

V

BAVLI TRACTATE YOMA CHAPTER FIVE

FOLIOS 47A-62A

5:1A-E

- A. They brought the ladle and fire pan out to him.
- B. And he took [from the pan] handful [of incense] and put [the incense] into the ladle —
- C. 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],
- D. such was the required measure [of the ladle].
- E. He took the fire pan in his right hand and the ladle in his left.

I.1. A. ...fire pan...:

- B. *A Tannaite statement:* he took the pan and went up to the top of the altar, took out the burning coals, and went down [**He took the silver fire shovel and went up to the top of the altar, and he cleared away the cinders from one side and the other, scooped up the innermost ashes, and came down (M. Tamid 1:4I)**]
- C. *In that case it is a pan of burning coals, in this case it is a pan of incense.*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. They took out for him the empty ladle from the chamber of the utensils and the heaped pan of incense from the chamber of the house of Abtinah [so these are different procedures entirely].

II.1 A. 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]:

- B. As to the ladle, what purpose did it serve on the Day of Atonement? The All-Merciful has said, “And he shall take his handfuls and bring it” (Lev. 16:12).
- C. *It is because no other procedure was possible [and he had to use a ladle]. For how otherwise should he act? Should he bring in the pan of burning coals and then bring in the incense in his hands? The All-Merciful speaks of one “bringing in,” and not two. Should he take the incense in his hands and put the pan of*

burning coals on top and go in that way? Then when he comes inside the veil what is he to do? Should he take it out between his teeth and set the pan of burning coals down? But if such a procedure would be inappropriate in the presence of a merely mortal king, how much less appropriate would it be before the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be he. So it is really impossible, and since it is impossible, we carry out the rite as it is done in connection with the offerings of the princes [as described at Num. 7:14, using a ladle full of incense].

III.1 A. He took the fire pan in his right hand and the ladle in his left:

- B. [Jung: This procedure is illogical. The ladle with the incense should be in his right hand, and the less important pan in the left. So the question is asked:] *Then the native would be in the earth and the stranger in the highest heavens!*
- C. 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].
- D. And even where both are alike, as in the case involving R. Ishmael b. Qimhit, still, this one is hot and the other cold.

III.2. A. They said about R. Ishmael b. Qimhit that he could take four qabs in his two handfuls, saying, “All women are valiant, but my mother’s valiancy hits the rooftop.”

- B. *There are those who say that [her valor] is because of the crumb-dough [that she ate when she was pregnant].*
- C. *And that is in accord with Rabbah bar Jonathan, for said Rabbah bar Jonathan said R. Yehiel, “Crumb-dough is good for a sick person.”*
- D. *There are those who say that her valor is because of the semen [that she got when she conceived her son], and that would accord with R. Abbahu.*
- E. *For R. Abbahu contrasted verses of Scripture: “It is written, ‘For you have sifted me with strength unto the battle’ (2Sa. 22:40), and by contrasted, ‘Who has girded me with valor for the battle’ (Psa. 18:33). Said David before the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Lord of the university, “You have first carefully sifted” and then “strengthened” me.”*

III.3. A. They said about R. Ishmael b. Qimhit that one time he was chatting with an Arab in the market place, and a spurt of spit from the latter’s mouth drooled onto his garments [which made him cultically unclean, so he could not conduct the Day of Atonement rites], so Yeshebab, his brother went in and served in his stead. It results that his mother witnessed two of her sons serving as high priests on the same day.

- B. They further said about R. Ishmael b. Qimhit that one time he went out and chatted with a certain noble, and a spurt of spit from the latter’s mouth drooled onto his garments [which made him cultically unclean, so he could not conduct the Day of Atonement rites], so Joseph his brother went in and served in his stead. It results that his mother witnessed two of her sons serving as high priests on the same day.

III.4. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. Qimhit had seven sons, and all of them served in the high priesthood.
- C. Said sages to her, “What did you do that you have enjoyed such merit?”

- D. She said to them, “In my entire life the beams of my house never saw the braids of my hair.”
- E. They said to her, “Many women have observed the same custom [as a mark of modesty] but it did them no good.”

III.5. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “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].
- C. *The question was raised:* What is the rule about making a measure to serve for his handfuls? *Is it the case that the rule applies in that case, since Scripture explicitly states, “With his fist” (Lev. 6: 8), but in the present case, where it is not written, “With his fist” (Lev. 6: 8), but where it is written, “his handful of fine incense,” that is not the rule; or perhaps we derive an analogy from the use of the language, “full” in both cases, applying the rule that derives from, “With his fist” (Lev. 6: 8)?*
- D. *Come and take note:* **such was the required measure of the ladle.** *Doesn’t this mean, that if he wanted to make another measure, he may do so? [The phrase speaks of the ladle, so one could have a measure made in accord with the volume the high priest’s hand could hold (Jung)].*
- E. *No, this is the sense of the statement:* thus he would take the handfuls within the Holy of Holies [Jung: this was the method of measurement within: the priest would empty incense from the ladle into his hands and then put it over the burning coals in the pan].
- F. *Doesn’t that yield the inference,* he takes a handful [outside] and then goes and takes a handful [inside]?
- G. *But perhaps the sense is that* if he wanted to make a measure for the purpose, he may do so? Or also, that he must take neither less nor more [two handfuls exactly].

III.6. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “And he shall take out a handful” (Lev. 2: 2) —
- C. Might one suppose that it should be overflowing?
- D. Scripture states, “In his handful” (Lev. 6: 8) [Cashdan: the flour is to be entirely within the handful, none bursting out at the ends or between the fingers].
- E. If “In his handful” (Lev. 6: 8), might one suppose that it is to be only with the tips of his fingers?
- F. Scripture states, “And he shall take out a handful” (Lev. 2: 2).
- G. How so?
- H. **He stretches out his three fingertips over the palm of his hand [M 1:2L].and then he takes the handful. [47B] In the case of a meal offered prepared on a griddle or on a pan [which are first baked into cakes and then broken up, and the priest takes a handful of the broken cakes, so particles protrude on all sides,] he must level it with his thumb on top and his little finger below. And this was by far the most difficult act of service that was required in the sanctuary [cf. T. Zeb. 1:17B-C].**

- I. **And this was** — *so were there no other exceedingly difficult acts of service in the Temple? Was there not the pinching of the bird of the neck and the taking of “both handfuls” [of incense on the day of atonement, both of them not easily performed]?*
- J. Rather, “This is one of the most difficult acts of service that were required in the sanctuary.”
- III.7.** A. *Said R. Yohanan, “R. Joshua b. Uza’ah raised this question, ‘How about that which is between the fingers of his fist’ [Jung: is it part of the fistful that is offered on the altar or is it remnant that is assigned to the priests]?”*
- B. *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?”*
- C. *Said R. Yohanan, “Joshua b. Uza’ah went and settled the question: ‘That which is between is subject to doubt.’”*
- D. *So what are we supposed to do?*
- E. *Said R. Hanina, “One burns the fistful first, then the portions between the fingers. For if you say that one burns the portions between the fingers first, it may be that they really are residue, you would have a case in which the residue diminished between taking the fistful and burning up of it, while a master has said, ‘Residue that was reduced in volume between the taking of the fistful and the burning therefore — they do not burn up any more fistfuls on their account.’”*
- F. *If so, then in the present case as well, apply the same rule, namely: whatever has been partly used in a fire offering must not be burned further as an offering.*
- G. *Said R. Judah b. R. Simeon b. Pazzi, “He burns them as residue of wood, in accord with what R. Eliezer said, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *R. Eliezer says, “‘For a sweet savor’ (Lev. 2:12) you may not take it up on the altar, but you may take it up for fuel.”*
- I. *So that issue in no way troubles R. Eliezer, but as to rabbis, what is to be said?*
- J. *Said R. Mari, “Fat priests [with fat fingers, which leave no space between them for any incense to get through] take the handful.”*
- K. *Well, if it comes to that, then from R. Eliezer’s viewpoint too to begin with we may follow the same procedure: Fat priests [with fat fingers, which leave no space between them for any incense to get through] take the handful.”*
- III.8.** A. *R. Pappa raised this question: “How about the middle portions in between in connection with the two handfuls of the Day of Atonement?”*
- B. *What’s the point of his question? If we derive the sense of “full” from “full” that occurs in connection with the fistful [Jung: just as with the fistful any heaping is not burnt up as an offering, the same would apply to heapings of the two handfuls, since “full” occurs at Lev. 2: 2 and Lev. 16:13], then the question before us is the same as the question about whether a measure may be made for the handfuls.*
- C. *This is what R. Pappa is asking: Do we require, “he shall bring in his handfuls,” (Lev. 16:12) and that condition has been met? Or perhaps we require, “he shall take...bring in” and that condition has not been met”*

D. *The question stands.*

III.9. A. Said R. Pappa, “It is obvious to me that “a full handful” refers to the way in which people ordinarily take a handful.”

B. R. Pappa raised this question, “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?*”

C. *The question stands.*

III.10. A. Said R. Pappa, “It is obvious to me that “his handfuls” refers to the way in which people ordinarily fill the hands.”

B. R. Pappa raised this question, “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?*”

C. *The question stands.*

III.11. A. R. Pappa raised this question, [48A] “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?*””

B. *The question stands.*

III.12. A. Mar bar R. Ashi raised the question, “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?*”

B. *The question stands.*

III.13. A. R. Pappa raised this question: “As to the handfuls of which they have spoken, are they to be heaped up or leveled?”

B. Said R. Abba to R. Ashi, “Come and take note: As to the handfuls of which they have spoken, they to be neither heaped up nor leveled but generously measured out.

A-F of the following set the stage for the problem raised at G, by defining the pertinent metaphor on the basis of which the problem will be solved. It is not uncommon in our Talmud for inert information to be laid out in preparation for the presentation of an analytical problem, though the present instance is unusual for the elaborate character of the factual substructure that is provided.

III.14. A. We have learned in the Mishnah the following passage: [If] it [the blood] was poured onto the floor and one [then] collected it, it is invalid [M. Zeb. 2:1D]. If it fell from the utensil onto the floor and one then collected it, it is valid.

B. *What is the source of the rule [that the blood must flow from the neck of the beast into a utensil]?*

C. It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- D. “And the anointed priest shall take of the blood of the bullock” (Lev. 4: 5) — of the life-blood [which spurts while the animal is dying], but not of the blood of the skin or of the residual blood that drains after death].
- E. “of the blood of the bullock” — he is to receive the blood directly from the bullock [and not allow it to gush to the pavement and then gather it up, and if he does so, it is invalid for the rite].
- F. *For if you think that “of the blood of the bullock” is meant to make that point, as it is written “of the blood” meaning even a portion of the blood, has not R. Judah said Rab said, “He who slaughters the animal must receive all of the blood of the bullock, for it says, ‘and all the remaining blood of the bullock he shall pour out’ (Lev. 4: 7).” So “from the blood of the bullock” means that he is to receive the blood directly from the bullock [and not allow it to gush to the pavement and then gather it up, and if he does so, it is invalid for the rite]. For the premise here is that [Freedman:] you subtract, add, and interpret [Freedman: you may subtract a letter from one word and add it to another where the context warrants it and then interpret the text in accordance with this alteration. The partitive ‘of’ or ‘from’ here is removed from ‘blood’ and added to ‘the bullock,’ so that it reads: and he shall take the blood from the bullock.]*
- G. *R. Papa raised this question: If the incense was scattered from his handfuls, what is the rule? Is his hand deemed the counterpart to the beast’s neck, so the incense would be invalid? Or perhaps it is comparable to a utensil of service, so it would not be invalid.*
- H. *The question stands.*

III.15. A. *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? Do we say, draw the analogy based on the common use of the word “full,” that occurs with regard to the meal offering. Just as in the matter of the meal offering improper intentionality takes effect, so here too, improper intentionality takes effect? Or do we not appeal to that analogy?*

- B. *Said R. Shimi bar Ashi to R. Pappa, “Come and take note: **Added R. Aqiba, ‘Fine flour, incense, frankincense, and coals, part of which one who had immersed on that selfsame day touched — he has invalidated the whole quantity of them’ [M. Ed. 8:1D-E]** [The utensil unites its contents.] Now if you accept the premise that, since the person who has immersed on the selfsame day has the power to invalidate it, keeping the materials overnight likewise has the power to do so, and since keeping the materials overnight [beyond the proper time for making use of them] invalidates them, so too will the improper intentionality to do so likewise invalidate them.”*

III.16. A. *R. Pappa raised this question: [48B] If the priest formed an improper intentionality during the removal of the coals for the incense, what is the result? Do we treat activities that are required for the performance of a religious duty as tantamount to the religious duty, or do we not take that view?*

- B. *The question stands.*

III.17. A. *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]?*

B. *Said to them R. Sheshet, “You have learned as a Tannaite statement, **He took the fire pan in his right hand and the ladle in his left.**”*

C. *But why did he not solve the problem for them by appeal to the following, which we also have learned in the Mishnah: **and the right hind leg in his left hand, and the flayed end outermost** [M. Tam. 4:3Q]?*

D. *If the rule had to be derived from that passage, I might have supposed that that is the rule in the case of carrying materials that are not essential to the rite of atonement, but when it comes to carrying materials that are essential to the rite of atonement, that would not be the rule. By citing the passage before us, he informed us that that is not the critical consideration at all.*

E. **[49A]** *An objection was raised: When it comes to a non-priest, a person who has yet to bury his deceased, a drunkard, or a blemished priest, with regard to receiving the blood, conveying the blood, or tossing the blood, persons in such classifications are invalid for the rite, and so too one who is sitting down, and so too one who does it with the left hand are likewise invalid for the rite.*

F. *This is a refutation indeed.*

G. *But lo, it is R. Sheshet himself who invoked this question by way of refutation [so he knew the passage, and why did he not consider it in forming his answer, which is contradicted by it]? For R. Sheshet said to the public interlocutor [who repeated aloud what the master said in a low voice] in the service of R. Hisda, “Ask R. Hisda, ‘If the blood is conveyed by a non-priest, what is the law?’” He said to him, “It is valid. And there is a verse of Scripture that supports my view: ‘And they killed the Passover lamb and the priests dashed of their blood and the Levites flayed them’ (2Ch. 35:11).” And R. Sheshet countered, “When it comes to a non-priest, a person who has yet to bury his deceased, a drunkard, or a blemished priest, with regard to receiving the blood, conveying the blood, or tossing the blood, persons in such classifications are invalid for the rite, and so too one who is sitting down, and so too one who does it with the left hand are likewise invalid for the rite.”*

H. *After he heard this tradition, he went and presented his objection.*

I. *But lo, R. Hisda has cited a verse of Scripture!*

J. *It is a case in which the lay persons served as does a portico [they held up the bowls but did not hand them over for use at the altar].*

III.18. A. *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?*

B. *The question stands.*

Pappa’s connection to the following is shown only after a massive interpolation, so that A continues at T.

- III.19.** A. *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?*
- B. Said R. Hanina, "Come and take note of the character of a question of the earlier generation [for we are doing as well as they are]." [This is taken at P to mean that he doubted one may do any such thing.]
- C. *Is that to imply that R. Joshua b. Levi was older [than Hanina]? But didn't R. Joshua b. Levi say, "Me did R. Hanina permit to drink a cress dish on the Sabbath"?*
- D. *To drink? That's obvious. For we have learned in the Mishnah: All sorts of foods a person eats [which serve for] healing, and all such drinks he may drink [M. Shab. 14:3D-E].*
- E. Rather, [the formulation should be:] to grind and then to drink a cress dish on the Sabbath.
- F. *Now what can have been the circumstances? If there was danger to life, then of course it was permitted, and if there was no danger to life, of course it was forbidden.*
- G. *In point of fact, it was a situation in which there was danger to life, and this is the force of the question that he presented to him:*
- H. *[And here is the question that he asked:} Does it have sufficient powers of cure so that for this purpose one may violate the Sabbath, or does it not have sufficient powers of healing so that for this purpose one may not desecrate the Sabbath?*
- I. *And why did he ask R. Hanina in particular?*
- J. *It was because he was an expert in pharmacological matters, for said R. Hanina, " "In all my days no one who consulted me concerning an injury to him caused by a white mule has lived."*
- K. *But lo, we can see that some people do recover from it.*
- L. *Say then, "[No one who consulted me concerning an injury to him caused by a white mule] has healed."*
- M. *But lo, we can see that some people do heal. We say this refers to [a mule] whose legs are white [which is especially ferocious].*
- N. *In any event, the upshot is that R. Hanina was as old as the other.*
- O. *Rather, this is what he said, "Our question is like one of the older generation."*
- P. *But did R. Hanina make such a statement [and did he not doubt that the high priest may take handfuls of incense that had been taken up by someone else]? And has not R. Hanina said, "'With a bullock' — but not with the blood of a bullock" [a priest must both slay the bullock and carry the blood into the holy of holies, so he could not enter with the blood of a bullock that someone else had killed (Jung)].*

- Q. And said R. Hanina, "A handful of incense that one took up before slaying the bullock — he has done nothing." [Jung: as the taking of the handful must not be performed before, but after, the slaying of the bullock, the first high priest must have slain his bullock and the one who takes his place must slay another bullock. It is evident that he cannot use the handfuls taken by the first high priest, which took place before the slaying of the second bullock. Hence it seems impossible that Hanina could have asked the question attributed to him here.]
- R. *This is the sense of his statement: since [Joshua] has raised the question, he must take the view that "with a bullock" includes also "with the bullock's blood," in which case, his question is like the question of an older generation.* [Jung: the second priest does not have to bring another bullock, for if he thought that he did, then the taking of the handful of incense before slaying the bullock would have been invalidated; hence the appropriate remark that others of an earlier generation, who in opposition to him hold that 'with a bullock' includes even 'with the blood of his bullock' have already asked the question.]
- S. [We now revert to the opening question.] *So what is the upshot of the matter?*
- T. 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.*"
- U. Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua to R. Pappa, "To the contrary, if the rule is that he takes the handful first and then has to take it again [into the holy of holies], then his fellow may not enter with his handful, for it is impossible that the handful will not lose or gain. But if it is the rule that he takes the handfuls once but does not take them again, *then your question is a real one. For the question has been raised already: does the priest take a handful and then go and take the handful again, or does he not do so? Come and take note: **such was the required measure of the ladle.** Does this not mean that, just as the measure in the outside is a handful, so it was a handful in the holy of holies?*
- V. *No, maybe it means, if he wanted to take the measure he could do so, or that he must not take either more or less in the one case than in the other.*
- W. *Come and take note: [49B] How does he do it [the second taking of the handful, in the holy of holies]? He takes hold of the dish [the ladle that holds the handfuls] with his fingertips — some say, with his teeth — and he pulls it with his thumb until it reaches his elbows. He then turns it over in his hands and heaps up the incense so that its smoke will rise slowly. Some say, he scatters it so that the smoke may rise fast. And this is the most difficult act of ministry in the sanctuary.*
- X. *So were there no other exceedingly difficult acts of service in the Temple? Was there not the pinching of the bird of the neck and the taking of "both handfuls" [of incense on the day of atonement, both of them not easily performed]?*
- Y. Rather, "This is one of the most difficult acts of service that were required in the sanctuary."

Z. *In any event, this yields the inference that the priest had to perform the act of taking the handful twice.*

AA. *That indeed settles the question.*

III.20. A. [Continuation of the inquiry into the substitution of one priest for another in the continuation of the performance of a rite:] *the question was raised*, if one priest slew the animal but died, may another priest take the blood into the altar? *Do we say*, “with a bullock” means, “even with the blood of the bullock,” *or perhaps* does “with a bullock,” mean, with the beast, not with its blood?

B. R. Hanina says, “‘With a bullock,’ and not with the blood of the bullock.”

C. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “‘With a bullock,’ and even with the blood of the bullock.”

D. R. Ammi said, “‘With a bullock,’ and not with the blood of the bullock.”

E. R. Isaac said, “‘With a bullock,’ and even with the blood of the bullock.”

F. *R. Ammi objected to R. Isaac Nappaha*, “**They register and then withdraw their registration from it until the moment that one will slaughter it** [M. **Pes. 8:3D**]. *Now if what you maintain were so, the formulation should be*, until the blood is tossed.”

G. That is a special case, since the language is used, “if it be too little for a lamb,” (Exo. 12: 4) which is to be read, “as long as the lamb is alive.” [This requires a shift in one of the consonants of the phrase, yielding the preferred meaning.]

H. *Objected Mar Zutra*, “**They do not redeem [a firstling of an ass] with (1) a calf, or (2) with a wild beast, or (3) with an animal which has been properly slaughtered, or (4) with an animal which is terefah, or (5) with a hybrid [of a he-goat and a ewe], or (6) with a koy [the offspring of a he-goat and a hind] [M. Bekh. 1:5A].** It may be done only with a lamb. [A slaughtered lamb then is no more regarded as a lamb, and that refutes the view that blood is equal to the animal itself (Jung).]

I. *That case is exceptional, since the meaning of “lamb” is established by analogy to the use of the word “lamb” in connection with the Passover.*

J. Then how about the proposition, just as in the case of the Passover lamb, it must be a male, unblemished, a year old [as at Exo. 12:3ff.], so here too it must be a male, unblemished, a year old?

K. Scripture states, “You shall redeem...you shall redeem...” (Exo. 13:13), encompassing both.

L. If when Scripture states, “You shall redeem...you shall redeem...” (Exo. 13:13), it serves to encompass both, *then how about including all the others?*

M. *If so, what use is there in the reference to “lamb”?*

O. **[50A]** *R. Isaac Nappaha objected to R. Ammi*, “‘Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth’ (Lev. 4:12) — that means, he should carry forth the whole of it. ‘And the bullock of the sin offering and the he goat of the sin offering’ (Lev. 16:27).” [Jung: this shows that the body of the bullock itself, after it is slain, is still designated ‘bullock.’]

P. *Said R. Pappa*, “*With regard to the hide, flesh, and shit, there is no contention. Where there is a dispute, it concerns the blood alone. The one authority*

maintains that 'blood' falls into the category of 'the bullock' [as a whole], and the other authority takes the position that 'blood' does not fall into the category of 'the bullock.'"

- Q. *Said R. Ashi, "It stands to reason that 'blood' falls into the category of 'the bullock' [as a whole], for it is written, 'with this shall Aaron come into the holy place, with a young bullock' (Lev. 16: 3). Now, does he bring it in with its horns? Isn't it with its blood, and yet it is called 'bullock.'"*
- R. *And the other party?*
- S. The sense of the verse is this: By what means is Aaron made ready to enter the holy place? With a bullock for a sin offering.
- T. *Well, then, why not settle the question [if one priest slew the animal but died, may another priest take the blood into the altar?] from the further consideration: it is a sin offering the owner of which has died, and a sin offering the owner of which has died is left to die [M. Tem. 2:2A]. [No further ministration is possible with it (Jung).]*
- U. *Said Rabin bar R. Ada to Raba, "Your disciples say that said R. Amram, '[The bullock of the day of Atonement] falls into the classification of a sin offering presented in behalf of the community, and the sin offering presented in behalf of the community is not left to die. For we have learned in the Mishnah, Said R. Meir, "And are not the baked cakes [M. Men. 4:5] of the high priest and the bullock of the Day of Atonement the offering of an individual, and they override both the Sabbath and [the prohibitions of] uncleanness?" [M. Tem. 2:1I]. Does this not yield the inference that there is one who takes the view that they represent offerings in behalf of the individual [and that view is given anonymity and therefore authority]!"*
- V. *And from your view, note the following Tannaite formulation: ["The offerings of the community override the Sabbath and the prohibitions of uncleanness. The offerings of the individual override neither the Sabbath nor the prohibitions of uncleanness" [M. Tem. 2: IH], the words of R. Judah.] Said to him R. Jacob , "We find in the case of the baked cakes of the high priest, the bullock of the Day of Atonement, and the Passover, which are offerings of an individual, that they override the Sabbath and the prohibitions of uncleanness" [M. Tem. 2:11]. We find in the case of the bullock which is brought on account of having committed the sin of idolatry and the festal offering, which are offerings of the community, that they do not override the Sabbath and [the prohibitions of] uncleanness." [A general rule did R. Jacob state, "Anything which is subject to performance at a fixed time by the authority of the Torah and cannot be done on the eve of the Sabbath overrides the Sabbath, and anything which is not subject to performance at a fixed time by the authority of the Torah and can be done on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath."] Does this yield the inference that there is one who takes the view that they represent offerings in behalf of the individual? [Surely not.] Rather, to begin with he responded to the initial Tannaite authority, whom he heard stating, the offering of the community overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and of uncleanness, and the offering of an individual does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath and of uncleanness.*

Then, said to him R. Meir, ‘Is the law governing the offering of an individual a governing principle? And **are not the baked cakes [M. Men. 4:5] of the high priest and the bullock of the Day of Atonement** and the Passover sacrifice all the offering of an individual, and they override both the Sabbath and [the prohibitions of] uncleanness? Then said to him R. Jacob, ‘The rule governing the public offering indeed is an encompassing principle. **And yet we find in the case of the bullock which is brought on account of having committed the sin of idolatry and the festal offering, which are offerings of the community, that they do not override the Sabbath and [the prohibitions of] uncleanness.** *So seize upon this governing rule: Anything which is subject to performance at a fixed time by the authority of the Torah and cannot be done on the eve of the Sabbath overrides the Sabbath, even in the case of an offering involving an individual, and anything which is not subject to performance at a fixed time by the authority of the Torah and can be done on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath, even in the case of an offering presented in behalf of the community.*

- W. *Objected Abbaye, “If on the day of atonement animals designated to serve as the bullock and the goat offered on the inner altar were lost and others designated in their place, and also the goats to atone for idolatry were lost, with others designated in their stead, [and which turned up after others had been sacrificed], all are left to die,” the words of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “They are put out to pasture until they are blemished, then are sold, and the proceeds go for the purchase of animals for free will offerings, for an animal designated as a sin offering for the community is never left to die” [cf. T. Kip. 3:9].* [The bullock of the Day of Atonement therefore is a community offering.]
- X. *He said to him, “What is the meaning of ‘bullock’ to which reference is made? This is the bullock that is presented for an error made by the community.”*
- Y. *But lo, the explicit Tannaite formulation has, ...on the day of atonement!*
- Z. *That pertains to the he-goat.*
- AA. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: If on the day of atonement animals designated to serve as the bullock and the goat offered on the inner altar were lost and others designated in their place, and also the goats to atone for idolatry were lost, with others designated in their stead, [and which turned up after others had been sacrificed], all are left to die,” the words of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “They are put out to pasture until they are blemished, then are sold, and the proceeds go for the purchase of animals for free will offerings, for an animal designated as a sin offering for the community is never left to die”?*
- BB. *Don’t state the passage in the language, for an animal designated as a sin offering for the community is never left to die, but rather state in the following language, for an animal designated as a sin offering for partners is never left to die.*
- CC. *[Since neither animal is left to die, whether it belongs to the community or to partners,] what difference does it make?*

- DD. *The priests won't have to bring an offering if they make a mistake in a legal decision [by the court.]* [Jung: If the court by error had wrongly advised the priests, such error would not be considered 'error of the community' as when a whole tribe by mistake transgresses the law, but would be considered a sacrifice of partners, which is not left to die. Herein lies the practical difference and that justifies the distinction.]
- EE. *Come and take note of how R. Eleazar raised the question, [50B]* "In the opinion of him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is an individual sacrifice, if one makes a declaration of substitution for it, is it a valid statement or not?" [The rule of Lev. 27:10 does not apply to a sacrifice in behalf of the community, but it would to that of an individual.] *Does this not then yield the inference that there is one who maintains that it is an offering of the community?*
- FF. *No, it merely yields the inference that there is one who maintains it is an offering of partners.*

- III.21.** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: R. Eleazar raised the question, "In the opinion of him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is an individual sacrifice, if one makes a declaration of substitution for it, is it a valid statement or not?" [The rule of Lev. 21:10 does not apply to a sacrifice in behalf of the community, but it would to that of an individual.]*
- B. *What's the point of the question anyhow? If the issue is, whether the validity of the act of substitution rests on the criterion of the classification of him who made the statement of consecration or on the status of him who is atoned for by the animal, it is self-evident that the matter depends upon the status of him who is atoned for by the animal.* For R. Abbuha said R. Yohanan said, "He who consecrates [something for the Temple and then proposes to pay the value of the object and redeem it from the Temple] must add a fifth to the actual value of the object when he redeems it, and one for whom atonement is made is the one who can effect a valid act of substitution for the beast designated for his atonement, and one who designates a portion of the crop for the priestly ration out of his own grain in behalf of untithed grain belonging to someone else — the power of designating what priest gets the specified part of the crop belongs to him who did the act of separation."
- C. *In point of fact it is obvious to him that the validity of the act of substitution rests on the criterion of the classification of him who is atoned for by the animal. And this is the problem that he means to set forth: Do his brothers, the priests, enjoy a fixed share in the atonement rite or do they receive atonement merely vicariously?*
- D. *Come and take note: A more strict rule applies to consecrated animals than to a substitute, and [a more strict rule] applies to a substitute than to consecrated animals...A community or partners declare [animals] to be sanctified, but do not effect a declaration of substitution [so that should a group of people or partners declare an animal substitute for one already consecrated, the former is not deemed consecrated] ...A more strict rule applies to the substitute...For sanctity applies to [a substitute] which is afflicted*

with a permanent blemish [M. 1:2], so that it does not go forth for unconsecrated purposes, for shearing and for labor and it overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath and of uncleanness and imposes the status of substitute, which is not case for a substitute. [cf. M. Tem. 2:3A]. **A more strict rule applies to a substitute than to consecrated animals. A more strict rule applies to the substitute. For sanctity applies to [a substitute] which is afflicted with a permanent blemish, so that it does not go forth for unconsecrated purposes, for shearing and for labor [M. Tem. 2:3A, E]** which is not the case of a consecrated animal. *Now as to the consecrated animal that is under discussion here, what can be its status? If we should say that it belongs to an individual, will the offering in that case override the restrictions of the Sabbath and uncleanness? So it must belong to the community. But will one belonging to the community impart the status of substitute to an animal that is designated as its substitute? [Of course not.] So is it not the bullock of the high priest, and the rule is that offering it overrides the considerations of both the Sabbath and impurity. That is because it is subject to being offered at a fixed time. But then a statement of substitution affecting it takes effect, which means that it is in the category of an offering of an individual!*

- E. Said R. Sheshet, “No. What is under discussion here is the ram of Aaron [that is brought by the high priest to atonement for himself on the Day of Atonement, so Lev. 16:43)]. *And that stands to reason, for if it should enter your mind that it is to the bullock, then is the rule that the substitute of the bullock does not override the considerations of the Sabbath or uncleanness, though on a weekday it may be offered? But is it not a substitute of a sin offering, and the substitute of a sin offering is left to die.*”
- F. *Not at all. In point of fact, reference is made to his bullock, and what is the sense of “substitute” in this passage? It is, that which .is classified as a substitute [Jung: the teaching speaks here of a substitute in general, not of a substitute of any particular, original sacrificial animal; the restriction concerning substitutes lies in the fact that no substitute ever suspends the law of the Sabbath, even though the substitute is going to be offered up.]*
- G. *If so, then when reference is made to “an offering,” the sense should be, that which goes by the name of the original offering [Jung: without referring to any original sacrifice in particular; why then refer the term either to his bullock or the ram of Aaron?*
- H. *No, he does not deal with whatever goes by the name of the original sacrifice. On what basis do I maintain so? Since the formulation is, **A more strict rule applies to the substitute. For sanctity applies to [a substitute] which is afflicted with a permanent blemish, so that it does not go forth for unconsecrated purposes, for shearing and for labor [M. Tem. 2:3A, E].** Now, if it should enter your mind to maintain, what is the meaning of “an offering”?* *The sense should be, that which goes by the name of the original offering, then lo, there is the matter of [51A] the firstling and tithe of cattle, the laws of which apply even to a permanently*

blemished beast and which are not available when they are redeemed for use for secular purposes, e.g., to be sheared or to be worked. *So the formulation does not mean to refer to that which goes by the name of the original offering.*

- I. *Then what differentiates the beast that is designated as a substitute?*
- J. *A single classification with a uniform set of rules governs all animals that have been designated as substitutes, while in the case of the animal originally designated as a sacrifice, it may fall under diverse rules, e.g., those affecting the firstling or those affecting tithe of cattle.*
- K. *Now as to R. Sheshet, instead of assigning the statement to the case of the ram of Aaron, why not refer it to the Passover offering, for that effects the suspension of the laws of the Sabbath and of uncleanness and it also can serve as the occasion of a substitution, since it is an offering presented by an individual?*
- L. *He takes the view, **They do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in behalf of a single individual [M. Pes. 8:7A].***
- M. *And why not refer it to the Passover offering set out at the second Passover?*
- N. *Does that override considerations of cultic uncleanness?*

III.22. A. [With reference to the statement, ...**We find in the case of the baked cakes of the high priest, the bullock of the Day of Atonement, and the Passover, which are offerings of an individual...We find in the case of the bullock which is brought on account of having committed the sin of idolatry and the festal offering, which are offerings of the community**], said R. Huna b. R. Joshua to Raba, “How come the Tannaite authority classifies the Passover as an offering in behalf of an individual, while he classifies the festal offering as one that serves the community? Is it because the festal offering is presented by mobs of people? So too the Passover offering is presented by mobs of people. But the second Passover offering then is not covered, since it is not offered up by mobs of people.”

- B. *He said to him, “If that were taken into account, then it should override the restrictions of the Sabbath and cultic uncleanness [but that is not the case].”*
- C. *He said to him, “Indeed, he takes the position of him who maintains that it indeed suspends the operation of those laws, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [the second Passover] overrides the prohibitions of the Sabbath but not the considerations of uncleanness. R. Judah says, “It also overrides the considerations of uncleanness.”*
- D. *What is the consideration behind the ruling of the initial authority?*
- E. *Since I have dismissed him fro observing the first Passover on account of uncleanness, is he after all going to keep it in a condition of uncleanness anyhow?*
- F. *And R. Judah?*

- G. The Torah has gone in search of a way for him to keep it in cleanness, but if he did not have the vicarious grace to keep it in such a way, then he has to keep it in a condition of uncleanness.

- III.23.** A. [Reverting to 21.A-C, R. Eleazar raised the question, Do his brothers, the priests, enjoy a fixed share in the atonement rite or do they receive atonement merely vicariously?] *why not find the answer by inference from the words of the All-Merciful, "...which [bullock] is of himself" (Lev. 16: 6), meaning, he brings an offering out of his own resources. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. "which is his" — from his own resources he presents the offering, and he does not present it out of the funds of the community.
- C. Might one suppose that the reason that he does not present the offering out of the resources of the community is that the community does not attain atonement through it, but he may then present it out of the resources of his brothers, the other priests, since his brothers, the other priests, do attain atonement through it?
- D. Scripture states, "which is his."
- E. Might one suppose that while he should not present the offering from the resources of the other priests, but if he did so it is valid?
- F. Scripture once more states, "which is his."
- G. That establishes that the detail is indispensable to the proper performance of the rite.
- H. *But from your perspective, if his fellow priests have no share in it, how even vicariously can they obtain atonement through it at all?*
- I. *Rather, the matter is exceptional when it comes to the personal fortune of Aaron, for the All-Merciful has declared his property free for the use of his brothers, the other priests; so too with regard to the substitute sacrifice, the property of Aaron is exceptional for the All-Merciful has declared his property free for the use of his brothers, the other priests.*

I:1, II:1 form rather standard compositions of Mishnah-exegesis, the one a Tannaite complement, the other a question of clarification. The treatment of the third clause of the Mishnah, "He took the fire pan..." exhibits a remarkable disproportion and presents us with a Talmud of exceptional generosity of intellect. We start, III:1-4, with a clarification of the arrangement; we proceed, III:5-6, with Tannaite glosses of details of the rite. Then we have a vast composite of sayings attributed to Pappa, on the theme of the taking of the incense. That composite runs from III:7 through III:18, and it carries in its wake a sizable secondary expansion, III:19-23. The whole obviously has been framed for a purpose other than Mishnah-exegesis. Pappa's several relevant sayings have been gathered in a topical composite, then give their own talmud. Here is a fine candidate for study in an inquiry into the other-than-Mishnah-exegetical composites of the Talmud.

5:1F-I

- F. **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,**
- G. **and the space between them was a cubit.**

- H. R. Yosé says, "There was only a single veil there alone,
I. "since it says, 'And the veil shall divide for you between the holy place and the most holy place' (Exo. 26:33)."

I.1 A. *Has R. Yosé given rabbis a good answer?*

- B. *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. [Jung: 1Ki. 6:16 refers to the two cedar covered partitions, with a vacant space between them that separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies, occupying the space of one cubit, but 'and he built twenty cubits on the hinder part of the house with boards of cedar from the floor into the joists,' leaves the matter unclear as to which of the two holy areas was to give up the space of one cubit].*

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

- B. "Between the altar and the candelabrum he would walk," the words of R. Judah. [Jung: walking toward the curtain, as he entered, he moved southward between the inner altar and the candelabrum, which was to the south,.]
- C. R. Meir says, "It was between the table and the altar."
- D. And there are those who say, "It was between the table and the wall."
- E. *Which authority is represented by "some say"?*
- F. *Said R. Hisda, "It is R. Yosé, who has said, 'Its entrance was at the north.'"* [Jung: he held that there was only one curtain, clasped on the north side, and since the entrance was on the north side, the high priest had to walk along the northern wall.]
- G. And R. Judah?
- H. *He will say to you, "Its entrance was at the south side."*
- I. *And in accord with which authority does R. Meir reason out matters? If he concurs with R. Judah, let the priest enter in the manner defined by R. Judah, and if he concurs with R. Yosé, let the high priest enter in the way that R. Yosé says.*
- J. *In point of fact, he concurs with the view of R. Yosé, but he will say to you, "The tables [ten tables in two rows of five, left and right of the table of the showbread] were placed between north and south, so they interrupt his progress, stopping him from getting in between the table and the wall."*
- K. *But if you prefer, I shall say: In point of fact the tables were set out from east to west, but it is inappropriate [52A] to enter straight inward [Jung: toward the east of the Divine Presence]. [Assuming the tables were placed between east and west, he could walk unimpeded along the north wall towards the holy of holies, but it would not be reverent to walk straight towards the holy place (Jung).]*
- L. And R. Yosé?
- M. He will say to you, "Israelites are beloved, so Scripture does not impose burdens on their messenger." [The high priest may avoid the detour and walk straight ahead (Jung).]

- N. *And from R. Judah's perspective, why not let him enter between the candlestick and the wall?*
- O. *His clothing would be blackened [from the soot of the candelabrum].*
- I.3.** A. 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."
- B. *Objected Rabina, "How come? Should we say, it is because of the verse, 'And the house that King Solomon built for the Lord — the length thereof was three score cubits and the breadths thereof twenty cubits and the height thereof thirty cubits' (1Ki. 6: 2)? And it is written, 'And the house that is, the Temple before the sanctuary, was forty cubits long' (1Ki. 6:17)? And further, 'And before the sanctuary that was twenty cubits in length and twenty cubits in breadth and twenty cubits in the height thereof' (1Ki. 6:20), with the result that we do not know whether the space of a cubit of the partition was to be deducted from the twenty or the forty? But perhaps the space of a cubit of the partition was to be deducted from neither the twenty nor the forty! The reference would be to free spaces and not to the walls. You may know that that is the high probability, for at every passage in which the walls are mentioned, they are mentioned separately, in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **And the sanctuary [including the porch and the holy of holies] was a hundred cubits by a hundred cubits, with a height of a hundred cubits. [The substructure [solid basement] was six cubits, and the height of the wall built on it was forty cubits, the wall frieze, a cubit, the place of drippings, two cubits, the roof beams, one cubit, the plaster, one cubit. And the height of the upper room was forty cubits, the wall frieze, one cubit, the place of drippings, two cubits, the roof beams, one cubit, and the plaster, one cubit. And the parapet was three cubits. And the scarecrow was one cubit** R. Judah says, "The scarecrow was not included in the measure; rather: the parapet was four cubits." From east to west was one hundred cubits:] The wall of the porch was five [cubits thick], and the porch, eleven; the wall of the sanctuary, six, and its inside, forty cubits. The dividing space was one cubit, and the Holy of Holies, twenty; the wall of the sanctuary, six; the cell, six; and the wall of the cell, five [M. Mid. 4:6-7B]."*
- C. *Rather, the issue is, is the status as to sanctification of the partition equivalent to that of the inner said, that is, the holy of holies, or the outer side. And that is in line with what R. Yohanan said, 'Joseph of Husal raised the question, "'And a sanctuary [the space between the partition dividing the Holy from the Holy of Holies] in the midst of the house from within he prepared to set there the ark of the covenant of the Lord' (1Ki. 6:19) — now the question was raised: what is the sense of the clause of Scripture? Is it, And a sanctuary in the midst of the house — from within he prepared to set there the ark'? Or perhaps this is the sense of the matter, And a sanctuary in the midst of the house from within...?'"*
- D. *But can he have been in doubt about such a thing? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority? Isi b. Judah says, "There are five verses of Scripture in the Torah that cannot be decisively parsed: [52B] 'lifted up' [Gen. 4: 7: if you do well, good, but you must bear the sin if you do not do well; or, if you do well, there will be lifting up of face, and if you do not do well, sin crouches at the door]; 'like*

almond blossoms [Exo. 25:33: three cups, made like along blossoms in one branch, a knop and a flower, or three cups, like almond blossoms, a knop and a flower]; ‘tomorrow’ [Exo. 17: 9: Go out and fight with Amalek tomorrow; I will stand on the top of the hill, or Go out and fight with Amalek, tomorrow I will stand...]; ‘cursed’ [Gen. 49: 6, 7: and in their self will they houghed oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce. Or, in their self will they houghed the cursed oxen. Their anger was fierce]. And ‘rise up’ [Deu. 31:16: Behold you are about to sleep with your fathers, and this people will rise up. Or: behold you are about to sleep with your fathers and you will in the future rise up].” *And it has been further taught on Tannaite authority:* Joseph of Husal is the same as Joseph the Babylonia, Issi b. Judah, Issi b. Gur Arye, Issi b. Gamaliel, Issi b. Mehalalal, but what is his real name? It is Issi b. Aqiba. [So Joseph of Husal cannot have had the problem imputed to him at C.]

- E. *In passages of the Torah, there are only those five unparsable verses, but in the prophetic writings there are more.*
- F. *But are there no more in the Torah? And lo, there are others, for R. Hisda raised this question: “As to this verse, what does it mean: ‘And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt offerings, lambs, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen, to the Lord’ (Exo. 24: 5)? Maybe they both were oxen [the burnt offerings and the peace offerings]?”*
- G. *Sure, but that was a matter of doubt to R. Hisda, while it was not a matter of doubt to Issi b. Judah.*

I:1, bearing I:2 in its wake, asks a question of Mishnah-exegesis. I:3 then reverts to the specific problem of I:1.

5:1K-Q

- J. The outer one was looped up at the south, and the inner one at the north.**
- K. He walks between them until he reaches the northern side.**
- L. [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.**
- M. [When] he has reached the ark, he places the fire pan between the two bars [Exo. 25:12].**
- N. He piled up the incense on the coals, so that the whole house was filled with smoke.**
- O. He came out, going along by the way by which he had gone in.**
- P. And he said a short prayer in the outer area.**
- Q. He did not prolong his prayer, so as not to frighten the Israelites.**
- I.1 A. [The outer one was looped up at the south, and the inner one at the north:]**
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 [as M claims]? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. When the ark was stored away, with it were stored away the bottle of manna, the jar of oil for anointing, the staff of Aaron, its buds and flowers, and the chest in which the Philistines had placed wood for the God of Israel, as it is said, “Now you shall take the ark of the Lord and put it upon a wagon, and the golden offerings you are returning to him in appeasement you shall put in a chest next to it and send it straight away” (1Sa. 6: 8).
- C. [Bavli lacks:] All of them were in the house of the Holy of Holies.
- D. [Bavli lacks:] And when the ark was stored away, the Commandments were stored away.
- E. Who stored it away?
- F. Josiah the King of Judah stored it away.
- G. Why did he do so?
- H. When he saw written in the Torah, “The Lord will bring you and your king whom you set over you to a nation that neither you nor your fathers have known” (Deu. 28:36), he commanded the Levites and they hid it away, as it is said, “And he said to the Levites who taught all Israel and who were holy to the Lord, Put the holy ark in the house which Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel, built; you need no longer carry it upon your shoulders. Now serve the Lord your God and his people Israel” (2Ch. 35: 3).
- I. [Bavli lacks:] He said to them, “Hide it away [for future use], so that it will not be taken away into exile like the rest of the Temple utensils, so put it back in its place, as it is said, ‘Now serve the Lord your God and his people Israel’ (2Ch. 35: 3).”
- J. [Bavli lacks:] Forthwith the Levites hid it away [T. [Sot. 13:1D-L](#)].
- K. *And said R. Eleazar, “We draw a verbal analogy from the use of the word ‘there’ in the setting of Exo. 16:33, ‘Take a jar and put there a full omer of manna,’ and in the setting of the altar before the ark: ‘and place the testimony I shall give you in the ark and I shall meet you there’ (Exo. 25:21-22). We know that Aaron’s staff was set with the manna because of the parallel formulations, ‘Return Aaron’s staff before the testimony as a memorial’ (Num. 17:25) and ‘Leave it before the Lord as a memorial’ (Exo. 16:33). We derive a further verbal analogy from the shared usages at ‘This shall be my holy anointing oil throughout your generations’ (Exo. 30:31) and ‘throughout your generations’ of Exo. 16:33 [on the jar of manna].”*
- L. *In point of fact, reference is made to the second sanctuary, and what is the sense of the language, **When he has reached the ark?** It means, he reached the place at which the ark had been located.*
- M. *But lo, the Tannaite formulation proceeds, **he places the fire pan between the two bars!***
- N. *Read: as if it were between the two bars.*

II.1 A. He piled up the incense on the coals, so that the whole house was filled with smoke:

- B. *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.*

- C. *One Tannaite formulation has it as he begins to heap it up on the inner side, that is, the outer wide to him [that is, at the inside part of the coal pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working outward towards his arm; he commenced to heap up the incense on the outer side of the pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working towards the inside, away from his arm (Jung)].*
- D. *And another Tannaite formulation has it as he begins to heap it up on the outer side, that is, the inner side to him.*
- E. *Said Abbaye, "It is a conflict of Tannaite formulations."*
- F. *And said Abbaye, "It stands to reason that matters are in accord with him who has said, he begins to heap it up on the inner side, that is, the outer wide to him, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **And they instruct him: "Be careful not to begin in front of you [53A] lest you be burned" [M. Tam. 6:3C].***

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

- B. "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 [T. Kip. 1:7F].**
- C. *What interpretation of Scripture supports that position?*
- D. **"And put the incense on the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat which is upon the testimony" (Lev. 16:13). That teaches that he prepares it on the outside and brings it in.**
- E. **Sages said to them, "Now has it not also been stated,"And put the incense on the fire before the Lord"?**
- F. **"From this it follows that whoever offers up incense offers up incense only inside.**
- G. **"If so, why is it said,"The cloud of the incense may cover"?**
- H. **"This teaches that he puts into it something which causes smoke to rise" [T. Kip. loc. cit.]**
- I. *And how do we know that he must put a smoke-raiser into it?*
- J. *Because it is said, "So that the cloud of incense may cover the ark cover" (Lev. 16:13).*
- K. **"If therefore he did not put in something which makes smoke rise, or if he left out any of its requisite spices, he is liable to the death penalty."**
- L. *But why not derive that ruling from the fact that he has entered the holy place without a valid purpose [Lev. 16: 2: that he come not at all times...lest he die"]?*
- M. *Said R. Sheshet, "With what situation do we deal here? It is one in which as to his entry, it was inadvertent, but as to his offering up the incense, it was deliberate."*
- N. *R. Ashi said, "You may even say that he deliberately did both actions. It is a case in which he brought in two sets of incense, one lacking, the other defective, so he is not guilty by reason of entering the holy place without a valid purpose of offering up valid incense; he is guilty by reason of the incense, since he offered up defective incense."*

- II.3.** A. The master has said: And how do we know that he must put a smoke-raiser into it? Because it is said, “So that the cloud of incense may cover the ark cover” (Lev. 16:13).]
- B. Why have one verse of Scripture added to another? [Jung: from the passage, “for in the cloud” we have inferred the necessity of the smoke raiser, so why an additional verse?]
- C. *Said R. Joseph, “This is the sense of the statement: I know on this basis only about the leaf of the smoke raiser. How on the basis of Scripture do I know that the root serves for the purpose of making the smoke rise? It is for that purpose that Scripture has said, ‘So that the cloud of incense may cover the ark cover.’”*
- D. *Said to him Abbayye, “Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority to the very opposite, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: When he put in the root of the smoke-raiser, it would rise up straight like a stick until it reached the ceiling beams; when it reached the ceiling beams, it would seep slowly down the walls, until the house became full of incense smoke, as it is said, ‘And the house was filled with smoke’ (Isa. 6: 4).”*
- E. *Rather, said Abbayye, “This is the sense of the statement: I know only the rule about the root of the smoke raiser. How do I know the rule concerning its leaf? Scripture states, ‘So that it may cover...’”*
- II.4.** A. R. Sheshet said, “I know only the rule governing the tent of meeting in the wilderness. How do we know the rule for the high place at Shilo and the eternal house? Scripture states, ‘So that it may cover...’”
- B. *But that fact derives from the clause, “And so shall he do for the tent of meeting, that dwells with them” (Lev. 16:16). [Jung: wherever he shall dwell with them they shall do this.]*
- C. *Rather, this is the sense of the statement: I know only that that is the rule for the Day of Atonement. How do I know that the same rule applies to other days of the year? Scripture states, “So that it may cover...”*
- II.5.** A. *Said R. Ashi, “One passage indicates that it is a religious duty to do so, and the other passage indicates that the procedure is indispensable.” [Jung: “So that it may cover” is the command; “he shall not come at all times...” is the prohibition indicating that the incense is indispensable.]*
- B. *Raba said, “One clause specifies the penalty, the other the admonition.”*
- C. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *R. Eliezer says, “‘...and not die...’ is the statement of the penalty; ‘...for I appear in the cloud...’ specifies the admonition. For I might have thought that both of these statements were made before the death of the sons of Aaron. To the contrary, Scripture states, ‘After the death of the two sons of Aaron’ (Lev. 16: 1).*
- E. *“I might suppose that both statements were made after the death of the two sons of Aaron. Scripture states, ‘For I will appear in the cloud upon the ark cover.’ How is the whole to be reconciled then? The admonition took place prior to the death of the two sons of Aaron, and the pronouncement of the penalty took place afterward.”*
- F. *What is the foundation for the inference just now proposed?*

- G. Said Raba, "Said Scripture, 'For I will appear in the cloud,' but he had not yet made his appearance."
- H. *So why were the two sons punished?*
- I. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. R. Eliezer says, "The sons of Aaron died only because they taught the law in the presence of their lord, Moses."
- K. *What exegesis of Scripture supports that allegation?*
- L. "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar" (Lev. 1: 7): they said, "Even though the fire comes down from heaven, it is a religious duty to bring some natural fire."

III.1 A. He came out, going along by the way by which he had gone in:

- B. *What is the source in Scripture for this statement?*
- C. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, "Said Scripture, 'So Solomon came to the high place that was at Gideon to Jerusalem' (2Ch. 1:13). Now what has Gideon to do with Jerusalem? But his exit from Gideon for Jerusalem is treated as comparable to his coming from Jerusalem to Gideon. Just as when he came from Jerusalem to Gideon, his face was directed to the high place in the same way as he had come in, so when he came from Gideon to Jerusalem, his face was toward to the high place in the same way as he had come in."
- D. "And so is the rule for the priests in their performance of their liturgy and for the Levites in their performance on their platform and the Israelites when they constitute their presence: when they take their leaves, they did not turn their faces away and go outward, but they turned their faces to the side and go along."
- E. "And so is the rule for a disciple who takes his leave from his master. He does not turn his face and go his way, but he turns his face to the side and goes his way."

III.2. A. *That is like the case of R. Eleazar. When he would take his leave from R. Yohanan, if R. Yohanan wanted to leave, R. Eleazar would stand in place, with his head bowed, until R. Yohanan had disappeared from his sight. When R. Eleazar wished to take his leave, he would back off until he disappeared from R. Yohanan's view.*

- B. *When Raba would take his leave from R. Joseph, he would go backwards so that his feet were bruised and the threshold of R. Joseph's house was bloodied. [53B] They told R. Joseph that that is what Raba did. He said to him, "May it be God's will that you raise your head above the whole city."*

III.3. A. Said R. Alexandri said R. Joshua b. Levi, "He who recites the Prayer has to take three steps backward, and at that point, he may recite the concluding words of peace."

- B. Said to him R. Mordecai, "Once he has taken three steps backwards, *he should remain standing*, as a disciple does who takes his leave of his master, for if he turns right off the bat, it is like a dog that goes back to his vomit."
- C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- D. He who recites the Prayer has to take three steps backward, and at that point, he may recite the concluding words of peace. And if he has not done so, it would have been better for him not to have said the Prayer.
- E. And in the name of Shamaiah they said, "One should say the word 'peace' toward the right and then toward the left: 'At his right hand was a fiery law unto them' (Deu. 33: 2); and Scripture further says, 'A thousand may fall at your side and ten thousand at your right hand' (Psa. 91: 7)."
- F. *What is the point of adding, and Scripture further says?*
- G. *Should you say that it is the ordinary practice to take something with your right hand [and there is no reason to treat doing so as an act of rite], Scripture further says, "A thousand may fall at your side and ten thousand at your right hand" (Psa. 91: 7).*

III.4. A. *Raba noticed that Abbaye stated the word "peace" for to the right. He said to him, "Do you think that the sense is, your right? It is your left to which I made reference, which is the same as the right hand of the Holy One, blessed be he."*

B. *Said R. Hiyya b. R. Huna, "I noted that both Abbaye and Raba took all three steps in one genuflection."*

IV.1 A. **And he said a short prayer in the outer area. He did not prolong his prayer, so as not to frighten the Israelites:**

- B. *What is the short prayer that he says?*
- C. *Raba bar R. Ada and Rabin bar R. Ada both in the name of Rab say, "May it be pleasing to you, Lord our God, that this year should be a year of heavy and rain and hot."*
- D. *But is a hot year such an advantage? Rather, say, "...if it is hot, let it be rainy."*
- E. *R. Aha b. Raba concludes in the name of R. Judah, "May no ruler depart from the House of Judah, and may your people Israel may not need sustenance from one another. And may the prayer of travellers not come before you [that it not rain]."*

IV.2. A. *R. Hanina b. Dosa was going along the way. It began to rain on him. He said, "Lord of the world, the whole world is enjoying satisfaction, but Hanina is in distress." The rain stopped.*

- B. *When he got home, he said, "Lord of the world, the whole world is distressed, but Hanina is enjoying satisfaction." It began to rain.*
- C. *Said R. Joseph, "Then what use is the prayer of the high priest when it comes up against R. Hanina b. Dosa."*

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

- B. **There was the case of a high priest who took a long time. His brothers, the priests, decided to come in after him. When he started to go in, he came out.**
- C. **They said to him, "Why did you take a long time?"**
- D. **He said to them, "Is it so hard a thing in your eyes that I was praying for you and for the sanctuary of your fathers that it not be destroyed?"**

- E. They said to him, “Don’t get in the habit of doing things that way. For lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: He did not prolong his prayer, so as not to frighten the Israelites” [T. Kip. 2:13D-G].

At each point there is a consistent pattern of direct comment on a point pertinent to the Mishnah-paragraph, followed by some secondary expansion either of the comment itself or of a detail of the comment. I:1, II:1 follow that pattern; II:2 then adds a Tannaite complement, which carries its own talmud in its wake. Units III and IV show the same general program.

5:2-4

5:2

- A. Once the ark was taken away, there remained a stone from the days of the earlier prophets, called Shetiyyah.
B. It was three fingerbreadths high.
C. And on it did he put [the fire pan].

5:3

- A. He took the blood from the one who had been stirring it [M. 4:3B].
B. He [again] went into the place into which he had entered and again stood on the place on which he had stood.
C. Then he sprinkled some [of the blood], one time upwards and seven times downwards.
D. But he did not intentionally toss it upwards or downwards.
E. But [he did it] like one who cracks a whip.
F. 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.”
G. He went out and he set down [the bowl of blood] on the golden stand in the Sanctuary.

5:4

- A. They brought him the goat.
B. He slaughtered it and received its blood in a basin.
C. He went into that same place into which he had entered, and stood on that same place on which he had stood.
D. And he sprinkled some [of the blood], one time upwards and seven times downwards.
E. But he did not intentionally sprinkle upwards or downwards.
F. But he [did it] like one who cracks a whip.
G. And thus did he count: “One, one and one, one and two,” and so forth.
H. He went out and he set it on the second stand which was in the Sanctuary
I. R. Judah says, “There was only one stand there alone.

- J. “He took the blood of the bullock and set down the blood of the goat in its place,”
- K. and sprinkled some of it on the veil toward the ark outside.
- L. [He sprinkled some of the blood] one time upwards and seven times downwards.
- M. But he did not intentionally sprinkle upwards or downwards.
- N. But he did it like one who cracks a whip.
- O. And thus did he count: “One, one and one, one and two,” and so forth.
- P. 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,
- Q. one time upwards and seven times downwards.
- R. But he did not intentionally sprinkle upwards or downwards.
- S. But he did it like one who cracks a whip.
- T. And thus did he count: “One, one and one, one and two,” and so forth.
- U. Then he emptied the blood of the bullock into the blood of the goat, and poured the contents of the full basin into the empty one.
- I.1 A. **Once the ark was taken away, there remained a stone from the days of the earlier prophets:**
 - B. *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.*
 - C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - D. **R. Eliezer says, “The ark was taken away to exile, in Babylonia [vs. M. [Sheq. 6:1, 6:2](#)], since it says, ‘Then Isaiah said to Hezekiah, Hear the word °S the Lord. Behold, the days are coming, when all that is in your house, and that which your fathers have stored up till this day, shall be carried to Babylonia. No thing shall be left, says the Lord’ (2Ki. 20:16-17). And ‘thing’ means nothing other than the [ten] things [commandments] which are in it.”**
 - E. **R. Simeon [B.: b. Yohai] says, “Lo, it says, ‘In the spring of the year King Nebuchadnezzar sent and brought him to Babylonia, with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord, land made his brother Zedekiah king of Judah and Jerusalem’ (2Ch. 36:10). Now what is the meaning of ‘the precious vessels of the house of the Lord’? This refers to the ark.”**
 - F. **R. Judah b. Laqish says, “The ark was stored away in its proper place, since it says, ‘And the poles were so long that the ends of the poles were seen from the holy place before the inner sanctuary; but they could not be seen from outside; and they are there to this day’ (1Ki. 8: 8)” [T. [Sheq. 2:18](#)].**
 - G. *And that proposition differs from the view of Ulla, for said Ulla, “R. Matia b. Heresh asked R. Simeon b. Yohai in Rome, ‘Since since R. Eliezer has taught us that on the first and second occasion the ark went into exile to Babylonia*
 - H. *“— the first being the one of which we have just spoken, “and he had brought to Babylonia together with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord” (2Ch. 36:10), and what is the second? as it is written, “And gone is from the*

daughter of Zion [54A] all her splendor” (Lam. 1: 6), *and what does “her splendor” mean? All that is enclosed within her [that is, the ark],*

J. ““what do you say?”

K. “He said to him, ‘I say, the ark was hidden away in its own location, as it is said, “And the poles were so long that the ends of the poles were seen from the holy place before the inner sanctuary; but they could not be seen from outside; and they are there to this day” (1Ki. 8: 8).”

L. *Said Rabbah to Ulla, “How does the verse yield that implication?”*

M. “As it is written, “And they were there unto this day’ (1Ki. 8: 8).”

N. “*Then does every passage in which it is written, ‘unto this day,’ mean, forever? Isn’t it written, ‘And the children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem, but the Israelites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day’ (Jud. 1:21)? Does that too mean, they did not go into exile? And hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, ‘For fifty two years, nobody passed through Judea: “For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation, because they are burned up so that none passes through...both the fowls of the heaven and the breast are fled, they are gone” (Jer. 9: 9) — and the numerical value of the word for beast is fifty-two.’ And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé says, ‘For seven years sulphur and salt prevailed in the land of Israel,’ and said R. Yohanan, ‘What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Yosé? It derives from an analogy formed on the occurrence of the word ‘covenant’ that occur in two passages, namely: “And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week” (Dan. 9:27), and further, “Then men shall say, Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord, the God of their fathers” (Deu. 29:24).” [Jung: thus the severe punishment for forsaking the covenant is that sulphur and salt cover the land.]*

O. *He said to him, “Here the word ‘there’ is used, but there, in the case of the ark, the word ‘there’ is not used.” [Jung: in the case of the ark, Scripture reads, “There unto this day,” implying for ever, while in the absence of “there” in Jud. 1:21, no such claim is made.]*

P. *Then is it the fact that where the word “there” occurs, the meaning is, “forever”? And by way of objection: “And some of them, even of the sons of Simeon, five hundred men, went to Mount Seir, having for their captains Pelatiah and Neariah and Rephaiah and Uzziel, the sons of Ishi. And they smote the remnants of the Amalekites that escaped and dwelt there unto this day” (1Ch. 4:42-3), but as a matter of fact, Sennacherib, King of Assyria, had come up and confused all the lands: ‘I have removed the bounds of the peoples and have robbed their treasures’ (Isa. 10:13).”*

R. *That is a valid refutation.*

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

B. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “So too we have learned as a Tannaite formulation: **There was the case in which priest was going about his business and saw that a block of the pavement was slightly different from the rest. He came***

and told his fellow. He did not finish telling [him] before he dropped dead. Then they knew without doubt that there the ark had been stored away [M. Sheq. 6:2].”

C. *What had he done [to warrant this penalty]?*

D. Said R. Helbo, “He was busy with his axe.”

E. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael:* Two blemished priests were sorting out wood when the axe of one of them slipped from his hand and fell on that place, and a flame burst forth and consumed him.

I.3. A. *R. Judah contrasted verses of Scripture:* ‘And the poles were so long that the ends of the poles were seen from the holy place before the inner sanctuary; but they could not be seen from outside; and they are there to this day’ (1Ki. 8: 8). And by contrast: ‘but they could not be seen from outside; and they are there to this day’ (1Ki. 8: 8). How so? They were visible but not actually seen.”

B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. “...that the ends of the poles were seen” — might one suppose that they did not protrude from their place?

D. Scripture states, “And the poles were so long...”

E. Might one suppose that they tore through the curtain and showed forth?

F. Scripture states, “...they could not be seen from outside.”

G. How so? They bulged out and protruded like a woman’s two breasts: “My beloved is unto me as a big of myrrh that lies between my breasts” (Son. 1:13).

H. Said R. Qattina, “When the Israelites come up for the pilgrim festival, they removed the curtain and showed the Cherubim, whose bodies were twisted with one another, and they say to them, ‘See how much you are loved before the Omnipresent, the way a man and woman love one another.’”

I. *Objected R. Hisda,* “‘But they shall not go in to see the holy things as they are being covered’ (Num. 4:20), and said R. Judah said Rab, ‘This refers to the time of putting the utensils away in their cases.’ [Jung: the Levites in the wilderness while carrying the vessels on their shoulders were not permitted to look at them before they were covered. How much less would the holy of holies be profaned by being shown to the people who had come to celebrate the festival, since the Cherubim were above the mercy seat in the holy of holies.]

J. Said R. Nahman, “The matter may be compared to a bride. So long as she is in her father’s house, she is bashful before her husband. When she reaches the house of her father in law, she is no longer bashful before her husband.”

K. *Objected R. Hana bar R. Qattina,* “**There was the case in which priest was going about his business and saw that a block of the pavement was slightly different from the rest. He came and told his fellow. He did not finish telling [him] before he dropped dead. Then they knew without doubt that there the ark had been stored away [M. Sheq. 6:2].**” [Jung: the same reserve still prevails in the Temple.]

- L. He said to him, "You speak of a divorcee. When she is divorced, she goes back to her original love." [Jung: the reserve of her original prenuptial state.]
- M. *Under what circumstances [are the curtains rolled back and the cherubim shown to pilgrims]? Should we say that this is in the first sanctuary? But was there a veil in the first sanctuary? So it must speak of the second sanctuary. But were there cherubim in the second sanctuary?*
- N. *In point of fact reference is made to the first sanctuary, and what is the meaning here of "veil"? The curtains at the entrances. For said R. Zira said Rab, "There were thirteen curtains in the second Temple, seven for the seven gates, one for the entrance to the entry, one for the entrance to the porch, two at the entrance of the holy place, and two above them, corresponding to them on the second floor" [Slotki: to form a partition between the chamber above the the holy place].*
- O. *R. Aha bar Jacob said, "In point of fact reference is made to the second sanctuary, and it had painted cherubim, in line with the verse: 'And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubim and palm trees and open flowers within and without' (1Ki. 6:29), 'and he overlaid them with gold fitted upon the graven work' (1Ki. 6:35). 'According to the space of each with wreaths round about' (1Ki. 7:36)."*
- P. *What is the meaning of with wreaths round about'?*
- Q. Said Rabbah b. R. Shila, [54B] "Like a man who embraces his companion."
- R. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "When the gentiles entered the sanctuary, they saw the cherubim embracing one another. They brought them out to the marketplace and said, 'These Israelites, whose blessing is a true blessing, and whose curse is a true curse, are engaged in such matters as these.' From that moment on they despised them: 'All that honored her despised her because they have seen her nakedness' Lam. 1: 8)."

II.1 A. ...called Shetiyyah:

- B. *A Tannaite statement: From it the world was created [T. Kip. 2:14C].*
- C. *Our Mishnah-teaching accords with him who has said, Out of Zion the world was created.*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. R. Eliezer says, "The world was created from its center: 'When the dust runs into a mass and the clods keep fast together' (Job. 38:38)."
- F. R. Joshua says, "The world was created from the sides: 'For he says to the snow, fall on the earth; likewise to the shower of rain and to the showers of his mighty rain' (Job. 37: 6)."
- G. R. Isaac Nappaha said, "A stone did the Holy One, blessed be he, toss into the ocean, from which the world was founded: 'Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened, or who laid the cornerstone thereof' (Job. 38: 6)."
- H. And sages say, "It was created from Zion: 'A Psalm of Asaph, God, God the Lord has spoken...out of Zion, the perfection of the world' (Psa. 50:1, 2)."

II.2. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eliezer the Great says, “‘These are the generations of the heavens and earth in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven’ (Gen. 2: 4) — the generations of heaven were made from heaven, and the generations of earth from earth.”
- C. And sages say, “Both these and those were created from Zion: ‘A Psalm of Asaph, God, God the Lord has spoken and called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof’ (Psa. 50:1, 2), and further, ‘Out of Zion the perfection of beauty God has shined forth,’ meaning, from it the beauty of the world was perfected.”

III.1 A. **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:**

- B. *What is the meaning of like one who cracks a whip?*
- C. R. Judah made a gesture [55A] like one swinging a whip.

III.2. A. *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. 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.
- C. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*
- D. Said R. Aha bar Jacob said R. Zira, “Said Scripture, ‘..and sprinkle [the blood of the he-goat] upon the ark cover and before the ark cover’ (Lev. 16:15). *With respect to the blood of the he-goat it is not necessary for Scripture to speak of sprinkling downwards, for that is to be inferred from the rite conducted with the blood of the bullock, in which the downward sprinkling is done. So why is it included here? It serves to establish a verbal analogy based on the ‘upon’ [the ark cover with the sprinkling] ‘before’ it, to make this point: just as the sprinkling before does not mean literally before [the blood falling on the ground, not on the ark cover], so sprinkling upon does not mean literally upon [Jung: not only not exactly upwards but really downwards].*”
- E. *To the contrary, let Scripture not make reference to “upon” [the ark cover] when it speaks of the bullock, for that may be derived from the analogy that the he-goats blood was sprinkling upon it. So why was it brought up? It is to compare sprinkling before it to sprinkling upon it, with the result: just as “upon” means, literally, so “before” means literally.*
- F. *How so! If, to be sure, you have said that “below” in the case of the he-goat serves to form a verbal analogy to “upon” in the case of the bullock, that is required in line with what the Tannaite authority of he household of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [made clear], for the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [stated], “Towards the front of the mercy seat on the east” (Lev. 16:14) — this provides the generative analogy for the fact that, in any passage in which it is stated, “front,” the meaning is, “the east side.” But if you maintain that the reference to “above” in the case of the bullock serves to establish an analogy to*

the “downward” with respect to the bullock, then what purpose is served by this “downward” in context?

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

- B.** “..and sprinkle [the blood of the he-goat] upon the ark cover and before the ark cover” (Lev. 16:15) —
- C.** 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.** Here is a way of forming a generative analogy:
- E.** There is reference to “blood” in the setting of sprinkling downward with the bullock’s blood, and there is a reference to “blood” in the setting of downward sprinkling with the goat’s blood. Just as sprinkling downwards with the bullock means, seven times, so sprinkling down with the goat’s blood is to be done seven times.
- F.** Or take this route:
- G.** There is reference to “blood” in the setting of sprinkling upwards with the goat’s blood, and there is reference to “blood” in the setting of downward sprinkling with the he-goat’s blood. Just as upwards the he-goat’s blood is sprinkled once, so downwards sprinkling of the he-goat’s blood is one time.
- H.** Let us then consider which is the appropriate analogy:
- I.** We should draw the analogy governing downward sprinkling from the rule governing downward sprinkling, and we should not invoke the rule for downward sprinkling from the one governing upward sprinkling.
- J.** Or, to the contrary: we should draw the analogy governing an aspect of the body of the rite from another aspect of the body of the same rite, but let us not drawn an analogy for governing an aspect of the body of the rite from an aspect of what is extraneous to that rite [that is, we do not treat as analogous the rite of the he-goat and the rite of the bullock].
- K.** Scripture accordingly states, “And he shall do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bullock” (Lev. 16:15).
- L.** For it is hardly necessary for Scripture to state, “as he did,” [Jung: since the sprinkling upon or before has been expressly mentioned in connection with the he-goat, these words are superfluous and bear some other intimation], and why does Scripture state, “as he did”? It is so that all of the actions concerning the two beasts should be the same [cf. Sifra CLXXXIX:II.3].
- M.** Thus: just as the sprinkling in the case of the blood of the bullock is done below seven times, so the sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat is done below seven times. So we learn how many times the blood is to be sprinkled in the case of both the bullock and the he-goat, which is seven.
- N.** Just as in the case of the blood of the he-goat, only one upward sprinkling was carried out, so only one sprinkling upward was done in the case of the bullock.

IV.1 *A. One, one and one, one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven:*

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

- C. "...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.
- C. 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" [T. [Kip. 2:16E-F](#)].
- D. *But in fact they do not differ. The one authority repeats matters as they are done in his locale, and the other as they are done in his locale, but all parties concur, nonetheless, that the first act of sprinkling has to be counted along with each of the subsequent actions.*
- E. *How come?*
- F. R. Eleazar said, "So that the priest may not make an error in the number of acts of sprinklings."
- G. R. Yohanan said, "Said Scripture, 'And before the ark cover he shall sprinkle,' and it was hardly necessary for Scripture to specify, 'he shall sprinkle,' so why does Scripture say, 'he shall sprinkle'? This teaches concerning the first act of sprinkling that it has to be counted with each subsequent act of sprinkling."
- H. *What is at issue between [Eleazar and Yohanan]?*
- I. *At issue between them is the case of a rite in which the high priest did not count out the number of sprinklings but also made no mistake [and if the counting is essential to the rite, his act is still null].*

V.1 A. He went out and he set down the bowl of blood on the golden stand in the Sanctuary:

- B. *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" [T. [Sheq. 3:3](#), cf. M. [Sheq. 6:5J](#)].*
- C. *What is the meaning of the phrase, because of the possibility of confusion?*
- D. Said R. Joseph, "Because of the possibility of confusing funds given in fulfillment of an obligation with those given as a freewill offering."
- E. *Said to him Abbayye, "So why not make two chests and write on them, this is for obligatory offerings, that is for votive offerings?"*
- F. R. Judah [\[55B\]](#) 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](#)].
- G. *Why not two? Because they might be confused. And why not put out two and write on them, "This is for the bullock," "This is for the he-goat"? So you must conclude that R. Judah does not deem inscriptions of that sort to make much difference.*
- H. *By way of objection: Thirteen shofar chests were in the sanctuary. And written on them were the following [in Aramaic]: (1) "New sheqels" and (2) "old sheqels," (3) "bird offerings," and (4) "young birds for a burnt offering"; (5) "wood" and (6) "frankincense"; (7) "gold for the Mercy seat," and on six, "for freewill offerings." New sheqels — those for each year [that is, for the present year]. Old sheqels — He who did not pay his sheqel last year pays his sheqel in the coming year. Bird offerings-these are for turtledoves. Young birds for a burnt offering-these are for pigeons. "And all*

of them are burnt offerings,” the words of R. Judah [M. Sheq. 6:5A-I]. [So he does accept the use of inscriptions.]

- I. *When R. Dimi came, he said, “They say in the West: it is a precautionary decree on account of the case of an animal designated as a sin offering, the owner of which has died.” [It is left to die. If the owner died, the money that he has put into one of the chests must be disposed of; it may not be used and if mixed with other funds renders the whole useless. That is the confusion, and that is why we do not set out money chests for obligatory bird offerings presented for inadvertent sin (Jung).]*
- J. *But do we really take account of such a possibility? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **He who sends his sin offering from overseas-they offer it up in the assumption that he is alive** [M. Git. 3:4J, cf. M. Tem. 4:1]?*
- K. *Rather, it is because of the case of a sin offering the owner of which has certainly died [after putting money in the chest, but before his offering was made].*
- L. *But then why not just select four zuz and toss them into the sea and the rest of the money in the chest will be available for use [the four zuz that have been selected retrospectively standing for a bird to be presented as a sin offering by the deceased]?*
- M. *R. Judah does not affirm the principle of retrospective clarification of the facts of a matter through post facto selection. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who purchases wine among Samaritans [in a situation in which he cannot separate tithes right away, but wishes to drink the wine], says, “Two logs out of one hundred which I shall separate, behold, these are made priestly rations, and [56A] the following ten logs are made first tithe, and the following nine logs are made second tithe.”** He regards the wine as unconsecrated produce and drinks it [M. Dem. 7:4], the words of R. Meir [T. Dem. 8:7AA]. [56B] R. Judah, R. Yosé, and R. Simeon prohibited [doing so] [T. Dem. 8:7BB]. It therefore follows that he does not affirm the principle of retrospective clarification of the facts of a matter through post facto selection.*
- N. *But how does that necessarily follow from this particular case? Maybe that case is exceptional, since the Tannaite formulation sets forth the operative consideration: They said to R. Meir, “Don’t you concede that there is the possibility that the wine skin may burst open, and the man will then turn out retrospectively to be drinking untithed wine?” And he said to them, “When it will have burst open [we take account of the possibility, not before].”*
- O. *Rather, it is in line with what Ayyo stated as a Tannaite formulation, for stated Ayyo as a Tannaite formulation: R. Judah says, ‘One may not make simultaneously stipulations in relationship to two events that may take place [e.g., two sages coming from opposite directions]. He may stipulate only in this way: “If a sage came from the east, my fictive fusion meal will be the one on the east, and if the sage came from the west, my fictive fusion meal will be the one I put on the west.” But he can’t say, “If one came from this direction and one came from that direction...”’*
- P. *And we reflected on that matter in this language: how come he can’t say, “If one came from this direction and one came from that direction...”? Because we do not affirm the principle of retroactive clarification of the facts [because the choice the*

man made between the two sages on the following day may not have been his choice at twilight on Friday, at the point at which the fictive fusion meal took effect (Slotki)]. *But then we should invoke the same consideration if the language was, if one came from the east or from the west!*

- Q. And said R. Yohanan, “Our Mishnah-paragraph speaks of a case in which the sage had already come” [within the Sabbath limit by twilight, though the man didn’t know. The meal was validated by an event that had happened, though the one who made the stipulation didn’t know that fact, so the meal is valid; the subsequent clarification of the facts didn’t validate the meal, the facts themselves did. The issue of retrospective clarification of the facts is not in play here.]
- R. *So now that we have ruled that R. Judah rejects the principle of retrospective clarification of the facts of a matter through post facto selection but he does accept the effectiveness of putting out inscriptions, then on the Day of Atonement we also should make two stands and write inscriptions on them!*
- S. *[The reason that we do not do so] is the fatigue of the high priest, for he might not pay any attention to these inscriptions [and put the blood down on the wrong stand]. For if you do not concede that point, then even if there is no writing, the blood that is for one offering is abundant, and that for the other is sparse [the bullock’s is abundant, the goat’s not].*
- T. *And if you should say, the priest does not receive the whole of the blood of the bullock, has not R. Judah said Rab said , “He who slaughters the animal must receive all of the blood of the bullock, for it says, ‘and all the remaining blood of the bullock he shall pour out’ (Lev. 4: 7)”?*
- U. *And should you say, some of it might be spilled, nonetheless, the blood of the one is lighter and that of the other darker. So it must follow that the operative consideration is the fatigue of the high priest, for he might not pay any attention to these inscriptions [and put the blood down on the wrong stand]. And here too, because of the fatigue of the high priest, he might not pay any attention to these inscriptions.*
- V.2.** A. *There was someone who in the presence of Raba went down and said, “Then he came forth, placed it upon the second stand in the Temple. He took the blood of the bullock and put the blood of the he goat.”*
- B. *He said to him, “In one detail you have stated matters in accord with rabbis, in another, in accord with R. Judah [the rabbis have a second stand, Judah says he took the blood of the bullock first and then put down the blood of the he-goat]. Say it in this way: He deposited the blood of the he-goat and took the blood of the bullock.”*

VI.1 A. **...and sprinkled some of it on the veil toward the ark outside:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And so shall he do for the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:16) —
- D. What is the point of Scripture here? It is, 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.

VI.2. A. "...Who dwells with them in the midst of their uncleanness" (Lev. 16:16) —

B. Even when they are unclean, the Presence of God is with them.

VI.3. A. *A certain Sadducee said to R. Hanina, "So now it is sure that all of you are unclean, for it is written, 'Her filthiness was in her skirts' (Lam. 1: 9)."*

B. *He said to him, "Come and see what is written concerning them: '...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."*

VI.4. A. But may a rule that is inferred by analogy then go and serve as the basis of another rule drawn by analogy? [Jung: we have inferred the number of upward and downward sprinklings with the blood of the bullock and the he-goat respectively; here again an attempt is made to infer through analogy the number of upward and downward sprinklings in the sanctuary on the basis of the sprinklings in the holy of holies. The rule is that in the laws pertaining to sacrifices something obtained by analogy may not in turn become the basis or source of a new inference by analogy; such inference is legitimate only when based upon the biblical text itself.]

B. This inference derived from the subject itself along with another matter and therefore is not to be classified as an inference by analogy. [Jung: In the primary analogy the main law prescribed upward and downward sprinklings is definitely taught in the biblical text, both in the case of the bullock and the he-goat; it is only their number that is inferred one from another. In such a case the primary analogy may be made the basis for a further analogy. It is only when the very law itself is mentioned in one case only, and then inferred through analogy for the other, that no further inference by analogy may be made. If, e.g., no reference had been made in the biblical text to any upward or downward sprinkling, such regulation being based on inference from one to the other, it would then be wrong to derive another law by analogy from the first law inferred by analogy.]

C. *Well, that would pose no problem to him who has said that it would not constitute an inference by analogy. But from the perspective of him who maintains that even that would constitute an inference by analogy, what is to be said?*

D. *It is only the areas that are inferred from one another [in the first analogy the inference was made from one animal for the other, in the second the concern is localities, the Holy or holies and the Temple area, extending the sprinkling regulations from the former to the latter (Jung)].*

E. *Or, if you prefer, I shall say, he simultaneously infers the sprinklings done outside from the sprinklings done inside.*

VI.5. A. *A Tannaite statement:*

B. When he sprinkles, he does not sprinkle the blood directly upon the curtain but only in its direction.

C. Said R. Eliezer b. R. Yosé, "I saw [the Temple veil] when I was there, and there were on it drops of blood deriving from the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement."

D. *But maybe they came from the bullock offered on account of a public offering by reason of error or the he-goats that are offered to atone for possible idolatry?*

- E. *He saw that they were in their proper order* [Jung: one on top of the other as the result of the motion of the priest, in the manner of one swinging a whip].
- F. *And so too it has been taught on Tannaite authority in the setting of the bullock offered on account of a public offering by reason of error along these same lines:* When he tosses the blood, the drops did not reach the veil. But if they reached the veil, so be it. Said R. Eliezer b. R. Yosé, "I saw [the Temple veil] when I was there, and there were on it drops of blood deriving from the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement."
- G. *But maybe this was blood deriving from the bullock and the goat that were offered on the Day of Atonement?*
- H. *He saw that they were not in their proper order.*

- VII.1** A. [Supply: **He took the blood of the goat and set down the blood of the bullock:**] If the blood of the goat was mixed up with the blood of the bullock —
- B. said Raba, "“He puts one sprinkling above and seven below [the red line around the altar], and that serves for both.
 - C. *They repeated that before R. Jeremiah, He said, “Dumb Babylonians! Because they live in a country of darkness, they say obscure traditions. Surely he would then be giving the upward sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat before the downward sprinkling of the blood of the bullock, while the Torah has said, ‘When he has made an end of atoning for the holy place’ (Lev. 16:20), meaning, he first completes the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock and then he completes the sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat.”*
 - D. Rather, said R. Jeremiah, "He sprinkles one time above and seven below for the sake of the bullock, and then he goes and places one sprinkling above and seven below for the sake of the he-goat."

- VII.2.** A. 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] —
- B. *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.”*
 - C. *Said to him Raba, “Up to this time those others called us dumb. But now they are going to call us the dumbest of the dumb, for we teach them but they don’t learn. Now he would be making the downward sprinkling of the he-goat before the upward sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat, while the Torah has made it clear that one is to place the blood upward and then downward.”*
 - D. **[57B]** Rather, said Raba, "One places seven sprinklings of blood below for the sake of the bullock and then goes and puts one above and seven below for the sake of the he-goat."

- VII.3.** A. 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)] —
- B. he sprinkles the blood and then goes and does it again and then goes and does it a third time.

- VII.4.** A. If part of the blood was confused for him, but part of the blood was not confused for him —
- B. *it is obvious that when he sprinkles the blood, he sprinkles that which derives from blood the status of which was certain.*
 - C. *However, as to the residue of the blood [the blood in the third cup, the status of which is unclear, since it is a mixture of blood from both animals], is it regarded as residue and to be poured out at the base of the altar, or is it classified as altogether rejected from use and therefore to be poured into the canal? [Sprinkled blood has not been taken from it, so perhaps it is just treated as waste and allowed to flow into the Kidron brook.]*
 - D. *Said R. Pappa, “Even from the perspective of him who has said, ‘Utilization of blood from one cup of blood renders its fellow residue [and not just waste],’ that is the case in a situation in which, if he wanted to use some of the blood for sprinkling, he could do so, but in the present case, if he wanted to use the blood for sprinkling, he could not do so, and therefore that is not the case.”*
 - E. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua to R. Pappa, “To the contrary! Even from the perspective of him who has said, ‘Utilization of blood from one cup of blood renders its fellow waste],’ that is the case if it is through affirmative action that the materia sacra has been rejected, but in a case in which affirmative action is not the cause of the rejection of the materia sacra, that is not the rule.”*
 - F. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - G. Earlier it is stated, “And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:25), while later on, “And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:30). In the case of a sin offering the blood of which one has received in four cups, how do we know that if the priest applied the blood from each one time on the altar [on the four horns thereof], all of the rest of the blood is poured out at the base of the altar? Scripture states, “And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:30). Then might you suppose that if one made the four applications from a single cup, all the rest of the blood is to be poured out at the base? Scripture states, “And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:25). How so? The remaining blood of that cup is poured out at the base, but the blood in the other cups is poured out into the sewer.
 - H. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if the priest received the blood of the sin offering in four cups and made all four applications of blood onto the horns of the altar from one of them, all of the rest is poured out at the base? Scripture states, ‘And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar’ (Lev. 4:30).”
 - I. But it also is written, “And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:25)!
 - J. *Said R. Ashi, “That is to exclude the residue of blood left in the throat of the animal.”*

VIII.1 A. Then he emptied the blood of the bullock into the blood of the he-goat:

- B. *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:*
- C. R. Josiah and R. Jonathan —
- D. one said, “The blood of the bullock and the he goat is mingled together for sprinkling on the horns.”
- E. And the other said, “The blood of the bullock and the he goat is not mingled together for sprinkling on the horns.”
- F. *You may further draw the conclusion that it is R. Josiah who has said, “The blood of the bullock and the he goat is mingled together for sprinkling on the horns.” For he has said, “Even though Scripture does not explicitly use the language, ‘together’ it is as though it were written ‘together.’ [Even though no definite instruction is to be found in the text, the inference that the blood of the bullock and he-goat be sprinkled together appears legitimate (Jung).]*
- G. *You may even maintain that it is R. Jonathan who takes that view, for the present case is exceptional, since the word “one” is written in context [Exo. 30:10: “And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once a year,” meaning, one sprinkling is to be made of the blood of both animals].*
- H. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority [to the contrary]:*
- I. ““And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat’ (Lev. 16:18) — meaning that they must be stirred together,” the words of R. Josiah.
- J. **[58A]** R. Jonathan says, “He sprinkled separately from the one and sprinkled separately from the other.”
- K. Said to him R. Josiah, “But is it not stated, ‘one’?”
- L. Said to him R. Jonathan, “But is it not said to him, ‘...of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat...’? If so, why is ‘one’ written? It is to tell you, once, not twice — from the blood of the bullock, once and not twice, from the blood of the he-goat likewise.”
- M. *A further Tannaite statement is as follows:*
- N. “And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat” (Lev. 16:18) — meaning that they must be stirred together.
- O. You say that they should be stirred together. But perhaps the rule is that from this blood by itself he sprinkles and from that by itself he sprinkles?
- P. *The anonymous formulation of matters accords with the position of R. Josiah.*

IX.1 A. ...and poured the contents of the full basin into the empty one:

- B. *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? [Jung: the priest is to receive the blood; if one bowl is considered an imposition, then the priest, whose hand does not hold the bowl containing the blood, is not really receiving the blood, so the ministration should be cancelled as invalid. The two bowls are homogeneous. If they are considered interposition, then the issue arises. If they bowls were not homogeneous, there would be no doubt that this constitutes interposition.] Or do*

we not deem one thing to interpose in the case of something else of its own classification?"

- C. *He said to him, "You have learned the Mishnah-formulation, and poured the contents of the full basin into the empty one. Does this not mean that he put a full bowl into an empty one [and therefore we do not deem this to have been interposition]?"*
- D. *No, he poured a full utensils into an empty one [and the situation is not comparable, so no conclusion can be drawn].*
- E. *But the first part of the passage states in so many words, **Then he emptied the blood of the bullock into the blood of the goat.***
- F. *That is repeated so as to mix them very well.*
- G. *Come and take note: [a priest] standing on utensils, on a beast, on the feet of his fellow, — he has rendered it invalid [M. Zeb. 2:1A]. [If the priest when receiving the blood was standing not on the floor of the sanctuary but on the other priest's foot, the rite is invalid; but the food is of the same classification as the priest's own foot, and since the rite is null, it means that the other priest's foot is assumed to form an interposed element.]*
- H. *The case of the foot is exceptional, since it is not possible for the other to treat it as null.*
- I. *There are those who say this is how he raised the question: is the correct manner of divine service performed in such a way or is the correct manner of divine service not performed in such a way?*
- J. *Come and take note of what the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], "And they shall take all the vessels of ministry wherewith they minister in the sanctuary" (Num. 4:12) — two or more utensils add up to one ministry of divine service.*

IX.2. A. *R. Ammi bar Hama asked R. Hisda, "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?"*

- B. *He said to him, "There is the following Mishnah-teaching that pertains: [Cf. M. Par. 6:3D: **If there was a sponge in the trough, the water which is in it [the sponge] is unfit.**] He empties out the water until the sponge is reached. [Jung: if someone was mixing the ashes of the red cow in the water of a trough of stone and there was a sponge in the trough, the water in the sponge is invalid, since the sponge is not a utensil. The water in the trough is to be poured out until the sponge is reached, and the water is valid. So the sponge is not considered interposing so as to invalidate the whole batch of water. Here too, the bast should not be considered as interposing between the bowl and the blood.]*
- C. *The case of water is exceptional, since it is diluted.*
- D. *There are those who say that this is how he settled the question for him: in the case of the blood it is permitted [since blood is thin] but in the case of the fistful it is invalid [Jung: the fistful of the flour offering was supposed to be received in the utensil after it has been taken up, analogous to receiving the blood, so any interposing object would render the act of ministry invalid.]*

I:1 takes up a minor detail of the Mishnah and develops a sizable composite on the theme of that detail. II:1 amplifies the issue of the Mishnah's detail and explains why it is important. III:1 clarifies the Mishnah's word choice and then supplies important proof-texts to amplify matters. IV:1 gives us a dispute on which the Mishnah's formulation represents a judgment. V:1 introduces the facts of the Mishnah to settle a dispute that intersects. VI:1 bears in its wake a sizable Tannaite complement, at VI.5 moreover adding to the rule. VII:1-4 provide a number of important theoretical questions, consequent upon the simple rule that I have cited out of the Mishnah. That is, the Mishnah sets up a situation in which confusion of the blood of the one beast with that of the other becomes possible, and then we consider a variety of cases of confusion. VIII:1 introduces an extraneous issue, to be addressed to our Mishnah-rule. IX.1 likewise asks a theoretical question to the resolution of which our Mishnah-rule contributes. While some of the compositions and even the composites are framed around other problems than Mishnah-exegesis, all are cast here in the form of Mishnah-exegesis.

5:5-6

5:5

- A. [58B] “And he went out toward the altar which is before the Lord” (Lev. 16:18).
- B. This is the golden altar.
- C. He began to purify [the altar] [by sprinkling the blood] in a downward gesture.
- D. From what point does he start?
- E. From the northeastern corner, then to the northwestern, southwestern, and southeastern ones.
- F. 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.
- G. R. Eliezer says, “He stood right where he was and purified [the altar by sprinkling the blood of purification] .”
- H. And at every one he sprinkled the horn from below to above,
- I. except for this one which was before him,
- J. on which he would sprinkle [the blood] from above to below.

5:6

- A. He tossed the blood on the top of the altar seven times.
- B. Then did he pour out the residue of the blood onto the western base of the outer altar.
- C. And that [the residue of the blood sprinkled on] the outer altar he poured out on the southern base.
- D. The two streams of blood then mingled together in the [flow of the] surrounding channel and flowed down into the Qidron brook.
- E. They are sold to gardeners for fertilizer.
- F. And the law of sacrilege applies to them [until the sale].

I.1 A. [And he went out toward the altar which is before the Lord. This is the golden altar:] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “And he went out toward the altar which is before the Lord” —
- C. What is the point of Scripture here?
- D. Said R. Nehemiah, “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.
- E. “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.” [Jung: The text should have read, ‘he shall make atonement on the altar that is before the Lord.’ ‘And he shall go out to the altar’ has no special significance. but since we find that on the occasion of other sacrifices he was standing outside, the words ‘and he shall go out’ here indicate that in this case he had been on the inner side.]

I.2. A. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “...which is before the Lord:”
- C. What is the point of Scripture here?
- D. Said R. Nehemiah, “Since we find in the case of the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement that the priest stands at the inner side of the altar and when he sprinkles, he sprinkles toward the veil, is it possible to suppose that the same rule applies here?
- E. “Scripture states, ‘...the altar of sweet incense before the Lord which is in the tent of meeting’ (Lev. 4: 7) — meaning, the altar before the Lord, not the priest before the Lord. How so? He stands outside the altar and sprinkles [from there].”

II.1 A. **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 [in sequence] 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.**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “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.
- D. R. Yosé the Galilean says, **“From the northeastern corner, then to the northwestern, southwestern, and southeastern ones.”**
- E. At the place from which R. Yosé the Galilean commences, R. Aqiba concludes. At the point from which R. Aqiba commences, R. Yosé the Galilean concludes.
- F. *Then all parties nonetheless concur that at the point at which he first comes in, he does not start the sprinkling.* [Jung: coming in from the west, he first reaches one of the western horns of the altar and yet does not commence with it.]
- G. *How come?*

- H. Said Samuel, “Said Scripture, ‘And he shall go out to the altar’ (Lev. 16:18) — the rite commences when he will have gone over the entire altar.”
- I. *Then from R. Aqiba, he should go around it to the right. Then should we say that at issue is that which R. Ammi bar Ezekiel stated, for said R. Ammi bar Ezekiel, “The sea that Solomon made ‘stood on twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, three looking toward toward the west, three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east’ (2Ch. 4: 4) — thus every time you turn, you must be to the right of the east.” Then one master concurs with R. Ammi bar Ezekiel and the other master rejects his view.*
- J. *Not at all. All parties concur with R. Ammi bar Ezekiel, but here what is at issue is the following: the one authority takes the view that the regulations governing conduct inside, at the inner altar, derive by analogy from the rules governing conduct at the outer altar, and the other master takes the view that we do not draw an analogy from the rules governing conduct at the inner altar for the rules governing conduct at the outer altar.*
- K. *And R. Aqiba — granting that he does not wish to derive the rules governing conduct at the inner altar from those that pertain to the outer altar, then he should maintain that if the priest wishes, he may do it one way, and if he wishes, he may do it the other [going either to the right or the left]!*
- L. *[By way of a theoretical answer,] R. Aqiba will say to you, “By strict rule of logic, at the corner which he approaches first, he should begin to conduct the rite. For [that would accord with the principle that] said R. Simeon b. Laqish, ‘People do not bypass the occasion for carrying out a religious duty.’ Then why does he not commence the rite from there? It is in line with the verse of Scripture, ‘And he shall go out to the altar’ (Lev. 16:18) — the rite commences when he will have gone over the entire altar. And it follows, as soon as he has sprinkled the blood on this horn, he returns to the horn from which to begin with he should have commenced.”*
- M. **[59A]** *And if you prefer, I shall say: if we were to concur that sprinkling on the inner altar was done through circumambulating the altar, there would have been no disagreement on the principle that we derive the regulations covering the rite at the inner altar by analogy from those governing the rite on the outer altar. But here, this is what is at issue: one master maintains that the sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand, and the other master maintains that the sprinkling was done through circumambulation.*
- N. *And if you prefer, I shall say: all parties concur that the sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand. But this is what is at issue between them: the one authority maintains that we derive the rules governing hand movements from the regulations governing those done by walking, and the other authority takes the view that we do not derive the rules governing hand movements from the regulations governing those done by walking.*
- O. *But does R. Yosé maintain that he sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand? Now, since at the end of the same passage, we have the statement, **R. Eliezer says, “He stood right where he was and purified the altar by sprinkling the blood of purification,”** it follows that the initial authority before us does not take that view at all. Rather, the matter is best worked out in the*

manner in which we have set forth the issues to begin with, namely: one master maintains that the sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand, and the other master maintains that the sprinkling was done through circumambulation.

- P. *And if you prefer, I shall say that this is what is at issue between them: “round about” mentioned in the setting of the inner altar bears the same meaning as “round about” stated in the setting of the outer altar [Jung: Lev. 16:18: ‘And he shall put it upon the horns of the altar round about’ — in the case of the outer altar, the sprinkling was done by walking around, the analogy then would render the same procedure proper with the inner altar], while the other master takes the view that the whole of the inner altar took up as much space as one horn of the outer altar.*

II.2. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Ishmael, “Two high priests survived in the first Temple. This one says, ‘I did the sprinkling at the inner altar by circular movement of my hand.’ The other said, ‘I did it by walking around the altar.’”
- C. “This one gave an ample explanation for his opinion, and that one gives an ample explanation for his opinion.
- D. “This one gave an ample explanation for his opinion: ‘round about’ mentioned in the setting of the inner altar bears the same meaning as ‘round about’ stated in the setting of the outer altar [
- E. “...and that one gives an ample explanation for his opinion: *the whole of the inner altar took up as much space as one horn of the outer altar.*”

III.1 A. **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:”**

- B. *In accord with which authority does our Mishnah-rule as framed by R. Eliezer concur?*
- C. *It accords with R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. R. Meir says, “R. Eliezer says, ‘**He stood right where he was and purified the altar by sprinkling the blood of purification.** And all the sprinklings he made from above downward, except the one that was diagonal, which he put from below to above.’”
- E. R. Judah says, “R. Eliezer says, ‘**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, so that his clothing would not get dirty [from dripping blood].**’”

IV.1 A. **He tossed the blood on the top of the altar seven times:**

- B. *As to the Hebrew word for “tossed the blood,” which uses the consonants for “purify,” what does the word mean?*
- C. *Said Raba bar R. Shila, “The center of the altar front, in line with what people say, ‘Noon-light shines, so it is midday.’*

- D. *By way of objection: He did not sprinkle it on the dust or on the coals, but he moves the coal to the sides and sprinkles [but only on the top surface of the altar] [T. Kip. 3:2B-C]. [Jung: the first interpretation of the word would identify it with the middle of the side of the altar, but this passage means it must be on top.]*
- E. Rather, said Rabbah bar R. Shila, “It means, on the cleared surface of the altar, in line with the usage, ‘And like the very heaven for clarity’ (Exo. 24:10).”

IV.2. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Hanania says, “He would sprinkle standing on the north side.”
- C. R. Yosé says, “He would sprinkle standing on the south side.”
- D. *What is at issue between them?*
- E. *At issue between them The one party maintains that the entrance was through the curtain on the south side, and the other [Yosé] takes the view that it was at the north. But all parties in any event concur that at the spot at which he completed sprinkling on the horns he would sprinkle on the top. What is the relevant verse of Scripture? “And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out” (Lev. 4: 7) — where he sanctifies it, which is at the horns, there he cleanses it through the seven sprinklings.*

V.1 A. **Then did he pour out the residue of the blood onto the western base of the outer altar:**

- B. 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.*

VI.1 A. **And that the residue of the blood sprinkled on the outer altar he poured out on the southern base:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “At the base of the altar” (Lev. 4:30) means, at the southern base of the altar.
- D. You say that it means at the southern base of the altar. But perhaps it means only at the western base of the altar, so that what is left undefined is derived from the rule that is spelled out [Freedman, *Zebahim* to 53A: Lev. 4: 7 holds that the blood of the sin offering prepared at the inner altar is to be poured out at the base of the altar of the burnt offering which is at the door of meeting. As one entered from the door he came first to the western base; there is therefore regarded as defined, and the question is, why not learn the meaning of Lev. 4:30, where the matter is not defined, from Lev. 4: 7, where it is?]
- E. Do you say so? But we infer the rule governing his coming down from the ascent from the rule governing his exit from the inner sanctum. Just as when he left the inner sanctum, it was to the nearest side, so when he came down from the ascent, he turned to the nearest side. [Freedman: when the priest left the inner sanctum with the residue of the blood from the inner altar, he poured it out at the western base, this being nearest to him. So also when he came down the ascent with the residue of the blood of the outer altar, after having applied the blood on the southwest corner, he poured it out at the southern base, this being nearest to him.]

VI.2. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Ishmael says, "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."
- C. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, "Both this and that are poured out at the southern base."
- D. *Now from the perspective of R. Ishmael, who has said that it is at the western base, the operative principle is that what is left undefined is derived from the rule that is spelled out [Freedman: Lev. 4: 7 holds that the blood of the sin offering prepared at the inner altar is to be poured out at the base of the altar of the burnt offering which is at the door of meeting. As one entered from the door he came first to the western base; there is therefore regarded as defined, so the meaning of Lev. 4:30, where the matter is not defined, derives from Lev. 4: 7, where it is]. But from the perspective of R. Simeon b. Yohai, who has said that it is at the southern base, what is the operative consideration?*
- E. *Said R. Ashi, "He has the theory that the entry was at the south."*
- F. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael in the matter of R. Simeon b. Yohai: "In both cases it was at the southern base. And your mnemonic is, the men won over the man" [Jung: the disciples of Simeon prevailed upon Ishmael to agree with them].*

VII.1 A. 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.

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "The laws of sacrilege apply to the money that is paid for the blood," the words of R. Meir and R. Simeon.
- D. And sages say, "They do not apply."
- E. **[59B]** *The dispute pertains only to whether or not the sacrilege would apply by authority of rabbis, but all concur that, so far as the law of the Torah is concerned, sacrilege does not apply to the blood.*
- F. *What is the source for that information?*
- G. Said Ulla, "Said Scripture, 'I have given the blood to you' (Lev. 17:11) — it is yours [and not subject to the laws of sacrilege]."
- H. *The household of R. Ishmael taught as a Tannaite statement, "'...I have given it to you for making atonement,' meaning, 'I have given it to you for atonement,' not to be subject to the laws of sacrilege."*
- I. R. Yohanan said, "Said Scripture, 'For the blood make atonement through the life' (Lev. 17:11) — the status prior to atonement is the same as afterward. Just as after the act of atonement, the law of sacrilege does not apply to it, so too prior to the act of atonement, the laws of sacrilege do not apply to it."
- J. *Why not say, Just as prior to atonement, it is subject to the laws of sacrilege, so after atonement, it is subject to the laws of sacrilege?*
- K. But is there something to which the laws of sacrilege apply after it has performed its religious duty?

- L. *Well, now, why not?* Lo, there is the case of the ash that is taken up from the altar. It has carried out its religious duty and yet remains subject to the law of sacrilege!
- M. **[60A]** [But that case does not supply a useful analogy,] because the verse covering taking up the ashes and the one involving the sacrificial portions of the scape goat represent two distinct scriptural verses that go over the same rule. Whenever two distinct scriptural verses go over the same rule, they cannot be used to establish an analogy that governs elsewhere [so the exception is null].
- N. *That objection poses no problem for one who takes the view that the verse dealing with the scapegoat bears the meaning that the scapegoat may not be used for private purposes [and so is in the classification of the ashes of the altar]. But to one who maintains that the verse dealing with the scapegoat bears the meaning that the scapegoat may be used for private purposes, what is to be said?*
- O. It is the fact that the matter of taking up the ashes of the altar and the rule governing the priestly garments represent two distinct scriptural verses that go over the same rule. Whenever two distinct scriptural verses go over the same rule, they cannot be used to establish an analogy that governs elsewhere.
- P. *That poses no problem to rabbis, who maintain, “Then Aaron shall ...take off the priestly garment and leave it there” (Lev. 16:23) means that the garments do not have to be buried and are subject to sacrilege, like the asses. But what is to be said to R. Dosa, who takes the view that a common priest may use such garments [which then are not subject to sacrilege and so are not analogous to the ashes of the altar]?*
- Q. It is that taking up the ashes of the altar and the rule governing the heifer the neck of which is to be broken in atonement for the finding of a neglected corpse [Deu. 21:1ff.] represent two distinct scriptural verses that go over the same rule. Whenever two distinct scriptural verses go over the same rule, they cannot be used to establish an analogy that governs elsewhere.
- R. *That poses no problem to him who says that they indeed cannot be used to establish an analogy that governs elsewhere. But to him who maintains that they can be used to establish an analogy that governs elsewhere, what is to be said?*
- S. *Both verses to which reference is made contain specific exclusions, namely, “the heifer” [for the heifer the neck of which is to be broken] and “place it on the altar.” The emphatic usages mean that these particular items are subject to the laws of sacrilege, but others are not.*
- T. *But no verse is required to exclude the blood from the rule affecting what is rendered abominable by an improper intention of the officiating priest, for we have learned in the Mishnah: and on account of whatever has that which renders the offering permissible [for offering or eating], whether for man or for the altar are they liable because of [transgression of the law of] refuse [M. Zeb. 4:3H], and the blood itself constitutes that which renders the offering permissible.*

The bulk of the Mishnah-commentary consists in the presentation of important Tannaite complements, which, in general, either provide proof-texts or examine the proof-texts that the Mishnah includes. The second point of interest in the Mishnah-commentary is in the authority behind an anonymous ruling, or in the range of opinion that an anonymous ruling encompasses. Within these two classes

of composition, the entire, extensive treatment of the present Mishnah-paragraph is classified.

5:7

- A. The entire rite of the Day of Atonement stated in accord with its proper order —
- B. if he did one part of the rite before its fellow, he has done nothing whatsoever.
- C. [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.
- D. And if before he had completed the acts of placing the blood on the inner altar, the blood was poured out,
- E. let him bring other blood and go and sprinkle it to begin with on the inner altar [M. 5:3-4].
- F. And so [is the rule] in the case of the sanctuary [M. 5:4], and so in the case of the golden altar [M. 5:5],
- G. for each of them constitutes an act of atonement unto itself [and need not be repeated].
- H. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “From the place at which he broke off, from there he begins once more.”

- I.1** A. [With reference to the statement, **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**], *our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority*:
- B. As to every rite concerning the Day of Atonement that is set forth in a fixed order, if a deed was done out of order and prior to its fellow, the priest has done nothing of consequence.
 - C. Said R. Judah, “When is that the case? In the instance of rites that are performed in the white garments inside the Holy of Holies. But as to rites that are performed in white garments outside of the Holy of Holies, if a deed was done out of order and prior to its fellow, what the priest has done is validly done.”
 - D. R. Nehemiah says, “When is that the case? In the instance of rites that are done in white garments, whether inside the Holy of Holies or outside. But as to rites that are done in golden garments outside of the Holy of Holies, what the priest has done is validly done.”
 - E. Said R. Yohanan, “And both authorities interpret the same verse of Scripture, namely, ‘And this shall be an everlasting statute to you...once in the year’ (Lev. 16:34). **[60B]** *R. Judah takes the view, This refers to a location in which atonement was effected one time a year. And R. Nehemiah maintains that this refers to activities through which atonement was effected one time a year.*
 - F. *But with reference to the position of R. Judah, is the word “place” even written in the relevant verse?*
 - G. *Rather, this is the foundation in Scripture for the position of R. Judah: it is written, “This,” [not that] and further, “once,” [not many times] so one excludes*

rites carried out in white garments, the other, those carried out in golden garments.

H. And R. Nehemiah?

I. *[His view of the implications of the exclusionary language is this:] one serves to exclude rites done in golden garments, the other to exclude from consideration the disposition of the residue of the blood, which is not essential to the conduct of the rite. [Jung: Even if the pouring out had been delayed beyond the order, services performed in the meantime remain valid; the fact that this is done in white garments has no affect on the enforcement of the order in which it is to be done.]*

J. And R. Judah?

K. *If [a rite that is carried out in white garments but not in its proper place in the order of service] is essential to the service [Jung: those parts of the service that were to follow it but that were performed before it], it is essential to the service here too, and if it would not impair the service elsewhere, it does not do so here.*

L. *That is in line with that which has been set forth on Tannaite authority:*

M. “‘And he shall make an end of atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar’ (Lev. 16:20) — if he atoned [by carrying out the rites required for atonement in other matters, e.g., the four sprinklings on the altar, the seven before the vil (Freedman)], he has completed the rite, but if he has not atoned, he has not completed the rite,” the words of R. Aqiba.

N. Said to him R. Judah, “Why should we not say, if he made an end to the rite, he has atoned, and if not, he did not atone? To indicate that if he left out one of the sprinklings, he has done nothing.”

O. *And in reflecting on the matter, we raised the question: what is at issue between them?*

P. R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi —

Q. *One said, “At issue is the correct interpretation of Scripture.” [Freedman: but not in law. Both hold that all four applications of blood are indispensable, and that pouring out the residue is not. Aqiba holds that the conclusion, atoning, illumines the beginning, make an end, so completion depends on atonement, on the four applications. Judah maintains that ‘atoning’ might merely refer to a single application of blood, and therefore the interpretation must be revised, and the beginning of the verse illuminates the end; only when he completely finishes the rite, having done the four applications, is atonement done.]*

R. *The other said, “At issue is whether or not pouring out the residue of the blood at the base is indispensable to the rite.”*

S. *Now you may draw the conclusion that it is R. Joshua b. Levi who took the position that at issue is whether or not pouring out the residue of the blood at the base is indispensable to the rite. For said R. Joshua b. Levi, “In the opinion of the one who said that the pouring out the residue of the blood is an indispensable part of the rite, one must bring another bullock and begin the rite on the inner altar.” [Freedman: if the residue of the blood was spilled after the four applications, another bullock must be*

slaughtered and its blood first sprinkled at the inner altar, and then the residue poured out at the base of the outer altar. But the priest cannot simply pour out all the blood at the base, for then it is not a residue, and it is indispensable that a residue be poured out. Thus Joshua b. Levi holds that there is a view that pouring out of the residue is indispensable.]

- T. *But does R. Yohanan not maintain this same theory of matters? And has not R. Yohanan said, “R. Nehemiah taught as a Tannaite authority in accord with the opinion of one who maintains that the pouring out of the residue of the blood is indispensable to the rite”?*
- U. *That is a difficulty.*

I.2. A. Said R. Hanina, ““A handful of incense that one took up before slaying the bullock — he has done nothing.” [Jung: as the taking of the handful must not be performed before, but after, the slaying of the bullock, the first high priest must have slain his bullock and the one who takes his place must slay another bullock.] *In accord with which of the two authorities is this statement made? It cannot accord with R. Judah, for were it brought into juxtaposition with R. Judah, has he not said, “When the language, ‘statute,’ was used, it was used only in connection with aspects of the rite that are performed in white garments within the Holy of Holies”?*

B. *You may even say that it accords with R. Judah. A detail of the rite that is required for the conduct of the rite in the inner Holy of Holies is classified as equivalent to any other aspect of the rite that is conducted in the Holy of Holies [even though it is not done there, it is under the same regulations].*

C. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **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.** But in line with what R. Hanina has said, it should read, he should start again by taking the handfuls. [Jung: since Hanina holds that taking the handfuls of the incense before the slaughtering of the bullock is invalid, he would have to take afresh a new handful before slaughtering the second bullock.]*

D. **[61A]** *His statement does not pertain to incense. [Jung: he would certainly have to take the handfuls anew.]*

I.3. A. Said Ulla, “If he slaughtered the he-goat before sprinkling the blood of the bullock, he has done nothing.”

B. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **[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.** But if Ulla’s view were correct, it should read: let him go and slaughter it. [Jung: It is assumed that the reference is to the sprinklings within the Holy of Holies, with the result that the he goat was slaughtered before the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock.]*

- C. *Ulla clarified the matter to refer to the sprinklings in the sanctuary, and so too R. Afes explained it to speak of the sprinklings in the sanctuary* [Jung: but the slaughter of the he-goat took place in the proper place, after the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled inside].

II.1 A. 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.”

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

C. “‘...he shall make atonement for the sanctuary’ (Lev. 16:33) —

D. “this refers to the inner sanctum.

E. “‘and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting:’

F. “this refers to the sanctuary.

G. “‘and for the altar:’ this means what it says.”

H. “‘and he shall make atonement:’

I. “this refers to the courtyards.

J. “‘for the priests:’ this means what it says.

K. “‘and for all the people of the assembly:’

L. “this refers to the Israelites.

M. “‘And he shall make atonement:’

N. “this refers also to the Levites.

O. “The law has treated them all the same as subject to a single act of atonement.

P. “This teaches that for other sins all of them find atonement through the goat that is sent away,” the words of R. Judah.

Q. R. Simeon says, “Just as the blood of the goat that is prepared within the temple effects atonement for the Israelites in respect to its contamination of the Temple and its Holy Things, so the blood of the young bull atones for the priests in respect to its contamination of the Temple and its Holy Things. Just as the confession said over the goat that is sent away atones for the Israelites in respect to other sins, so the confession that is said over the young bull atones for the priests in respect to other sins” [Sifra CLXXXVI:II.1-2].

R. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

S. “And when he has made an end of atoning for the holy place” —

T. this refers to the inner sanctum.

U. “‘and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting:’

V. “this refers to the sanctuary.

W. “‘and for the altar:’ this means what it says.”

X. This teaches that for all these distinct acts, atonement must be effected. On the basis of this reading, they have said:

Y. [If] he put some of the placings of blood inside and then the blood was poured out,

Z. let him bring new blood and begin afresh inside.

- AA. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “He begins only at the place at which he stopped” [cf. M. [Yoma 5:7H](#)].
- BB. [If] he completed the placings of blood inside and then the blood was poured out,
- CC. let him bring fresh blood and begin at the beginning outside.
- DD. [If] he finished the placings of blood outside in the sanctuary and then the blood was poured out,
- EE. let him bring new blood and start again with the sprinklings that are to be done in the sanctuary.
- FF. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “He begins only at the place at which he stopped” [cf. M. [Yoma 5:7H](#)].
- GG. If he had finished with the sprinklings that were supposed to be done in the sanctuary and the blood was poured out, let him bring new blood and start again with the sprinkling for the altar.
- HH. If he did some of the sprinklings that are owing to the altar and the blood was poured out, let him bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinkling due on the altar.
- II. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “He begins only at the place at which he stopped” [cf. M. [Yoma 5:7H](#)].
- JJ. If he had finished the sprinklings due on the altar and the blood was poured out, all parties concur that this does not invalidate the rite any further [cf. T. [Kip. 3:5-6](#)].

II.2. A. Said R. Yohanan, “And both parties [the anonymous authority, who is Meir, as against Eleazar and Simeon] interpret the same verse of Scripture, namely, ‘With the blood of the sin offering of atonement...once a year’ (Exo. 30:10) —

- B. “R. Meir takes the view, ‘of one sin offering I have spoken to you, and not two sin offerings.’
- C. “R. Eleazar and R. Simeon maintain, ‘Of one sprinkling I have spoken to you, not two sprinklings.’” [Jung: the word for sin-offering can mean also, act of sprinkling.]

II.3. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said Rabbi, “For me did R. Jacob make a distinction with respect to logs-measures of oil used for the purification of the person cleansed from the skin ailment [Lev. 14:21].” [Jung: Jacob had taught that unlike the sprinklings of the Day of Atonement, there was no dispute concerning the question here, where one must start again after a service has been performed out of order.]
- C. *But is there no dispute in that other matter? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. If in purifying the person afflicted with the skin ailment the priest put part of the applications of blood within the sanctuary and the blood was poured out, he must bring another log of oil and start again from the beginning with the applications that are supposed to be made inside the Temple courtyard.

- E. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, "From the place at which he stopped he starts once again."
- F. If he completed the applications that are to take place within the sanctuary and the log was poured out, he shall bring another log again and start over with the application on the thumbs and toes.
- G. If he had done some of the application on the thumbs and toes and the log was poured out, let him bring another and start again from the beginning with the application on the thumbs and toes.
- H. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, "From the place at which he stopped he starts once again."
- I. If he finished putting on the material on the thumbs and toes and the log was poured out, then all parties concur that the applications on the head are not essential to the rite [if not properly performed].
- J. *Say*: "For me did R. Jacob repeat the same difference of opinion with respect to logs-measures of oil used for the purification of the person cleansed from the skin ailment."

II.4. A. The master has said: ...the applications on the head are not essential to the rite:

B. *What is the basis in Scripture for that opinion? Should we say it is as written, "And what remains over of the oil" (Lev. 14:29)? Then what about the following: "But that which is left of the meal offering" (Lev. 2:10) — would you say that, here too, this procedure is not essential to the rite? [The disposition of the residue of meal offering is critical to the valid performance of the rite.]*

C. *That passage is exceptional, for it is written, "And the rest" "and what remains over" (Lev. 14:17) [Jung: as to the oil applied to the thumbs and toes, this is thus classed as residue and what is applied to the head then is the residue of the residue and its disposition is inconsequential].*

II.5. A. Said R. Yohanan, **[61B]** "In the case of the guilt offering of the leper that was slaughtered for some other than the purpose for which the beast had originally been designated, we have come to the dispute between R. Meir, on the one side, and R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, on the other.

B. *"R. Meir: for he has said, let him bring another beast and begin with the applications of blood as at the beginning. Here too, let him bring another beast and slaughter out with the correct intentionality.*

C. *"R. Eleazar and R. Simeon: for they say, 'From the place at which he stopped he starts once again.' But here there is no remedy."*

D. *Objected R. Hisda to him, "But lo, the word 'it' is written" [at Lev. 14:12, 'and offer it as a guilt offering — only the one that was waved together with the oil; Meir surely must concur, and therefore the proposed dispute is null (Jung)].*

E. *That is a problem!*

- F. *Nonetheless, it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Yohanan:*
- G. the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment that was slaughtered for some purpose other than that for which it was originally designated, or the blood of which was not put on the thumb and big toe of the person to be purified — the beast in any event may be offered up, and libations must be presented with it; but another guilt offering is required to render the man fit.
- H. And R. Hisda?
- I. He will say to you, “Sure — ‘is required’ — but in fact there is no remedy for this man.”
- J. *And would a Tannaite authority repeat as an official tradition a teaching such as, ‘is required’ — but in fact there is no remedy for this man?*
- K. *Certainly. For has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. **A totally hairless Nazir —**
- M. **the House of Shammai say, “He has to pass a razor across his whole body.”**
- N. **And the House of Hillel say, “He does not have to do so” [T. [Naz. 1:6A-C](#)].**
- O. And said R. Abina, “When **the House of Shammai say, “He has to...,** the sense is, he has to, but he has no remedy [since it cannot make any difference].”
- P. *And he differs from R. Pedat, for said R. Pedat, “The House of Shammai and R. Eleazar have taken the same position. In the case of the House of Shammai, it is the one that we have just mentioned. As to R. Eleazar, it is in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **If he did not have a thumb, a big toe, [or] a right ear he can never have purification. R. Eleazar says, “One puts it [the blood] on their place.” R. Simeon says, “If he put it on the left [side instead of the right], he has carried out his obligation” [M. [Neg. 14:9E-G](#)]. ”***

II.6. *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “And the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt offering” — might one think that this is done with a utensil?
- C. Scripture states, “and the priest shall put it” (Lev. 14:14) — just as the putting on of the blood is to be done by the priest’s hand itself, so the taking of the blood also should be done by the priest’s hand itself.
- D. Might one suppose that that is the same for the altar [so that blood to be sprinkled on the altar is received not in a utensil but in the hand]?
- E. Scripture states, “For as the sin offering so is the guilt offering” (Lev. 14:13) — just as the sin offering requires a utensil for receiving the blood, so the guilt offering requires a utensil for receiving the blood.

- F. You must then draw the conclusion that in the case of two priests who received the blood of the guilt offering of the one healed of the skin ailment, one in his hand, the other in a utensil, the one who received the blood in a utensil went to the altar and put the blood there, and the one who received it in his hand went to the person who had been healed of the skin ailment and put it on the specified parts of his body.

II.7. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **“And all of them [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 (Jung)] impart uncleanness to clothing and are burned in the place of ashes,”** the words of R. Eleazer and R. Simeon.
- C. **And sages say, “They do not impart uncleanness to clothing and are not burned in the place of the ashes, except for the very last one, which completes the service [of atonement].” [T. Kip. 3:6E-H].**
- D. *Raba asked R. Nahman, “How many goats does he send away [if the blood of the he-goat was poured away after the sprinklings in the Holy of Holies, in which case he needs to bring two goats and start with the casting of lots once more]?”*
- E. He said to him, “Is he supposed to send away his whole flock? [Only one is sent away].”
- F. He said to him, **[62A]** “So does he not burn his flock [even though “all of them are burned in the place where the ashes are deposited]?”
- G. *“But how are the cases parallel? In this instance ‘it’ is written [at Lev. 16:10, meaning, only one of these goats is sent away], but in the other case, ‘it’ is not written.”*

II.8. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. *R. Pappi in the name of Raba said, “He sends away the first.”*
- C. *R. Shimi in the name of Raba said, “He sends away the last.”*
- D. *There is no problem understanding what R. Shimi in the name of Raba said, namely, “He sends away the last,” for he takes the view that that is because it is with that beast that he has completed the rite of atonement. But what in the world can R. Pappi in the name of Raba take as his premise?*
- E. *He concurs with R. Yosé, who has said, “The religious duty is performed with the first one.”*
- F. *Which saying of R. Yosé? Should I say that it is the statement of R. Yosé in connection with the baskets, as we have learned in the Mishnah: [R. Yosé says,] “With three baskets, each holding three seahs, they take up the heave offering of the [coins collected in the] [sheqel] chamber, And written on them are the Hebrew letters alef, bet, gimel” [M. Sheq. 3:2A-B]? And it has been taught on Tannaite authority, said R. Yosé, “Why is it that it is written on them are the Hebrew letters alef, bet, gimel? It is to know which of them was taken up first out of the chamber, so that it is to be used first — for the actual performance of the commandment properly applies to the first”? But maybe the operative*

consideration is that when the first of the baskets is ready to be used, the others are not yet ready to be used. [Jung: when one basketful is taken up first, one would obviously use that first, but the goat of the first pair could not be sent away before all the sprinklings of blood had been made, when the second is fitting to be sent away first].

- G. *So it must be the ruling of R. Yosé in connection with Passover, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: "He who designated a beast to serve as his Passover and it got lost, and then he designated another in its stead, and then the first was found so that lo, both of them are present and accounted for, which of them he prefers he offers up," the words of sages. R. Yosé says, "The religious duty should be performed with the first of the two, but if the second was preferable than it, then he presents the latter."*

I:1, with a secondary amplification at I:2, provides a Tannaite complement to the Mishnah's rule, word for word. I:3 then raises a theoretical question that illustrates the Mishnah's rule. We note that it also bears close formal links to I:2. II:1 complements the debate of Eleazar and Simeon with the anonymous authority of the Mishnah (Meir). II:2 defines the exegetical roots of the dispute; II:3 glosses the foregoing, and II:4 deals with a tangential detail of the gloss. II:5 then asks whether the same dispute as the Mishnah presents occurs elsewhere, and that bears in its wake further clarification. So the entire composite, though complex in its construction, in fact has been put together in complete dependence upon the Mishnah's statement.