The Gemara now formulates the proof: Who is the author of anonymous halakhic statements made in the Sifra?39 Rabbi Yehuda. And this baraita from the Sifra teaches: The lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering. Apparently, according to Rabbi Yehuda, the lottery is indispensable. This refutation of the opinion of the one who says that the lottery is not indispensable, i.e., Rabbi Yannai, according to the second version of his dispute, is indeed a conclusive refutation.

§ The Gemara addresses a similar case of designating offerings: Rav Hisda said: Nests,40 a pair of birds of which one bird must be sacrificed as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering become designated for the specific type of offering only at one of two distinct points: Either upon the owner’s taking of them, when he initially purchases and consecrates them for his offering, or upon the priest’s actual performance of the sacrificial rite upon them.

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said: What is the reason of Rav Hisda? As it is written in one verse: “And she shall take” two turtledoves or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt-offering and the other for a sin-offering (Leviticus 12:8). In another verse, it is also written: “And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin-offering and the other for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 15:15). The verses mention only the possibility of designating the offering either upon taking them or upon the performance of the sacrificial rite.

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Hisda’s ruling from the baraita cited above: The verse states, with regard to the goat of Yom Kippur: “And Aaron shall … offer it for a sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:9). This indicates that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

A verse is needed to teach this halakha, as I might have come to the opposite conclusion: Is there not an a fortiori inference? Just as in a case in which the use of a lottery does not consecrate the animals with a specific designation, nevertheless verbally designating the animals with the required status does consecrate them, so too, in a case in which the use of a lottery does consecrate the animals, is it not logically right that verbally designating the animals with the required status should consecrate them?

To counter this reasoning, the verse states: “He shall make it a sin-offering” to indicate that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering.

The Gemara explains the challenge to Rav Hisda’s ruling: But here, in the case of designating the goats, the baraita is focusing on the moment at which the lottery is held, which is neither the time of taking the goats nor the time of performing the sacrificial rite. Yet the baraita teaches that were it not for a verse that teaches otherwise, it would be possible to permanently establish the animals’ designation through a verbal designation at that time. This contradicts Rav Hisda’s ruling.

Anonymous statements in the Sifra – anonymous: The compendiums of halakhic midrash are composed of collections of exegetical derivations from the verses of the Torah. The Sifra, which means literally the book, is composed of halakhic midrash on the book of Leviticus. The Sifri, or literally, the books, is composed of halakhic midrash on the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. These compendiums, along with the Mishna, are considered part of the tannaitic literature, although their final editing took place during the time of the amoraim; consequently, a halakhic midrash is often referred to as a baraita.

Each compendium generally reflects the opinion of a single tanna. Anonymous statements in the Mishna are presumed to be in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir. Anonymous statements in the Sifra are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. In the Sifri, they are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon.

Nests – עוף נests: There are various circumstances in which a person is required to sacrifice two birds, either turtledoves or pigeons. One is always sacrificed as a burnt-offering and the other as a sin-offering. For example, a poor person who is required to bring a sliding-scale offering brings a bird pair (Leviticus 5:7–10), as does a poor woman after giving birth (Leviticus 12:8), a poor leper (Leviticus 14:22), and a zav or zavah following their purification (Leviticus 15:29–30).

Nests become designated only – עוף נests: Some say that this rule also applies to the offering of a nazirite. He is obligated to bring two animals, one as a burnt-offering and one as a sin-offering. Here, too, the law is that the designation can take place either at the moment of purchase or when the animals are sacrificed ( Tosafot Yeshanim).
The Gemara rejects the challenge: Rava said: The baraita does not contradict Rav Hisda's ruling. This is what the baraita is saying: Just as in a case in which the use of a lottery does not consecrate the animals with a specific designation, even if it is held at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite, nevertheless verbally designating the animals with the required status does consecrate them if it is done at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite; so too, in a case in which the use of a lottery does consecrate the animals, although it is held neither at the time of taking the animals nor at the time of performing the sacrificial rite, is it not logically right that verbally designating the animals with the required status should consecrate them, if it is done at the time of taking the animals or at the time of performing the sacrificial rite?

To counter this reasoning, the verse states: "He shall make it a sin-offering" to indicate that the lottery makes it a sin-offering, but verbally designating the goat with the status of a sin-offering does not make it a sin-offering. Rava has thereby explained the reasoning of the baraita in accordance with Rav Hisda's ruling.

Come and hear another challenge to Rav Hisda's ruling: One who inadvertently enters the Temple while ritually impure is required to bring a sliding-scale offering to achieve atonement. This offering is unique in that the specific offering one is required to bring depends upon his financial situation. With regard to this offering, a baraita teaches about the case of a poor person who ritually impurified the Temple, i.e., entered the Temple while ritually impure; and he set aside money for his nests, his bird pair, as he is required, as a poor person, to bring one bird as a sin-offering and one bird as a burnt-offering for atonement; and then he became wealthy, and he is consequently required to bring an animal sin-offering; and afterward, unaware of the halakha that he is no longer required to bring a bird pair, he separates his money into two portions and said that these coins are for his sin-offering and those coins are for his burnt-offering.

Then, in such a case, he adds more money and brings his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money set aside for his sin-offering, but he may not add more money and bring his obligation of an animal offering from the money set aside for his burnt-offering.

The Gemara explains the challenge to Rav Hisda's ruling: But here, in the case of designating the money, the baraita is focusing on a moment which is neither the time of taking the money nor the time of performing the sacrificial rite with the birds. And yet the baraita teaches that through a verbal designation one can permanently establish the status of the money, as is apparent from the fact that the money set aside for the burnt-offering may not be used toward the sin-offering. This contradicts Rav Hisda's ruling.

A sliding-scale offering – דוד וּלְקִיחָה: This offering is unique in that the type of offering required depends on the financial status of the sinner. A person with sufficient means is required to bring a sin-offering of a female lamb or goat. A poor person who is unable to afford such an offering brings a pair of birds instead, one as a burnt-offering and one as a sin-offering. A person who cannot afford even a pair of birds brings a meal-offering.

A sliding-scale-offering is brought for the inadvertent violation of three sins: (1) Violating an oath; (2) taking a false oath to avoid giving testimony; (3) entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial foods while ritually impure. The Gemara here demonstrates its point using the case of one who entered the Temple while ritually impure, as this is the most common case, but the point could have been made with the other cases as well (Tosafot).

He adds and brings his obligation from the money for his sin-offering – יִשָּׂא צְבָאֹת: The Gemara in tractate Kentor derives from verses in the Torah that money designated for a bird sin-offering may be used toward an animal sin-offering.

Rabbi Yoshiya – רב יָשְׁיָא: The Rashash emends the Gemara here to state: Rabbi Haga said that Rabbi Hoshaya said. This is in line with the Gemara on the next amud, in which Rabbi Haga cites Rabbi Hoshaya and not Rabbi Yoshiya. According to this, Rabbi Elazar in the Gemara here and Rabbi Haga are in dispute over what Rabbi Hoshaya actually said.

The offering of a poor or wealthy person – נֵסְקָא בְּכָלִים: If a poor person sacrifices the offering of the wealthy, the offering is valid. If a wealthy person sacrifices the offering of the poor, the offering is not valid, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Hoshaya (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Shegagot 10:13).

HALAKHA

The offering of a poor or wealthy person – נֵסְקָא בְּכָלִים: If a poor person sacrifices the offering of the wealthy, the offering is valid. If a wealthy person sacrifices the offering of the poor, the offering is not valid, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Hoshaya (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Shegagot 10:13).
There is no redemption for a bird – אֲנַיָּן אֵין לִפְדֵי הַנַּפְשִׁים
In many cases, when an animal consecrated as an offering becomes disqualified, it is redeemed for money. A fifth of its value is then added to that money and used toward purchasing new animals, fit for offering. Through its redemption, it is deconsecrated and becomes non-sacred. The possibility of redemption is mentioned in the Torah only with respect to animals, but not with respect to bird-offerings. As such, bird-offerings can never be redeemed.

A poor person who brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring – עָנִי לְרַבּוֹת: בָּשׁוֹמֵשׁ לַפְּרֵידָה בְּרֵישֵׁי הַקְּדוֹשָׁב
If one sets aside a bird for an offering and it is disqualified, it cannot be redeemed for the purpose of purchasing a new bird with the money used to redeem it. This is because there is no redemption for a bird (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashim 5:10).

 הלכה
There is no redemption for a bird – אֲנַיָּן אֵין לִפְדֵי הַנַּפְשִׁים
In many cases, when an animal consecrated as an offering becomes disqualified, it is redeemed for money. A fifth of its value is then added to that money and used toward purchasing new animals, fit for offering. Through its redemption, it is deconsecrated and becomes non-sacred. The possibility of redemption is mentioned in the Torah only with respect to animals, but not with respect to bird-offerings. As such, bird-offerings can never be redeemed.

A poor person who brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring – עָנִי לְרַבּוֹת: בָּשׁוֹמֵשׁ לַפְּרֵידָה בְּרֵישֵׁי הַקְּדוֹשָׁב
If one sets aside a bird for an offering and it is disqualified, it cannot be redeemed for the purpose of purchasing a new bird with the money used to redeem it. This is because there is no redemption for a bird (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashim 5:10).

The Gemara asks: How can the baraita be referring to a case where he had taken the birds for his offering? If so, the next statement in the baraita: He adds more money and brings his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money set aside for his sin-offering, what does it mean? If he had taken them, then clearly he is not holding onto money with which to purchase them.

The Gemara suggests a solution: That statement in the baraita is referring to a case in which he redeemed the bird by transferring its sanctity to money that can then be used toward the purchase of an animal. The Gemara rejects this possibility: But there is no redemption for a bird, so this could not possibly be the case of the baraita.

Rav Pappa said: That statement in the baraita is referring to a case where he took only one bird. As such, the baraita means: If he purchased the bird for his burnt-offering, then he should add more money and bring his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money he had intended to use to purchase the second bird for his sin-offering. And this bird, which was purchased for his burnt-offering, goes toward a free-will offering. However, if he purchased the bird for his sin-offering, then he cannot add more money and bring his obligation of an animal sin-offering from the money he had intended to use to purchase the second bird for his burnt-offering. And this bird, which was purchased for his sin-offering, goes to its death, i.e., it is left to die, as is the halakha of a sin-offering whose owner has achieved atonement with another offering.

The Gemara proceeds to examine the dispute cited above. Returning to the matter itself, Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Hoshaya said: A wealthy person who ritually impurifies the Temple, and brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring, i.e., a bird pair, he does not fulfill his obligation. Rabbi Haga said that Rabbi Hoshaya said: He does fulfill his obligation.

The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna: A poor leper who brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring fulfills his obligation. A wealthy person who brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring does not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara answers: It is different there, in the case of leper, as it is written: “This shall be the law of the leper on the day of his purification” (Leviticus 14:2). The word “this” serves to emphasize that the details of the purification process must be carried out without any deviation.

The Gemara asks: If so, if any deviation is unacceptable, then in the case of the first clause, in which a poor leper brings the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring, he should also not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara answers: The Merciful One includes that case by stating: “The law of” (Leviticus 14:2). As it was taught in a baraita: “The law of” was stated in order to include a poor leper who brought the offering that a wealthy person is required to bring. One might have thought that even a wealthy person who brought the offering that a poor person is required to bring also fulfills his obligation. Therefore, the verse states “this” to indicate that the wealthy person may not deviate from what is required of him.
The Gemara asks: And let us derive the halakha for the parallel case of a sliding-scale offering from the halakha with regard to the offering of leper. Consequently, in the case of a sliding-scale offering, if a wealthy person brings the offering that a poor person is required to bring, he does fulfill his obligation, contrary to Rabbi Haggai’s opinion. The Gemara answers: With regard to a sliding-scale offering, the Merciful One excludes the validity of such an offering by stating: “If he be poor” (Leviticus 14:11). The word “he” serves to emphasize that the offering required for a poor person is valid only for him.

MISHNA The High Priest tied a strip of crimson and positioned the goat opposite the place from which it was dispatched, i.e., near the gate through which it was taken; and the same was done to the goat that was to be slaughtered, opposite the place of its slaughter.

He comes and stands next to his bull a second time, and places his two hands upon it, and confesses. And this is what he would say: Please God, I have sinned, I have done wrong, and I have rebelled before You, I and my family, and the children of Aaron, your sacred people. Please God, grant atonement, please, for the sins, and for the wrongs, and for the rebellions that I have sinned, and done wrong, and rebelled before You, I, and my family, and the children of Aaron, your sacred people, as it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant: “For on this day atonement shall be made for you to cleanse you of all your sins; you shall be clean before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:30). And they, the priests and the people in the Temple courtyard, respond after him upon hearing the name of God: Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and all time.

GEMARA A dilemma was raised before them: The mishna teaches two halakhot with regard to the scapegoat: A strip of crimson is tied to it, and it is positioned opposite the place from which it will be dispatched. When the mishna continues: And the same is done to the slaughtered one opposite its place of slaughter, is it referring to the tying of a strip of crimson, and it is teaching that a strip is also tied on the goat being sacrificed around the place of its slaughter, i.e., its neck? Or, is it referring to the positioning of the goat, and it is teaching that the goat being sacrificed should be stood opposite the place where it will be slaughtered?

Come and hear a resolution from a baraita that Rav Yosef taught: He ties a strip of crimson to the head of the scapegoat and positions it opposite the place from which it will be sent; and the same is done to the slaughtered one, opposite its place of slaughter. This is done for two reasons: So that each goat, i.e., the goat for God and the goat for Azazel, cannot become mixed up with the other one, and so that the goats cannot become mixed up with other goats.

**NOTES**

**Tied a strip of crimson wool upon the head of the scapegoat –** The commentators ask: Elsewhere, the Gemara establishes that having an animal offering carry any sort of burden is considered an act of labor, which is prohibited. If so, why is it permitted to tie a strip of crimson on the goat’s head? Some suggest that since this is done for the benefit of the Jewish people and isn’t an outright act of labor, it is permitted (Gevurat Ari; Neum Yehudah).

**Tying or positioning –** It is also possible that the mishna is teaching that a strip of crimson should also be tied to the goat that is to be sacrificed to God. However, while the other interpretation is not accepted as the correct understanding of the mishna, nevertheless, it is not dismissed. The goat is in fact positioned near the north, where it will be slaughtered (Rosh; Shit Yitzchak; Gevurat Ari).

**Cannot become mixed up with other goats –** In addition to the goat for God whose blood was to be applied inside the Holy of Holies and Sanctuary, there is an additional goat sin-offering which is sacrificed as part of the additional service and whose blood is applied to the outer altar. It was necessary to have a way to tell these goats apart in the event they became intermingled.

**BACKGROUND**

Strip (lashon) of crimson – לָשׁוֹן. This was a bundle of combed wool shaped somewhat like a tongue, or in Hebrew, lashon. It was dyed a shade of red called carmine, and was produced from the blood of the tol´at shani, a type of insect. Current research suggests that the tol´at shani is the scale insect Kermes echinatus, which feeds on the sap of evergreen trees and is found in Israel. Its color is generally referred to in the Bible as shani or tol´at shani.
Blazes high and blazes low — חֲלוּקָּה וְאַחַת בִּשְׁיָרֵי קָטֵיר: The commentary here follows the explanation of Rashi. Other commentators provide a different explanation. If the fire blazes upward, then it is valid, since the required items burned directly above and presumably in close proximity to the heifer. If the flame is low, it means it spreads out along the ground, and therefore the strip burned some distance from the heifer itself (Tosafot Yeshanim; Riva).

He wraps the cedar wood and the hyssop with the remnants of the strip of crimson – הכרך והלָשׁוֹן בִּשְׁיָרֵי קָטֵיר: When the red heifer is being burned, the hyssop is bound to the cedar wood with a strip of crimson. The bundle is then cast into the fire (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma 32).

The Gemara explains the proof from the baraita. Granted, if you say that the baraita is referring to tying, it works out well. Since both goats have a strip tied to them and to different places upon them, they will always be distinguishable both from one another and also from any other animals. But, if you say that it is referring to positioning the goat being sacrificed, but no strip of crimson is tied to it, granted, each one cannot be mixed up with its counterpart, since this one, the goat to be sent away, has a strip of crimson tied to it, and that one, the goat being sacrificed, does not have a strip of crimson tied to it. However, the goat being sacrificed could still be mixed up with other animals, since it has no strip tied to it. Rather, must one not conclude from the baraita that it is referring to tying? The Gemara confirms: Indeed, learn from it that it is so.

The Gemara discusses halakhot pertaining to the strip of crimson wool: Rabbi Yitzhak said: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between two strips of crimson, one of the red heifer and one of the scapegoat. One of them requires a minimum amount, and one does not require a minimum amount. But I do not know to which of them the requirement to have a minimum amount pertains.

Rav Yosef said: Let us see and examine the matter. It is logical that since the strip of the scapegoat, which requires division, it requires a minimum amount to be able to achieve this. Before the goat descends into Azazel, the strip is cut into two; half of it is tied between the goat’s horns and half of it is tied to a nearby rock. However, the crimson strip of the heifer does not require division, therefore it does not require a minimum amount.

Rami bar Hama strongly objects to this: The strip of the heifer also requires a minimum amount because it needs to have weight, in order to be heavy enough to fall into the heart of the fire in which the heifer is being burned (see Numbers 19:6). Rava said to him: The requirement for the strip to have weight is the subject of a dispute between tannaim, and Rav Yosef holds in accordance with the opinion that it does not need to have weight.

The Gemara asks: Is it true that the strip of the red heifer does not require division? Abaye raised an objection to this from a mishna in tractate Parah: How does he perform the burning of the items that are burned together with the red heifer? He wraps the cedar wood and the hyssop with the remnants of the strip of crimson and casts them into the fire in which the heifer is being burnt. The reference to the remnant of the strip of crimson indicates that only part is burned. This suggests that it also requires division. The Gemara answers: Emend the mishna in tractate Parah. Instead of saying: The remnants of the strip, say: It was done with the tail end of the strip of crimson.

The Torah requires that as part of the preparation of the ashes of the red heifer, cedar wood, hyssop, and a strip of crimson be cast into the midst of the burning of the heifer” (Number 19:6). The Gemara discusses what happens if these items burn before actually reaching the burning mass of the heifer: Rabbi Hanin said that Rav said: If the cedar wood and the strip of crimson were caught by the flame of the burning heifer, and they burned in the air before coming into contact with the mass of the heifer itself, it is valid. The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: If the strip of crimson was singed before reaching the heart of fire, he brings another strip and sanctifies it by ensuring it burns together with the mass of the heifer.

Abaye said: This is not difficult: Here, the baraita is dealing with a case in which the flame blazes high. Since the strip was still a significant distance from the burning mass, its burning is invalid. There, Rabbi Hanin is dealing with a case in which the flame blazes low, in close proximity to the mass of the heifer. Therefore, it is considered to have been burned together with it and is valid.
**Perek IV**

When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between three strips of crimson: One of the red heifer, and one of the scapegoat, and one of the leper. One of them must have the weight of ten zuzim; and one of them must have the weight of two sela, which is eight zuzim; and one of them must have the weight of a shekel, which is two zuzim, but I cannot explain which is which.

When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he explained in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan which weight each item requires, as follows:

The strip of crimson of the red heifer* has the weight of ten zuzim; and the strip of the scapegoat* has the weight of two sela, which is eight zuzim; and the strip of the leper* has the weight of a shekel, which is two zuzim.

And Rabbi Yoḥanan further said: Rabbi Shimon ben Halafta and the Rabbis disagree with regard to the strip of crimson of the red heifer. One said: It has the weight of ten zuzim. And one said: It has the weight of one shekel. And your mnemonic for remembering that while both argue that only one of the extreme values was required no one suggested the middle value of two sela is required, is the aphorism from a mishna: God equally values both the one who gives much and the one who gives little as long as his intention is to Heaven.

Rabbi Yirmeya ben Diʾiṭa said to Rava: It is not with regard to the strip of the red heifer that they disagree; rather, it is with regard to the strip of the scapegoat that they disagree. And on that very day that they disputed this issue, Rava bar Kisi died, and they made a mnemonic out of it, associating the halakha with his name: The death of Rava bar Kisi atones like the scapegoat, since the death of the righteous person atones for his generation.

Rabbi Yitzḥak said: I heard a teaching that there is a distinction between two slaughters: One of the red heifer, and one of the bull of the High Priest on YOM Kippur. The slaughter of one of them is validated even if done by a non-priest, and the slaughter of the other one is invalid if done by a non-priest. But I do not know which of them is which.

An amoraic dispute was stated: With regard to the slaughter of the red heifer and the bull of the High Priest on YOM Kippur, there is a dispute between Rav and Shmuel: One said: A red heifer slaughtered by a non-priest is invalid, whereas the bull of the High Priest slaughtered by a non-priest is valid. And the other one said: His bull is invalid, but the red heifer is valid.

*NOTES*

So that they will all be in a single bundle – אֲמַרְתָּ הַגָּזָה הַלַּחֶם בְּגֶפֶר יָדּוֹ מִשָּׁה—Rashi explains that the purpose is to be able to carry them all together. Rabbi Yosef writes that bundling the items makes them look better. The Riva connects the binding to the ritual of the Paschal lamb in Egypt, where the objects were tied together. He claims that here too, it is a requirement from the Torah to do so.

Strip of crimson for the red heifer and the leper — לְצַו: With regard to the leper, the Torah states: “And the priest shall take for the one who is to be purified two live pure birds, cedar wood, a strip of crimson, and hyssop” (Leviticus 14:4). The text describing the red heifer states: “And the priest shall take cedar wood, hyssop, and a strip of crimson and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer” (Numbers 19:6).

**BACKGROUND**

Weights – תֹּם וֹיְקִים: The methods of measures and weights in ancient times were not uniform, and sometimes different systems were used together. There are therefore many opinions with regard to the value of the weights mentioned by the Sages. The following are the range of estimates in grams for the various weights mentioned here: One shekel, 7.2–9.6 g, Two sela, 28.8–38.4 g, ten zuzim, 36–48 g.

**HALAKHA**

The strip of crimson of the heifer – נְשָׁיָה לְזַר: The strip of crimson of the red heifer weighed five sela, which is twenty zuzim. Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma 3:2).

The strip of the scapegoat – לְצַו: The strip of crimson that was tied to the head of the scapegoat weighed two sela, in accordance with Ravin’s statement (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom Hakippurim 3:4).

The strip of the leper – לְצַו: The strip of crimson of the leper weighed one shekel, in accordance with Ravin’s statement (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Kamar Totzarot 11:1).

**NOTES**

With regard to the scapegoat they disagree — בַּשְׂפָּר: The reason to require the larger size strip of ten zuzim is to ensure that even after it is divided it will still be a significant size, so that people can see it from a distance and know whether it has turned white (Tozidot Ḥeninah).