As it was stated... Rav Huna... Rav Huna's opinion.

Rav Huna's opinion. However, according to Rashi, the question is based on the opinions of both Sages and therefore cannot be cited as a determining factor in establishing the halakha.

Excrement in its place – פָּרֵֽעַ בְּמִקְמָתוּ: For one who has excrement in its place, in his anus, it is required to recite Shema even if it is not visible when he stands. If he does recite Shema in those circumstances, he is required to recite it again (Mishna Berura). However, he is permitted to recite Shema if the excrement is not visible at all (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 75).

Excrement on his skin – פָּרֵֽעַ עַל גִּבְּבֵיהּ: Some permit reciting Shema for one with excrement on his skin that is covered by his garments, or for one who reaches his hand into a lavatory in which there is no odor, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna (Rif, Rosh). However, others prohibit doing so, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda (Rabbeinu Hananel; Or Zarua). Some permit reciting Shema when the excrement is covered by his flesh and not when it is covered by garments (Rosh; Rabbeinu Yona). With the exception of exigent circumstances (Mishna Berura), one should adopt the stringent ruling in this matter (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 75).

A halakha with regard to a meal – הַגָּלֶל מִפְּנֵי בָּנָיו: If a group was sharing a meal and one left to urinate, he is required to wash the hand used to rub the drops away. To avoid suspicion, he should wash his hands before the other participants in the meal. If he neither rubbed away any drops nor touched an unclean place, he need not wash (Rema, citing Hagahot Ochri). These halakhot apply if the individual reenters with the intention of drinking; however, if he intends to eat he is required to wash both hands. If he left to talk to a friend and was out for some time he should wash both hands upon his return because he was distracted (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 170).

Rav Huna's opinion. However, according to Rashi, the question is based on the opinions of both Sages and therefore cannot be cited as a determining factor in establishing the halakha.

Excrement in its place – פָּרֵֽעַ בְּמִקְמָתוּ: For one who has excrement in its place, in his anus, it is required to recite Shema even if it is not visible when he stands. If he does recite Shema in those circumstances, he is required to recite it again (Mishna Berura). However, he is permitted to recite Shema if the excrement is not visible at all (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 75).

Excrement on his skin – פָּרֵֽעַ עַל גִּבְּבֵיהּ: Some permit reciting Shema for one with excrement on his skin that is covered by his garments, or for one who reaches his hand into a lavatory in which there is no odor, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna (Rif, Rosh). However, others prohibit doing so, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda (Rabbeinu Hananel; Or Zarua). Some permit reciting Shema when the excrement is covered by his flesh and not when it is covered by garments (Rosh; Rabbeinu Yona). With the exception of exigent circumstances (Mishna Berura), one should adopt the stringent ruling in this matter (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 75).

A halakha with regard to a meal – הַגָּלֶל מִפְּנֵי בָּנָיו: If a group was sharing a meal and one left to urinate, he is required to wash the hand used to rub the drops away. To avoid suspicion, he should wash his hands before the other participants in the meal. If he neither rubbed away any drops nor touched an unclean place, he need not wash (Rema, citing Hagahot Ochri). These halakhot apply if the individual reenters with the intention of drinking; however, if he intends to eat he is required to wash both hands. If he left to talk to a friend and was out for some time he should wash both hands upon his return because he was distracted (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 170).

Jug – מַכְּטָב: This term refers to a round earthenware jug with an attached lid. This vessel was used both as a container and for washing one's hands.

Ancient earthenware jug from the eighth century BCE.

The Gemara asks: If so, in what way is it that different from excrement on his flesh? As it was stated in a case where one has excrement on his flesh or that his hands were placed into a bathroom that Rav Huna said: It is nevertheless permitted to recite Shema. And Rav Hisda said: It is prohibited to recite Shema in those cases. The Gemara rejects this: The situations are not comparable. There is no dispute that excrement in its place is more severe, as in the anus the filth is great because it is new and malodorous. And if it is not in its place, its filth is not great, as it is dried and less malodorous. It is with regard to that situation that there is an amoraic dispute.

The Gemara proceeds to discuss a related topic. The Sages taught a halakha with regard to a meal in a baraita: A person who exits a meal to urinate washes one of his hands, the one that he used to brush off drops of urine, and enters to resume the meal. If one left, spoke with another, and lingered outside, he washes both of his hands and enters to resume the meal. Presumably, during the lengthy conversation he was distracted from maintaining the cleanliness of his hands, requiring him to wash his hands again. And when one washes his hands for the meal he should not wash them outside and then enter, due to the concern that doing so will arouse suspicion that he did not wash his hands. Rather, he enters and sits in his place and washes both his hands, and returns the jug of water to pass among the guests and ask if anyone requires water, to make certain that everyone is aware that he washed his hands.

Rav Hisda said: We said this principle with regard to making certain that one washes his hands in public only when he enters to drink; however, if he enters and intends to eat he may even wash his hands outside and enter. Why is this so? It is because it is well known that he is fastidious and would not handle food without cleaning urine and the like off his hands. Rav Nahman bar Yitzkhak said: And I can even wash my hands outside when I intend only to drink, because they know that I am fastidious and that I certainly washed my hands before I entered to eat.
MISHNA

A person does not enter the Temple courtyard for the Temple service, even if he is pure, until he immerses. Five immersions and ten sanctifications the High Priest immerses and sanctifies his hands and feet, respectively, on the day of Yom Kippur. And all of these immersions and sanctifications take place in the sacred area, the Temple courtyard, on the roof of the Hall of Parva, except for this first immersion alone. As that immersion is not unique to Yom Kippur, it may be performed outside the courtyard. They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people in the interest of modesty, and then the High Priest immersed and sanctified his hands and feet.

GEMARA

They asked ben Zoma with regard to this immersion: Why is it a requirement for anyone who enters to perform the Temple service? He said to them: Just as one who moves from service in one sacred area to service in another sacred area, i.e., the High Priest on Yom Kippur, who moves from one service to another in the Temple courtyard and the Sanctuary; and likewise one who moves from service in an area that one who enters while impure is punished by karet, the courtyard, to service in another area that one who enters impure is punished by karet, the Sanctuary or the Holy of Holies, requires immersion; so too, with regard to one who moves from a non-sacred area to a sacred area, and from a place that one who enters while impure is not punished by karet to a place that one who enters while impure is punished by karet, is it not right that he require immersion? This first immersion was instituted for purposes of sanctity rather than purity.

Rabbi Yehuda says: It is an ancillary immersion, which is not a mitzva, instituted so that one will remember any old impurity that he contracted and withdraw. In the course of immersion, he will remember if he was exposed to a source of seven-day impurity and will refrain from serving in the Temple.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do ben Zoma and Rabbi Yehuda, who provided two different rationales for the immersion, disagree?

NOTES

Entering the courtyard for service – funda bikkur ha’levavot

Rashi’s explanation, which appears in the Jerusalem Talmud, is that immersion is required not only as preparation for service; rather, even one who enters the courtyard with no intention of serving must immerse. Other commentators explain that the plain meaning of the mishna must be observed, and immersion is required only as a prelude to service. Still, even one who enters the courtyard with no intention to serve might be called upon to participate in some sacred act associated with the service, like slaughtering, and therefore must immerse in any case (Tosafot Yeshanaim).

Except for this alone – rohkim

The early commentaries point out that the five immersions of the High Priest on Yom Kippur are a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. How, then, could the legal status of the first of the immersions be different from the others and even be considered distinct from the service of the day (Rashi; Rambam)? They answer that although the tradition of five immersions is from Sinai, their location and timing was not mandated. Therefore, the ruling that the first immersion is unlike the others and may be performed in a non-sacred area poses no problem (Yad Yeuda; Katot LaMoad).

One who moves from one sacred area to another sacred area – funda bikkur ha’levavot

Some commentators explain that this is a reference to the High Priest’s change of garments, since he removes one set of sacred garments and dons another set of sacred garments. This understanding clearly distinguishes this phrase from the phrase that follows: One who moves from an area punishable by karet to an area punishable by karet, which refers to places in the Temple. According to the interpretation that appears in the Gemara, the second phrase seems redundant (Tosefot Rit; Tosafot Yeshanaim).

HALAKHA

Immersion before entering the courtyard – funda bikkur ha’levavot

One may not enter the courtyard for service without first immersing, even if he is pure (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash 5:4).

Five immersions – funda bikkur ha’levavot

During the Yom Kippur service, the High Priest immerses five times and sanctifies his hands and feet ten times (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:2).

All take place in the sacred area – funda bikkur ha’levavot

All the immersions that the High Priest performs on Yom Kippur take place in the sacred area. The first immersion is an exception and may be done in a non-sacred area, as it is merely an ancillary immersion so that one will remember any old impurity that he might have contracted and, if relevant, refrain from serving in the Temple, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:3).

BACKGROUND

They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people – funda bikkur ha’levavot

Spreading of the linen sheet
The immersion of the leper — בטילה. On the eighth day of his purification process, the leper comes to the Temple, where he performs an additional immersion before his offerings are sacrificed. This ruling is in accordance with an unattributed mishna in tractate Nega'im and the Gemara here (see Lehem Mishne; Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Meuhrei Kapparah 4:1).

The leper at the Gate of Nicanor — מים סбро ורפס. The leper concludes his process of purification by standing outside the Israelite courtyard near the eastern entrance, on the threshold of the Gate of Nicanor. He is purified there by having the blood of his guilt-offering and oil smeared on his head and big toe (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Meuhrei Kapparah 4:2).

The Gemara wonders: And according to ben Zoma, is the service desecrated? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a High Priest who did not immerse and did not sanctify his hands and feet between donning the golden garments and the white linen garments, and similarly, with regard to a High Priest who did not immerse between performance of one service and another service, his service is valid. However, both a High Priest and a common priest who did not sanctify his hands and feet at all in the morning and performed the service, his service is disqualified. If the High Priest’s failure to immerse between services does not desecrate the service, all the more so that failure to perform the first immersion would not desecrate the service, as ben Zoma derives the first immersion from the immersion of the High Priest. Apparently, that is not the basis of their dispute.

Rather, it is with regard to whether one who fails to immerse before service stands in violation of a positive mitzva that they disagree. According to ben Zoma, he stands in violation of a positive mitzva because there is a special requirement to perform this immersion for the purpose of sanctification. According to Rabbi Yehuda, he does not stand in violation of a positive mitzva.

The Gemara wonders: And does Rabbi Yehuda hold in accordance with this line of reasoning? Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: A leper on the eighth day of his purification, after he has already immersed at the end of the seventh day, immerses again and stands at the Gate of Nicanor in the Temple to bring his purification offerings and to have the priest sprinkle the blood of the guilt-offering and the oil that accompanies his purification offerings on his hands and big toes to complete the purification process. Rabbi Yehuda says: He does not require an additional immersion, as he already immersed the previous evening. Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda does not require a special immersion in the morning to remind the leper of old impurity.

The Gemara answers: In that case of the leper, the reason that no immersion is required in the morning is as the reason was taught in the baraita: As he already immersed the previous evening. That immersion purified him and reminded him of any old impurity that he might have. This is in no way connected to the matter of ancillary immersion.

The Gemara asks: And the one who grasps this baraita as a contradiction to Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion, in what manner does he grasp it — ליה או יא או יא? In explaining the literal translation of this phrase, the Avukah states that the term לו יא should be spelled with an עי instead of an עי, and the phrase means: And the one who mixed these matters together, for what purpose did he do so? Most commentators explain that the term in this context refers to a particular type of question that challenges another question, whose answer is obvious. In that situation the Gemara asks what was the thought process behind the original question.

Because the Gemara wants to raise a contradiction between another baraita and this baraita — ובראש ובראש בם קריא. Some commentators explain that this style of discourse in the Gemara came about in the following manner: One of the Sages in the study hall sought to raise a contradiction between two baraitot. However, since that topic was not under discussion in the study hall at that time, that Sage was forced to tie his question to the matter that was under discussion. The dispute between ben Zoma and Rabbi Yehuda. Although the solution to the preliminary question was obvious, it served as a segue to the actual problem that he sought to raise (Toledot Yitzhak).

The purification of the leper — קדשה בטילה. After the priest determines that a leper is certainly afflicted with leprosy, he is required to reside outside the settled area until he is cured. When he believes that his condition has abated he comes before the priest, who verifies that he is healed. He then counts seven days, during which he remains impure and after which he immerses. On the eighth day he comes to the Temple to bring the offerings that he is required to sacrifice. The priest places all that accompanies the purification offerings and blood from his guilt-offering on his ear lobe and on his thumb and big toe. After his offerings are sacrificed, he is completely purified. This process is detailed in the Torah (see Leviticus 14:1–32) and in the mishnayot of tractate Nega'im.

Not only lepers — זכרין ובר_epi. Some commentators explain that in this source, Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion is not mentioned at all. The baraita states that the leper immerses, as do all others who enter the courtyard (Peirush Kadmon).
רַבָּנַן דְּרַבָּנָן אָמַר יְהוּדָה דְרַבָּנָן טָבֵיל דִּילְמָא צָרִיךְ לֵיהּ דַּﬠֲתֵיהּ טָבֵיל עַל כֶּבֶן כָּל בָּﬠֵית אוֹ בְּטוּמְאָה מְצוֹרָע אָמְרוּ לִי יְהוּדָה דָּיֵישׁ הַזָּאַת הָא הָא דְּטָבֵיל הָא רַבִּי דָּיְישִׁיﬠֲלֵיהּ (מְצוֹרָע בִּיאַת; אָמַר וְאִידֵי סֶרֶךְ יוֹחָנָן דְּלָא סְבִירָא שלִישִׁי דְאָמַר בִּיאַת שָׁאנֵי אֶלָּא! רַבִּי דָּיְישִׁי אָמַר וְלָא תָּנֵי לָא)

The Gemara asks: If it is a case where the leper did not immerse at all the previous evening, he requires the sun to set after his immersion to be sufficiently purified to enter the Temple. Rather, both this baraita and that baraita refer to a case where the leper immersed, but this baraita requires a second immersion is in a case where he was distracted from his efforts to avoid impurity imparted by a corpse; that baraita that does not require a second immersion is in a case where he was not distracted.

The Gemara asks: If he was distracted from his efforts to avoid impurity imparted by a corpse, it is sprinkling of purification waters on the third and the seventh days that he requires, not merely immersion. As Rabbi Dostai bar Matun said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Distraction from efforts to avoid impurity requires sprinkling of purification waters on the third and the seventh days.

Rather, both this baraita and that baraita refer to a case where the leper was not distracted, and this is not difficult; this baraita is referring to a case where the leper immersed the evening before with the intention of entering the Temple; that baraita is referring to a case where the leper did not immerse in the evening with the intention of entering the Temple. In that case, he requires a second immersion for purification even to enter the sacred area. And if you wish, say instead: Teach the baraita with a slight emendation: It was not lepers that they said immerse there; rather, all people immersed there. Rabbi Yehuda does not qualify the statement of the Rabbis but disputes it. In his opinion, lepers do not require immersion in the morning at all.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Let us say that the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Yehuda, hold in accordance with the opinion of ben Zoma, who maintains that this immersion is an obligation by Torah law for anyone entering the courtyard. And the fact that the dispute in the baraita is taught with regard to a leper, contrary to the opinion of ben Zoma, comes to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda4 that even a leper does not require immersion. Or perhaps fundamentally the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Yehuda; however, the halakha of a leper is different because he is accustomed to impurity,5 and that is why a second immersion was instituted for him. Rav Yosef said to him: A leper is different because he is accustomed to impurity.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: According to Rabbi Yehuda, who said the immersion is not an actual obligation but it is an ancillary immersion to remind the individual of old impurity,