These animals are not killed directly by human hands, as is imprecise here, as only a single goat is brought. It is prohibited to harm a consecrated animal, but they are put to death instead.

The Gemara raises another difficulty by citing a verse: “And the blood of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the Sanctuary, shall be taken outside the camp” (Leviticus 16:27). Once again, the verse proves that even after it has been slaughtered and its blood is brought into the Holy of Holies, the animal is still called a bull. Rav Pappa said: Everyone agrees that when it is intact, with its hide, its flesh, and its excrement, it is called a bull. When they disagree is with regard to the blood. One Sage holds that its blood is called a bull, and one Sage holds that blood alone is not called a bull.

The Gemara asks: And the other one, who maintains that blood is not called a bull, how does he interpret this verse? The Gemara answers that he can explain the verse as follows: With what did Aaron become qualified to enter the sacred place? With his bringing of a young bull for a sin-offering. However, the blood itself, which he brings inside, is not called a bull.

Rav Ashi said: It is reasonable to say in accordance with the one who said that blood is called part of the bull, as it is written: “With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull” (Leviticus 16:13). Is that to say that he brings it in, to the Holy of Holies, with its horns? Rather, he enters with its blood, and yet the Torah calls that a bull. This proves that the blood itself is called a bull.

The Gemara returns to the issue of a replacement High Priest entering with the blood of the first bull: And let him derive the answer to this problem from the fact that it is a sin-offering whose owners have died. After all, the bull of the first High Priest is a sin-offering and its owner has died. Since there is a principle that a sin-offering whose owners have died is left to die, this should resolve the dilemma. Ravin bar Rav Adda said to Rava: Your students say that Rav Amram said that the sin-offering bull of the High Priest is a communal sin-offering, as the High Priest brings it both on his own behalf and for his fellow priests, and a communal sin-offering is not left to die.

As we learned in a mishna in tractate Temurah that tanna’im debate which offerings override Shabbat and ritual impurity. Rabbi Meir said to him: But consider the Yom Kippur bull, and the meal-offering resembling a wafer brought specially by the High Priest, and the Paschal offering, each of which is an individual offering and overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity. Since Rabbi Meir says that these are individual offerings, it is not correct to say by inference that there is one who says that these offerings are communal.

The Gemara rejects this proof. And according to your reasoning, consider that which was taught there: Rabbi Ya’akov said to him: But there are the cases of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, and the goats for a sin of idolatry, and the Festival peace-offering, which are all communal offerings and override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity. According to the above reasoning, it can be claimed by inference that there is one who says that these are individual offerings, which is incorrect.
Rather, Rabbi Meir responded to the first tanna, as he heard him say in the form of a general principle: Communal sacrifices override Shabbat and ritual impurity, but individual sacrifices override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity. In response to this claim, Rabbi Meir said to him: Is this statement with regard to an individual offering a general principle? But consider the Yom Kippur bull, and the meal-offering resembling a wafer of the High Priest, and the Paschal offering, each of which is an individual offering and overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity.

And Rabbi Yaakov responded to the first tanna from a different perspective: Is this statement with regard to a communal offering a general principle, which overrides ritual impurity? But there are the cases of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, and the goats for a sin of idolatry, and the Festival peace-offering, which are all communal offerings and override neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity.

Rather, grasp this principle: Any offering that has a fixed time for its sacrifice overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity even if it is an individual offering; and any offering of no fixed time overrides neither Shabbat nor ritual impurity, and this is the case even if it is a communal offering. With regard to the issue at hand, as the emphasis of both Rabbi Meir’s and Rabbi Yaakov’s statements is whether the offerings they referred to override Shabbat and ritual impurity, not their classification as individual or communal offerings, nothing can be inferred from their comments in this regard. Consequently, it remains possible that the bull of the High Priest is an individual offering.

Abaye raised an objection to Rava: Is the bull of the High Priest an individual offering? But we learned in a baraita: With regard to the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur that were lost, and he separated others in their stead, and the first animals were subsequently found, all of the second set shall be left to die. And likewise, goats for a sin of idolatry that were lost and he separated others in their stead, all of them shall be left to die. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: They shall be left to graze until they become unift, whereupon they are sold and their proceeds go for a free-will offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This proves that the Yom Kippur bull is called a communal sin-offering.

Rava said to Abaye: What bull is referred to here? A bull for an unwitting communal sin. Abaye retorted: But the baraita taught: Of Yom Kippur, which clearly indicates that it is referring to the bull of Yom Kippur. Rava answered: When the tanna of this baraita taught: Of Yom Kippur, he was referring only to the goat. That is, the baraita should be read as follows: The communal bull and the goat of Yom Kippur, which is also a communal offering.

Abaye further asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to the bull of Yom Kippur and the goat of Yom Kippur that were lost and he separated others in their stead, and the first animals were subsequently found, all of the second set shall be left to die. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: They shall be left to graze until they become unift, whereupon they are sold and their proceeds go for a free-will offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This baraita explicitly states that the bull of Yom Kippur is considered a communal offering.

Rava answered him: Do not say: As a communal sin-offering is not left to die. Rather, say: As a sin-offering of partners is not left to die. Since some of the partners are still alive, the sin-offering is not left to die. The bull of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is considered a sin-offering of partners because it attones not only for the High Priest, but for his fellow priests, as well. The Gemara asks: And if ultimately the bull is not left to die, what is the practical difference whether the bull of the High Priest is considered a communal sin-offering or a sin-offering of partners? Why did Rava insist on calling it a sin-offering of partners?
According to some opinions, even an entire tribe that sinned in one action adds a public confession as atonement. In certain situations where one person consecrates an animal for another person’s offerings, e.g., for a nazirite or woman after childbirth, the beneficiary need not be aware of the consecration. Since the sacrifice is consecrated for someone else’s atonement, the beneficiary becomes the owner for all intents and purposes, including the ability to effect substitution. Conversely, with regard to the halakha that the person who consecrates an item has to add a fifth to its value in the event that he redeems it, in this case this requirement applies only to the one who actually consecrated the animal (see Me’n.).

The Gemara answers that there is a difference between these two categories with regard to a court that issues an incorrect ruling to an entire community, e.g., a tribe of Israel, and the people act in accordance with that ruling. The halakha in this case is that the court must bring a bull for an unwitting communal sin. Rava insisted on referring to the bull that atones for all of the priests on Yom Kippur as a sin-offering of partners, not a communal sin-offering, for the following reason: If a court composed of priests issued a mistaken ruling, and the priests acted in accordance with that teaching, the priests do not bring a bull for this ruling, as they are not considered a community but a large partnership.

The Gemara offers another solution to the question. Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar raised the following dilemma:

According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an offering of an individual, one can perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution in this case? In other words, if the High Priest violated a prohibition and designated a substitute by saying that this bull should be switched with another, does the substitution take effect or not? Is it not correct to say by inference from the wording of Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma that there is one who says that these offerings are communal?

The Gemara rejects this contention: No, this is no proof, as one can say by inference that there is one who says that these offerings are of partners. There is no definitive proof that the bull of Yom Kippur is a communal sacrifice. In any event, the question of why the bull is not invalidated upon the death of the High Priest has been resolved, as the reason is either because it is a communal sacrifice or because it is a sacrifice of partners.

Since the Gemara has mentioned Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma, the Gemara addresses the matter itself. Rabbi Elazar asked: According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an individual offering, can one perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution? The Gemara asks: What is the dilemma he is raising? What is the basis of his inquiry?

The Gemara suggests that his dilemma is as follows: Do we follow the one who consecrates the animal, i.e., the High Priest, as he was the one who paid for it, in which case it is considered an individual sacrifice and his substitution is effective? Or do we follow the one who seeks atonement by the offering, and as this bull atones both for the High Priest and the entire community of his fellow priests, it is considered a communal sacrifice, and therefore his substitution is not effective? The question is: Which party is followed for the purposes of substitution?

The Gemara expresses surprise at this possible interpretation of Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma: It is obvious that we follow the one who seeks atonement, as Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yohanan said: With regard to one who consecrates his animal for an offering but intends it for someone else’s atonement, if he subsequently redeems the animal, he adds a fifth to it. This is in accordance with the halakha that one who redeems an animal that he himself dedicated must add a fifth of its value to the redemption, whereas if the person for whom it atones redeems it, he does not add a fifth. And the one for whom the sacrifice atones can perform substitution for it, whereas the one who consecrated the animal cannot effect substitution, as he is not considered its owner for the halakhot of substitution.

According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an offering of an individual, one can perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution in this case? In other words, if the High Priest violated a prohibition and designated a substitute by saying that this bull should be switched with another, does the substitution take effect or not? Is it not correct to say by inference from the wording of Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma that there is one who says that these offerings are communal?

The Gemara rejects this contention: No, this is no proof, as one can say by inference that there is one who says that these offerings are of partners. There is no definitive proof that the bull of Yom Kippur is a communal sacrifice. In any event, the question of why the bull is not invalidated upon the death of the High Priest has been resolved, as the reason is either because it is a communal sacrifice or because it is a sacrifice of partners.

Since the Gemara has mentioned Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma, the Gemara addresses the matter itself. Rabbi Elazar asked: According to Rabbi Meir, who says that the bull of Yom Kippur is an individual offering, can one perform substitution for this animal or can one not perform substitution? The Gemara asks: What is the dilemma he is raising? What is the basis of his inquiry?

The Gemara suggests that his dilemma is as follows: Do we follow the one who consecrates the animal, i.e., the High Priest, as he was the one who paid for it, in which case it is considered an individual sacrifice and his substitution is effective? Or do we follow the one who seeks atonement by the offering, and as this bull atones both for the High Priest and the entire community of his fellow priests, it is considered a communal sacrifice, and therefore his substitution is not effective? The question is: Which party is followed for the purposes of substitution?

The Gemara expresses surprise at this possible interpretation of Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma: It is obvious that we follow the one who seeks atonement, as Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yohanan said: With regard to one who consecrates his animal for an offering but intends it for someone else’s atonement, if he subsequently redeems the animal, he adds a fifth to it. This is in accordance with the halakha that one who redeems an animal that he himself dedicated must add a fifth of its value to the redemption, whereas if the person for whom it atones redeems it, he does not add a fifth. And the one for whom the sacrifice atones can perform substitution for it, whereas the one who consecrated the animal cannot effect substitution, as he is not considered its owner for the halakhot of substitution.
The benefit of discretion – בתקיפות

The one who separated teruma from his own produce has the privilege of choosing which priest receives the teruma, although it is considered distasteful for a priest to pay for teruma in any way, there is no prohibition against somebody seeking to benefit a particular priest by giving the teruma. Although it is considered distasteful for a priest to pay for teruma, the person who does so violates a prohibition and receives lashes as a punishment. Therefore, despite the fact that this switch is prohibited, if an act of substitution is performed, the second animal does acquire a measure of sanctity, while the initial animal also remains sacred. All animals can be used as substitutes, whether they are whole or blemished, and the animal designated as a substitute can never be worked or redeemed. The fate of the substitute varies with the particular type of offering. In some instances, such as a substitute for a sin-offering, the animal is left to die. In other cases, such as a guilt-offering, the animal is put to work (Rambam Sefer Kedosim, Hilkhot Terumot 2.2).

Substitution takes effect on a permanently blemished animal – בהלכת

The status of substitution takes effect on a permanently blemished animal. This animal cannot be redeemed, but one can be redeemed or an animal of similar kind and quality. The actual substitute must be put to work (Rambam Sefer Kedosim, Hilkhot Terumot 3.3).

The Gemara rejects this suggested explanation of Rabbi Elazar’s dilemma: Αn actually, it is obvious to Rabbi Elazar that we follow the one who seeks atonement by the offering, and this is his dilemma: Do his fellow priests achieve atonement by the essence of the offering, i.e., part of the offering is sacrificed on their behalf, which means they are partners in the bull? Or perhaps they achieve atonement incidentally, while the main atonement is that of the High Priest. If the atonement of the other priests is merely incidental, the High Priest can effect substitution with this bull.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma: There is a stricture that applies to the initial sacrifice, beyond the stricture that applies to the designated substitute, and there is a stricture that applies to the substitution, beyond the stricture that applies to the sacrifice. The baraita elaborates: There is a stricture that applies to the initial sacrifice, as the sanctity of the sacrifice applies to an individual as it does to a community, and the sacrifice overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity, and one can perform substitution for the original sacrifice, which is not the same with regard to the substitute, to which these halakhot do not apply.

The baraita continues: There is a stricture that applies to the substitute beyond the stricture that applies to the initial sacrifice, in that the sanctity of the substitution takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal. And the substitute cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume a non-sacred status; that is, it may only be sacrificed as an offering and eaten but under no circumstance can it be redeemed for its wool to be sheared and to be worked, which is not the case with regard to the initial sacrifice, as it can be redeemed in certain situations.

The Gemara explains: What are the circumstances of this sacrifice? What exactly is the sacrifice referred to in this baraita? If we say it is the sacrifice of an individual, does the sacrifice of an individual override Shabbat and ritual impurity? Rather, if we say that we are dealing with the sacrifice of a community, can one perform substitution for a communal sacrifice? Rather, is it not the case that we are dealing here with the Yom Kippur bull, which overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity, as it is a sacrifice that has a fixed time? And likewise, one can perform substitution for this offering, as it is an offering of an individual. This interpretation resolves the Gemara Elazar’s dilemma.

The Gemara rejects this contention. Rav Sheshet said: No, this is no proof, as it can be claimed that the baraita is referring to the ram of Aaron that the High Priest sacrifices as a burnt-offering on Yom Kippur, as the verse states: “With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 16:3). This offering is certainly the High Priest’s alone and is therefore classified as the offering of an individual.
The Gemara comments: So, too, it is reasonable that this is the offering referred to in the *buraita*, for if it should enter your mind to say that we are dealing with the bull of the High Priest, consider the following: Is it only Shabbat and ritual impurity that the substitution of the bull does not override, which indicates that one may sacrifice this substitute on a weekday? It is a substitute for a sin-offering, and the *halakha* is that the substitute for a sin-offering is left to die. Rather, we certainly must be dealing with the ram for a burnt-offering, as the substitute for a burnt-offering cannot be sacrificed.

The Gemara rejects this supporting argument: No, it is actually possible that the offering referred to in the *buraita* is the Yom Kippur bull of the High Priest, and what is the substitution that was mentioned? It does not refer to a substitution of the bull, but rather the *buraita* deals with the general category of substitution, i.e., it means that the phenomenon of substitution in general includes *halakhot* that do not apply to offerings.

The Gemara asks: If so, one can also say that the sacrifice mentioned in the *buraita* means the general category of sacrifices, rather than a specific offering. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: The *buraita* is not teaching about a general category of sacrifices, i.e., it is definitely not dealing with the phenomenon of offerings in general.

The Gemara continues: From where do I know that this is so? From the fact that it is taught: There is a stricture that applies to the substitution beyond the strictures that apply to the initial offering, in that the sanctity of the substitution takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and the substitute cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred status for its wool to be sheared and to be worked. And should it enter your mind to say: What is the sacrifice mentioned here, it means the general category of sacrifices; this cannot be the case, as there is an example of an offering to which these *halakhot* also apply,

e.g., a firstborn or an animal tithe, the sanctity of which takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and this offering cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred status for its wool to be sheared and to be worked. Rather, you must say that the *buraita* is not teaching a general category of sacrifices, but when it states: Offering, it is referring to a particular one.

The Gemara asks: And what is different about the two statements, i.e., why does the *tanna* deal with a specific case in one area, but a general category in the other? The Gemara explains: Substitution is one category, as there is no difference between one case of substitution and another. By contrast, with regard to sacrifices, there is a firstborn and there is the animal tithe, whose *halakhot* differ from other offerings, and therefore one cannot establish a single general principle. Consequently, the *tanna* certainly is referring to a specific offering.