A goat that he slaughtered before presentation of the blood of the bull – לְפִנִּי הַקּוֹדֶשׁ וְלִפְנַי אֵלּוּ: If the High Priest slaughters the goat before presentation of the blood of the bull, he has achieved nothing and must bring another goat. The halakhah is in accordance with the opinion of Ulla (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5:2).

And likewise Rabbi Afes said – אֶת הַכֹּהֲנִים: "He shall make atonement!" is the innermost sanctum, and likewise on the golden altar, if the blood spills he must go back and begin that cycle of sprinklings afresh. The Sages taught: "And he shall make atonement for the most sacred place, and he shall make atonement for the 'Tent of Meeting and for the altar; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly" (Leviticus 16:33). "And he shall make atonement for the most sacred place," this is the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies; "the Tent of Meeting," this is the Sanctuary; "altar" is meant as per its plain meaning; "he shall make atonement," is referring to the second mention of this phrase in the verse, these are the courtyards.

The priests is meant as per its plain meaning; "people of the assembly," these are the Israelites; "he shall make atonement," these are the Levites, who also gain atonement. They are all equated in this verse in that they achieve one atonement in this verse, which indicates that they all achieve atonement through the scapegoat for all other transgressions, apart from the ritual impurity of the Temple and consecrated objects, i.e., entering the Temple or eating consecrated food while ritually impure. The bull presented inside atones only for the priests, while the goats atone solely for Israelites. Only the scapegoat atones equally for all Jews. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

Rabbi Shimon says: Just as the blood of the goat presented inside atones for Israelites who sinned with the ritual impurity of the Temple and its consecrated objects, so too, the blood of the High Priest’s bull atones for the priests who sinned with the ritual impurity of the Temple and its consecrated objects. And just as the confession over the scapegoat atones for Israelites with regard to all other transgressions, so too, the confession over the bull atones for the priests with regard to all other transgressions, and therefore the priests do not require atonement through the scapegoat.

The Sages taught in another baraita: "And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place, and the 'Tent of Meeting, and the altar, he shall present the live goat" (Leviticus 16:20). "And when he has finished atoning for the sacred place," this is the sprinklings in the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies; "Tent of Meeting," this is the sprinklings toward the curtain in the Sanctuary; "altar," as per its plain meaning. This teaches that they each constitute a separate atonement unto themselves, i.e., each one of these actions achieves a distinct atonement. If a disqualification occurs in any of the atoning actions, he must return to the beginning of that action.
From here the Sages stated: If the High Priest presented some of the presentations inside the Holy of Holies and then the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins from the start of the presentations inside. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He need not start the cycle of sprinklings again; rather, he begins only from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations inside and then the blood spilled, he brings other blood and starts at the beginning of the presentations in the Sanctuary. However, he does not begin the presentations inside anew, as he has already sprinkled all the required blood inside, and that stage of the service is complete.

If he presented some of the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins again from the start in the Sanctuary, as he has not yet completed all the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins only from the place where he stopped.

Rabbi Yohanan said: And both of them, meaning the first tanna, i.e., Rabbi Meir, the accepted author of unattributed mishnaot, Rabbi Elazar, and Rabbi Shimon, derived their opinions from one verse: “And Aaron shall make atonement upon its corners once a year; with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement once a year he shall make atonement for it throughout your generations; it is most sacred to the Lord” (Exodus 30:10).

Rabbi Yohanan elaborates: Rabbi Meir holds that God said: I said to you to bring one sin-offering and not two sin-offerings. In other words, the High Priest may not sprinkle the blood of two offerings on the inner altar. Consequently, if the blood of the sin-offering spilled in the middle of the rite, he may not complete the presentation with the blood of another animal; rather, he must slaughter new offerings so that he can present all the sprinklings at the altar from one sin-offering. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon hold that God said: I said to you to perform one sprinkling and not two sprinklings. If he already sprinkled once, the High Priest need not sprinkle again, and if the blood spilled in the middle, the rite is completed with the blood of another offering.

He finished the presentations inside and the blood spilled – רֹאֵי. If the High Priest finished the presentations in the Holy of Holies and then the blood spilled, he brings other blood and restarts from the beginning of the presentations in the Sanctuary. The same applies if the blood spilled in the middle of the presentations in the Sanctuary, in accordance with the opinion of the first tanna (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5:6).

He finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled – רֹאֵי. If the High Priest finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled, he brings other blood for the presentations at the altar, in accordance with the opinion of the first tanna (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5:6).

He finished the presentations at the altar and the blood spilled – רֹאֵי. If the High Priest finished the presentations at the altar and the blood spilled, leaving no other blood to pour as the remainder at the base of the altar, he need not slaughter another offering in order to do so, as this action is not indispensable. The halakha is in accordance with the conclusion of the Gemara that all the Sages agree in this regard (see Lehem Mishneh; Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5:8).
It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Rabbi Ya’akov differentiated for me with respect to log. In other words, Rabbi Ya’akov said that although Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon disagree with Rabbi Meir with respect to the sprinkling on Yom Kippur, maintaining that the High Priest restarts from where he stopped, if some of the oil from the log used for purifying the leper® spills in the middle of the sprinkling, these tanna'im do not disagree that the priest must start that rite afresh.

The Gemara expresses surprise at this claim: And do they not disagree with regard to this issue as well? But wasn’t it taught explicitly in a baraita: If he presented some of the presentations of oil that he sprinkles inside the Temple and the log spilled,® he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations in the Sanctuary; and Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins from the place where he stopped.

Likewise, if he finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the log spilled, he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations that he puts on the thumbs of the leper. If he put some of the presentations on the leper’s thumbs and the log spilled, he brings another log and begins from the start of the presentations on his thumbs. Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say: He begins from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations on his thumbs and the log spilled, everyone agrees that the presentations on the head are not indispensable. This baraita proves that Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon also disagree with Rabbi Meir with regard to the purifying oil of the leper.

The Gemara answers: Rather, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s statement must be amended, as one should say: Rabbi Ya’akov taught me this dispute with regard to log. Just as there is a dispute with regard to spilled blood during the presentations on Yom Kippur, Rabbi Ya’akov taught that a similar dispute applies to the leper’s log of oil.

The Gemara analyzes this issue: The Master said above that everyone agrees that the presentations of oil placed on the head of the leper are not indispensable. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? If we say it is because it is written: “And the rest of the oil that is in the priest’s hand he shall put upon the head of him that is to be purified, to make atonement for him before the Lord” (Leviticus 14:29), which indicates that this presentation involves only the rest of the oil and is therefore not an essential element of atonement, however, if that is so, consider the verse: “But the rest of the meal-offering shall be for Aharon and his sons; it is one of the sacred offerings of the Lord by fire” (Leviticus 2:3). Should we say, so too, that they are not indispensable? This cannot be the case, as the halakha is that if the remnants of the meal-offering are lost before the handful is burnt, the owner of the offering must bring another handful.

The Gemara answers: It is different there, with regard to the leper’s log of oil, as it is written earlier: “And of the rest of the oil that is in his hand, the priest shall put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be purified, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the big toe of his right foot” (Leviticus 14:17), and it is also written: “And of the rest of the oil that is in the priest’s hand, he shall put upon the head of him that is to be purified” (Leviticus 14:18). This shows that the presentation on the head is performed only with the remainder of the oil, and therefore this action is certainly not indispensable.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said:

He presented some of the presentations of oil that he sprinkles inside and the log spilled – the remainder of the presentations of oil spilled, if, in the purification ritual of a leper, the priest had poured from the oil into his hand and begun to sprinkle when the log spilled, and this happened before he finished sprinkling seven times, he brings another log and starts the seven presentations again. If it spilled after the seven presentations, he brings another log and starts on the thumbs. If he had begun to place the oil on the thumbs and then the log spilled, he brings another log and presents on the thumbs from the start. If he finished the thumbs when the log spilled, although he lacks enough oil to apply from his hand onto the head of the leper, he need not bring another log, as the presentation on the head is not indispensable (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Mehunei Kappara 5:5).
And according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon, who say that he begins from the place where he stopped, here he has no remedy. According to their opinion, a service that has not been completed properly remains valid. In this case, once he has slaughtered the animal he cannot bring a second guilt-offering, as the verse states: “And offer it for a guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:12), and not two guilt-offerings.

Rav Hisda strongly objects to this: But isn’t it written: “And offer it for a guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:12), which indicates that he must offer that same guilt-offering he waved earlier, and if he does not do so the rite is invalid? If so, even according to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, he cannot use another offering. The Gemara comments: Indeed, this is difficult⁴⁶ for Rabbi Yoḥanan.

Even so, it was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan: With regard to a leper’s guilt-offering that the priest slaughtered not for its own sake, or if the priest did not put some of its blood on the leper’s thumbs, this guilt-offering is raised and sacrificed on the altar and requires libations as though it were valid. And yet the leper must bring another guilt-offering to make him eligible, i.e., pure of his leprosy. Evidently, there is an opinion that he may offer another guilt-offering, which apparently contradicts the opinion of Rav Hisda that everyone agrees that he cannot use another offering. And Rav Hisda could have said to you: What is the meaning of the term: Must, stated here? It means that he must do so, but since it is impossible he has no remedy.

The Gemara expresses surprise at this contention: But would a tanna teach: Must, when he means that he has no remedy? The Gemara answers: Yes, and indeed it was taught in a baraita: With regard to a totally bald nazirite,⁴ who cannot shave his hair with a razor as required, Beit Shammai say: He must perform the act of the passing of a razor anyway, and Beit Hillel say: He need not perform the act of the passing of a razor.⁴ And Rabbi Avina said that when Beit Shammai say: Must, they mean he must do so, but since it is impossible, he has no remedy.

With regard to a leper’s guilt-offering that was slaughtered not for its own sake⁴⁸ but for the purpose of a burnt-offering or peace-offering, we have arrived at the dispute between Rabbi Meir on the one hand and Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon on the other hand. Rabbi Yoḥanan clarifies his statement: According to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said that in the case of a service that was not completed he brings another animal and starts from the beginning, here too, in the case of the leper’s guilt-offering, he brings another animal and slaughters it, as Rabbi Meir maintains that a service that has not been completed is considered as though it had not been performed at all.

A leper’s guilt-offering, etc. — See Tosafot and other early commentaries, who challenge Rashi’s interpretation of this passage that this is referring to a guilt-offering that was slaughtered for the purpose of a burnt-offering or peace-offering, and accept Rabbenu Hananel’s version of the text, which reads: The blood of a leper’s guilt-offering that spilled before it was placed on the thumbs. According to this reading, the connection between this halakha and the debate between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon is clear. However, some commentaries point out that there are problems with this version as well. In justification of Rashi’s version, it should be noted that the guilt-offering of a leper is unique in that it is accompanied by libations, which are offered regardless of the fate of the animal. Since the disqualification of the animal does not entirely nullify this offering, it can indeed be compared to a disqualification that occurs during the midst of a service (Gevurat Ḥeil).

That was slaughtered not for its own sake — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ In the case of most offerings, with the exception of the Paschal lamb and the sin-offering, if they were not slaughtered for their own sake but for the sake of another type of offering, they are not entirely invalidated but are burned on the altar in the normal fashion. The only difference between an offering of this kind and one performed properly is that an animal slaughtered for the sake of another type of offering does not fulfill the obligation of its owner, who must bring another offering in its stead.

This is difficult — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ Although the Gemara immediately proceeds to cite a baraita in support of the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, at this stage of the discussion the challenge still stands (Kashot Meyushav).

The passing of a razor — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ An individual who takes a nazirite vow assumes three prohibitions: Consuming wine and grape products, contracting ritual impurity from a corpse, and cutting his hair. Upon completion of his term, the nazirite comes to the temple, sacrifices offerings, and cuts his hair. These acts signify the completion of his vow, whereupon he is permitted to drink wine and to come into contact with a dead body. The question here is which of these actions are indispensable to the ritual of a nazirite.

HALAKHA

A leper’s guilt-offering that was slaughtered not for its own sake — See Tosafot and other early commentaries, who challenge Rashi’s interpretation of this passage that this is referring to a guilt-offering that was slaughtered for the purpose of a burnt-offering or peace-offering, and accept Rabbenu Hananel’s version of the text, which reads: The blood of a leper’s guilt-offering that spilled before it was placed on the thumbs. According to this reading, the connection between this halakha and the debate between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon is clear. However, some commentaries point out that there are problems with this version as well. In justification of Rashi’s version, it should be noted that the guilt-offering of a leper is unique in that it is accompanied by libations, which are offered regardless of the fate of the animal. Since the disqualification of the animal does not entirely nullify this offering, it can indeed be compared to a disqualification that occurs during the midst of a service (Gevurat Ḥeil).

That was slaughtered not for its own sake — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ In the case of most offerings, with the exception of the Paschal lamb and the sin-offering, if they were not slaughtered for their own sake but for the sake of another type of offering, they are not entirely invalidated but are burned on the altar in the normal fashion. The only difference between an offering of this kind and one performed properly is that an animal slaughtered for the sake of another type of offering does not fulfill the obligation of its owner, who must bring another offering in its stead.

This is difficult — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ Although the Gemara immediately proceeds to cite a baraita in support of the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, at this stage of the discussion the challenge still stands (Kashot Meyushav).

The passing of a razor — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ An individual who takes a nazirite vow assumes three prohibitions: Consuming wine and grape products, contracting ritual impurity from a corpse, and cutting his hair. Upon completion of his term, the nazirite comes to the temple, sacrifices offerings, and cuts his hair. These acts signify the completion of his vow, whereupon he is permitted to drink wine and to come into contact with a dead body. The question here is which of these actions are indispensable to the ritual of a nazirite.

A leper’s guilt-offering, etc. — See Tosafot and other early commentaries, who challenge Rashi’s interpretation of this passage that this is referring to a guilt-offering that was slaughtered for the purpose of a burnt-offering or peace-offering, and accept Rabbenu Hananel’s version of the text, which reads: The blood of a leper’s guilt-offering that spilled before it was placed on the thumbs. According to this reading, the connection between this halakha and the debate between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon is clear. However, some commentaries point out that there are problems with this version as well. In justification of Rashi’s version, it should be noted that the guilt-offering of a leper is unique in that it is accompanied by libations, which are offered regardless of the fate of the animal. Since the disqualification of the animal does not entirely nullify this offering, it can indeed be compared to a disqualification that occurs during the midst of a service (Gevurat Ḥeil).

That was slaughtered not for its own sake — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ In the case of most offerings, with the exception of the Paschal lamb and the sin-offering, if they were not slaughtered for their own sake but for the sake of another type of offering, they are not entirely invalidated but are burned on the altar in the normal fashion. The only difference between an offering of this kind and one performed properly is that an animal slaughtered for the sake of another type of offering does not fulfill the obligation of its owner, who must bring another offering in its stead.

This is difficult — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ Although the Gemara immediately proceeds to cite a baraita in support of the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, at this stage of the discussion the challenge still stands (Kashot Meyushav).

The passing of a razor — See Tosafot.⁴⁸ An individual who takes a nazirite vow assumes three prohibitions: Consuming wine and grape products, contracting ritual impurity from a corpse, and cutting his hair. Upon completion of his term, the nazirite comes to the temple, sacrifices offerings, and cuts his hair. These acts signify the completion of his vow, whereupon he is permitted to drink wine and to come into contact with a dead body. The question here is which of these actions are indispensable to the ritual of a nazirite.
A leper who has no thumbs – בְּגָדִים מְטַמְּאִים: The reasoning here is that according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Elazar, the bulls and goats are all considered one offering, as even if there is an interruption in the middle of the sprinkling the rite continues with the blood of a different animal. Conversely, as the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Meir, maintain that each stage of the atonement requires its own offering if the blood is spilled, atonement is achieved through only one of the animals, not all of them (Tosafot Yeshanim).

Render ritually impure and are burned – תַּלְמוּד מְקַבְּלִים: With regard to these and all sin-offerings whose blood is brought inside the temple, the Torah states that their flesh and hides are entirely burned and that one who performs these actions is thereby rendered ritually impure, as are the garments he wears at the time (see Leviticus 16:27–28).

How many goats does he send away - לַמִּזְבֵּחַ נָתַן: According to some commentaries, this question is referring specifically to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon, who maintain that atonement is achieved through all the animals. Others maintain that the question applies to the opinion of the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Meir, as well. He merely states that atonement is achieved through the last of the bulls, since the earlier ones were disqualified. With regard to the scapegoats, however, as they themselves are not disqualified, they are all fit for the mitzva (Tosafot Yeshanim).

The baraita continues: One might have thought that even with regard to the blood of the leper’s guilt-offering that he presents on the altar, like the blood of other guilt-offerings, it is so that he collects the blood in his hand rather than with a vessel. Therefore, the verse states: “For as the sin-offering is, so is the guilt-offering” (Leviticus 14:13): Just as a sin-offering requires a vessel for collection of its blood, so too, the blood of a guilt-offering requires collection in a vessel. And you find that you must say: The leper’s guilt-offering requires two priests to collect its blood; one collects by hand, and the other one collects in a vessel. The one who collected in a vessel comes to the altar and sprinkles some of the blood on it, and the one who collected by hand comes to the leper and sprinkles some of the blood on him.

We learned in a mishna there: And all of the animals whose blood was spilled, as stated in the mishna, render ritually impure the garments of those who are occupied with burning them. If a bull or goat was slaughtered, but their blood spilled after one stage of atonement, and another animal is brought to complete the sprinkling, the first animal is burned, an action that renders ritually impure the garments of the individuals who perform the burning, And each of these first animals is burned in the place of the ashes, in accordance with the halakha of inner sin-offerings. This is the statement of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon. And the Rabbis say: They do not render the garments impure and they are not burned in the place of the ashes, except for the last animal, since the atonement is completed with it.

Rava inquired before Rav Nahman: How many goats does he send away? If the blood of the bull or the goat on Yom Kippur spilled, other animals are brought to complete the atonement. Only the last offering, through which the atonement is completed, is burned in the place of the ashes, and only that offering renders impure the garments of those who burn it (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avoda Yom HaKippurim 5:9).

Which offerings render garments ritually impure – מְטַמְּאִים: When the leper’s guilt-offering is slaughtered, two priests collect its blood. One collects some of the blood in a vessel and sprinkles it on the altar, while the other collects it in his right hand and pours it into his left palm. He then sprinkles some of this blood on the leper with his right finger. The halakha is in accordance with the ruling of the Rambam (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Meshuvas Kappara 4:2).