I will infer via a verbal analogy: Atonement is stated here, with regard to the bull of the sin-offering, and atonement is stated there, with regard to the scapegoat. “And the goat designated by the lottery for Azazel shall be left standing alive before God, to atone with it” (Leviticus 16:10). Just as the atonement that is stated with regard to the goat is atonement achieved through words, as neither is the goat slaughtered nor is its blood sprinkled on the altar, so too, the atonement stated with regard to the bull refers to atonement achieved through words.

And if it is your wish to state a claim rejecting that proof, there is a different proof. It says: “And Aaron shall then offer his bull of sin-offering and atone for himself and his household. And he shall slaughter his bull of sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:11). Here, the term atonement is used despite the fact that the bull has not yet been slaughtered. Apparently, the atonement of the bull is achieved through confession and not through sprinkling the blood.

The Gemara seeks to clarify the midrash: What is the meaning of: And if it is your wish to say, which indicates that there is room to undermine the first source? Why is a second source required? The Gemara answers: And if you say that instead of deriving the atonement of the bull from the atonement of the scapegoat, let us derive it from the goat that is offered within, whose atonement is achieved through sprinkling its blood in the innermost sanctum; therefore, it was taught in the 

HALAKHA

And from where is it derived that the confession must begin with the word please? It is stated here: Atonement, and it is stated there, just before Moses’s plea following the sin of the Golden Calf at Horeb: “Perhaps I may secure atonement for your sin” (Exodus 32:30). Just as there, the prayer includes: “Please, this people is guilty of a great sin” (Exodus 32:31), so too here, the term please should be used. And from where is it derived that the Yom Kippur confession includes the name of God? It is stated here: Atonement, and it is stated with regard to the heifer whose neck is broken: “Atoner, O God, for Your nation of Israel whom You redeemed, and do not let grief for the blood of the innocent remain among Your people Israel, and they will be atoned of bloodguilt” (Deuteronomy 21:5). Just as there, with regard to the heifer, the name of God is mentioned, so too here, the name of God is mentioned.

Abaye said: Granted, the obligation to include the name of God in the confession at Horeb cannot be derived from the heifer whose neck is broken, since what was, was. The sin of the Golden Calf predated the mitzva of the heifer. However, you should derive that the confession in the ritual of the heifer whose neck is broken requires use of the term: Please, from Horeb, where Moses employed that term. And if you say that is so, and the term: Please, should be employed, didn’t we learn in a mishna that the priests say: “Atoner, O God, for Your nation, Israel” (Deuteronomy 21:5), while the mishna does not state the term please. Apparently, the formula of confession during the ritual of the heifer is not derived from Horeb. The Gemara says: It is indeed difficult why that is not derived.
Boxwood –  בּוֹסֲדוֹבְדְּרֶשׁ. The accepted identification of this plant is the long-leaved boxtree, Buxus sempervirens longifolia, a shrub which grows to a height of up to 10 m. An evergreen whose leaves are long and shiny on their upper side, it has thin stems with a circumference of no more than 20 cm. Boxwood, which is bright yellow, has always been considered superior wood in that it is dense, very hard, and flexible, and boards made from it are quite smooth and long-lasting.

**BACKGROUND**

Boxwood –  בּוֹסֲדוֹבְדְּרֶשׁ. The accepted identification of this plant is the long-leaved boxtree, Buxus sempervirens longifolia, a shrub which grows to a height of up to 10 m. An evergreen whose leaves are long and shiny on their upper side, it has thin stems with a circumference of no more than 20 cm. Boxwood, which is bright yellow, has always been considered superior wood in that it is dense, very hard, and flexible, and boards made from it are quite smooth and long-lasting.

**PERSONALITIES**

Ben Gamla –  בֵּן גַּמְלָה. Yehoshua ben Gamla was a High Priest at the end of the Second Temple period. He married the famous and wealthy widow Marra bat Batus, who used her money and influence to secure his position. Although the Sages disapproved of the method of his election, they nevertheless praised his great deeds, the most important of which was establishing a network of schools for Jewish children throughout Eretz Yisrael. It was said that were it not for Yehoshua ben Gamla, the Torah would have been forgotten from among the Jewish people. Apparently, he was also known as Yehoshua ben Gamliel, who was among the last of the High Priests in the Temple and who was killed during the destruction of the Temple.

**LANGUAGE**

Machine (mukhen) –  מַכְהֶן. From the Greek Μηχανή, mekhane, meaning machine, wheel, or lever.

The prophet said to the Jewish people –  הָבוּ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל. The question was raised: Why is Solomon described as a prophet? Although he was a prophet, it is inappropriate to refer to him in that manner since the verse cited is from the Writings and not from the Prophets. Perhaps the Gemara here is not referring to the statement of Solomon; rather, it is citing the verse in Proverbs to evoke the statement of the prophet Moses (see Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes).

MISHNA

The priest then came to the eastern side of the Temple courtyard, farthest from the Holy of Holies, to the north of the altar. The deputy was to his right, and the head of the patrilineal family belonging to the priestly watch that was assigned to serve in the Temple that week was to his left. And they arranged two goats there, and there was a lottery receptacle there, and in it were two lots. These were originally made of boxwood, and the High Priest Yehoshua ben Gamla fashioned them of gold, and the people would mention him favorably for what he did.

Since the mishna mentions an item designed to enhance the Temple service, it also lists other such items: The High Priest ben Katin made twelve spigots for the basin so that several priests could sanctify their hands and feet at once, as previously the basin had only two. He also made a machine (mukhen) for sifting the basin into flowing water during the night so that its water would not be disqualified by remaining overnight. Had the water remained in the basin overnight, it would have been necessary to pour it out the following morning. By immersing the basin in flowing water, the water inside remained fit for use the next morning.

**NOTES**

A machine for the basin –  מַכְהֶן לְבַשָּׁן. According to most commentators, the machine was a wheel used to lower the basin into a pit where water flowed. The Rambam explains that the machine described here was a type of barrier surrounding the laver, and the wheel filled the area surrounded by the barrier with water from the pit. In this way the water was not disqualified because it remained contiguous with the water in the pit.

Twelve spigots for the basin –  מַכְהֶן לְבַשָּׁן. The basin had twelve spigots so that all the priests participating in the daily offering could sanctify their hands simultaneously (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 3:18).
Gold chandelier – אֲבֵדָת מִכְּלָל זָהָב: Most commentators explain this to be a chandelier, although the author of the Me’iri, citing the Rambam, explains that it is a shimmering golden pane.

And so too do we find with the three ministering angels – מִכְּלָל זָהָב: The Gemara does not explain the source of this statement. Rashi explains that the term in the verse: “Stood over him [nitzavim alav]” (Genesis 18:2), indicates they all stood together, and did not come before him one at a time, from which proper etiquette can be derived. Some commentators explain that since Abraham spoke to one of the angels, clearly the greatest of the three, apparently Abraham discarded his stature from the way in which they were standing (see Maharsha and HaBeinah).

GEMARA From the fact that it says in the mishna that the priest comes to the north of the altar, it can be learned by inference that the altar itself does not stand in the north but in the south of the courtyard. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the mishna? The Gemara answers: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, as it was taught in a baraita that from the verse: “And he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward before God” (Leviticus 1:11), it is derived that the entire north side should be vacant. The altar is in the south, and the north is vacant. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov.

The Gemara asks: But isn’t the first clause, the previous mishna, as explained above, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who holds that the altar was partially in the north? The Gemara rejects this assertion: The entire mishna, including the first clause, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov. Emend the previous mishna and teach it as referring to the space adjacent to the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar and not actually the space between them, north of the altar, where everyone agrees that it is the north.

The mishna states that the deputy High Priest stands to the right of the High Priest, and the head of the patrilineal family is to his left. Rav Yehuda said with regard to the laws of etiquette: One who walks to the right of his teacher is a boor, in that he hasn’t the slightest notion of good manners. The Gemara asks: Didn’t we learn in the mishna that the deputy, who is like a student to the High Priest, is to the right of the High Priest, and the head of the patrilineal priestly family responsible for the Temple service that day is to his left?

And furthermore, it was taught in a baraita: ‘Three people who were walking on the road’ should not walk in single file but should walk with the teacher in the middle, the greater of the students on his right, and the lesser of them to his left. And so too do we find with the three ministering angels who came to Abraham: Michael, the greatest of the three, was in the middle, Gabriel was to his right, and Raphael was to his left. Apparently, a student walks to the right of his teacher.

Rav Shmuel bar Pappa interpreted it before Rav Adda: He does not walk next to his teacher as an equal, but walks slightly behind him so that he is slightly obscured by his teacher. The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: One who walks next to his teacher is a boor; one who walks behind his teacher, allowing his teacher to walk before him, is among the arrogant. The Gemara answers: He does not walk directly beside him but slightly to his side and slightly behind his teacher.

HALAKHA

Three people who were walking on the road – נִבְרֶשֶׁת הַמִּזְבֵּח: When three people walk together on a road, the most prominent walks in the middle, the next most prominent to his right, and the least prominent to his left (Shulchan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 242:7).

To his side – בַּר: It is prohibited for a student to walk alongside his teacher; rather, he should remain slightly to his side and slightly behind him. If there is a distance of four cubits between them, he may walk to his side (Shulchan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 242:16).
The mishna continues: And there was a lottery receptacle in the east of the courtyard there, and in it were two lots. The Sages taught the following in a baraita with regard to the verse: ‘And Aaron shall place lots on the two goats, one lot for God and one lot for Azazel’ (Leviticus 16:8). Lots is a general term; they may be fashioned from any material, as the Torah does not specify the material of which they are made.

One might have thought that he should place two lots on this goat and two lots on that goat; therefore, the verse states: “One lot for God and one lot for Azazel” (Leviticus 16:8), meaning there is only one lot here for God, and there is only one lot here for Azazel. Likewise, one might have thought he should place the lot of God and the lot of Azazel on this goat, and the lot of God and the lot of Azazel on that goat; therefore, the verse states: One lot for God, i.e., there is only one lot here for God, and there is only one lot here for Azazel. If so, what is the meaning when the verse states lots, in the plural, since each of the two goats has one lot not two? It is to teach that the two lots should be identical; that he should not make one of gold and one of silver, or one big and one small.

It was taught in the baraita that the lots may be fashioned from any material. The Gemara asks: This is obvious, considering that the Torah does not designate a particular material. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary only due to that which was taught in a baraita: Because we find with regard to the High Priest’s frontplate that the name of God was written upon it, therefore, the verse states: Lot, lot, twice to include other materials and not exclusively gold. It includes lots made of olive wood, and includes lots made of walnut wood, and includes lots made of boxwood.

The mishna continues: The High Priest ben Katin made twelve spigots for the basin. It was taught: Ben Katin did this so that twelve of his fellow priests, who are occupied with sacrificing the daily offering as explained above, could sanctify their hands and their feet simultaneously. It was taught: In the morning, when the basin is full, one sanctifies his hands and his feet from the spigots fixed at the top of the basin because the water level is high. And in the afternoon, when the water level is low, he sanctifies his hands and his feet from the spigots fixed at the bottom.

The mishna continues with regard to ben Katin: He also made a machine for sinking the basin. The Gemara asks: What is this machine? Abaye said: It is a wheel with which he lowered the basin into the pit.

The mishna continues: King Munbaz would contribute the funds required to make the handles of all the Yom Kippur vessels of gold. The Gemara asks: If he wanted to donate money to beautify the Temple, he should have made the vessels themselves of gold, not just the handles.
Abaye said: Although gold is not suitable for knife blades, as it is too soft for use in slaughter, the mishna is referring to knife handles. The Gemara raises an objection from a different baraita: King Munbaz also made the bases of vessels, the grips of vessels, the handles of vessels, and the handles of knives of Yom Kippur of gold. Apparently, knives are not categorized as vessels; therefore, the handles of the Yom Kippur vessels that Munbaz donated were not knife handles. The Gemara answers: Abaye interpreted that Munbaz donated gold for the handles of axes and hatchets. The blades of these implements cannot be made of gold; rather, like knives, they require stronger material.

The mishna continues: Queen Helene, his mother, fashioned a decorative gold chandelier above the entrance of the Sanctuary. It was taught in a mishna: When the sun rose, sparks would emanate from the chandelier, which was polished, and everyone knew that the time to recite Shema had arrived. The ideal time to recite Shema is at the moment of sunrise.

The Gemara raises an objection: One who recites Shema in the morning with the men of the priestly watch, who served in the Temple during a given week, or with the men of the non-priestly watch, designated groups of Israelites who accompanied the priestly watch to Jerusalem that week, did not fulfill his obligation. That is because the men of the priestly watch recite Shema too early so that they will have sufficient time to perform the Temple service, and the men of the non-priestly watch, who recite lengthy prayers and stand over the daily morning offering when it is sacrificed, postpone reciting Shema. For whom, then, did the emanating sparks signal the time to recite Shema? Abaye said: It was an indicator for the rest of the people in Jerusalem, who recited Shema at the appropriate time to recite Shema.

Queen Helene was wife of a monarch from Adiabene, a small kingdom in northern Syria, on the Tigris river. Helene lived in the generation prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, and she and her sons Munbaz and Izatz, also known as Bezoutus, became familiar with the Torah by Jews who passed through their land. They later converted, and apparently many members of their country’s nobility converted with them. Queen Helene visited Jerusalem several times and donated many gifts to the Temple and to ordinary people suffering economic hardship. Her sons continued to help the Jewish people and to ply the Temple with gifts. In addition, they sent troops from Adiabene to support the fighters during the great rebellion that culminated in the destruction of the Temple. Queen Helene and her son Munbaz are mentioned several times in the Talmud as paradigms of fear of God and of righteousness.
The Rif and others disagree and permit it, and in the
(see Rabbeinu Yeru
Alternating –

was written with initials. Others suggest that the letters
were written out of sequence, or in lines of three words
(see Sud’ Yitzhak). In the Jerusalem Talmud, apparently, the
scribe writing the soto portion during the soto ceremony
intended to write letters that were the size and form of
the letters on the tablet, but the tablet did not contain
the entire text.

HALAKHA
Writing a scroll for a child – שַׁבֵּה שָׁכַב. Citing the Ram-
barn, the author of the Shulban Arukh rules that one
does not write scrolls for children even for educational purposes,
in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi in tractate
Gittin. The Rif and others disagree and permit it, and in the Bah it
is written that doing so is customary throughout the Jewish
people (Taz, Bi’er Heitev; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 283:2).

BACKGROUND
Alexandria – אלכסנדריה. This port city, which lies west
of the Nile delta, was founded by Alexander the Great in
332 B.C.E. In its glory days, during the Ptolemaic rule in Egypt
and until the end of the mishnaic period, Alexandria was
one of the largest cities and cultural centers in the world.
The greatest scientists, doctors and artisans of the time lived
in Alexandria, and Alexandrian doctors were renowned
throughout the entire world. The Sages of the Talmud were
very familiar with Alexandrian doctors and held them in
high regard, often praising the medical accomplishments
of this important urban center.

$ The mishna relates: Queen Helene also fashioned a golden
tablet on which the sota Torah portion was written. The Gemara
comments: You learn from this that one may write a scroll that
contains only several portions of the Torah, from which a child
may be taught. The Sages disputed whether it is permitted to do
so even for the purpose of education. Reish Lakish said in the
name of Rabbi Yannai: There is no proof from this mishna, as the
tablet prepared by Queen Helene consisted of the letters of the
alef-beit, i.e., only the first letter of each word was written on the
tablet, representing the word.

The Gemara raises an objection from the halakhot of sota: When
the scribe writes the sota scroll, he looks and writes that which is
written on the tablet. Apparently, the full text of the passage
was written on the tablet. The Gemara rejects this: Emend the
baraita and say: He looks and writes like that which is written
on the tablet. The tablet aids the scribe in remembering the text
that must be written.

The Gemara raises an objection from a different baraita: When
he writes, he looks and writes that which is written on the
scroll. And what is written on the tablet? If a man lay with you...
and if he did not lay with you; if you strayed ... If you did not
stray (see Numbers 5:19–20). Apparently, the full text of the pas-
sage was written on the tablet. The Gemara answers: There, it was
written

with alternating complete words and initials. The first words of
each verse were written there, but the rest of the words in the verse
were represented by initials. Therefore, this contribution of Queen
Helene does not resolve the question of whether writing a scroll
for a child is permitted.

$ The mishna related: For NICANOR, miracles were performed
to his doors. The Sages taught in the Tosfeita: What miracles
occurred for his doors? They said: When Nicanor went to
bring copper doors for the eastern gate of the Temple from
Alexandria in Egypt, famous for its craftsmanship, on his return
voyage by ship, a storm arose in the sea and threatened to drown
him. The ship’s passengers took one of the doors, which were
exceedingly heavy, and cast it into the sea, fearing that the weight
of the doors would sink the ship. And still the sea did not rest
from its rage.