.

3. I:3: But as to the ordinance of the lot, is this the operative consideration? Surely it was made for a different operative consideration altogether.

B. AND WHEN THEY ARE MANY WHO WANTED TO DO SO, THEY RUN UP THE RAMP. AND WHOEVER GETS THERE BEFORE HIS FELLOW, WITHIN FOUR CUBITS OF THE ALTAR, WON THE PRIVILEGE.

1. II:1: As to the four cubits to which they have made reference, does that include the one cubit of the projecting base and the one cubit of the gallery around the altar Jung: so that the real distance in a straight line from the main structure of the altar would be six cubits? Or perhaps that excludes the one cubit of the projecting base and the one cubit of the gallery around the altar?

C. AND IF THE TWO CAME AT THE SAME TIME, THE ONE IN CHARGE SAYS TO THEM, "CHOOSE UP BY RAISING A FINGER."

1. III:1: But let him count them by heads? The fact before us supports the view of R. Isaac, for said R. Isaac, “It is forbidden to count out Israelites by number, even for the purpose of carrying out a religious duty.”

D. A TOPICAL APPENDIX ON SAUL

1. III:2: Said R. Nehilai bar Idi said Samuel, “When a man is appointed as governor over the community, he gets rich. Take the case of Saul, for instance. To begin with it is written, ‘And he counted them with pebbles’ (1Sa. 11: 8), but in the end, ‘And he counted them by means of sheep’ (1Sa. 15: 4).”

2. III:3: “And he strove in the valley” (1Sa. 15: 5): Said R. Mani, “This had to do with what went on in the valley.” Saul was striving because of what happens in the valley, he argued from that ceremony against the slaying of the Amalekites.

3. III:4: “How little does a man whose Master sustains him have to grieve or trouble himself! Saul sinned only once, but it yielded weighty consequences, while David sinned twice, and it did not yield weighty consequences.

4. III:5: “Saul was a year old when he began to reign” (1Sa. 13: 1):

5. III:6: Why did the kingdom of Saul not last?

6. III:7: Why was Saul punished?

E. AND WHAT DO THEY PUT FORTH? ONE OR TWO. BUT THEY DID NOT PUT OUT THE THUMB IN THE TEMPLE.

1. IV:1: Well, if they put out two, is there any need to specify that they put out one?

a. IV:2: Gloss of foregoing.

F. M'SH S: THERE WERE TWO WHO GOT THERE AT THE SAME TIME, RUNNING UP THE RAMP. AND ONE SHOVED HIS FELLOW. AND HE THE OTHER FELL AND BROKE HIS FOOT. WHEN THE COURT SAW THAT THE MATTER WAS DANGEROUS, THEY ORDAINED THAT THE RIGHT OF CLEARING OFF THE ASHES FROM THE ALTAR SHOULD BE APPORTIONED ONLY BY LOT.

1. V:1: Tannaite complement.

a. V:2: Gloss of the retelling of the story.

b. V:3: as above.

c. V:4: as above.

G. CLEARING THE ASHES OFF THE ALTAR:

1. VI:1: Tannaite complement: “And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments and carry forth the ashes” (Lev. 6: 4) — Might I draw the inference that, just as on the Day of Atonement, he takes off the consecrated garments and puts on the secular garments, the high priest changes clothing at every different act of service, so he should do the same on this occasion as well? Scripture states, “And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments,” treating as comparable the clothing he puts on and the clothing that he takes off. Just as the former is consecrated, so the latter is consecrated.

a. VI:2: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. VI:3: As above.

l. VI:4: Secondary development of the issue raised in the foregoing gloss.

2. VI:5: R. Abin raised the question: “As to removing the ashes from the altar, how much is to be removed? Do we draw an analogy from the rule governing taking off the tithe, or from what was removed from the spoil of Midian?”

3. VI:6: Said Rab, “As to four acts of service, if a non-priest performs them, he is liable to the death penalty: sprinkling the blood, smoking the fat, pouring out the water libation and pouring out the wine libation.” Levi says, “Also removing the ashes.”

a. VI:7: Tannaite complement to the foregoing dispute.

H. THERE WERE FOUR LOTS, AND THIS WAS THE FIRST OF THE FOUR

1. VII:1: Why do they draw lots and then go and draw lots again?

2. VII:2: When they draw lots, what garments do they wear?

VIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 2:3

A. THE GENERAL PROCEDURE OF THE LOTTERY:

1. I:1: When they draw the lottery, is it for a single act of service or perhaps it is for all of the acts of service that they take the lottery?

B. THE SECOND LOT: (1) WHO SLAUGHTERS THE ANIMAL, (2) WHO TOSSES THE BLOOD, (3) WHO CLEARS THE ASHES OFF THE INNER ALTAR, (4) WHO CLEARS THE ASHES OFF THE CANDELABRUM, AND WHO BRINGS THE LIMBS UP THE RAMP; (5) THE HEAD, (6) RIGHT HIND LEG, (7) TWO FORELEGS, (8) RUMP, (9) LEFT HIND LEG, (10) BREAST, (11) NECK, (12) TWO FLANKS, AND (13) INNARDS; THE FINE FLOUR, THE BAKED CAKES (LEV. 6:21), AND THE WINE. THIRTEEN PRIESTS ACQUIRED THE RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SERVICE.

1. II:1: The question was raised: who receives the blood collecting it and sprinkling it on the altar?

E. SAID BEN AZZAI BEFORE R. AQIBA IN THE NAME OF R. JOSHUA, “IN THE WAY IN WHICH IT WALKED IT WAS OFFERED.”

1. III:1: Tannaite complement: What is the definition of “the way in which it walked”?

a. III:2: Gloss of the foregoing: How come the head goes together with the right hind leg?

b. III:3: As above: All concur that the head is offered up first. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

IX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 2:4

A. THE THIRD LOT: “THOSE WHO ARE NEW TO THE BURNING OF THE INCENSE, COME AND DRAW LOTS.”

1. I:1: Never did anyone get to repeat the burning of the incense.

a. I:2: Thematic appendix: Said Raba, “You will never find a neophyte rabbi who gives a concrete decision on law unless he derives from either the tribe of Levi or the tribe of Issachar.

2. I:3: They do not draw lots for the daily whole offering presented at twilight, but the priest who had the merit of performing the right at dawn is the one who has the merit of doing so at twilight.

B. THE FOURTH: “THOSE WHO ARE NEW AND THOSE WHO ARE EXPERIENCED — WHO WILL BRING UP THE LIMBS FROM THE RAMP TO THE ALTAR ITSELF?”

1. II:1: Our Mishnah-rule does not accord with the position of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

2. II:2: R. Eliezer b. Jacob does not concur with the position of R. Judah, and R. Judah does not concur with the position of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for if it were the case that they did, there would be too few lotteries.

X. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 2:5

A. THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING WAS OFFERED BY NINE, TEN, ELEVEN, OR TWELVE PRIESTS, NO LESS, NO MORE. HOW SO? IT ITSELF WAS OFFERED BY NINE PRIESTS. ON THE FESTIVAL OF TABERNACLES, IN THE HAND OF ONE ADDITIONAL PRIEST WAS A FLASK OF WATER — THUS TEN. AT DUSK, BY ELEVEN: IT ITSELF BY NINE, AND TWO, WITH TWO PIECES OF WOOD IN THEIR HANDS. AND ON THE SABBATH, BY ELEVEN: IT ITSELF BY NINE, AND TWO PRIESTS, WITH TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE FOR THE SHOW BREAD IN THEIR HANDS.

AND ON THE SABBATH WHICH COINCIDES WITH THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES, IN THE HAND OF YET ANOTHER PRIEST WAS A FLASK OF WATER.

1. I:1: On the Festival of Tabernacles, the water libation is offered up only at the time of the morning whole offering. On what basis is that statement made? It is because the Tannaite formulation states, And on the Sabbath that coincides with the Feast of Tabernacles, in the hand of yet another priest was a flask of water.

B. AT DUSK, BY ELEVEN: IT ITSELF BY NINE, AND TWO, WITH THE TWO PIECES OF WOOD IN THEIR HANDS.

1. II:1: “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the daily whole offering presented at twilight requires the presentation of two logs of wood through two priests? As it is said, ‘And the sons of Aaron shall lay wood in order upon the fire’ (Lev. 1: 7). Now if, in context, that statement has no bearing on the daily whole offering presented at dawn, since it is written in that connection, ‘And the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning and he shall lay the burnt offering in order upon it’ (Lev. 6: 5), assign the statement to the context of the daily whole offering that was presented at twilight.”

2. II:2: The lottery was taken on occasion to identify assignments for thirteen priests, at times for fourteen, at times for fifteen, and at times for sixteen.

XI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 2:6-7

A. A RAM WAS OFFERED BY ELEVEN: THE MEAT BY FIVE, THE INNARDS, FLOUR, AND WINE BY TWO EACH. AN OX WAS OFFERED BY TWENTY-FOUR: THE HEAD AND THE RIGHT HIND LEG — THE HEAD BY ONE, AND THE RIGHT HIND LEG BY TWO; THE RUMP AND THE LEFT HIND LEG — THE RUMP BY TWO, AND THE LEFT HIND LEG BY TWO; THE BREAST AND THE NECK — THE BREAST BY ONE, AND THE NECK BY THREE; THE TWO FORELEGS BY TWO; THE TWO FLANKS BY TWO; THE INNARDS, THE FINE FLOUR, AND THE WINE BY THREE EACH. UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES? IN THE CASE OF PUBLIC OFFERINGS. BUT IN THE CASE OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S OFFERING, IF ONE PRIEST WANTED TO OFFER IT UP ALL BY HIMSELF, HE OFFERED IT UP.

FLAYING AND CUTTING UP BOTH THESE AND THOSE OFFERINGS ARE SUBJECT TO THE SAME RULES.

1. I:1: Cutting them up and flaying them are subject to the same rule for both public and private offerings: both may be done by a non-priest.
 - a. I:2: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.
2. I:3: A non-priest who laid out the pile of wood in order on the altar is subject to the death penalty.
3. I:4: Another version of the dialectics of the foregoing.

XII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:1-2

A. THE SUPERVISOR SAID TO THEM, “GO AND SEE WHETHER THE TIME FOR SLAUGHTERING THE SACRIFICE HAS COME.” IF IT HAS COME, HE WHO SEES IT SAYS, “IT IS DAYLIGHT!”

1. I:1: What is the meaning of the language, “It is daylight”?

B. MATTITHIAH B. SAMUEL SAYS, “HE SAYS, ‘HAS THE WHOLE EAST GOTTEN LIGHT?’ “TO HEBRON?”

1. II:1: R. Judah b. Betera says, “He says, ‘The whole of the east has gotten light, even to Hebron. And all of the people have gone out to their jobs’”
2. II:2: The prayer ordained by Abraham which is recited at dusk is to be said from the point at which the walls begin to fall into shadows without direct sunlight.

C. “AND HE SAYS, ‘YES.’”

1. III:1: Who is it who says this “yes”? Should I say it was a man standing on the roof? Then is the one who is the dreamer also appointed as the interpreter of dreams? Is the one who asks the question the same as the one who answers it? So it must be someone who is standing on the ground. But then, how would he know?

D. AND WHY WERE THEY REQUIRED TO DO THIS? FOR ONCE THE MOONLIGHT CAME UP, AND THEY SUPPOSED THAT THE EASTERN HORIZON WAS BRIGHT:

1. IV:1: Can there be confusion between the light of the moon and the light of the sun? It was a cloudy day, so the light was diffused in all directions.

a. IV:2: That yields the observation that on a cloudy day the sun is felt all over.

l. IV:3: The diffused light of the sun is harsher than the sun itself. Examples of the same paradox as is noted above.

2. IV:4: Resuming from 1:C: The Scriptural basis for the position of Rabbi.

a. IV:5: Gloss on the proof-text cited above, now read in its own context.

E. AND SO THEY SLAUGHTERED THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING AND HAD TO BRING IT OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING. THEY BROUGHT THE HIGH PRIEST DOWN TO THE IMMERSION HUT.

1. V:1: When did this mistake take place, so that the high priest was brought down to immerse?

a. V:2: Not only this alone that is, that the daily whole offering slaughtered at night has to be burned, but even a bird that was presented as a burnt offering, the neck of which was pinched by night, or the meal offering from which a handful was taken at night have to be thrown out at the place of burning.

F. THIS GOVERNING PRINCIPLE APPLIED IN THE TEMPLE: WHOEVER COVERS HIS FEET AND DEFECATES REQUIRES IMMERSION, AND WHOEVER URINATES REQUIRES SANCTIFICATION THE WASHING OF HANDS AND FEET.

1. VI:1: There is no difficulty understanding why there must be immersion of the feet, because of the splashings, but why is it necessary to wash hands?

G. RULINGS ON HYGIENE IN CONNECTION WITH EXCREMENT

1. VI:2: If there is shit in the anus, it is forbidden to recite the Shema.

2. VI:3: A ruling regarding the communal meal: one who leaves to urinate must wash one hand upon returning. One who goes out to speak to his fellow and walked a distance must wash both his hands upon returning.

XIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:3-4A

A. A PERSON DOES NOT ENTER THE COURTYARD FOR THE SERVICE, EVEN IF HE IS CLEAN, UNLESS HE IMMERSES.

1. I:1: They asked Ben Zoma, "What is the reason for this immersion?" He said to them, "If one who goes in from one holy area to another, or from a place not subject to the punishment of extirpation to one that is, requires immersion, he who enters from an ordinary area to a holy place, which is subject to punishment of extirpation, surely should require immersion."

a. I:2: Secondary theoretical questions, depending on the dispute in the foregoing.

b. I:3: As above.

B. FIVE ACTS OF IMMERSION, AND TEN ACTS OF SANCTIFICATION OF THE HANDS AND FEET, DOES THE HIGH PRIEST CARRY OUT ON THAT DAY.

AND ALL OF THEM ARE IN THE SANCTUARY AT THE PARVAH CHAMBER, EXCEPT FOR THIS ONE ALONE.

1. II:1: Tannaite complement: Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day. And all of them are in the sanctuary at the Parvah chamber, except for this one alone (M. **Yoma. 3:3B-C**), which was on unconsecrated ground, on top of the gate that was beside his own cell.

C. THEY SPREAD OUT A LINEN SHEET BETWEEN HIM AND THE CROWD:

1. III:1: Why linen in particular?

XIV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:4B-G, 3:5

A. HE TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES, WENT DOWN, IMMERSED, CAME UP, AND DRIED OFF. THEY BROUGHT HIM GOLDEN GARMENTS, AND HE PUT THEM ON, AND (1) HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET.

1. I:1: This teaching that only one sanctification is carried out in connection with the first immersion, when he changes from his non-holy garments into the garments of gold does not accord with the position of R. Meir, who has said in connection with the second immersion, when the high priest changes from garments of gold to linen, he takes off his clothes first, then sanctifies himself, there must be two sanctifications for putting on the garments.

B. THE FIVE ACTS OF IMMERSION, AND TEN ACTS OF SANCTIFICATION OF THE HANDS AND FEET, THAT THE HIGH PRIEST CARRIES OUT ON THAT DAY

1. I:2: Development of the theme introduced in the foregoing concerning the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest carries out on that day. “And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:23) — Why does he come in? He comes only to remove the censer and fire pan. The entire passage is stated in the correct order of the sequence of actions that are described except for this one item.

2. I:3: How on the basis of Scripture do we know about the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest immerses or sanctifies on that day? Scripture states, ‘And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting and shall put off the linen garments...and he shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place and put on his other garments and come forth and offer his burnt offering’ (Lev. 16:23, 24). Lo, in this way you have learned that whoever changes from the performance of one act of service to another is required to immerse.

a. I:4: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. I:5: As above.

c. I:6: As above.

d. I:7: As above. Reversion to the issue of I:1 above.

e. I:8: Continuation of the foregoing.

C. THEY BROUGHT HIM THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING. HE CUT THE WINDPIPE AND GULLET, AND ANOTHER PRIEST COMPLETED THE SLAUGHTERING ON HIS BEHALF.

HE RECEIVED THE BLOOD AND TOSSED IT. HE WENT IN TO OFFER UP THE INCENSE OFFERING OF THE MORNING, TO TRIM THE LAMPS, AND TO OFFER UP THE HEAD AND LIMBS, BAKED CAKES, AND WINE.

1. II:1: What is the meaning of “cut”?

2. II:2: How far is the cut that the high priest makes?

D. THE PROPER ORDER OF THE DAILY PRIESTLY RITES

1. II:3: The proper order of the daily priestly rites. The large pile takes precedence over the second pile for the incense; the second pile for the incense comes before laying in order the two logs of wood, laying in order of two logs of wood takes precedence over removing the ashes from the inner altar, removing ashes from the inner altar takes precedence over trimming the five lamps, trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering, the blood of the daily whole offering takes precedence over the trimming of the two lamps, the trimming of the two lamps takes precedence over the incense, the incense takes precedence over the limbs, the limbs take precedence over the meal offering, the meal offering takes precedence over the pancakes, the pancakes take precedence over the drink offerings, the drink offerings take precedence over the additional offerings, the additional offerings take precedence over the frankincense censers, the frankincense censers take precedence over the daily whole offering of twilight.

a. II:4: Gloss of the clause, The large pile takes precedence over the second pile for the incense

b. II:5: Gloss of the clause, the second pile for the incense comes before laying in order the two logs of wood

c. II:6: Gloss of the clause, laying in order of two logs of wood takes precedence over removing the ashes from the inner altar

d. II:7: Gloss of the clause, trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering

e. II:8: Gloss of the clause, the incense takes precedence over the limb

f. II:9: Gloss of the clause, trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering: How come he trims the five lamps first, let him do the two first

g. II:10: Gloss of the clause, trimming the two lamps takes precedence over burning the incense

h. II:11: Gloss of the clause, the incense takes precedence over the limbs.

i. II:12: Gloss of the clause, the limbs take precedence over the meal offering

j. II:13: Gloss of the clause, the meal offering takes precedence over the pancakes

k. II:14: Gloss of the clause, the pancakes take precedence over the drink offerings

l. II:15: Gloss of the clause, the drink offerings take precedence over the additional offerings

m. II:16: Gloss of the clause, the additional offerings take precedence over the frankincense censers,

E. THE INCENSE OFFERING OF THE MORNING WAS OFFERED BETWEEN THE TOSSING OF THE BLOOD AND THE OFFERING UP OF THE LIMBS.

1. III:1: Now who can stand behind this anonymous statement, for it cannot be rabbis, since in their view the rite should intervene between the blood and the lamps and be done before the lamps have been trimmed, and it cannot be in accord with Abba Saul, who would have the rite intervene between the lamps and the limbs!

F. THAT OF TWILIGHT WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE BURNING OF THE LIMBS AND THE DRINK OFFERINGS.

1. IV:1: What is the source in Scripture for this rule?

a. IV:2: Tannaite exegesis affected by the foregoing.

G. IF THE HIGH PRIEST WAS DECREPIT OR INFIRM, THEY HEATED HOT WATER FOR HIM AND POURED IT INTO THE COLD WATER, TO RELIEVE THE CHILL.

1. V:1: They heated lamps of wrought iron on the eve of the Day of Atonement, which they would then toss into cold water to relieve the chill.

XV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:6-7

A. THEY BROUGHT HIM TO THE PARVAH CHAMBER, AND IT WAS IN THE SANCTUARY.

1. I:1: What is the meaning of Parvah?

B. THEY SPREAD OUT A LINEN SHEET BETWEEN HIM AND THE CROWD.

HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET AND TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES. R. MEIR SAYS, "HE TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET." HE WENT DOWN, IMMERSSED, CAME UP, AND DRIED OFF. THEY BROUGHT HIM WHITE CLOTHES. HE PUT THEM ON AND (3) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET.

1. II:1: Why in particular was it made of linen?

C. "AT DAWN HE WOULD PUT ON A GARMENT OF PELUSIUM LINEN WORTH TWELVE MANEHS, AND AT DUSK, HE WORE INDIAN LINEN WORTH EIGHT HUNDRED ZUZ," THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. AND SAGES SAY, "AT DAWN HE WOULD PUT ON A GARMENT WORTH EIGHTEEN MANEHS, AND AT DUSK, ONE WORTH TWELVE MANEHS. IN ALL IT WAS WORTH THIRTY MANEHS."

1. III:1: The Tannaite formulation including the sum total (In all it was worth thirty manehs) serves to indicate that with garments worth less than that sum the rite is not to be carried out. But if one set of clothing is worth less than the specific amount, and the other set of clothing more, we have no objection so long as the sum total is as indicated.

D. THESE BELONG TO THE PUBLIC. AND IF HE WANTED TO SPEND MORE, HE COULD DO SO AT HIS OWN EXPENSE.

1. IV:1: With regard to garments provided by the priest out of his own funds, R. Huna bar Judah, and some say, R. Samuel bar Judah, stated as a Tannaite ruling, “After the rite in behalf of the community has been completed, a priest whose mother made for him a tunic might put it on and officiate wearing that at a private service, on the stipulation that he then hand it over to the community.”

2. IV:2: They say that Ishmael b. Phiabi’s mother made for him a tunic worth a hundred maneh. And he would put it on and stand and make offerings on the altar wearing it

E. WEALTH, POVERTY, AND TORAH STUDY

1. IV:3: The poor man, rich man, and wicked man come to judgment. To the poor man they say, “How come you did not engage in Torah-study?”

XVI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:8

A. HE CAME OVER TO HIS BULLOCK. NOW HIS BULLOCK WAS SET BETWEEN THE PORCH AND THE ALTAR.

1. I:1: From what authority have you heard the statement that the area between the hall and the altar was classified as “north”?

B. ITS HEAD WAS TO THE SOUTH AND ITS FACE TO THE WEST. AND THE PRIEST STANDS AT THE EAST, WITH HIS FACE TO THE WEST:

1. II:1: How is this to be imagined?

C. AND HE PUTS HIS TWO HANDS ON IT:

1. III:1: Tannaite complement: How does one place hands on the head of an offering of the highest grade of sanctity?

D. AND STATES THE CONFESSION. AND THUS DID HE SAY, “O LORD, I HAVE COMMITTED INIQUITY, TRANSGRESSED, AND SINNED BEFORE YOU, I AND MY HOUSE. O LORD, FORGIVE THE INIQUITIES, TRANSGRESSIONS, AND SINS, WHICH I HAVE DONE BY COMMITTING INIQUITY, TRANSGRESSION, AND SIN BEFORE YOU, I AND MY HOUSE. 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 OF YOUR SINS SHALL YOU BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD (LEV. 16:30).”

1. IV:1: Tannaite complement: How does he recite the confession?

a. IV:2: Illustrative case.

2. IV:3: Tannaite complement: atonement comes about through the confession. “And he shall make atonement” (Lev. 16:11) — it is concerning atonement expressed in words that Scripture speaks.

3. IV:4: And how do we know that the confession commences with the word, “O”?

4. IV:5: And how do we know that the confession makes use of the name of God?

a. IV:6: Secondary analysis of the foregoing: Now there is no problem understanding by we do not derive the rule governing Horeb from the case of the heifer the neck of which is to be broken, since what was was and the analogy of the latter case is simply irrelevant. But should not the procedure governing the sacrifice of the heifer the neck of which is to be broken not be conducted in accord with the analogy provided by the conduct of atonement at Horeb?

E. AND THEY RESPOND TO HIM, “BLESSED IS THE NAME OF THE GLORY OF HIS KINGDOM FOREVER AND EVER.”

1. V:1: Rabbi says, “‘For I will praise the name of the Lord, ascribe greatness to our God’ (Deu. 32: 3) — said Moses to Israel, ‘When I mention the name of the Holy One, blessed be he, you ‘ascribe greatness to our God.’”

XVII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:9-10

A. HE CAME TO THE EAST SIDE OF THE COURTYARD, TO THE NORTH OF THE ALTAR:

1. I:1: since the passage refers to “the north of the altar,” it must follow that the altar does not stand in the northern area of the courtyard so no part of the altar extended into the northern half of the court. Then who is the authority behind this passage? It is R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

B. WITH THE PREFECT AT HIS RIGHT HAND AND THE HEAD OF THE FATHER’S HOUSE AT THE LEFT. THERE WERE TWO GOATS.

1. II:1: Said R. Judah, “He who walks at the right hand of his master is a boor.”

C. THERE ALSO WAS A BOX WITH TWO LOTS.

THEY USED TO BE A BOXWOOD, BUT BEN GAMLA MADE THEM OF GOLD. CONSEQUENTLY HE WAS REMEMBERED WITH HONOR.

1. III:1: Tannaite complement on lot-casting.

D. BEN QATIN MADE TWELVE STOPCOCKS FOR THE LAVER, WHICH HAD HAD ONLY TWO.

1. IV:1: Ben Qatin made twelve spouts for the laver so that his twelve brothers, the priests, who are taken up with the daily whole offering, may at simultaneously wash their hands and feet.

E. AND HE TOO MADE A MECHANISM FOR THE LAVER, SO ITS WATER SHOULD NOT BE INVALIDATED BY BEING KEPT OVERNIGHT.

1. V:1: What sort of mechanism was it?

F. KING MONOBASES HAD HANDLES MADE OF GOLD FOR ALL THE VESSELS USED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

1. VI:1: Why didn’t he make the utensils themselves out of gold?

G. HELENE, HIS MOTHER, SET A GOLDEN CANDLESTICK OVER THE DOOR OF THE SANCTUARY.

1. VII:1: Helene, his mother, set a gold candlestick over the door to the sanctuary. She also made a golden tablet on which was written the pericope of the accused wife, so that when the sun rises, sparks of golden light sparkle forth from it, so people know that the sun is rising.

H. SHE ALSO MADE A GOLDEN TABLET, ON WHICH WAS WRITTEN THE PERICOPE OF THE ACCUSED WIFE.

1. VIII:1: That fact yields the inference that one may write a scroll for a child for purposes of instructional exercise.

I. AS TO NICANOR, MIRACLES WERE DONE AT HIS DOORS. AND THEY REMEMBERED HIM WITH HONOR,

1. IX:1: Tannaite complement: Now what is the miracle which was done with them?

XVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 3:11

A. BUT THESE WERE REMEMBERED DISHONORABLY: THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD OF GARMU DID NOT WANT TO TEACH OTHERS HOW TO MAKE THE SHOW BREAD.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement on this theme.

B. THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD OF ABTINAS DID NOT WANT TO TEACH OTHERS HOW TO MAKE THE INCENSE.

1. II:1: Tannaite complement on this theme.

2. II:2: More of the same. Said R. Ishmael, "Once I was talking on the way and I came across one of the children of their children..."

3. II:3: Said R. 'Aqiba, "Simeon b. Luga told me, 'A certain child of the sons of their sons and I were gathering grass in the field. Then I saw him laugh and cry..."

C. HYGRAS B. LEVI KNEW A LESSON OF SINGING BUT DID NOT WANT TO TEACH IT TO ANYONE ELSE.

1. III:1: Tannaite complement on this theme.

D. BEN QAMSAR DID NOT WANT TO TEACH OTHERS HOW TO WRITE.

1. IV:1: Tannaite complement on this theme.

E. CONCERNING THE FIRST ONES LISTED IS STATED THE FOLLOWING VERSE: "THE MEMORY OF THE JUST IS BLESSED" (PRO. 10: 7). AND CONCERNING THESE LATTER ONES IS STATED THE FOLLOWING VERSE: "BUT THE NAME OF THE WICKED SHALL ROT."

1. V:1: What is the meaning of the phrase, "But the name of the wicked shall rot"?

F. AN APPENDIX ON THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED

1. V:2: A righteous man is remembered on his own account, but a wicked one, on account of his buddies.

2. V:3: What is the source of this statement that rabbis say, 'The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing'?"

3. V:4: Eleazar: There was a righteous man who lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their example, and a wicked man who lived between two righteous men and did not learn from their example.
4. V:5: Eleazar: Out of the blessing that a righteous man gives you can infer the curse for the wicked, and from the curse that a wicked man gives you may infer the blessing for the righteous.
5. V:6: Eleazar: Even on account of a single righteous man is the world created.
6. V:7: Eleazar: Whoever forgets a single matter of what he has learned brings about exile for his children.
7. V:8: R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan: a righteous man does not take his leave from the world before another righteous man like him is created.
8. V:9: R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan: The Holy One, blessed be he, saw that the righteous are few. He went and planted some of them in every generation
9. V:10: R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan: Even for the sake of a single righteous man the world endures.
10. V:11: R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan: When a man has lived out the better part of his years and has not sinned, he will not likely sin again.
11. V:12: R. Simeon b. Laqish: If someone comes to make himself unclean, they open the way to him, but if he comes to purify himself, they assist him.
12. V:13: A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael, Transgression dulls the heart of man.
13. V:14: Tannaite statement: if a person makes himself a bit unclean, he is made very unclean.
14. V:15: Tannaite statement: If someone sanctifies himself a bit, he is made abundantly sanctified

XIX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 4:1

A. HE SHOOK THE BOX WITH THE LOTS AND BROUGHT UP THE TWO LOTS.

1. I:1: Why was it necessary for him to shake the box with the lots?
2. I:2: The box was made of wood, and it was secular, and it could hold no more than the two hands at the mouth.

B. ON ONE WAS WRITTEN, “FOR THE LORD,” AND ON ONE WAS WRITTEN, “FOR AZAZEL.” THE PREFECT WAS AT HIS RIGHT, AND THE HEAD OF THE MINISTERING FAMILY AT HIS LEFT. IF THE LOT “FOR THE LORD” CAME UP IN HIS RIGHT HAND, THE PREFECT SAYS TO HIM, “MY LORD, HIGH PRIEST, RAISE UP YOUR RIGHT HAND.” IF THE ONE “FOR THE LORD” CAME UP IN HIS LEFT HAND, THE HEAD OF THE MINISTERING FAMILY SAYS TO HIM, “MY LORD, HIGH PRIEST, RAISE UP YOUR LEFT HAND.”

1. II:1: Our Mishnah-passage is not in accord with the Tannaite authority behind the following statement: “The prefect of the priests and the high priest put their hands into the box. If the lot “for the Lord” comes up in the hand of the high

priest, then the prefect of the high priest says to him, ‘My Lord, High Priest, raise up your right hand,’ and if it comes up in the right hand of the prefect of the priests, the head of the court says to the high priest, ‘Say your word’ “a sin offering for the Lord”.”

2. II:2: And who is that Tannaite authority the one behind our anonymous Mishnah-paragraph, who differs from R. Judah?

C. ANTHOLOGY ON SIMEON THE RIGHTEOUS

1. II:3: Throughout the forty years that Simeon the Righteous serves as high priest, the lot would always come up in the right hand. From that time onward, sometimes it would come up in the right hand, sometimes it would come up in the left hand.

2. II:4: In the year in which Simeon the Righteous died, he said to them that in that year he would die. “Every Day of Atonement, appears to me an old man dressed in white and cloaked in white, who enters with me and goes forth with me to and from the Holy of Holies, while this year an old man appeared to me dressed in black and cloaked in black, who went in with me but did not come out with me.”

3. II:5: Forty years before the destruction of the sanctuary, the lot did not come up in the right hand, and the thread of crimson never turned white, and the westernmost light never shone, and the doors of the courtyard would open by themselves.

a. II:6: Gloss on the foregoing.

D. HE PUT THEM ON THE TWO GOATS AND SAYS, “FOR THE LORD, A SIN OFFERING.” R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “HE DID NOT HAVE TO SAY, ‘SIN OFFERING,’ BUT ONLY ‘FOR THE LORD.’” AND THEY RESPOND TO HIM, “BLESSED IS THE NAME OF THE GLORY OF HIS KINGDOM FOREVER AND EVER.”

1. III:1: Ten times that day he expresses the Divine Name, three in the first confession, three in the second confession, three in connection with the he-goat that is sent away, and one in connection with the lots.

E. RULES GOVERNING THE RITE OF DRAWING LOTS FOR THE GOATS: IS CASTING LOTS ESSENTIAL TO THE RITE?

1. III:2: Taking up a lot from the box is essential to the rite, but putting it on the bullock’s head is not essential to the rite. Vs. Even taking up the lot is not essential to the rite.

a. III:3: An issue that is implicit in a subsidiary component of the foregoing, namely: The status of the two birds presented for bird offerings one for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering is articulated only either at the time that the owner purchases the fowl or at the time that the priest prepares the offering.

l. III:4: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

XX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 4:2

A. HE TIED A CRIMSON THREAD ON THE HEAD OF THE GOAT WHICH WAS TO BE SENT FORTH, AND SET IT UP TOWARDS THE WAY BY WHICH IT WOULD BE SENT OUT.

AND ON THAT WHICH WAS TO BE SLAUGHTERED HE TIED A CRIMSON THREAD AT THE PLACE AT WHICH THE ACT OF SLAUGHTER WOULD BE MADE (THE THROAT).

1. I:1: The question was raised: does the language, “And on that which was to be slaughtered he tied a crimson thread at the place at which the act of slaughter would be made,” refer to the tying of the red thread or to the placing of the animal?

B. THREE OFFERINGS THAT INVOLVE THREAD: THE GOAT THAT IS SENT AWAY, THE RED COW, AND THE PURIFICATION-RITE OF THE PERSON AFFLICTED WITH THE SKIN-AILMENT. AN ANTHOLOGY

1. I:2: Said R. Isaac, “I have heard two threads, one concerning the red cow that is burned to yield purification-ashes in line with Num. 19, the other concerning the he-goat that is sent forth. One requires a thread of specified length, the other not. But I don’t know which of the offerings requires the specified length of thread, which not.”

a. I:3: Amplification of a piece of information used in the foregoing.

2. I:4: Restatement of Isaac’s statement, I:2, in other language. When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan said, I have heard traditions concerning three threads, one assigned to the red cow, one assigned to the goat that is to be sent forth, and one assigned to the person who is healed from the skin ailment of Lev. 13-14....

3. I:5: Further consideration of the issue raised by Isaac. Said R. Yohanan, R. Simeon b. Halafta and rabbis differ in the matter of the red cow. One said it is to have the weight of ten zuz, the other said it should have the weight of a shekel.

4. I:6: Said R. Isaac, “I heard rulings concerning two acts of slaughter, one that of the red cow, the other concerning his bullock the high priest’s, one validly done by a non-priest, the other invalidly done by a none priest, but I don’t know which is which.”

a. I:7: Continuation of the foregoing: As to the slaughter of the red cow by a non-priest — R. Ammi said, “The act is valid.” And R. Isaac Nappaha said, “It is invalid.”

5. I:8: In support of the position of Rab “The red cow — his act is invalid,” objected R. Joshua bar Abba.

6. I:9: In the entire section pertaining to the red heifer there are passages that bear the inference of an exception from what is implied in the preceding passage, and there are texts that stand independent of the implications of the context, fore or aft.

a. I:10: Illustration of I:9. “And you shall give it to Eleazar the priest” (Num. 19: 3) — it is assigned to Eleazar the priest, but those that are offered in generations to come do not have to be assigned to Eleazar the priest.

- b.** I:11: Illustration of I:9. “And he shall bring it forth” (Num. 19: 3) — that one should not bring forth another with it.
- c.** I:12: Illustration of I:9. “And he shall slay it” (Num. 19: 3) — that he should not slaughter any other animal with it.
- d.** I:13: Illustration of I:9. “Before him” (Num. 19: 3) — In Rab’s view, it means that he should not become inattentive in regard to it.
- e.** I:14: Illustration of I:9. “And Eleazar the priest shall take of its blood with his finger” (Num. 19: 4) — In Samuel’s view, this is so as to revert the rite to Eleazar a non-priest having slaughtered the animal.
- f.** I:15: Illustration of I:9. “And the priest shall take cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet” (Num. 19: 4) — In Samuel’s view, it means that even a common priest may do so.
- g.** I:16: Illustration of I:9. “Then the priest shall wash his clothes” (Lev. 19: 7) — in his priestly garments.
- h.** I:17: Illustration of I:9. “And the priest shall be unclean until evening” (Lev. 19: 7) — he shall be in his priestly garments, in in generations to come.
- i.** I:18: Illustration of I:9. “And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and lay them up” (Num. 19: 9) — “a man” — that validates participate by a non-priest. “...that is clean” — that validates a woman. “...and lay them up” — it must then be someone with sufficient capacity for understanding to lay them up, excluding one who is dead and dumb, an idiot, or a minor, who do not have sufficient understanding to lay them up.
- j.** I:19: Illustration of I:9. “And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean” (Num. 19:19) “clean” implies that he was unclean before. That indicates that a person who has undergone the rites of purification and awaits sunset for the completion of the -process is valid to officiate at the burning of the red cow.
- l.** I:20: Amplification of a detail in the foregoing: A Tannaite authority repeated as a rule in the presence of R. Yohanan, “All acts of slaughter performed by a non-priest are valid except for one pertaining to the red cow.”

C. AND HE CAME TO HIS BULLOCK A SECOND TIME AND PUT HIS TWO HANDS ON IT AND MADE THE CONFESSION. AND THUS DID HE SAY, “O LORD, I HAVE COMMITTED INIQUITY, TRANSGRESSED, AND SINNED BEFORE YOU, I AND MY HOUSE AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, YOUR HOLY PEOPLE.

O LORD, FORGIVE, I PRAY, THE INIQUITIES, TRANSGRESSIONS, AND SINS WHICH I HAVE COMMITTED, TRANSGRESSED, AND SINNED BEFORE YOU, I, MY HOUSE, AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, YOUR HOLY PEOPLE, ‘AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES, YOUR SERVANT, FOR ON THIS DAY SHALL ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU TO CLEANSE YOU. FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YOU BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD’ (LEV. 16:30).” AND THEY RESPONDED TO HIM, “BLESSED IS THE NAME OF THE GLORY OF HIS KINGDOM FOREVER AND EVER.”

1. II:1: What differentiates the first confession, in which he did not say, “And the children of Aaron, your holy people,” from the second confession, in which he did say, “And the children of Aaron, your holy people”?

XXI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 4:3-6

A. HE SLAUGHTERED IT AND RECEIVED ITS BLOOD IN A BASIN. HE HANDED IT OVER TO HIM WHO WOULD STIR IT WHILE STANDING ON THE FOURTH TERRACE OF THE SANCTUARY SO THAT IT WOULD NOT CONGEAL.

1. I:1: But isn't it written in Scripture, “And no man shall be in the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:17)? How then could the priest stir the blood on the fourth terrace in the sanctuary?

a. I:2: Exegesis of Lev. 16:17. “And no man shall be in the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:17) — Might one suppose, not even in the Temple court? Scripture states, “in the tent of meeting.”

b. I:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

I. I:4: Gloss of a detail of I:2. The master has said: I know only that that rule applies in the time of burning the incense. What is it that implies that rule?

II. I:5: Extension of the foregoing.

A. I:6: Gloss of a detail of I:5. Scriptural foundations therefor.

B. I:7: Further gloss of the basic premise of I:5.

B. HE TOOK THE FIRE PAN AND WENT UP TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR. HE CLEARED OFF COALS TO EITHER SIDE AND SCOOPED UP GLOWING CINDERS FROM BELOW. THEN HE CAME DOWN AND SET IT DOWN ON THE FOURTH TERRACE OF THE COURTYARD.

EVERY DAY HE WOULD SCOOP OUT THE CINDERS WITH A SILVER FIRE PAN AND EMPTY THEM INTO A GOLDEN ONE.

1. II:1: How come? The Torah took into consideration the capital available to Israel.

C. BUT TODAY HE WOULD CLEAR OUT THE COALS IN A GOLD ONE, AND IN THAT SAME ONE HE WOULD BRING THE CINDERS INTO THE INNER SANCTUARY.

1. III:1: How come? So as not to fatigue the high priest.

D. ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD CLEAR OUT CINDERS WITH ONE HOLDING FOUR QABS AND EMPTY THAT INTO ONE HOLDING THREE QABS. BUT TODAY HE WOULD CLEAR THEM OUT WITH ONE HOLDING THREE QABS, AND IN THAT SAME ONE HE WOULD BRING THE CINDERS INTO THE INNER SANCTUARY. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “EVERY DAY HE WOULD CLEAR THE CINDERS OUT IN ONE HOLDING A SEAH AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE HOLDING THREE QABS. BUT TODAY HE WOULD CLEAR THE CINDERS IN ONE HOLDING THREE QABS, AND IN THAT SAME ONE HE WOULD BRING THE CINDERS IN.”

1. IV:1: One qab of the embers was scattered when the priest emptied the coal pan containing four qabs into one containing only three, so he swept the scattered embers into the channel. Analysis of Tannaite versions of rules on the topic.

E. EVERY DAY IT WAS HEAVY BUT TODAY IT WAS LIGHT.

1. V:1: Every day it was thick, but today it was thin.

F. EVERY DAY ITS HANDLE WAS SHORT. BUT TODAY IT WAS LONG.

1. VI:1: How come? So that the arm of the high priest might support it.

**G. “EVERY DAY IT WAS OF YELLOW GOLD, BUT TODAY IT WAS OF RED GOLD,”
THE WORDS OF R. MENAHEM.**

1. VII:1: There are seven kinds of gold to which Scripture refers.

**H. EVERY DAY ONE WOULD OFFER UP HALF A MANEH OF INCENSE AT DAWN AND
HALF AT DUSK. BUT TODAY HE WOULD ADD HIS TWO HANDFULS OF INCENSE.
EVERY DAY IT WAS FINE. BUT TODAY IT WAS THE FINEST OF THE FINE.**

1. VIII:1: Tannaite complement: Since Scripture states, “And you shall beat some of it very small” (Exo. 30:36), why was it necessary to say, “beaten small” (Lev. 16:12)?

**I. EVERY DAY THE PRIESTS GO UP ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE RAMP AND GO DOWN
ON THE WEST.**

1. IX:1: It is because a master has said, “Every turn that you make in the Temple must be to the right, the east.”

**J. BUT TODAY THE HIGH PRIEST GOES UP RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THE RAMP AND
GOES DOWN RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE. R. JUDAH SAYS, “AT ALL TIMES THE HIGH
PRIEST GOES UP IN THE MIDDLE AND GOES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE.”**

1. X:1: How come?

**K. EVERY DAY THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIES HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM THE
LAVER. TODAY HE DOES IT FROM A GOLDEN JUG. R. JUDAH SAYS, “AT ALL TIMES
THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIES HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM A GOLDEN JUG.”**

1. XI:1: How come?

**L. “EVERY DAY THERE WERE FOUR STACKS OF WOOD THERE. BUT TODAY THERE
WERE FIVE,” THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “EVERY DAY THERE WERE
THREE, BUT TODAY THERE WERE FOUL.” R. JUDAH SAYS, “EVERY DAY THERE
WERE TWO. BUT TODAY THERE WERE THREE.”**

1. XII:1: Tannaite complement: All parties concur concerning two.

a. XII:2: What is the basis in Scripture for that concurrence?

b. XII:3: Further Scriptural proof for proposition set forth at XII:1.

c. XII:4: In any event all, parties concur that one adds an additional pile on that day. How in Scripture do they know that fact?

d. XII:5: What does “Fire shall be kept burning upon the altar continually” (Lev. 6: 6) mean?

e. XII:6: Said R. Eleazar in the name of Bar Qappara, “R. Meir used to say, ‘For any of the limbs of the daily whole offering that were left over a special wood pile is arranged, even on the Sabbath.’” Further exposition of XII:1.

M. BUT TODAY THERE WERE FIVE:

1. XIII:1: Said R. Aha bar Jacob, “It was necessary to add that detail to Meir’s formulation of the rule.”

2. XIII:2: And when Bar Qappara says, “R. Meir used to say, ‘For any of the limbs of the daily whole offering that were left over a special wood pile is arranged, even on the Sabbath,’” he differs from R. Huna, who has said, “The continual offering suspends the Sabbath only at its beginning but not at its end.”

a. XIII:3: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

3. XIII:4: With reference to “Fire shall be kept burning upon the outer altar continually, it shall not go out” (Lev. 6: 6), He who puts out the fire on the fire pan or the candelabrum, Abbaye said, “He is liable.” And Raba said, “He is exempt.”

XXII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:1A-E

A. THEY BROUGHT THE LADLE AND FIRE PAN OUT TO HIM.

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: he took the pan and went up to the top of the altar, took out the burning coals, and went down.

B. AND HE TOOK FROM THE PAN HANDFUL OF INCENSE AND PUT THE INCENSE INTO THE LADLE — A LARGE ONE IN ACCORD WITH THE LARGE SIZE OF HIS HAND, OR A SMALL ONE IN ACCORD WITH THE SMALL SIZE OF HIS HAND, SUCH WAS THE REQUIRED MEASURE OF THE LADLE.

1. II:1: As to the ladle, what purpose did it serve on the Day of Atonement? The All-Merciful has said, “And he shall take his hands full and bring it” (Lev. 16:12). It is because no other procedure was possible.

C. HE TOOK THE FIRE PAN IN HIS RIGHT HAND AND THE LADLE IN HIS LEFT.

1. III:1: Then “the native would be in the earth and the stranger in the highest heavens”! The one the ladle is small, and the coal pan is large so the right hand gets the heavier weight, left-handedness being a disqualification for this office.

a. III:2: Amplification of a detail introduced in the foregoing composition.

b. III:3: Continuation of the amplification on the theme tangential to III:1.

c. III:4: As above.

2. III:5: “With his fist” (Lev. 6: 8) — this means he must not make a measure serve for his fistful but must take the fistful as a random sample. The question was raised: What is the rule about making a measure to serve for his handfuls?

3. III:6: Tannaite complement: “And he shall take out a handful” (Lev. 2: 2) exegesis.

4. III:7: How about that which is between the fingers of his fist — is it part of the fistful that is offered on the altar or is it remnant that is assigned to the priests. Said R. Pappa, “As to that which is inside, there is no question, it belongs to the fistful without a doubt. About that which is outside, there also is no problem. It belongs to the residue. The issue concerns only portions that are in-between the fingers. What about these?”

5. III:8: Another question raised by Pappa: How about the middle portions in between in connection with the two handfuls of the Day of Atonement?

6. III:9: Another question raised by Pappa: If the priest took the handful with his fingertips, or with the sides of his hands, or from below upwards Cashdan: he cupped his hand and pressed it, palm upwards, into the flour and thus took a handful — what is the law?

7. III:10: Another question raised by Pappa: If the priest filled his hands with his fingertips, or if he filled the hands one by one and then brought them together — what is the law?

8. III:11: Another question raised by Pappa: If the priest stuck the handful to the side of the utensil rather than pouring it to the bottom — what is the law? Do we require putting it inside the utensil and that condition has been met here, or must it be put down inside of the utensil, which condition has not been met here?

9. III:12: If the priest turned the utensil upside down and put the handful of meal on the bottom of the utensil, what is the law? Do we require putting it inside the utensil and that condition has been met here, or must the rite be done in the correct manner, and that condition has not been met here?

10. III:13: Another question raised by Pappa: As to the handfuls, are they to be heaped up or leveled?

11. III:14: Excursus on the critical importance of the use of utensils to collect materia sacra, in this case, a bowl to collect the blood, rather than the incense, leading to the problem that forms the center of interest: R. Papa raised this question: If the incense was scattered from his handfuls, what is the rule?

12. III:15: R. Pappa raised this question: If the priest while taking the handfuls of incense formed an improper intention e.g., to eat the meat after the proper time or to offer up the incense tomorrow instead of today, what is the law?

13. III:16: R. Pappa raised this question: If the priest formed an improper intentionality during the removal of the coals for the incense, what is the result?

14. III:17: The question was addressed to R. Sheshet: If one conveyed the blood to the altar in the left hand, what is the law since the rites in general must be done with the right hand? Reply: He took the fire pan in his right hand and the ladle in his left.

15. III:18: R. Pappa raised this question: If one's fellow took the handful and put it into his hands, what is the law? We require handfuls and lo, that condition has been met, or perhaps the issue is that he take and bring the incense, and lo, that condition has not been met?

a. III:19: Secondary expansion of the problem: R. Joshua b. Levi raised the question: If one took the handful but died suddenly, what is the law concerning another priest's taking over his handful? Said R. Pappa, If it is the rule that he takes the handful first and then has to take it again into the holy of holies, then his fellow may enter with his handful, because the handful is still the same; but if the rule is that he takes the handfuls once but does not take them again, your question becomes pertinent."

b. III:20: Continuation of the inquiry into the substitution of one priest for another in the continuation of the performance of a rite: if one priest slew the animal but died, may another priest take the blood into the altar?

I. III:21: Gloss of a tangential detail in the foregoing.

II. III:22: As above.

III. III:23: Reverting to the issue of III:21.

XXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:1F-I

A. HE THEN WALKED THROUGH THE SANCTUARY UNTIL HE CAME TO THE SPACE BETWEEN THE TWO VEILS WHICH SEPARATE THE HOLY PLACE FROM THE MOST HOLY PLACE, AND THE SPACE BETWEEN THEM WAS A CUBIT. R. YOSÉ SAYS, "THERE WAS ONLY A SINGLE VEIL THERE ALONE, SINCE IT SAYS, AND THE VEIL SHALL DIVIDE FOR YOU BETWEEN THE HOLY PLACE AND THE MOST HOLY PLACE (EXO. 26:33)."

1. I:1: Has R. Yosé given rabbis a good answer? Rabbis will say to you, those matters discussed in Exodus related to the tabernacle in the wilderness, but as to the second sanctuary, since there was no partition wall such as had been in the first Temple, sages were unclear as to whether its status as to sanctification was comparable to the inner space or the outer space, so they made two curtains.

2. I:2: Tannaite complement: Between the altar and the candelabrum he would walk vs. it was between the table and the altar.

3. I:3: Continuing No. 1: Said R. Nathan, "As to the cubit of partition, sages reached no decision whether it was assigned the status as to sanctification that adhered to the inner space, that of the Holy of Holies, or to that of the outer space, that of the Holy Place."

XXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:1K-Q

A. THE OUTER ONE WAS LOOPED UP AT THE SOUTH, AND THE INNER ONE AT THE NORTH. HE WALKS BETWEEN THEM UNTIL HE REACHES THE NORTHERN SIDE.

WHEN HE HAS REACHED THE NORTHERN SIDE, HE TURNS AROUND TOWARD THE SOUTH, WALKS ALONG WITH THE CURTAIN AT HIS LEFT UNTIL HE HAS REACHED THE ARK.

1. I:1: With what situation do we deal here? Should we say it is with the first sanctuary? But then were their curtains in the first sanctuary? We have already

established that there was no curtain. But then is reference made to the second sanctuary? Then was there an ark there?

B. WHEN HE HAS REACHED THE ARK, HE PLACES THE FIRE PAN BETWEEN THE TWO BARS. HE PILED UP THE INCENSE ON THE COALS, SO THAT THE WHOLE HOUSE WAS FILLED WITH SMOKE.

1. II:1: According to which authority have we learned the Mishnah-formulation at hand? It is in accord with the one who maintains that he heaped up the incense.

2. II:2: Tannaite complement: “And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord” (Lev. 16:13) — It was so that he should not not arrange it outside and bring it inside. That was to refute the position of the Sadducees, who say that he should burn the incense while he is still outside.

a. II:3: Gloss to a detail tangential to the foregoing.

b. II:4: Continuation of the exegesis critical to the foregoing.

l. II:5: Gloss on the exegesis presented in the foregoing.

C. HE CAME OUT, GOING ALONG BY THE WAY BY WHICH HE HAD GONE IN.

1. III:1: What is the source in Scripture for this statement?

a. III:2: Illustration of the foregoing.

l. III:3: Expansion on the theme of the foregoing, now to other contexts altogether.

A. III:4: Illustration of foregoing.

D. AND HE SAID A SHORT PRAYER IN THE OUTER AREA. HE DID NOT PROLONG HIS PRAYER, SO AS NOT TO FRIGHTEN THE ISRAELITES.

1. IV:1: What is the short prayer that he says?

a. IV:2: Secondary expansion on a tangential point of the foregoing.

2. IV:2: Illustrative case.

XXV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:2-4

A. ONCE THE ARK WAS TAKEN AWAY, THERE REMAINED A STONE FROM THE DAYS OF THE EARLIER PROPHETS:

1. I:1: The language of the Tannaite formulation is not, once the ark was hidden away, but rather, once the ark was taken away. Our Mishnah-statement been formulated in accord with him who has said, The ark went into exile to Babylonia.

2. I:2: Continuation of the foregoing. Said R. Nahman, “A Tannaite statement: And sages say, ‘The ark was hidden away in the chamber of the wood shed.’”

a. I:3: Exegesis of a proof-text important at I:1.

b. I:4: Secondary continuation of the theme of the foregoing.

B. ...CALLED SHETIYYAH.

IT WAS THREE FINGERBREADTHS HIGH. AND ON IT DID HE PUT THE FIRE PAN.

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: From it the world was created T. Kip. 2:14C. Our Mishnah-teaching accords with him who has said, Out of Zion the world was created.

2. II:2: The same proposition.

C. HE TOOK THE BLOOD FROM THE ONE WHO HAD BEEN STIRRING IT. HE AGAIN WENT INTO THE PLACE INTO WHICH HE HAD ENTERED AND AGAIN STOOD ON THE PLACE ON WHICH HE HAD STOOD. THEN HE SPRINKLED SOME OF THE BLOOD, ONE TIME UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID NOT INTENTIONALLY TOSS IT UPWARDS OR DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID IT LIKE ONE WHO CRACKS A WHIP.

1. III:1: What is the meaning of like one who cracks a whip?

2. III:2: When he sprinkled, he did not sprinkle on the ark cover but against its thickness. And when he is to sprinkle upwards, he first turns his hand down, and when he is to sprinkle downwards, he first turns his hand up. What is the source in Scripture for this rule? Said Scripture, ‘..and sprinkle the blood of the he-goat upon the ark cover and before the ark cover’ (Lev. 16:15).

3. III:3: Further Tannaite exegesis of the same proof-text. “..and sprinkle the blood of the he-goat upon the ark cover and before the ark cover” (Lev. 16:15) — On this basis we learn how often the he-goats blood is to be sprinkled upwards, which is one time. But how many times the blood of the he-goat is to be sprinkled downward I do not know.

D. IT WAS THREE FINGERBREATHS HIGH. AND ON IT DID HE PUT THE FIRE PAN.

AND THUS DID HE COUNT: “ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO, ONE AND THREE, ONE AND FOUR, ONE AND FIVE, ONE AND SIX, ONE AND SEVEN.”

1. IV:1: “...’One, one and one, one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven,’” the words of R. Meir. R. Judah says, “‘One, one and one, two and one, three and one, four and one, five and one, six and one, seven and one.’”

E. HE WENT OUT AND HE SET DOWN THE BOWL OF BLOOD ON THE GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY.

1. V:1: Dispute on the number of stands that there were, between this clause and Judah’s statement in the next, is placed into a larger context, namely: There we have learned as a Tannaite teaching: R. Judah says, “There was no shofar chest for bird offerings, because of the possibility of confusion.” What is the meaning of the phrase, because of the possibility of confusion? Said R. Joseph, “Because of the possibility of confusing funds given in fulfillment of an obligation with those given as a freewill offering.” Said to him Abbayye, “So why not make two chests and write on them, this is for obligatory offerings, that is for votive offerings?” R. Judah does not deem inscriptions of that sort to make much difference, for we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, “There was only one stand there alone. He took the blood of the bullock and set down the blood of the goat in its place” M. 5:4I.

a. V:2: Illustrative case.

F. THEY BROUGHT HIM THE GOAT. HE SLAUGHTERED IT AND RECEIVED ITS BLOOD IN A BASIN. HE WENT INTO THAT SAME PLACE INTO WHICH HE HAD ENTERED, AND STOOD ON THAT SAME PLACE ON WHICH HE HAD STOOD. AND HE SPRINKLED SOME OF THE BLOOD, ONE TIME UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID NOT INTENTIONALLY SPRINKLE UPWARDS OR DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID IT LIKE ONE WHO CRACKS A WHIP. AND THUS DID HE COUNT: “ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO,” AND SO FORTH. HE WENT OUT AND HE SET IT ON THE SECOND STAND WHICH WAS IN THE SANCTUARY. R. JUDAH SAYS, “THERE WAS ONLY ONE STAND THERE ALONE. HE TOOK THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK AND SET DOWN THE BLOOD OF THE GOAT IN ITS PLACE.”

AND SPRINKLED SOME OF IT ON THE VEIL TOWARD THE ARK OUTSIDE.

1. VI:1: Tannaite complement: “And so shall he do for the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:16) — Just as he sprinkles the blood of the bullock in the inner sanctum once upward and seven times downward, so must he sprinkle it at the altar outside, and as he sprinkles the blood of the he goat in the inner sanctum once upward and seven times downward, so must he do at the altar outside.

2. VI:2: Continuation of exegesis of the proof-text: “...Who dwells with them in the midst of their uncleanness” (Lev. 16:16) — Even when they are unclean, the Presence of God is with them.

a. VI:3: Disputation-story.

3. VI:4: Reversion to the proof-proposition of VI.1: But may a rule that is inferred by analogy then go and serve as the basis of another rule drawn by analogy.

4. VI:5: When he sprinkles, he does not sprinkle the blood directly upon the curtain but only in its direction.

G. HE SPRINKLED SOME OF THE BLOOD ONE TIME UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID NOT INTENTIONALLY SPRINKLE UPWARDS OR DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID IT LIKE ONE WHO CRACKS A WHIP. AND THUS DID HE COUNT: “ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO,” AND SO FORTH.

HE TOOK THE BLOOD OF THE GOAT AND SET DOWN THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, AND HE SPRINKLED SOME OF IT ON THE VEIL TOWARD THE ARK, ON THE OUTSIDE OF THE VEIL, ONE TIME UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS:

1. VII:1: If the blood of the goat was mixed up with the blood of the bullock — said Raba, ““He puts one sprinkling above and seven below the red line around the altar, and that serves for both.”

2. VII:2: If in the process of sprinkling the final sprinklings of blood the blood of one was mixed up with the blood of the other after the upward sprinkling with the blood of the bullock was complete R. Pappa in the presence of Raba contemplated saying, “He puts seven below for the sake of the bullock and for the sake of the he-goat, and then he goes and puts one above the line for the sake of the he-goat.”

3. VII:3: If the cups of blood were confused with one another so the priest doesn’t know which has blood of the bullock and which blood of the he-goat (Jung) — he sprinkles the blood and then goes and does it again and then goes and does it a third time.

4. VII:4: If part of the blood was confused for him, but part of the blood was not confused for him — it is obvious that when he sprinkles the blood, he sprinkles that which derives from blood the status of which was certain.

H. BUT HE DID NOT INTENTIONALLY SPRINKLE UPWARDS OR DOWNWARDS. BUT HE DID IT LIKE ONE WHO CRACKS A WHIP. AND THUS DID HE COUNT: “ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO,” AND SO FORTH.

THEN HE EMPTIED THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE GOAT:

1. VIII:1: We have learned the Mishnah-rule in accord with the position of him who has said, they mixed the blood to sprinkle it on the horns of the inner altar. For it has been said: R. Josiah and R. Jonathan — one said, “The blood of the bullock and the he goat is mingled together for sprinkling on the horns.” And the other said, “The blood of the bullock and the he goat is not mingled together for sprinkling on the horns.”

I. AND POURED THE CONTENTS OF THE FULL BASIN INTO THE EMPTY ONE.

1. IX:1: R. Ammi bar Hama asked R. Hisda, “If he put one bowl into another and received the blood that way, what is the upshot? Do we deem something to interpose before something else of its own classification? Or do we not deem one thing to interpose in the case of something else of its own classification?”

2. IX:2: If the priest put bast in the bowl and received the blood with it, what is the rule? Is heterogeneous matter considered interposition or not? Would we reason, it is not considered interposition, since it penetrates the blood? Or perhaps that makes no difference?”

XXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:5-6

A. AND HE WENT OUT TOWARD THE ALTAR WHICH IS BEFORE THE LORD (LEV. 16:18). THIS IS THE GOLDEN ALTAR.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: What is the point of Scripture here? Since we find in the case of the bullock that is presented on account of all transgressions of error in respect to ‘any one of the commandments’ (Lev. 4: 1) that the priest stands outside the altar and, when he sprinkles, sprinkles toward the curtain, one might have supposed that also in this case the rule is the same. So Scripture states, ‘And he went out toward the altar .’ So where had he been prior? He must have been located before the inner side of the altar.

2. I:2: Further exegesis of another clause of the same verse by the same authority.

B. HE BEGAN TO PURIFY THE ALTAR BY SPRINKLING THE BLOOD IN A DOWNWARD GESTURE. FROM WHAT POINT DOES HE START? FROM THE NORTHEASTERN CORNER, THEN TO THE NORTHWESTERN, SOUTHWESTERN, AND SOUTHEASTERN ONES. AT THE PLACE AT WHICH HE BEGINS IN THE PROCESS OF PURIFICATION ON THE OUTER ALTAR, AT THAT POINT DOES HE COMPLETE DOING THE SAME AT THE INNER ALTAR.

1. II:1: Tannaite complement: “He began to purify the altar by sprinkling the blood in a downward gesture. From what point does he start? From the southeastern

corner to the southwestern corner to the northwestern corner to the northeastern corner,” the words of R. Aqiba. Vs. Yosé’s view, given above.

a. II:2: Story illustrating a detail of the foregoing.

C. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “HE STOOD RIGHT WHERE HE WAS AND PURIFIED THE ALTAR BY SPRINKLING THE BLOOD OF PURIFICATION. AND AT EVERY ONE HE SPRINKLED THE HORN FROM BELOW TO ABOVE, EXCEPT FOR THIS ONE WHICH WAS BEFORE HIM, ON WHICH HE WOULD SPRINKLE THE BLOOD FROM ABOVE TO BELOW:”

1. III:1: In accord with which authority does our Mishnah-rule as framed by R. Eliezer concur? It accords with R. Judah.

D. HE TOSSED THE BLOOD HEBREW: PURIFIED ON THE TOP OF THE ALTAR SEVEN TIMES.

1. IV:1: As to the Hebrew word for “tossed the blood,” which uses the consonants for “purify,” what does the word mean?

2. IV:2: Tannaite complement: Hanania says, “He would sprinkle standing on the north side.” R. Yosé says, “He would sprinkle standing on the south side.”

E. THEN DID HE POUR OUT THE RESIDUE OF THE BLOOD ONTO THE WESTERN BASE OF THE OUTER ALTAR.

1. V:1: For said Scripture, “And all the remaining blood of the bullock he shall pour out” (Lev. 4: 7), and when he comes forth from the sanctuary, he hits this side of the altar base first of all.

F. AND THAT THE RESIDUE OF THE BLOOD SPRINKLED ON THE OUTER ALTAR HE POURED OUT ON THE SOUTHERN BASE.

1. VI:1: Tannaite complement: “At the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:30) means, at the southern base of the altar.

2. VI:2: Tannaite complement: Blood that is residue of offerings presented at the inner altar and also blood that is residue of offerings presented at the outer altar are poured out at the western base of the outer altar.

G. THE TWO STREAMS OF BLOOD THEN MINGLED TOGETHER IN THE FLOW OF THE SURROUNDING CHANNEL AND FLOWED DOWN INTO THE QIDRON BROOK. THEY ARE SOLD TO GARDENERS FOR FERTILIZER. AND THE LAW OF SACRILEGE APPLIES TO THEM UNTIL THE SALE.

1. VII:1: Tannaite complement: “The laws of sacrilege apply to the money that is paid for the blood,” the words of R. Meir and R. Simeon. And sages say, “They do not apply.”

XXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 5:7

A. THE ENTIRE RITE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT STATED IN ACCORD WITH ITS PROPER ORDER — IF HE DID ONE PART OF THE RITE BEFORE ITS FELLOW, HE HAS DONE NOTHING WHATSOEVER. IF HE TOOK CARE OF THE BLOOD OF THE GOAT BEFORE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, LET HIM GO AND SPRINKLE SOME OF THE BLOOD OF THE GOAT AFTER HE HAS SPRINKLED THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK. AND IF BEFORE HE HAD COMPLETED THE ACTS OF PLACING THE BLOOD ON THE

INNER ALTAR, THE BLOOD WAS POURED OUT, LET HIM BRING OTHER BLOOD AND GO AND SPRINKLE IT TO BEGIN WITH ON THE INNER ALTAR.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: As to every rite concerning the Day of Atonement that is set forth in a fixed order, if a deed was done prior to its fellow and thus out of order, the priest has done nothing of consequence.

a. I:2: Secondary problem flowing from a tangential point in the foregoing.

2. I:3: If he slaughtered the he-goat before sprinkling the blood of the bullock, he has done nothing. This bears close formal links to the foregoing but refers us back to the Mishnah and so belongs as an independent composition of Mishnah-exegesis.

B. AND SO IS THE RULE IN THE CASE OF THE SANCTUARY, AND SO IN THE CASE OF THE GOLDEN ALTAR. FOR EACH OF THEM CONSTITUTES AN ACT OF ATONEMENT UNTO ITSELF AND NEED NOT BE REPEATED. R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON SAY, “FROM THE PLACE AT WHICH HE BROKE OFF, FROM THERE HE BEGINS ONCE MORE.”

1. II:1: Two Tannaite complements of the debate involving Eleazar and Simeon: exegesis of Lev. 16:33, the second of which is relevant to our Mishnah-rule.

2. II:2: The exegetical foundations of the dispute.

a. II:3: Does the same dispute pertain elsewhere? Comparison of the rule governing the rite of the Day of Atonement in this regard with the rite of purifying the person cleansed of the skin-ailment. It is alleged that there was no dispute concerning the question of whether in that matter one must start again after a service has been performed out of order.

l. II:4: Gloss of a tangential detail in the foregoing.

b. II:5: Does the same dispute pertain elsewhere? A further dispute between Eleazar and Simeon, on the one side, and Meir, on the other, concerning the rite of the leper; this is now on the guilt offering of the leper that was slaughtered for some other than the purpose for which the beast had originally been designated.

l. II:6: Further discussion of the purification rite of the person healed of the skin ailment.

3. II:7: Further clarification of the dispute of the Mishnah: “And all the bullocks and he-goats listed in our Mishnah, in the rites of which the blood was poured out before completing the individual atonement or service and for which substitutes are obligatory impart uncleanness to clothing and are burned in the place of ashes,” the words of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon.

a. II:8: Clarification of a detail of the foregoing.

XXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 6:1

A. THE TWO GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT — THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT CONCERNING THEM IS THAT THE TWO OF THEM BE EQUIVALENT IN APPEARANCE, HEIGHT, AND VALUE, AND THAT THEY BE PURCHASED

SIMULTANEOUSLY. BUT EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE NOT EQUIVALENT IN THESE REGARDS, THEY ARE VALID.

IF ONE PURCHASED ONE THIS DAY AND THE OTHER THE NEXT, THEY ARE VALID.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: “And he shall take...two he-goats” (Lev. 16: 5) — the smallest number of the plural is two, so why does Scripture find it necessary to say, “two”? To indicate that they should be equivalent.

B. 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.

1. II:1: Tannaite complement: 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.” This composite bears a heavy addition of secondary inquiry.

2. II:2: Tannaite complement to the proposition examined at II:1: 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 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.” “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): 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?

C. 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.”

1. III:1: 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.” 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. 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.”

1. IV:1: 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!

2. IV:2: Why in Judah's opinion the beast is left to die: the casting of the lot does not effect the classification of beasts from one year to the next.

XXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 6:2-4

A. 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, 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)." 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."

1. I:1: But he does not make reference to "the children of Aaron, your holy people." Now who is responsible for this formulation of matters?

B. HE GAVE THE SCAPEGOAT OVER TO THE ONE WHO WAS TO LEAD IT OUT.

1. II:1: Tannaite complement."And he shall send it the scapegoat away by the hand of an appointed man" (Lev. 16:12) — "man" serves to validate for participation in the rite even a non-priest, 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."

2. II:2: They asked R. Eliezer, "If the beast fell ill, what is the law as to carrying it on the messenger's shoulder?"

a. II:3: Attached formal continuation, on a different subject.

b. II:4: As above.

l. II:5: Tangential remark on a detail of the foregoing.

C. ALL ARE VALID TO LEAD IT OUT. BUT HIGH PRIESTS MADE IT A PRACTICE OF NOT LETTING ISRAELITES LEAD IT OUT. SAID R. YOSÉ, "M'SH W: ARSELA LED IT OUT, AND HE WAS AN ISRAELITE."

THEY MADE A RAMP FOR IT, ON ACCOUNT OF THE BABYLONIANS, WHO WOULD PULL OUT ITS HAIR: ...AND SAY, "TAKE AND GO, TAKE AND GO."

1. III:1: 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."

XXX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 6:4-6

A. THE EMINENT PEOPLE OF JERUSALEM USED TO ACCOMPANY HIM TO THE FIRST BOOTH.

THERE WERE TEN BOOTHS FROM JERUSALEM TO THE RAVINE, A DISTANCE OF NINETY RIS — SEVEN AND A HALF TO A MILE.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: “There were ten tabernacles within a distance of twelve miles,” the words of R. Meir, etc.

B. AT EACH BOOTH THEY SAY TO HIM, “LO, HERE IS FOOD, HERE IS WATER.”

1. II:1: Tannaite complement: 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.

C. AND THEY ACCOMPANY HIM FROM ONE BOOTH TO THE NEXT, 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.

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.

1. III:1: Why not tie the whole thread to the rock?

2. III:2: Tannaite complement: At first they would tie the crimson thread onto the entrance of the hall 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.

D. AND IT DID NOT REACH HALFWAY DOWN THE MOUNTAIN BEFORE IT BROKE INTO PIECES.

1. IV:1: 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?

2. IV:2: Tannaite complement: “Azazel” — it should be a terrain that is rough and tough.

a. IV:3: Recapitulation of a tangential detail of the foregoing in a Tannaite complement: “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. “...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 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.

E. HE CAME AND SAT HIMSELF DOWN UNDER THE LAST TABERNACLE UNTIL IT GOT DARK.

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.”

1. V:1: Tannaite complement: The one who is to take the goat to the wilderness imparts uncleanness to garments, but the one who sends the messenger away accompanying him on his mission do not impart uncleanness to garments.

XXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 6:7

A. MEANWHILE, THE HIGH PRIEST CAME TO THE BULLOCK AND GOAT WHICH ARE TO BE BURNED. HE TORE THEM OPEN AND REMOVED THEIR INNARDS. HE PUT THEM ONTO A DISH AND BURNED THEM UP ON THE ALTAR.

1. I:1: Is this when he burned them up on the altar?

B. HE THEN TWISTED THE LIMBS OF THE BEASTS ON POLES, AND THEY CARRIED THEM OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING.

1. II:1: It was twisted in the form of net-work.
2. II:2: 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. 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:

1. III:1: Tannaite complement: proof that 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. R. SIMEON SAYS, “ONCE THE FIRE HAS TAKEN HOLD OF THE GREATER PART OF THE BEASTS’ CARCASSES:”

1. IV:1: How does R. Simeon deal with the language, “outside the camp” since he maintains that the garments are made unclean only when the fire has caught hold of the carcass?
2. IV:2: 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.

XXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 6:8

A. THEY SAID TO THE HIGH PRIEST, “THE GOAT HAS REACHED THE WILDERNESS.” NOW HOW DID THEY KNOW THAT THE GOAT HAD COME TO THE WILDERNESS? THEY MADE SENTINEL POSTS, AND WAVED FLAGS, SO THEY MIGHT KNOW THAT THE GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS.

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.”

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, AS IT SAYS, ‘THOUGH YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET, THEY SHALL BE AS WHITE AS SNOW’ (ISA. 1:18).”

1. I:1: Bet Hiddudo is located in the wilderness, and as soon as the he-goat has reached the wilderness, the religious duty concerning the beast has been carried out.”

XXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 7:1-2

A. THE HIGH PRIEST CAME TO READ IN THE WOMEN’S COURT. IF HE WANTED TO READ WHILE WEARING LINEN GARMENTS, HE READS WEARING THEM. IF NOT, HE READS WEARING HIS OWN WHITE VESTMENT:

1. I:1: Since the Tannaite formulation states, his own white vestment, it follows that the act of reading does not constitute a component of the rite. But then it says, If he wanted to read while wearing linen garments, he reads wearing them, yields the inference that the priestly vestments are available for private benefit!

2. I:2: Further discussion of the same proposition. From the statement, But they spread them out, doubled them over, and lay them down under their heads, and cover themselves with their own clothes, it is to be inferred that the priestly vestments are available for private benefit. Said R. Pappa, “Do not say ‘under their heads’ but ‘next to their heads.’”

B. THE BEADLE OF THE COMMUNITY TAKES THE SCROLL OF THE TORAH AND GIVES IT TO THE HEAD OF THE COMMUNITY, AND THE HEAD OF THE COMMUNITY GIVES IT TO THE PREFECT OF THE PRIESTS, AND THE PREFECT GIVES IT TO THE HIGH PRIEST.

1. II:1: That yields the inference, they pay respect to the disciple in the presence of the master.

C. THE HIGH PRIEST RISES AND RECEIVES IT:

1. III:1: Is it then to be inferred that he had been sitting?

a. III:2: Further exegesis of the proof-text tangentially cited in the foregoing, namely, Neh. 8:3ff.

l. III:3: Exegesis of Neh. 9:4.

b. III:4: Continuation of the exegesis of Neh. 8:3.

D. AND READS “AFTER THE DEATH” (LEV. 16), AND “HOWBEIT ON THE TENTH DAY” (LEV. 23:26-32).

1. IV:1: By way of contrast: They skip from place to place in the prophetic lections but not in the Torah lections (M. **Meg. 4:4E**). There is no conflict of rules. The one rule applies where the passage is skipped long enough to cause an interruption to the one who translates from Hebrew to Aramaic, the other where

the passage is not skipped long enough to cause an interruption to the one who translates from Hebrew to Aramaic.

E. THEN HE ROLLS UP THE TORAH AND HOLDS IT TO HIS HEART AND SAYS, “MORE THAN WHAT I HAVE READ OUT BEFORE YOU IS WRITTEN HERE.”

1. V:1: Why so? So as not to bring the scroll of the Torah in disrepute.

F. AND ON THE TENTH (NUM. 29:7-11) WHICH IS IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS HE READS BY HEART.

1. VI:1: But why not leave the scroll rolled up and recite the passage by heart? Why leave the scroll open, if the reader is not going to read from it?

G. THEN HE SAYS EIGHT BLESSINGS OVER IT: “... FOR THE TORAH, ... FOR THE TEMPLE SERVICE, ... FOR THE CONFESSION, ... FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN, ... FOR THE SANCTUARY (BY ITSELF), FOR ISRAEL (BY THEMSELVES), ... AND FOR THE PRIESTS (BY THEMSELVES):”

1. VII:1: They say a blessing for the Torah as they say the blessing in the synagogue, and for the Temple service, for the Thanksgiving, for the forgiveness of sin, as they ordinarily do.

H. AND FOR THE REST OF THE PRAYER:

1. VIII:1: The rest of the Prayer is as follows: petition, song, and beseeching that your people Israel need to be saved.

I. HE WHO CAN SEE THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE IS READING CANNOT SEE THE BULLOCK AND GOAT WHICH ARE BURNED. AND HE WHO CAN SEE THE BULLOCK AND GOAT WHEN THEY ARE BURNED CANNOT SEE THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE IS READING. BUT THIS IS NOT BECAUSE HE IS NOT PERMITTED TO DO SO, BUT BECAUSE IT WAS QUITE A DISTANCE.

AND THE RITES CONCERNING BOTH OF THEM WERE DONE SIMULTANEOUSLY.

1. IX:1: That is self-evident.

XXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 7:3-4

A. IF THE HIGH PRIEST READS THE SCRIPTURES WEARING LINEN GARMENTS, HE (4) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, TOOK THEM OFF, DESCENDED, IMMERSED, CAME UP, AND DRIED OFF. THEY BROUGHT HIM THE GOLDEN GARMENTS. HE PUT THEM ON AND (5) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET.

“THEN HE WENT OUT AND PREPARED HIS RAM AND THE RAM OF THE PEOPLE LEV. 16:24, AND THE SEVEN UNBLEMISHED LAMBS A YEAR OLD NUM. 29:81,” THE WORDS OF R. ELIEZER. R. AQIBA SAYS, “THEY WERE OFFERED WITH THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING MADE AT DAWN. AND THE BULLOCK, BURNT OFFERING, AND GOAT OFFERED OUTSIDE (NUM. 29:11) WERE OFFERED WITH THE DAILY WHOLE OFFERING MADE AT DUSK.”

1. I:1: The question was raised: what is the sense of the statement, They were offered with the daily whole offering made at dawn, while the bullock, burnt offering, and goat offered outside (Num. 29:11) were offered with the daily whole offering made at dusk? Or perhaps this is the sense of his statement: with the daily

whole offering made at dawn they were offered, and the bullock burnt offering with them, while the goat that was offered outside was offered with the daily whole offering made at dusk? Further, when, in R. Eliezer's view, who omits reference to it, is the bullock for the whole offering sacrificed? And, further, according to both R. Eliezer and R. Aqiba, when are the sacrificial portions of the sin offering offered up in smoke?

2. I:2: R. Judah says in Aqiba's name, "One of the seven lambs is offered up with the whole offering presented at dawn, and six are with the whole offering at twilight." R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says in his name, "Six of them are offered with the daily whole offering at dawn, and one with the daily whole offering at twilight."

3. I:3: All parties concur in any event that there was only one ram offered in behalf of the community on the Day of Atonement. In accord with whose view is that position reached?

B. HE (6) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET AND TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES AND WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED AND CAME UP AND DRIED OFF. THEY BROUGHT HIM WHITE GARMENTS, AND HE PUT THEM ON, AND (7) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET. HE WENT IN TO BRING OUT THE LADLE AND FIRE PAN. HE (8) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES, WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED, CAME UP AND DRIED OFF. THEY BROUGHT HIM GOLDEN GARMENTS AND HE PUT THEM ON. HE (9) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, AND ENTERED IN TO OFFER UP THE INCENSE MADE AT DUSK, TO TRIM THE LAMPS. THEN HE (10) SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, AND TOOK OFF HIS CLOTHES.

1. II:1: "And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting" (Lev. 16:23) — Why does he come in? He comes only to remove the censer and fire-pan. The entire passage is stated in the correct order of the sequence of actions that are described except for this one verse.

2. II:2: Continuation of the analysis of the problem begun at II:1.

C. THEY BROUGHT HIM HIS OWN CLOTHING AND HE PUT IT ON. THEN THEY ACCOMPANY HIM ALL THE WAY HOME:

1. III:1: When the one who was to send the he goat out came back and met the high priest in the street, He would say to him, "My lord, high priest, we have carried out your mission." If he met him in his house, he would say to him, "We have carried out the mission of him who gives life to all who live."

a. III:2: Said Rabbah, "When in Pumbedita our rabbis take leave of one another, this is what they say: 'May he who gives life give you a long and good and well-ordered life: "I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living" (Psa. 116: 9).'"

b. III:3: "To you, men, I call" (Pro. 8: 4): Said R. Berekhiah, "This refers to disciples of sages who look like women but do mighty deeds like men."

c. III:4: Further sayings of Berekhiah.

D. AND THEY CELEBRATE A FESTIVAL FOR ALL HIS FRIENDS WHEN HE HAS COME FORTH WHOLE FROM THE SANCTUARY.

1. IV:1: Tannaite complement:

XXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 7:5

A. THE HIGH PRIEST SERVES IN EIGHT GARMENTS, AND AN ORDINARY PRIEST IN FOUR: TUNIC, UNDERPANTS, HEAD COVERING, AND GIRDLE. THE HIGH PRIEST IN ADDITION WEARS THE BREASTPLATE, APRON, UPPER GARMENT, AND FRONTLET.

B. DISQUISITION ON THE WEAVING OF THE PRIESTLY GARMENTS

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: All things concerning which the word “fine linen” is said had their threads sixfold the word for fine linen and six using the same consonants; “twined” means eightfold threads; the robe was twelvefold threads, the curtain, twenty-four-fold; the breastplate and apron, twenty-eight fold.

a. I:2: Systematic exposition of components of the opening Tannaite statement: “fine linen” is said had their threads sixfold: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

b. I:3: “twined” means eightfold threads: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

c. I:4: “the robe was twelvefold threads:” how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

d. I:5: “the curtain, twenty-four-fold:” how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

e. I:6: “the breastplate and apron,” twenty-eight fold: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?

C. COMPOSITE ON THE DISPOSITION OF THE PRIESTLY GARMENTS AND OTHER SACRED OBJECTS AND UTENSILS

1. I:7: Said Rahba said R. Judah, “One who makes a tear in the priestly garments is punishable with a flogging: ‘that it be no rent’ (Exo. 28:32).”

2. I:8: Said R. Eleazar, “He who removes the breastplate from the apron or the saves of the ark is subject to a flogging.”

3. I:9: R. Yosé b. Hanina contrasted these verses

D. MORAL LESSONS TO BE DRAWN FROM THE VERSES ON THE TEMPLE’S FURNITURE

1. I:10: R. Hama b. Hanina said, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘You shall make the boards of the tabernacle of acacia wood, standing up’ (Exo. 26:15).” Should you say, “Their hope is lost, their prospects null,” Scripture to the contrary says, “Acacia wood standing up” (Exo. 26:15), meaning that they stand for ever and ever.

2. I:11: R. Hama b. Hanina said, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘The plaited garments for ministering in the holy place’ (Exo. 35:19)? Were it not for the priestly garments, there would not have remained of Israel a single remnant and survivor.”

3. I:12: Rahba said R. Judah said, “Three arks did Bezalel make.”

a. I:13: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing. Said R. Yohanan, “There were three crowns: the altar, the ark, and the table.”

b. I:14: R. Continuation of the foregoing: Yohanan contrasted these verses: “An alien” and we read the word as “crown” — yielding this lesson: if he deserves it, it is a wreath to him, if not, it is alien to him.

E. TORAH-STUDY-SAYINGS

c. I:15: R. Yohanan contrasted these verses: “Make you an ark of wood” (Deu. 10: 1) vs. “And they shall make an ark of acacia wood” (Exo. 25:10) — on this basis we derive the rule that as to a disciple of a sage, his fellow townsfolk are commanded to do his work for him.

1. I:16: “Within and without you shall overlay it” (Exo. 25:11) — said Raba, “Any disciple of a sage whose inside is not like his outside is no disciple of a sage.

2. I:17: Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘And this is the Torah that Moses set before the children of Israel’ (Deu. 4:44)? If one enjoys grace, the Torah is made for him a life-giving elixir a word that uses the same letters as the word for set, but if one does not enjoy grace, the Torah is made for him a deadly poison.”

3. I:18: R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan contrasted these verses: “The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart” (Psa. 19: 9) and “The word of the Lord is tried” (Psa. 18:31)?” If one enjoys grace, it gives him joy, if not, it gives him distress.

4. I:19: “The work of the skilful workman” (Exo. 26:31), “The work of the skilful embroiderer” (Exo. 26: 1) — Said R. Eleazar, “They embroidered of their tracing.”

F. BY THESE DID THEY RECEIVE INQUIRIES FOR THE URIM AND THUMMIM:

1. II:1: When R. Dimi came, he said, “In the garments in which the high priest officiates, the priest anointed for war also officiates: ‘And the holy garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him’ (Exo. 29:29) — for the one who comes after him in hierarchical standing.”

2. II:2: With regard to the proposition, In the garments in which the high priest officiates, the priest anointed for war also officiates: in session, R. Abbahu stated this tradition in the name of R. Yohanan. R. Ammi and R. Assi turned away. There are those who say, R. Hiyya bar Abba said it, and R. Ammi and R. Assi turned away.

G. COMPOSITE ON CONSULTING THE URIM AND THUMMIM

1. II:3: Tannaite complement: How do people consult the Urim and Thummim?

2. II:4: Why are they called Urim and Thummim?

3. II:5: How was it done? How was the message delivered? R. Yohanan says, “The letters stood in relief.” The names of the twelve sons of Jacob were inscribed on the Urim and Thummim. The answer always came through the letters that stood in relief.

H. AND THEY RECEIVED INQUIRY ONLY FROM THE KING, THE COURT, OR FROM SOMEONE IN THE SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC:

1. III:1: What is the scriptural source of this rule?

XXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:1-2

A. ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IT IS FORBIDDEN

1. I:1: Is it merely forbidden? The man is subject to the penalty of extirpation!

2. I:2: And is it the fact that in any passage in which the Tannaite formulation declares the penalty to be extirpation, the language of prohibition is not used at all as is the premise of the opening question?

3. I:3: Reversion to a detail of I:1: As to half of the requisite volume of forbidden substance — R. Yohanan said, “It is forbidden by the law of the Torah.” And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “It is permitted by the law of the Torah.”

B. COMPOSITE ON THE AFFLICTION OF SOULS ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, IN PARTICULAR, THROUGH FASTING

1. I:4: Tannaite complement: “You shall afflict your souls” (Lev. 16:29) — might one suppose that a person should therefore sit in the sun or in the cold so as to suffer anguish? Just as the prohibition of work means, sit and do nothing, so the commandment to afflict one’s soul means, sit and do nothing by abstinence.

2. I:5: Tannaite complement as above, with the resolution: Just as the prohibition of work covers a matter for which in another context one would incur liability on the Sabbath in particular, so the affliction of the soul covers something for which in another context one would incur liability. And what might that be? This would refer to eating meat of a sacrifice that has been subjected by the officiating priest to an improper intention or eating meat that has been left over and not burned at the required time.

3. I:6: “You shall afflict your souls” (Lev. 16:29) — here we find a reference to affliction, and elsewhere we find a reference to the same matter. Just as elsewhere, the affliction concerns hunger, so here the affliction must concern hunger.

C. APPENDIX ON THE AFFLICTION THAT INVOLVES EATING: THE CASE OF MANNA

1. I:7: “Who fed you in the wilderness with manna...that he might afflict you” (Deu. 8:16) — R. Ammi and R. Assi — One said, “One who has a loaf of bread in his basket is not the same as one who has no loaf of bread in his basket. And one said, “One who sees what he is eating is not the same as one who does not see while he is eating.”

a. I:8: Continuation of Ammi & Assi composite; an interpolated proposition tangential in the foregoing.

b. I:9: Continuation of Ammi & Assi composite.

c. I:10: Continuation of Ammi & Assi composite.

l. I:11: Thematic add-on.

- 2.** I:12: “We remember the fish that we used to eat in Egypt for nothing” (Num. 11: 5) — Rab and Samuel: “Real fish” vs. “A euphemism for sexual relations.”
- 3.** I:13: “The cucumbers and the melons” (Exo. 11: 5) — “In the manna they tasted every sort of food but not the taste of the five specified items, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, and garlic.”
- 4.** I:14: “Now the manna was like coriander seed” (Num. 11: 7) — “It was round like coriander seed and white like pearl.”
- a.** I:15: Tannaite complement: “Now the manna was like coriander seed” (Num. 11: 7): — the letters for the word for coriander bears the meaning that the manna was like flax seed in its capsules.
- b.** I:16: Tannaite complement: The letters for the word for coriander bear the meaning that the manna told the Israelites whether an infant was born at nine months, after intercourse with the first husband, or at seven months, after intercourse with the second husband.
- l.** I:17: Just as the prophet told the Israelites what was to be found in clefts or holes, so manna would reveal to Israelites what was in the clefts and holes.
- 5.** I:18: “And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, the manna fell upon it” (Num. 11: 9). “And the people shall go and gather” (Exo. 16: 4). “The people went about and gathered it” (Num. 11: 8) — how so?
- 6.** I:19: It is written “bread” and also “dough of cakes” and “they ground it” (Num. 11: 8) — how so?
- 7.** I:20: “...or beat it in mortars” (Num. 11: 8) — This teaches that with the man there descended for the Israelites women’s cosmetics, that is, things that are ground in a mortar.
- 8.** I:21: “And boiled it in pots” (Num. 11: 8) — This teaches that with the manna there descended for the Israelites the makings of a pudding.
- 9.** I:22: “And they brought yet to him freewill offerings every morning” (Exo. 36: 3) — What is the meaning of every morning? Precious stones and jewels descended from heaven and were given by the people as freewill offerings.
- 10.** I:23: “And the taste of it was like the taste of a cake baked with oil” (Num. 11: 8) — Just as the infant tastes at the breast any number of tastes, so for the manna, whenever the Israelites ate it, they found in it a whole variety of flavors.
- 11.** I:24: “And Moses said, This shall be when the Lord shall give you in the evening meat to eat and in the morning bread to the full” (Exo. 16: 8) — Meat, for which they asked not in the right way, was given to them at the wrong time. Bread, for which they asked in the right way, was given to them at the right time.
- 12.** I:25: “While the meat was yet between their teeth” (Num. 11:33). And it is written, “But a whole month” (Num. 11:20) — how so? The middling folk died on the spot, the wicked suffered pain for a whole month.

13. I:26: “And they spread them all abroad” (Num. 11:32) — “Don’t read, ‘they spread abroad’ but read the same letters with the vowels that yield, ‘they were slaughtered.’ This teaches that the Israelites incurred the penalty of being slaughtered.”

14. I:27: “And they spread them all abroad” (Num. 11:32) —

15. I:28: It is written, “bread,” and also “oil,” and also “honey” (Exo. 16:29, 31, Num. 11: 8). Which was it? Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “For the young, bread; for the old, oil, for the children, honey.”

16. I:29: The word for quail is written to be pronounced shlaw but we pronounce it as slaw. What does this mean? Said R. Hanina, “When the righteous eat it, it is at ease, but when the wicked eat it, it is like thorns for them.”

a. I:30: Said R. Hanan bar Raba, “There are four kinds of quail, and these are they: thrush, partridge, pheasant, and quail.”

18. I:31: It is written, “And when the dew on top, dew on the bottom; it looked like something put in a box.” Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “Drew on top, dew on the bottom; it looked like something put in a box.”

19. I:32: “A fine scale-like thing” (Num. 11:9) — Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “It is something that melts on the palm of the hand.” R. Yohanan said, “It is something that is absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts of the human body.”

20. I:33: Tannaite complement: “Man did eat the bread of the mighty” (Psa. 78:25) — “It is the bread that the ministering angels eat,” the words of R. Aqiba.

21. I:34: “But now our soul is dried away, there is nothing at all” (Num. 11: 6) — They said, “This manna is going to dry up their bowels. For is there any born of woman who takes in but doesn’t excrete?” the words of R. Aqiba.

22. I:35: His disciples asked R. Simeon b. Yohai, “How come the manna came down to the Israelites only once a year?”

23. I:36: Now R. Tarfon and R. Ishmael and sages were in session, dealing with the passage on manna, and R. Eleazar the Modite was in session among them. R. Eleazar the Modite responded and say, “The manna that came down for Israel was sixty cubits high.”

a. I:37: Issi b. Judah says, “The manna that came down for Israel kept ascending until all the kings of the east and west saw it, as it is said, ‘You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies, my cup runs over’ (Psa. 23:5, 6).”

24. I:38: Continuation of I:36.

D. ...TO (1) EAT, (2) DRINK:

1. II:1: As to these five afflictions, to what do they correspond?

a. II:2: Expansion on a secondary development of the foregoing.

E. ...(3) BATHE, (4) PUT ON ANY SORT OF OIL:

1. III:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from bathing or putting on oil is classified as affliction?

a. III:2: Secondary exegesis of the proof-text of III:1: What is the meaning of “I ate no pleasant bread”?

2. III:3: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from putting on oil is classified as affliction?

3. III:4: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from putting on oil is classified as affliction?

a. III:5: Secondary expansion of the proof-text cited at III.1, 4.

4. III:6: Another proof concerning how on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from putting on oil is classified as affliction?

F. ...(5) PUT ON A SANDAL,

1. IV:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from wearing sandals is an affliction?

G. ...(6) OR ENGAGE IN SEXUAL RELATIONS:

1. V:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that refraining from sexual relations is classified as affliction?

H. APPENDIX ON THE PROHIBITION AGAINST WASHING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

1. V:2: Tannaite complement: It is equally forbidden to wash part of one's body as the whole of one's body. But if one's hands were filthy with mud or shit, he may wash in the usual manner and not concern himself.

2. V:3: Tannaite complement: A woman may rinse one hand in water to give bread to an infant and need not concern herself.

3. V:4: Tannaite complement: If he was going to receive his father, master, or disciple, he crosses over the sea or river in the normal way, even up to his neck, and need not scruple.

a. V:5: A set of illustrative cases.

4. V:6: Continuation of V:4: As to walking through water up to one's neck objected R. Joseph, But even on a weekday is such an action permitted?

a. V:7: And what is the rule concerning the Sabbath, on which people may wear sandals? May they walk through water wearing them?

5. V:8: On the Day of Atonement it is forbidden to sit in mud.

6. V:9: On the Day of Atonement it is permitted to cool off by sitting on fruit.

a. V:10: Illustrative stories.

I. APPENDIX ON THE PROHIBITION OF WEARING SHOES ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

1. V:11: A story yields the question, What is the law about wear on the Day of Atonement sandals of bamboo?

2. V:12: Minors are permitted to do all of them except putting on sandals, for appearance's sake.

J. BUT A KING AND A BRIDE WASH THEIR FACES. “AND A WOMAN WHO HAS GIVEN BIRTH MAY PUT ON HER SANDAL” THE WORDS OF R. ELIEZER. AND SAGES PROHIBIT.

1. VI:1: Who is the authority behind this anonymous Mishnah-rule?

K. HE WHO EATS A LARGE DATE'S BULK OF FOOD, INCLUSIVE OF ITS PIT...:

1. VII:1: As to the date's bulk of which they have spoken, does it include the pit or does it not include the pit?

2. VII:2: The large date of which they have spoken is bigger than an egg's bulk, and it is an established fact for our rabbis that by that means one's hunger is sated, but with less than that volume one's hunger will not be sated.

3. VII:3: The large date of which they have spoken is less in volume than an egg.

4. VII:4: All standard measures for foods are the bulk of an olive, except for the minimum volume required for food to contract uncleanness, because in that case Scripture has used a different expression, on which account sages have imposed a distinct volume. Proof for the view derives from Scripture's presentation of the law of the Day of Atonement.

a. VII:5: Amplification of a detail in the foregoing: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the minimum volume required for food to contract uncleanness is an egg's bulk? Said R. Abbahu said R. Eleazar, "Said Scripture, 'All food therein that may be eaten' (Lev. 11:34) — this refers, then, to food that derives from that which also is edible, and what might that be? It is the egg of a hen."

l. VII:6: Continuation of foregoing: R. Eleazar, "He who eats forbidden fat at this time must record the volume, since another court may come along and impute to the requisite measures a larger volume."

b. VII:7: Continuation of VII:5: The laws covering measurements of minimal quantities, and penalties constitute law revealed to Moses at Sinai.

L. OR HE WHO DRINKS THE EQUIVALENT IN LIQUIDS TO A MOUTHFUL IS LIABLE.

1. VIII:1: Not literally 'a mouthful,' but the volume is any case in which if he moved the liquid to one side of his mouth it would look like a mouthful would be a violation.

M. ALL SORTS OF FOODS JOIN TOGETHER TO FORM THE VOLUME OF THE DATE'S BULK, AND ALL SORTS OF LIQUIDS JOIN TOGETHER TO FORM THE VOLUME OF A MOUTHFUL.

1. IX:1: Said R. Pappa, "If one ate a piece of raw meat with salt, they join together to form the requisite volume to incur liability, and that is so even though salt is not really classified as a food, for, since people do eat it, it joins together."

2. IX:2: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "The brine on green vegetables joins with the vegetables to form the requisite volume to incur liability for a date's bulk on the Day of Atonement."

3. IX:3: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "He who eats too big a meal on the Day of Atonement is exempt from penalty. How come? '...who does not afflict...' (Lev. 23:29) is what Scripture has said, excluding the eating of a meal that brings discomfort."

N. HE WHO EATS AND HE WHO DRINKS — THESE PROHIBITED VOLUMES DO NOT JOIN TOGETHER TO IMPOSE LIABILITY FOR EATING OR FOR DRINKING, RESPECTIVELY.

1. X:1: Who is the Tannaite authority behind this statement?

XXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:3

A. IF ONE ATE AND DRANK IN A SINGLE ACT OF INADVERTENCE, HE IS LIABLE ONLY FOR A SINGLE SIN OFFERING. IF HE ATE AND DID A PROHIBITED ACT OF LABOR, HE IS LIABLE FOR TWO SIN OFFERINGS.

1. I:1: Explaining the absence of “you shall not” in connection with the prohibition of eating or drinking or acts of labor, said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Now come no explicit admonition is mentioned in connection with the commandment to afflict oneself? It is because it is not possible to formulate one.

2. I:2: An effort to formulate a valid admonition such as Simeon b. Laqish says is not possible.

3. I:3: As above: A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael stated, “Here we find a reference to afflicting the soul, and elsewhere we find reference to afflicting the soul. Just as in the latter case, there is no penalty unless there has been a prior admonition, so here too there can be no penalty unless there is a prior admonition.

4. I:4: As above: We derive the fact by analogy between the phrase, ‘a solemn day of rest’ that occurs in connection with an everyday Sabbath and the same usage that occurs with reference to the Day of Atonement. Just as in the that case, there is no penalty unless there has been a prior admonition, so here too there can be no penalty unless there is a prior admonition. R. Pappa said, “The Day of Atonement itself is called the Sabbath, for said Scripture, ‘In the ninth day of the month, from evening to evening, you shall keep your Sabbath’ (Lev. 23:32).”

B. IF HE ATE FOODS WHICH ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR EATING, OR DRANK LIQUIDS WHICH ARE NOT ‘SUITABLE FOR DRINKING —

1. II:1: One who chews pepper on the Day of Atonement is exempt from punishment. If he chewed ginger on the Day of Atonement, he is exempt.

2. II:2: Tannaite complement: one who eats leaves of calamus, he is liable, of vine, liable.

C. IF HE DRANK BRINE OR FISH BRINE — HE IS EXEMPT.

1. III:1: Who is the Tannaite authority behind our Mishnah-rule, which holds one culpable for drinking vinegar?

a. III:2: Secondary story.

XXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:4

A. AS TO CHILDREN, THEY DO NOT IMPOSE A FAST ON THEM ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT. BUT THEY EDUCATE THEM A YEAR OR TWO IN ADVANCE, SO THAT THEY WILL BE USED TO DOING THE RELIGIOUS DUTIES.

1. I:1: Since they educate the children two years in advance, can there be any question about doing so one year in advance? Of course we do so, and why should the Mishnah include that detail?

2. I:2: In the case of girls, at the age of eight and nine, they educate them to fast for a few hours of the day, at the age of ten and eleven, they finish out the day, by the authority of rabbis, and at twelve, they finish out the day by the authority of the Torah.

XXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:5

A. A PREGNANT WOMAN WHO SMELLED FOOD AND GREW FAINT — THEY FEED HER UNTIL HER SPIRITS ARE RESTORED.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: A pregnant woman who smelled meat in the status of Holy Things or pig meat — for her they stick a reed into the juice and put it on her mouth. If she recovers, well and good, and if not, they feed her the gravy itself. If she recovers, well and good, but if not, they feed her the permitted fat itself, for there is nothing at all that stands ahead of the saving of life.

a. I:2: Illustrative case: There was a pregnant woman who smelt something. They came before Rabbi. He said to her, “Go and whisper to her that today is the Day of Atonement.”

B. A SICK PERSON — THEY FEED HIM ON THE INSTRUCTION OF EXPERTS. IF THERE ARE NO EXPERTS AVAILABLE, THEY FEED HIM ON HIS OWN INSTRUCTIONS, UNTIL HE SAYS, “ENOUGH.”

1. II:1: If the patient says he needs and the physician says he does not need food, they obey the patient.

2. II:2: We have learned in the Mishnah: A sick person — they feed him on the instruction of experts. Are we then to conclude, on the instruction of experts yes, but on his own initiation no? On the instruction of a plurality of experts yes, but on the instruction of a single expert no?

3. II:3: ...they feed him on the instruction of experts — *that’s obvious!* We’re dealing with a case of doubt concerning the saving of life, and a doubt concerning the saving of life is resolved in a lenient way.

4. II:4: Mar bar R. Ashi said, “In any case in which the patient said, ‘I need to eat,’ even though there are a hundred who say he does not need to eat, we listen to him, since it is said, ‘The heart knows its own bitterness’ (Pro. 14:10).”

XL. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:6-7

A. HE WHO IS SEIZED BY RAVENOUS HUNGER — THEY FEED HIM, EVEN UNCLEAN THINGS, UNTIL HIS EYES ARE ENLIGHTENED.

1. I:1: Tannaite complement: How do they know that his eyes are enlightened? Sufficient so that he knows the difference between good and bad food.

2. I:2: Tannaite complement: He who was seized by blinding hunger — they feed him that which violates the law in least possible measure. If there were before him untithed produce and carrion, they feed him carrion.

3. I:3: Tannaite complement: He who was seized by blinding hunger — they feed him honey and all kinds of sweets, for honey and sweets enlighten one's eyes.

4. I:4: He who was seized by blinding hunger — they feed him the fat tail with honey.

5. I:5: Said R. Yohanan, "Once I was seized by blinding hunger, so I ran to the east side of a fig tree..."

6. I:6: R. Judah and R. Yosé were going along the way, and R. Judah was seized by blinding hunger. He jumped a shepherd and ate his bread. Said to him R. Yosé, "You have jumped a shepherd." A second "going along the way" story is affixed here.

B. HE WHO WAS BITTEN BY A CRAZY DOG — THEY DO NOT FEED HIM A PIECE OF ITS LIVER'S LOBE. AND R. MATIA B. HARASH PERMITS DOING SO.

C. APPENDIX ON THE TOPIC OF MAD DOGS

1. II:1: Tannaite complement: Five statements were made concerning a mad dog

2. II:2: What is the source of the madness in a dog?

D. FURTHER DID R. MATIA B. HARASH SAY, "HE WHO HAS A PAIN IN HIS THROAT — THEY DROP MEDICINE INTO HIS MOUTH ON THE SABBATH:

1. III:1: R. Yohanan suffered from scurvy. He went to a certain matron. She made him something on Thursday and on Friday. He said to her, "So what should I do on the Sabbath?"

2. III:2: When R. Yohanan suffered from scurvy, he would put on this remedy on the Sabbath and was healed. This he did in accord with Matia's ruling in the Mishnah.

E. BECAUSE IT IS A MATTER OF DOUBT AS TO DANGER TO LIFE. AND ANY MATTER OF DOUBT AS TO DANGER TO LIFE OVERRIDES THE PROHIBITIONS OF THE SABBATH."

1. IV:1: Why was it necessary to go on and say further, And any matter of doubt as to danger to life overrides the prohibitions of the Sabbath?

2. IV:2: Tannaite complement: They remove debris for one whose life is in doubt on the Sabbath. And the one who is prompt in the matter, lo, this one is to be praised. And it is not necessary to get permission from a court. How so? If one saw a child fall into the ocean and cannot climb up, or if his ship is sinking in the sea, and he cannot climb up, he spreads a net and pulls him out of there. And it is not necessary to get permission from a court.

3. IV:3: In matters having to do with danger to life, they are not guided by the condition of the majority.

F. HE UPON WHOM A BUILDING FELL DOWN — IT IS A MATTER OF DOUBT WHETHER OR NOT HE IS THERE, IT IS A MATTER OF DOUBT WHETHER IF HE IS THERE, HE IS ALIVE OR DEAD, IT IS A MATTER OF DOUBT WHETHER IF HE IS THERE

AND ALIVE HE IS A GENTILE OR AN ISRAELITE — THEY CLEAR AWAY THE RUIN FROM ABOVE HIM.

1. V:1: What's the point of this statement of hypothetical cases?

G. IF THEY FOUND HIM ALIVE, THEY REMOVE THE REMAINING RUINS FROM ABOVE HIM.

1. VI:1: That's obvious!

H. BUT IF THEY FOUND HIM DEAD, THEY LEAVE HIM BE UNTIL AFTER THE SABBATH.

1. VII:1: That too is obvious!

2. VII:2: Tannaite complement: On the Sabbath, when people are removing debris, if the buried person gives no sign of life, how far is the debris removed? Until one reaches his nose.

3. VII:3: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that danger to life overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath?

XLI. Mishnah-Tractate Yoma 8:8-9

A. A SIN OFFERING AND AN UNCONDITIONAL GUILT OFFERING ATONE.

1. I:1: A sin offering and an unconditional guilt offering atone: is it possible that while the guilt offering for a certain sin atones, a suspensive guilt offering does not? But lo, "atonement" is inscribed with reference to that too!

B. DEATH AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ATONE WHEN JOINED WITH REPENTANCE.

1. II:1: That is the case only when joined with repentance, but not when not joined with repentance — then may we say that this does not accord with the position of Rabbi?

C. REPENTANCE ATONES FOR MINOR TRANSGRESSIONS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE COMMANDMENTS.

1. III:1: Since it is the fact that it atones for a negative commandment that has been violated, is there any need to specify that it also atones for a positive commandment that has been violated?

a. III:2: Amplification of a detail of the foregoing.

D. COMPOSITE ON REPENTANCE

2. III:3: The types of atonement that R. Ishmael expounded, with each of which repentance is required.

a. III:4: Gloss of the foregoing. What is the definition of the profanation of the Divine Name?

b. III:5: Continuation of the topic of the foregoing.

1. III:6: Said R. Hama bar Hanina, "Great is repentance, which brings healing to the world: 'I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely' (Hos. 14: 5)."

2. III:7: Said R. Levi, "Great is repentance, which reaches up to the throne of glory: 'Return, Israel, to the Lord your God' (Hos. 14: 2)."

3. III:8: Said R. Yohanan, ““Great is repentance, for it overrides a negative commandment that is in the Torah...””
4. III:9: Said R. Jonathan, “Great is repentance, for it brings redemption near....”
5. III:10: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Great is repentance, for by it sins that were done deliberately are transformed into those that were done inadvertently....”
6. III:11: Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “Great is repentance, for it lengthens the years of a person....”
7. III:12: Come and take note of how the characteristic of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not like the characteristic of mortals. If a mortal insults his fellow by something that he has said, the other may or may not be reconciled with him. And if you say that he is reconciled with him, he may or may not be reconciled by mere words. But with the Holy One, blessed be he, if someone commits a transgression in private, he will be reconciled with him in mere words.
8. III:13: R. Meir would say, “Great is repentance, for on account of a single individual who repents, the whole world is forgiven in its entirety.”
9. III:14: How is a person who has repented to be recognized?
10. III:15: Said R. Judah, “Rab contrasted verses of Scripture: it is written, ‘Happy is he whose transgression is covered, whose sin is pardoned’ (Psa. 32: 1), and further, ‘He who covers his transgression shall not prosper’ (Pro. 28:13). But there is no contradiction, the one speaks of a sin that is publicly known, the other of a sin that is not publicly known.”
11. III:16: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “When a person does a transgression once, he is forgiven, a second time, he is forgiven, a third time, he is forgiven. But when he does it a fourth time, he is not forgiven: ‘Thus says the Lord, for three transgressions of Israel, yes for four, I will not reverse it’ (Amos 2: 6); and further, ‘Lo, all these things does God work, twice, yes, three times, with a man’ (Job. 33:29).”
12. III:17: Tannaite complement. Matters concerning which one has said confession on the preceding Day of Atonement, one does not have to include in the confessions of the coming Day of Atonement, unless he did those same transgressions in the intervening year.
13. III:18: Tannaite complement. “And he has to specify each individual sin,” the words of R. Judah b. Patera, as it is said, ‘O Lord, these people have sinned a great sin and have made a god of gold’ (Exo. 32:31).” R. Aqiba says, “It is not necessary to list each sin. If so, why does it say, ‘And made a god of gold’? But: Thus did the Omnipresent say, ‘Who made you make a god of gold? It is I, who gave you plenty of gold.’”
14. III:19: Two truly good providers arose for Israel, Moses and David. Moses said, “Let my sin be written down: ‘because you believed not in me to sanctify me’ (Num. 20:21).” David said, “Let mine not be written down: ‘Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is pardoned’ (Psa. 82: 1).”
15. III:20: They make public hypocrites’ evil deeds on account of the desecration of the divine name, as it is said, ‘When a righteous man turns from his

righteousness and commits iniquity and I lay a stumbling block before him, he shall die' (Eze. 3:20) — to make public his hypocrisy.

16. III:21: Repentance of a confirmed sinner postpones punishment, and that is even though the decree against him of punishment has already been signed and sealed.

17. III:22: It is not good for the wicked to be shown respect in this world. It is good for the righteous not to be shown favor in this world.

18. III:23: He who brings merit to the community never causes sin: so that he will not end up in Gehenna, while his disciples are in the Garden of Eden. And he who causes the community to sin — they never give him a sufficient chance to attain penitence, so that he will not end up in the Garden of Eden, while his disciples are in the Gehenna: “

E. AND AS TO SERIOUS TRANSGRESSIONS, REPENTANCE SUSPENDS THE PUNISHMENT UNTIL THE DAY OF ATONEMENT COMES ALONG AND ATONES.

HE WHO SAYS, “I SHALL SIN AND REPENT, SIN AND REPENT” — THEY GIVE HIM NO CHANCE TO DO REPENTANCE.

1. IV:1: Why repeat two times, sin and repent, sin and repent?

F. IF HE SAID, “I WILL SIN AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT WILL ATONE,” — THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT ATONE.

1. V:1: May we say that our Mishnah-ruling is not in accord with Rabbi?

G. FOR TRANSGRESSIONS DONE BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ATONES. FOR TRANSGRESSIONS BETWEEN MAN AND MAN, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ATONES, ONLY IF THE MAN WILL REGAIN THE GOOD WILL OF HIS FRIEND.

THIS EXEGESIS DID R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH STATE: “‘FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YOU BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD’ (LEV. 16:30) — FOR TRANSGRESSIONS BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT DOES THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ATONE. FOR TRANSGRESSIONS BETWEEN MAN AND HIS FELLOW, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ATONES, ONLY IF THE MAN WILL REGAIN THE GOOD WILL OF HIS FRIEND.” SAID R. AQIBA, “HAPPY ARE YOU, O ISRAEL. BEFORE WHOM ARE YOU MADE CLEAN, AND WHO MAKES YOU CLEAN? IT IS YOUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN, AS IT SAYS, ‘AND I WILL SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER ON YOU, AND YOU WILL BE CLEAN’ (EZE. 36:25). AND IT SAYS, O LORD, THE HOPE OF ISRAEL (JER. 17:13) — JUST AS THE IMMERSION POOL CLEANS THE UNCLEAR, SO THE HOLY ONE, BLESSED BE HE, CLEAN ISRAEL.”

1. VI:1: R. Joseph bar Habu raised a contradiction to R. Abbahu, “For transgressions between man and man, the Day of Atonement atones, only if... — but it is written, ‘If one man sin against his fellow man, God will pacify him’ (1Sa. 2:25).”

2. VI:2: Said R. Isaac, “Whoever offends his fellow, even if through what he says, has to reconcile with him.”

a. VI:3: Illustrative story: R. Abba had a complaint against R. Jeremiah, Jeremiah went and sat at the door of R. Abba. In the interval his serving

girl through out slops. Some drops fell on his head. He said, "They've made a dung heap out of me," and about himself he cited the verse, "He raises up the poor out of the dust" (1Sa. 2: 8).

b. VI:4: Illustrative story: When R. Zira had a quarrel with someone, he would pass by him repeatedly, so as to show himself to him, so that the other might come forth to seek reconciliation with him.

c. VI:5: Illustrative story: Rab reconciled with someone he had offended.

H. COMPOSITE ON THE RECITATION OF THE CONFESSION

3. VI:6: Tannaite complement: The religious duty of saying the confession applies at the eve of the Day of Atonement at dusk. But sages have said, A man should say the confession before eating and drinking, lest he be distracted while eating and drinking.

4. VI:7: What does one say as the prayer of confession?

5. VI:8: On three occasions in the year priests raise up their hands in the priestly benediction four times a day, and these are they: (1) at the dawn prayer, (2) the additional prayer, (3) the afternoon prayer, and (4) the closing of the gates: on the occasion of fasts, on the occasions of prayers of members of the delegation, and on the Day of Atonement (M. Ta. 4: 1). What is the definition of the closing of the Temple gates?

a. VI:9: Illustrative story. Ulla bar Rab went down to lead the congregation in prayer in the presence of Raba. He opened with, "You have chosen us..., " and closed with, "What are we, what is our life." He praised him.

6. VI:10: The recitation of the Prayer at the closing of the gates exempts one from having to say the Evening Prayer.

a. VI:11: Tannaite supplement to a subsidiary analysis of the foregoing.

Points of Structure

1. DOES BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE YOMA FOLLOW A COHERENT OUTLINE GOVERNED BY A CONSISTENT RULES?

The Mishnah-tractate dictates the Talmud's treatment of its topic, and seen whole, the Bavli-tractate belongs in the classification of a commentary. The order of topics demonstrates that fact, since at only a very few points are we unable to relate a large-scale composite to the topical program of Mishnah-tractate Yoma. And, as those who have reviewed the tractates now in print will have noted, other tractates do not even demand that we recognize exceptions of any kind. Indeed, this tractate derives much of its power from its elaborate presentations of topics that in the Mishnah receive only a little attention, or none at all. But for that same reason it proves exceptional when compared to the tractates that address only the Mishnah's propositions, or the Mishnah's topics seen as themes, rather than as the occasion for propositional exercises at all.

2. WHAT ARE THE SALIENT TRAITS OF ITS STRUCTURE?

Overall, we find two distinct components of the structure of the Talmud-tractate: comments on the Mishnah, generally episodic if also systematic, and also large-scale composites.

3. WHAT IS THE RATIONALITY OF THE STRUCTURE?

The rationality of the document finds its definition in the principles of Mishnah-exegesis, on the one side, and the program of Mishnah-re-presentation on the other. That is to say, if we were to remove all of the compositions and composites not linked to Mishnah-amplification in one form or the other, we should find little left of the tractate as we know it.

4. WHERE ARE THE POINTS OF IRRATIONALITY IN THE STRUCTURE?

I identify these asymptomatic entries: I.A, B, E, G, VII.D, VIII.A, XII.G, XIV.B, D, XV.E, XVIII.F, XIX.C, E, XX.B, XXXV.B, C, D, E, G, XXXVI.B, C, H, I, XL.C, XLI.D, H. Now the issue is, how have these entries changed the face of the Bavli-tractate's representation of the Mishnah-tractate?

Points of System

1. DOES THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE YOMA SERVE ONLY AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME?

This question finds its answer in two facts. First, how many compositions of the Mishnah-tractate altogether lack Talmud-discussions? The answer is, few, and these prove episodic. We cannot predict which Mishnah-paragraphs will lack Talmud-compositions or propose a theory on the traits that would characterize the Mishnah-sentences that are treated or those that are not. The matter appears to me to be random. Second, and perhaps of greater interest, how many composites in the Talmud stand completely out of relationship with the Mishnah? That question is answered in the next rubric.

2. HOW DO THE TOPICAL COMPOSITES FIT INTO THE TALMUD-TRACTATE YOMA AND WHAT DO THEY CONTRIBUTE THAT THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME WOULD LACK WITHOUT THEM?

The tractate is formidable in size, and it carries with it a large and important component of free-standing composites, some of which intersect with the Mishnah in topic, others of which bear upon the theme of the tractate but make no contribution to the amplification of anything that the Mishnah-tractate has to say about that theme. We know that the compilers undertake an initiative of weight when we find jarring juxtapositions. We may suppose that the compilers mean only to provide information, not an occasion for reflection through startling points of intersection, when a topic introduced in the Mishnah in a tangential way is given an exposition lacking all argument or coherent point. The difference then is the mixing of things ordinarily kept distinct as against the provision of information on a subject. This becomes clear in the exposition that follows.

I.A: The framers begin with a remarkable conception, which is to compare the rite of the Day of Atonement with another rite, so placing Leviticus Sixteen into relationship with other systematic Pentateuchal expositions of the most distinguished offerings of the cultic calendar. In selecting another rite for comparison, what guided them? I see three distinct considerations. First is the formal one, which is articulated: rites that demand that the high priest prepare for a week in advance. But there are more than formal considerations. For, second, the compilers surely reflected on critical cultic occasions that brought the cult outside the walls of the Temple. Since a major step in the order of service here is to send forth the scapegoat, it is quite natural to take up a comparable occasion on which a sacrifice is made outside of the Temple. For that purpose, the rite of burning the red cow to produce ashes for purification water, in line with the rite described at Numbers Chapter Nineteen, comes to mind; that offering is not in the Temple but on Mount of Olives. What draws these two offerings into alignment is a third quality. The scapegoat carries with it the sins of the people; the purification-water bears the classification of *hat'at*, translated both purification- and sin. In the present context, therefore, by raising the question of how rites compare, two rites of atonement, one for uncleanness, the other for sin, are drawn into alignment for purposes of comparison and contrast. But having moved beyond the limits of the Talmud's presentation, I note at the end the formal consideration obviously

governs, even though the substantive effect — introducing the notion of rites that take up conduct outside of the cult — is to direct attention from the inner to the outer dimensions of the Day. This initiative at the formal level finds its counterpart in substantive ways, as we shall see, when the Talmud insists in its re-presentation of the topic of the Day of Atonement upon asking about considerations external to the Temple and its cult but critical to the life of Israel and its sanctification and salvation.

I.B: The initiative at the opening composite is carried forward on a still larger scale at I.B: what makes the requirement of the Day of Atonement unique, and how we relate the rules governing that day with those governing another comparable occasion, the consecration of the Tent of Meeting. The upshot is that in the majestic opening reading, the Mishnah's simple, factual account is left behind, as the topic, the rite of the Day of Atonement, is addressed in its own, much larger setting of comparable rites, first, the burning of the red cow, second, the consecration of the tent of meeting. Only at I.C, D, do we come back to the high priesthood.

I.E: As if I.A, B, did not suffice to draw attention from the Mishnah's facts to the context, I.E really revises the entire matter, and the composite does so in a dramatic way. Now the entire face of the presentation by the Mishnah changes. From purification of sin and uncleanness, on the one side, and the formation of the tabernacle/Temple, on the other, we proceed to what is always the critical issue in the Rabbinic system, the destruction of the Temple. This is now set forth as the result of the corruption of the priesthood, particularly the high priesthood. So the Day of Atonement calls to mind [1] sin, [2] the Temple and its cult, and [3] the power of sin to destroy the Temple and its cult. The treatment of the third theme seems to me miscellaneous, and the upshot is, what we have is the theme alone, not an exposition that makes some stunning point in the way that I.A, and B do. The upshot, however, is the same, and that is, the definition of an entirely fresh context in which the theme of the Mishnah-tractate, the Day of Atonement, is going to be expounded. Indeed, once we have worked our way through I.A and B, we can scarcely see as definitive for the topic the Mishnah-tractate's identification of its program of exposition — Leviticus Chapter Sixteen, point by point. What the Mishnah-tractate's authors found important about the Day of Atonement the Bavli-tractate's compilers chose to treat as subsidiary and incidental to the points they wished to register at the very beginning of their tractate.

I.G: Why should the topic of the councillors' chamber, I.F, should call to mind the requirement of putting a mezuzah on the doorposts of all Israelites' houses — gates of houses, courts, provinces, cities? The juxtaposition of subjects is jarring. But if we remember where we started — finding contexts in which to interpret the order of service of the Day of Atonement — the answer presents itself quite readily. We begin by moving from the Temple outward: rites comparable in that preparation outside of the cult (the high priest's separation) and beyond the limits of the Temple (the scapegoat, the red cow). We proceeded to a clear statement that the reason the Temple was destroyed was the sins of the priesthood and of Israel. Now we treat as comparable the sanctity of the dwellings of all Israel and

the sanctity of the Temple and its chambers. The mezuzah marks off Israel's dwellings as holy, a counterpart to the Temple's very walls and hangings. The presentation, by contrast with the topic, proves once more miscellaneous; I see no point at which anything is said, beyond the introduction of the topic itself, that bears meaning, let alone a clear and relevant proposition.

VII.D: Saul is introduced because he violated the prohibition of taking a census; but then he provides the occasion to underscore the power of sin, however small, to yield weighty consequences. Still, it seems to me this topical appendix does not vastly change the face of the setting in which it is presented.

VIII.A: The exposition of the general procedure of the lottery simply spells out details of the Mishnah's topic.

XII.G: The secondary amplification of facts and rules relevant to the Mishnah's topic seems to me inert.

XIV.B: The wonderful composite at XIV.B really clarifies the presentation of the Mishnah's topic; it does not introduce an unanticipated topic, let alone a problem out of alignment with the Mishnah's, but only works in its own way through the very information that the Mishnah has already given. The improvement upon the Mishnah's presentation nonetheless is particularly talmudic: a more systematic and orderly account of what has already been laid out in a systematic manner.

XIV.D: The richly glossed account of the proper order of the daily priestly rites — by contrast to that of the Day of Atonement — enriches in a factual way the Mishnah's own presentation. I do not discern a single point at which a not-to-be-predicted subject makes an appearance.

XV.E: Now we come to a small but important insertion. We have been told that priests could spend their own money on enhancing the rites. Now we are told, in a huge composition of obvious artistic merit, how riches and poverty and good looks are fundamentally irrelevant to Torah-study. Whether one is rich or poor, handsome or ugly, all are obligated to Torah-study. This composition forms a subtle but powerful comment on the topic of the Mishnah-composite before us, the kind of editorial insertion that changes the face of the whole.

XVIII.F: Once more, we have a startling juxtaposition, one that the Mishnah-composite accommodates but hardly requires. That is, the exposition of the Mishnah-composition is complete in its own terms. Then we have a massive composite on the righteous and the wicked in general. But while in the Mishnah, attention focuses upon those who contributed to the cult or refused to do so, here we deal with issues of personal morality, on the one side, and the power of the righteous to save the world, on the other. The conduct in the cult now recedes into the background, and conduct in the social order of holy Israel comes to the fore. The comment made by placing this remarkable composite here is then unmistakable. Virtue in everyday affairs forms the primary consideration, and Israelites who wish to do what is right take priority over those whose virtue involves only cultic activities. Since the Mishnah has cited Pro. 10:7 in the setting of those who were remembered favorably or unfavorably for their activities in the Temple, while the Talmud wishes to read the same verse in the setting of Israel's everyday life, the intent is obvious. Here is a fine example of how the Talmud's

compositors make their statement through the juxtaposition of distinct composites, and the comparison and contrast of those composites' themes or even propositions, respectively.

XIX.C: I see this entry as topical; nothing is jarring here, since we have dealt with the outcome of the lottery, and the composite on Simeon begins with that subject. The composite has been assembled for its own purpose, which is to present Simeon the Righteous, but fits in quite well as a supplement to the Mishnah's rule, nothing more.

XIX.E: The question of whether the rite under discussion is essential or merely recommended in no way changes the Mishnah's presentation of the subject.

XX.B: Here we find a reprise of the opening exercise in comparison of the rite of the Day of Atonement, the rite of burning the Red Cow, and other, cognate rituals, now the purification rite involving thread. The composite is a very sizable one, but I am unable to identify in it any proposition, or even a theme, that leads us to take up a position outside of the framework of the factual repertoire of the Mishnah. Here is a lost occasion for theological reflection, sharpening by contrast the quite remarkable character of the juxtapositions that make their own, fresh statement.

[XXII.C: We note a substantial composite of questions raised by Pappa, C.4ff.; but these fit well into the topical program of XXII.C and in no way form a distinct composite with its own principle of selection and coherence.]

XXXV.B: The topic of the Mishnah — the high priest's garments — accounts for the inclusion of this composite.

XXXV.C: The same goes for this composite. But the next items change the picture.

XXXV.D: We move from rules on the disposition of the sacred objects to moral lessons to be drawn from verses that deal with the utensils and furniture of the Temple. The moral lessons are commonplaces; what is interesting is only that at this point a set of sayings is introduced to impart to the Mishnah's topic a set of meanings that the Mishnah does not require.

XXXV.E: Here we find the jarring juxtaposition that bears the Talmud's statement upon the Mishnah's topic or proposition, not only the Talmud's re-statement thereof. We move from moral lessons deriving from Scripture's account of the Temple's appurtenances to Torah-study sayings pertinent to those same matters. The moral sayings now are recast as lessons for disciples of sages, and the important lesson is that the sage's disciple must be sincere in his convictions and conduct, his inside corresponding to his outside.

XXXV.G: Here we have a topical composite to supplement the Mishnah's exposition.

XXXVI.B: Now we come to Talmud's most remarkable theological statement. We begin with a preparatory composite on the affliction of souls through fasting. This is important because it introduces the theme of hunger as affliction. And that raises to the surface a question that invites the stunning juxtaposition of the next entry.

XXXVI.C: A verse invites our interest in manna, which is, “Who fed you in the wilderness with manna...that he might afflict you” (Deu. 8:16). So we turn to a huge and coherent exposition of manna as a form of affliction, on the one side, but grace, on the other. What happens when the subject of manna is introduced? The issue of fasting for Heaven is given its counterpart: Heaven feeding Israel. So the topic, fasting on the Day of Atonement, is given a new dimension of meaning, we give to Heaven, but Heaven has fed us, and feeds us, so the transaction is reciprocal. When humanity fasts and shows its humility and contrition, Heaven responds with the realization of grace that is provided through supernatural food. Fasting, a deed in the natural world, evokes in Heaven a supernatural response. Now the activities of the Day of Atonement are set into a fresh context and recast in cosmic dimensions. The cultic program for the Day recedes in consequence; the activities of the private person take over. God’s interest and response address what all Israel does. Nothing in the Mishnah’s presentation of the holy day, it goes without saying, has prepared us for such an amazing interjection of a theme that is at once unanticipated and alien, and, once introduced, also quite natural.

XXXVI.H: What we have here is a repertoire of relevant facts.

XXXVI.I: The same is so here. The face of the Mishnah is unaffected.

XL.C: This brief appendix treats the topic of the Mishnah.

XLI.D: The composite on repentance carries forward the Mishnah’s theme; I see here nothing that will have surprised the Mishnah’s own framers in context. Nor do I find any proposition that vastly revises the standard picture of the subject. We therefore see how critical to the making of the Talmud’s own statement is the intrusion of the unanticipated topic — that principally, possible even, that alone.

XLI.H: This composite stands out of all relationship to the Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of its Talmud-unit. It is rare in the Talmud to come across a discussion so out of phase with the Mishnah-context as the present item. The real question is, why has the compositor of XVI.D not included the composite in his presentation of the high priest’s confession. If I were making the Talmud over, that is the point to which I would move XLI.H. As it is, it is not only out of place but also fails to make the point that, in the right position, it can have made. It suffices to observe that, in the dozen and a half tractates to date, I have found no other composite that both stands out of relationship to its larger context, whether Mishnaic or Talmudic, and also fails to make the contribution that it ought to have made in its proper context, in the way that this one does. That exception to the rule of brilliant composition forms a mark of the Talmud’s compositors’ amazing intellectual rigor.

3. CAN WE STATE WHAT THE COMPILERS OF THIS DOCUMENT PROPOSE TO ACCOMPLISH IN PRODUCING THIS COMPLETE, ORGANIZED PIECE OF WRITING?

To understand what our compilers have accomplished, we have to call to mind the fundamental program of the Mishnah-tractate. Even a simple glance at the Mishnah-tractate suffices to show that all chapters but the final one are devoted to an exposition of the Temple rite on the Day of Atonement. Only the last chapter of the Mishnah-tractate addresses the situation of the individual Israelite, not in the Temple cult, and how he observes the occasion. The Mishnah-tractate therefore closely follows the presentation of

the Day of Atonement at Leviticus Chapter Sixteen, which carefully catalogues the activities of the high priest on the holy day, but in a sentence or two suffices to tell ordinary folk how they are to conduct themselves. The challenge facing the Talmud-tractate framers, therefore, is to place the facts of the Mishnah's first seven chapters into a framework that accords proportion and balance to the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate. That is to say, along with the exposition of the facts of Leviticus Chapter Sixteen as the Mishnah lays them out and complements them, the meaning of the Day of Atonement in the holy life of Israel the people has to be set forth.

Now, when the compilers of the Bavli address the Mishnah, they define for themselves three tasks. First and paramount, they identify what they deemed to be the Mishnah's problematic, that is, what the Mishnah states that they deem to require amplification. So they clarify the Mishnah's words and phrases; they find Scriptural bases for the Mishnah's rules; they ask about the authority behind an anonymous ruling and make an effort to show that rulings belonging to a given authority may be accepted even by those who oppose his position on a parallel matter. Second, they add some sizable complexes of materials that address a topic of the Mishnah, rather than the problematic thereof, and as we now have seen, they organize sizable compositions into composites that supplement the Mishnah's inclusion of a topic with more information about that topic. These composites so far as I can see lack any proposition and accomplish little more than the recapitulation of marginally interesting facts. They fill space, they do not impart structure or add sense. And, third, as we now have seen, the Bavli's framers make us see the Mishnah's topic in a very different way from the way that we would understand that topic absent their work. This they do at critical points in the tractate.

Let us quickly review the main points that we derive from the massive composites that stand wholly outside of the exposition of our Mishnah-tractate and even of our Mishnah-tractate's topic:

- 1.** the rites of the Day of Atonement fall into the larger framework of Israel's rites of purification and atonement for sin; these take place outside of the cult, as much as inside the Temple; they require of the high priest a higher level of sanctification through purification than the Temple's internal cult requires
- 2.** the rite of sanctification of the tent of meeting — also in the world beyond the Temple walls — is comparable to the rite of the Day of Atonement
- 3.** the world intruded on the Temple by reason of Israel's (unatoned-for) sin, which brought about the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of its cult — all the more reason to atone for sin on the Day of Atonement
- 4.** the Temple's points of domestic sanctity, its special chambers, are comparable in their holiness to Israel's points of sanctity, its homes, towns, and cities, all of which are encompassed in the signs of sanctification that apply both in the holy place and also in the homes and towns of holy Israel
- 5.** the Temple requires high priests who can invest their own funds in its rites; the study of Torah is obligatory on all Israel equally, without regard to wealth or poverty, beauty or ugliness
- 6.** Righteous people in this world strengthen their capacity to do what is right; they can avoid the influence of wicked neighbors; even on account of a single righteous man is the

world created; a righteous man does not take his leave from the world before another righteous man like him is created the Holy One, blessed be he, saw that the righteous are few. He went and planted some of them in every generation; even for the sake of a single righteous man the world endures; when a man has lived out the better part of his years and has not sinned, he will not likely sin again. And we are responsible for what we make of ourselves, specifically: if someone comes to make himself unclean, they open the way to him, but if he comes to purify himself, they assist him, but transgression dulls the heart of man.; if a person makes himself a bit unclean, he is made very unclean; if someone sanctifies himself a bit, he is made abundantly sanctified.

7. The propositions prominent in the exposition of the theme of the manna treats the manna as Heaven's response to self-affliction for sin. Thus "Who fed you in the wilderness with manna...that he might afflict you" (Deu. 8:16): Just as the prophet told the Israelites what was to be found in clefts or holes, so manna would reveal to Israelites what was in the clefts and holes. Meat, for which they asked not in the right way, was given to them at the wrong time. Bread, for which they asked in the right way, was given to them at the right time. "While the meat was yet between their teeth" (Num. 11:33). And it is written, "But a whole month" (Num. 11:20) — The middling folk died on the spot, the wicked suffered pain for a whole month. When the righteous eat the quail, it is at ease, but when the wicked eat it, it is like thorns for them. "Man did eat the bread of the mighty" (Psa. 78:25) — "It is the bread that the ministering angels eat." The manna marked Israel as supernatural — and so does its fasting.

These important additions, in the form of large-scale composites, introduce into the representation of the theme of the Day of Atonement conceptions and considerations of which the Mishnah scarcely takes cognizance. While the conception of Heaven's response to afflicting oneself by fasting is providing manna in the wilderness — the bread that the angels eat! — strikes me as the single most remarkable initiative, the other propositions before us prove equally striking. Seen as a group, they yield the following proposition: the Day of Atonement, which the Torah lays out as principally a Temple occasion, overspreads the world. That is not a merely-moral statement but one of cultic consequence, since we see the rite itself as one affecting the world beyond the Temple walls in the way in which the one analogous in its careful concern for the high priest's purification, the burning of the red cow, does. Israel's sin in the world intrudes into the cult, because the Temple, the mark of divine favor, was lost on account of Israel's sin. But Israel's virtue, the virtue of self-affliction through fasting, can win Heaven's cordial response, analogous to the provision of manna in the wilderness. That is because Israel's ordinary life compares with the Temple's sanctification; even as the Temple space is sanctified, so Israel's space is marked off by signs of the holy. Just as the Temple's priests display their riches in the ample cult, so Israel's sages display their resources of virtue and intellect in the service of the mind and heart, study of the Torah. And, it must follow, the righteousness represented by a life fearful of sin and rich in repentance, which comes to its climax on the Day of Atonement, infuses the entire people of Israel, not only the priesthood in the Temple on that same holy day.

The upshot is, the Mishnah's presentation of the Day of Atonement, its recapitulation of the themes of Leviticus Chapter Sixteen in the proportions of Scripture's treatment of that topic, is both replicated and revised. What for Leviticus and Mishnah-tractate Yoma forms a cultic occasion, in which Israel participates as bystanders, emerges in Bavli-

tractate Yoma as an event in the life of holy Israel, in which all Israel bears tasks of the weight and consequence that, on that holy day, the High Priest uniquely carries out. On the Day of Atonement, holy Israel joins the high priest in the Holy of Holies; this they do on that day by afflicting themselves through fasting and other forms of abstinence, recalling how with Heaven's favor they would eat the bread of angels; this they do on the other days of the year by entering into the disciplines of the Torah; this they do through their lives of virtue. The Day of Atonement, the occasion on which the high priest conducts the rite in the privacy of the Holy of Holies, emerges transformed: the rites are private, but the event is public; the liturgy is conducted in the holy Temple, with sins sent forth through the scapegoat, but the event bears its consequences in holy Israel, where sins are atoned for in the setting of the everyday and the here and now. What is singular and distinct — the rites of atonement on the holiest day of the year in the holiest place in the world — now makes its statement about what takes place on every day of the year in the ordinary life of holy Israel.

And that is how the Day of Atonement would make its way through time, not the sacrificial rite of the high priest in the Temple, but the atonement-celebration of all Israel in the world. What mattered to the compilers of Leviticus and the Mishnah alike was the timeless rite of atonement through the bloody rites of the Temple. What captured the attention of the framers of the Bavli-tractate, by contrast, was the personal discipline of atonement through repentance on the Day of Atonement and a life of virtue and Torah-learning on the rest of the days of the year. They took out of the Holy of Holies and brought into the homes and streets of the holy people that very mysterious rite of atonement that the Day of Atonement called forth. When the compilers of our Talmud moved beyond the limits of the Mishnah-tractate, they transformed the presentation the day and its meaning, transcending its cultic limits. And it was their vision, and not the vision of Leviticus Sixteen and the Mishnah's tractate, that would prove definitive.

The irony comes to expression in the fact that, from antiquity to our own day, the Day of Atonement would enjoy the loyalty of holy Israel come what may, and everywhere, Judaism's single most widely observed occasion. That fact attests to the power of the distinctive ideas set forth by the framers of the Bavli to transform a sacerdotal narrative into a medium of the inner, moral sanctification for Israel, the holy people in utopia entering into the status of the holy priest and the locus of the Temple's inner sanctum. But that reframing of the rite defines the Bavli-tractate's compilers intent, since, after all, it turns out to form the very first point that the framers of the Bavli make when they commence their exposition of the Mishnah-tractate. The opening composite turns out to bear the entire message, just as it should.