He derives... a verbal analogy between statute and statute – it would appear that everyone accepts the existence of this verbal analogy. The only dispute is which halakha should be expounded from it. Therefore, the Sifrei teaches that the rite should be performed in the white priestly vestments that the High Priest wears on Yom Kippur (see Riva).

Is it not written "And he shall make an atonement for..."? Since the first tanna provides a rationale for the halakha; the Gemara initially understands that he holds that the halakha is a rabbinc decree. However, the Gemara concludes: Since the implication of the word "it" is so compelling, everyone certainly agrees with this derivation, and therefore even the first tanna must assume the halakha is a Torah law. He simply offers a rationale for it (Tosafot).

Who interprets the rationale for the mitzva in the verse – אֲרֵךְ אֵלֶּה עַל עַל בְּדֶרֶךָ This certainty, even those who disagree with this approach of Rabbi Shimon agree that one should interpret the rationale of mitzvot. The dispute lies in the issue of whether one may draw halakhic conclusions based on these interpretations. Those who disagree with Rabbi Shimon assume that the halakha consistently follows the strict interpretation of the verse and not the suggested rationale for it.

And even according to the first tanna, is it not written "it"? Why does he not derive the halakha from the word "it"? The Gemara explains: Who is the first tanna? It is Rabbi Shimon, who interprets the rationale for the mitzva in the verse6 and draws halakhic conclusions based on that interpretation. Therefore, he accepts that the halakha is derived from the word "it," but he also provides a rationale for the halakha. If so, what is the practical difference between them? The practical difference between them is in a case...
A priest in his priestly state – בַּם כֹּהֵן. The priest who performs the rite of the red heifer wears the four priestly garments of the common priest, even if he is himself performing the actions of a High Priest. This is based on the mishna in tractate Parah and is brought in the Gemara here (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Parah Aduma 1:2).

The Gemara proceeds to expound the next verse: “And Elazar the priest shall take some of its blood with his finger” (Numbers 19:4). What is indicated by specifying Elazar? According to Shmuel, since the phrase “before him” in the previous verse indicates that Elazar himself did not need to slaughter the red heifer but that rather a non-priest could, it is necessary in this stage to return it to Elazar, to indicate that he must himself take the blood with his finger. According to Rav, this is an example of a restrictive expression following a restrictive expression, as both verses indicate that the rite may be performed only by a priest. And there is a hermeneutical principle that a restrictive expression following a restrictive expression comes only to amplify the halakha and include additional cases. In this case, it serves to teach that even a common priest may perform the rite.

The Gemara then proceeds to expound another verse in the same passage: “And the priest shall wash his clothes” (Numbers 19:7). Why is there a need to restate the involvement of the priest? To teach that he should be in his priestly state, i.e., wearing his priestly garments and fit for service. In the next phrase of the verse, the involvement of the priest is restated: “And the priest shall be impure until evening” (Numbers 19:7). This repetition is to teach that even in future generations the rite is to be performed only by a priest in his priestly state.

The Gemara analyzes this derivation according to the two sides of the dispute the Gemara cited previously: It works out well according to the one who said that for future generations the rite of the red heifer may be performed by a common priest. It is therefore understandable that the verse emphasizes that the priest has to perform the rite in his priestly state. But according to the one who said that for future generations it must be performed by a High Priest, now that we require the High Priest, is it necessary to mention that he must be in his priestly state? Yes, sometimes there is a matter that could be derived by means of an a fortiori inference, and the verse nevertheless unnecessarily writes it explicitly.

A restrictive expression following a restrictive expression comes only to amplify – בְּכֹהֵן דַּﬠֲתָךְ אֵין דְּפָרָה לְאֶלְﬠָזָר. This hermeneutical principle is unrelated to the phenomenon that occurs in many languages that a double negative indicates a positive. In fact, the principle does not relate specifically to negative terms such as “but” or “only”; rather, it relates to restrictive phases that limit the scope of the halakha.

In fact, it would appear that this principle is more closely related to the principle: Two verses that come for the same purpose do not teach. This principle states that if a halakha is expressed by the Torah in one specific case, it may be assumed that the case was just an example, and one should therefore apply the halakha to other cases as well. However, if the halakha is expressed with regard to two different cases, the assumption is that it applies only in those two specific cases and should not be applied elsewhere. Therefore, the principle: Two verses that come for the same purpose do not teach, means that if two verses teach the same halakha, that halakha is not applied to additional cases.

The principle: A restrictive expression following a restrictive expression comes only to amplify the halakha, follows a similar logic. If the Torah states a halakha and then writes a single restrictive expression that concerns halakha, it is assumed that the expression was written to limit the scope of the halakha. However, once there are two restrictive expressions, it seems that the expressions are not written to limit the scope, as one such expression would suffice for this. Rather, the fact that there are two such expressions indicates that they are just examples of the halakha and so should not be understood as coming to limit the scope of the halakha. As such, there is no reason not to apply the halakha to additional cases that would have otherwise been excluded had the restrictive expressions been understood as coming to limit the scope of the halakha.

Based on this understanding, the principle applies only when the two restrictive expressions do not themselves teach two distinct things. In such a case, both expressions would be necessary, and the logic of the principle would fall away (Yad Malakhi).

The verse nevertheless unnecessarily writes it explicitly – בַּם כֹּהֵן דַּﬠֲתָךְ אֵין דְּפָרָה לְאֶלְﬠָזָר. Some commentators claim that this rule holds true with other hermeneutical principles as well, such as verbal analogy, juxtaposition, and analogy. With regard to the use of this principle for an a fortiori inference, the commentators further suggest that there is certainly a good reason for the Torah to explicitly state the halakha, either because the logic of the a fortiori inference is refutable or because when something is written explicitly it carries a certain stringency beyond a halakha derived purely by inference (Yad Malakhi). Some note that the principle is never applied in a case where the text seems repetitive or verbose. In such a case, it is clear that there is something to be derived from it (Riva).
The Gemara expounds another verse in the passage: “And a man who is pure shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and place them” (Numbers 19:9). The verse states “a man” to qualify a non-priest to perform this stage of the rite. The verse states “pure” to qualify even a woman to perform this stage. The verse states “and place” to indicate that only one who has the basic level of intelligence to be able to intentionally place the ashes in their place is qualified to do so, thereby excluding a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor; since they do not have the basic level of intelligence to be able to intentionally place the ashes in their place.

The Gemara prefaces its exposition of another verse in the passage, which details the sanctification of the ashes of the red heifer, by citing a dispute concerning that stage: We learned in a mishna there, in tractate Para: Everyone is qualified to sanctify the ashes of the red heifer, i.e., to pour the water over them, except for one person takes and two people put – an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda qualifies a minor, but disqualifies a woman and a hermaphrodite.

What is the reason of the Rabbis, i.e., the first tanna? As it is written: “And they shall take for the impure of the ashes of the burning of the sin offering from sin, and he shall put running water thereto in a vessel” (Numbers 19:17). The word “they” is understood as referring to those who perform the previous stage of gathering the ashes. The verse therefore states: Those whom I disqualified for you for gathering the ashes, I have disqualified for you also for sanctification; and those whom I have qualified for you for gathering the ashes, I have qualified for you for sanctification.

And why does Rabbi Yehuda not accept this reasoning? If so, let the verse say: And he shall take. What is the meaning of “and they shall take”? The use of the plural serves to qualify additional people who were excluded from the previous stage. It means that with regard to even a minor, who I disqualified there with regard to collecting the ash, here, with regard to sanctification, he is qualified.

From where does Rabbi Yehuda derive that a woman is unfit? The verse states “and he shall put” and not: And she shall put. How do the Rabbis interpret this verse? They assume that if the Merciful One had written: And he shall take… and he shall put, I would have said the rite is not valid unless one person takes and the same one puts the ashes in the water. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “and they shall take” to indicate that the taking and the putting need not necessarily be executed by the same individual.

And if the Merciful One had written two plural forms such as: And they shall take… and they shall put, I would have said the rite is not valid unless two people take and two people put. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “and they shall take” and “and he shall put” (Numbers 19:17), to indicate that even if two take and one puts the rite is nevertheless valid.

The Gemara continues to expound the verses: “And a man who is pure shall take hyssop and dip it into the water” (Numbers 19:18). According to the Rabbis, who hold that the sanctification of the ashes in the previous stage may be performed by woman but not a minor, the word “man” indicates that for this stage, the taking and dipping of hyssop, only a man is qualified but not a woman, and the word “pure” is written to qualify even a minor for this stage. And according to Rabbi Yehuda, who holds the previous stage may be performed by a minor but not by a woman, the word man indicates that for this stage only an adult is qualified but not a minor, and the word pure is written to qualify even a woman for this stage.

The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna in tractate Para: Everyone is qualified to sprinkle the purification waters except for a person whose sexual organs are concealed (tumtum), and a hermaphrodite (androginus), and a woman. And concerning a minor who has a basic level of intelligence, a woman may assist him and he sprinkles the purification waters. The mishna disqualifies a woman for the sprinkling but qualifies a minor.
Pure, which by inference suggests that initially he was ritually impure. This halakhic midrash has been interpreted in several ways. According to Rashi, the Torah’s identification of the individual as pure suggests that he had only just emerged from his state of impurity. The Ritva takes a similar approach and claims that he was impure until this moment but is now pure. The Sifrei employs a verbal analogy from other cases, such as tithes, where the term pure is expounded to indicate the status of one who has immersed that day. The Rashba argues that identifying him as pure implies that he is pure only to the extent of this immersion, and that he is not completely pure. The Ritva takes a similar approach. One who immersed that day with regard to the red heifer – see Bava Batra 77a. This is a case of one restrictive expression after another. Because the Torah uses the term pure twice, it includes people who are not completely pure.
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One who immersed that day with regard to the red heifer – see Bava Batra 77a. This is a case of one restrictive expression after another. Because the Torah uses the term pure twice, it includes people who are not completely pure. The Tanna referred to here is not a Sage from the tannatic period. Rather, the term is referring to those who memorized large numbers of mishnayot and baraitot to be able to quote them for the Sages who were engaged in analysis. Occasionally, the Sage had to amend the versions of these baraitot that had become corrupted or that represented minority opinions that had been rejected.

The Gemara expounds the next verse: “And the pure one shall sprinkle upon the impure” (Numbers 19:19). The previous verse already states that the one who sprinkles must be ritually pure. This requirement is repeated here to make the following inference: He is pure, which by inference suggests that initially he was ritually impure and has now removed that impurity. This fact is significant only if the reference is to a person who has still not completed his purification process. As such, the repetition of the requirement that the one who sprinkles be pure teaches about one who immersed that day, that he is qualified to sprinkle the waters in the rite of the red heifer. This is one who was rendered ritually pure with a type of ritual purity from which he will become fully ritually pure only upon nightfall.

Rabbi Asi said: When Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish analyzed the passage of the red heifer to try to identify a consistent pattern in the way the implied conditions should be understood, i.e., when they exist to preclude conditions implied in previous stages, and when they imply conditions that remain in force in subsequent stages. They brought up from it only as the amount of earth that the fox brings up from a plowed field, meaning that they reached few conclusions. Rather, they said in conclusion that in some verses the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse preclude the application of conditions that are implied by a previous verse; whereas in other verses, the conditions implied by the phrasing of the verse stand on their own and apply also in subsequent verses. However, there is no obvious pattern of how to determine which verse employs which style.

A tanna who would recite baraita in the study hall recited a baraita before Rabbi Yoḥanan: All slaughters are valid if performed by a non-priest, except that of the red heifer. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Go out and teach that baraita outside the house of study, but not inside, as it is incorrect. We have not found any case of a slaughtering by a non-priest that is invalid.

As the amount of earth that the fox brings up – see Bava Batra 77a. The fox’s footprints are small, since it walks on the ends of its toes, and because it is a light animal with swift movements, the prints it leaves are faint. Therefore, as a fox walks it unearths only a small amount of soil.

And Rabbi Yehuda does not disagree. The mishna implies that even he agrees with the mishna’s ruling.
The Gemara comments: And Rabbi Yoḥanan was very convinced of this. Needless to say that he did not listen to that Tanna, but he did not even listen to his own teacher, who maintained the same opinion as cited by the Tanna, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shim'on ben Yehoẓaddak: The slaughtering of the red heifer by a non-priest is invalid. Rabbi Yoḥanan added: And I say it is valid, for we have not found any case of a slaughtering by a non-priest that is invalid.

The mishna states: The High Priest comes and stands next to his bull a second time and confesses: Please God, I have sinned… And my family and the children of Aaron, your sacred people. The Gemara asks: What is different about the first confession that he made over the bull, in which he did not say: And the children of Aaron, your sacred people?

The school of Rabbi Iṣḥaḳ taught: That is the method to which the attribute of justice lends itself. Better that an innocent person should come and gain atonement on behalf of the guilty, and a guilty person should not come and gain atonement on behalf of another guilty person. At the first confession, the High Priest has still not achieved atonement for himself. Therefore, it is more appropriate for him to wait until the second confession to seek atonement for the priesthood.

MISHNA

The High Priest would slaughter the bull⁴⁹ and receive its blood in a bowl, and give it to the one who stirs it.⁵⁰ The stirrer would stand on the fourth row⁵¹ of tiles in the Sanctuary and stir the blood lest it coagulate while the High Priest sacrificed the incense. He would take a coal pan and ascend to the top of the altar and clear the upper layer of coals to this side and to that side and with the coal pan scoop up coals from among the inner, consumed coals. And he would then descend and place the coal pan with the coals on the fourth row of tiles in the Temple courtyard.

The mishna comments on some of the contrasts between the service and protocols followed on Yom Kippur and those followed throughout the rest of the year: On every other day, a priest would scoop up the coals with a coal pan made of silver and pour the coals from there into a coal pan of gold. But on this day, on Yom Kippur, the High Priest scoops up with a coal pan of gold, and with that coal pan he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies.⁶⁰

On every other day, a priest scoops up the coals with a coal pan of four kav⁶¹ and pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. But on this day, the High Priest scoops with one of three kav, and with it he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Yeosei says a variation of this distinction: On every other day, a priest scoops up the coals with a coal pan of a se'ah, which is six kav, and then pours the coals into a coal pan of three kav. But on this day, the High Priest scoops with a coal pan of three kav, and with it he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies.

On every other day, the coal pan was heavy. But on this day it was light, so as not to tire the High Priest. On every other day, its handle was short, but on this day it was long so that he could also use his arm to support its weight. On every other day, it was of greenish gold, but on this day it was of a red gold. These are the statements of Rabbi Menahem.

On every other day, a priest sacrificed a peras, half a maneh of incense in the morning, and a peras in the afternoon, but on this day the High Priest adds an additional handful of incense and burns it in the Holy of Holies. On every other day, the incense was ground fine as prescribed by the Torah, but on this day it was superfine.

HALAKHA

The High Priest would slaughter the bull – רִאָשָׁנָה The High Priest acts in the same way as he does with the daily offering, in that he only begins the slaughter and a second priest completes it. Although this is not mentioned explicitly here, it is obvious: If such a procedure is followed for the daily offering, which is a sheep and whose slaughter takes little exertion, then certainly for the bull on Yom Kippur, when the High Priest must be careful not to overly exert himself, he will also follow the same procedure (Rid., see Tosefta Yom Tov).

Stirs it – מְנוֹשֵׁה The Rambam explains that this is achieved by swirling the bowl around so that the blood spins around but the bowl does not, in order that the blood not coagulate. The bowl was constructed in such a way that it would tip if it were put down by the priest, which would make the blood spill. This was done to ensure it would not be placed in a stationary position, which would cause the blood to clot.

The fourth row – רִאָשָׁנָה If Rabbi Elyakim suggests this is the first step leading to the Sanctuary. And with that coal pan he would bring the coals into the Holy of Holies – מְנוֹשֵׁה. Generally, the High Priest does not bring anything gold into the Holy of Holies. This is due to the principle: The prosecutor cannot be counsel for defense. The children of Israel used their gold in order to sin in the incident of the Golden Calf. Gold therefore became associated with that sin and its presence, so to speak, recalls their sin. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use it in order to achieve atonement. However, this principle applies only to the garments of the High Priest, which themselves effect atonement. It does not preclude the use of a gold coal pan or other gold items used inside the Holy of Holies.

On every other day, the coal pan was heavy – מְנוֹשֵׁה. The coal pan was heavy because it was made from thick metal, so that it would not wear away through constant use.

The High Priest slaughters the bull – רִאָשָׁנָה The High Priest acts in the same way as he does with the daily offering, in that he only begins the slaughter and a second priest completes it. Although this is not mentioned explicitly here, it is obvious: If such a procedure is followed for the daily offering, which is a sheep and whose slaughter takes little exertion, then certainly for the bull on Yom Kippur, when the High Priest must be careful not to overly exert himself, he will also follow the same procedure (Rid., see Tosefta Yom Tov).
The arrangements of wood on the altar –

The wood on the altar was arranged in a specific manner. On the eastern side of the ramp, the wood was arranged in a way that allowed the High Priest to ascend and descend on the eastern side of the ramp. On the western side, the wood was arranged in a way that allowed the High Priest to ascend and descend on the western side. This arrangement is described in the Gemara as "the arrangement of wood on the altar." The arrangement was such that it allowed the High Priest to ascend and descend in the middle of the ramp, while also maintaining a sacred space around the area where the wood was arranged. This arrangement was a way for the High Priest to sanctify himself and the area around him.

On every other day, the High Priest sanctifies his hands and his feet from the laver; on Yom Kippur he uses a golden coal pan. The silver coal pan was used on the eastern side of the ramp and descend on the western side, on Yom Kippur they ascend and descend in the middle of the ramp. On every other day, the priest who is privileged to scoop the coals uses a silver coal pan and pours the coals into one made of gold; on Yom Kippur the High Priest scoops the coals with a golden coal pan. The silver coal pan was heavy, but the gold pan was light. The silver coal pan had a short handle, but the gold one had a long handle (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:5).

The arrangements of wood on the altar –

On every other day there were three arrangements of wood on the altar, but on Yom Kippur there were four, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhah Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:5).

On every other day, priests ascend on the eastern side of the ramp and descend on its western side, but on this day the High Priest ascends in the middle of the ramp and descends in the middle. Rabbi Yehuda says: ‘There was no difference in this regard. Even during the rest of the year, the High Priest always ascends in the middle of the ramp and descends in the middle, due to his eminence.

On every other day, the High Priest sanctifies his hands and his feet from the laver like the other priests, and on this day he sanctifies them from the golden coal, due to the eminence of the High Priest. Rabbi Yehuda says there was no difference in this regard. Even during the rest of the year, the High Priest always sanctifies his hands and his feet from the golden coal.

On every other day there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar, but on this day there were five; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: ‘On every other day there were three, but on this day there were four. Rabbi Yehuda says: On every other day there were two, but on this day there were three.’

GEMARA

The mishna states that the blood of the bull is stirred by a priest standing on the fourth row of tiles in the Sanctuary, while the High Priest sacrifices the incense in the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: But is it not written “And there shall be no man in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, until he comes out” (Leviticus 16:17). How then could the stiring be standing in the Sanctuary? Rav Yehuda said: Emed and teach the mishna as saying: The fourth row of tiles of the Sanctuary, i.e., outside the Sanctuary on the fourth row from its entrance.

The Sages taught in a baraita: “The verse states: ‘And there shall be no man in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, until he comes out.’ The verse prohibits anyone to be inside the Tent of Meeting during the burning of the incense.

I might have thought nobody should be present, even in the Temple courtyard. Therefore, the verse states “in the Tent of Meeting,” limiting the prohibition to the Temple itself. I have derived only that a prohibition exists in the Tent of Meeting of the Tabernacle that was in the desert, from where do I derive that the prohibition applies also to the Tabernacle that stood in Shilo, and that it applies also to the Eternal House, i.e., the Temple in Jerusalem? The verse states “in the Sanctuary,” indicating that the prohibition applies to any Sanctuary.

I have derived only that a prohibition exists during the burning of the incense; from where do I derive that the prohibition applies also during the presentations of the bull’s blood in the Holy of Holies? The verse states: “When he goes in to make atonement,” and atonement is achieved through the presentations of blood. I have derived only that a prohibition exists from the time of his entrance into the Holy of Holies; from where is it derived that the prohibition remains in force until his exit? The verse states: “Until he comes out.”