

HALAKHA

A goat that he slaughtered before presentation of the blood of the bull – שְׁעִיר שְׁחָטוּ קֹדֶם מִתְּנוּ דָמוֹ – שֶׁל פֶּרִי: 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 halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Ulla (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:2).

LANGUAGE

Rabbi Afes – רַבִּי אָפֶס: Probably from the Greek name ἄπις, *Apis*, or Ἐπειός, *Epius*.

NOTES

And likewise Rabbi Afes said – וְכֵן אָמַר רַבִּי אָפֶס: Ulla has no choice but to interpret the mishna in this manner, so that it would not conflict with his opinion, but why did Rabbi Afes explain that the mishna is referring specifically to the presentations in the Sanctuary? One answer is that Rabbi Afes thereby reconciles an apparent contradiction between the first clause and latter clause of the mishna. The mishna first states: Each act of Yom Kippur, but proceeds to list only some of its rites. Therefore, he explains that the mishna is not dealing with every stage of the Yom Kippur service but only with the presentations in the Sanctuary (*Toledot Yitzhak*).

The most sacred place, this is the innermost sanctum – מִקְדָּשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ זֶה לִפְנֵי וְלִפְנֵי – Rashi's interpretation of this statement has been challenged from several perspectives, both with regard to his opinion in general that this refers to the sin that requires atonement, as well as the details of his opinion, i.e., that the sin is that of one who entered the Holy of Holies while ritually impure and never became aware of his transgression. Some commentaries suggest that the verse is not dealing with atonement itself, i.e., what the priest is atoning for, but with the method by which he achieves atonement in each of these places (*Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosefot HaRosh*).

These are the Levites – אֵלֵי הַלְוִיִּם: It is odd that a special verse is necessary to include the Levites, who are part of the Jewish people. One suggestion is that as the inclusion of regular Israelites is derived from the phrase: "People of the assembly," and it is unclear whether the Levites are called a people, they therefore need to be included specially (*Gevurat Ari*). A different *baraita* includes slaves, not Levites, as derived from the phrase: "He shall atone."

בְּקִטּוֹת לֹא קָא מִיָּרִי.

אָמַר עוּלָא: שְׁעִיר שְׁחָטוּ קֹדֶם מִתְּנוּ דָמוֹ שֶׁל פֶּרִי – לֹא עָשָׂה וְלֹא בָלוּם. תִּנּוּ: הַקֹּדֶשׁ דָּם הַשְּׁעִיר לְדָם הַפָּר – יַחְזוּר וַיִּזְהַר מִדָּם הַשְּׁעִיר אַחַר דָּם הַפָּר. וְאִם אֵיתָא, יַחְזוּר וַיִּשְׁחוּט מִבְּעֵי לֵיהּ! תִּרְגְּמָא עוּלָא: בְּמִתְנֻת שְׁבִהֵיכָל. וְכֵן אָמַר רַבִּי אָפֶס: בְּמִתְנֻת שְׁבִהֵיכָל.

“וְכֵן בְּהֵיכָל וְכֵן בְּמִזְבֵּחַ” וְכוּ'. תִּנּוּ רַבָּנִי: “וְכִפֵּר אֶת מִקְדָּשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ” – זֶה לִפְנֵי וְלִפְנֵי, “אֵהָל מוֹעֵד” – זֶה הֵיכָל, “מִזְבֵּחַ” – כְּמִשְׁמַעוּ, “וְכִפֵּר” – אֵלֵי עֲרוֹת,

“הַכֹּהֲנִים” – כְּמִשְׁמַעוּ, “עַם הַקְּהָל” – אֵלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “וְכִפֵּר” אֵלֵי הַלְוִיִּם – הוֹשִׁי בּוֹלֵן לְכַפֵּר אַחַת, שְׁבוּלָן מִתְּכַפְּרִין בְּשְׁעִיר הַמִּשְׁתַּלַּח בְּשָׂאֵר עֲבִירוֹת, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי הִיָּדָה.

רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אָמַר: כְּשֶׁם שְׁדָם הַשְּׁעִיר הִנְעִשָׂה בְּפָנִים מְכַפֵּר עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּטוּמְאֹת מִקְדָּשׁ וְקִדְשָׁיו, כֵּן דָּם הַפָּר מְכַפֵּר עַל הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּטוּמְאֹת מִקְדָּשׁ וְקִדְשָׁיו. וְכִשֶּׁם שְׁוִידוּי שֶׁל שְׁעִיר הַמִּשְׁתַּלַּח מְכַפֵּר עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּשָׂאֵר עֲבִירוֹת – כֵּן וִידוּי שֶׁל פֶּרִי מְכַפֵּר עַל הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּשָׂאֵר עֲבִירוֹת.

תִּנּוּ רַבָּנִי: “וְכִבֵּר מִכַּפֵּר אֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ” – זֶה לִפְנֵי וְלִפְנֵי, “אֵהָל מוֹעֵד” – זֶה הֵיכָל, מִזְבֵּחַ – כְּמִשְׁמַעוּ, מִלְּמַד שְׁבוּלָן כְּפָרָה כְּפָרָה בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמוֹן.

The Gemara answers that this is no proof, as he is not dealing with the incense. In practice, the High Priest must indeed go back and scoop new incense after slaughtering the bull. The mishna did not mention this detail because it is discussing the issue of the sprinkling of blood, not the incense service.

Ulla said: With regard to a goat that he slaughtered before presentation of the blood of the bull,^h it is as though he did nothing. The Gemara asks: But we learned in the mishna that if he performed the sprinkling of the blood of the goat before the sprinkling of the blood of the bull, he must repeat the action and sprinkle the blood of the goat after sprinkling the blood of the bull. And if it is so that Ulla is correct, the mishna should have said that he must return and slaughter another bull. The Gemara answers: Ulla interpreted the mishna as referring only to the presentations in the Sanctuary that were performed out of order. However, it is essential that the presentations in the Holy of Holies must be performed before the slaughter of the goat. And likewise, Rabbi Afes^l saidⁿ that the mishna is referring to the presentations in the Sanctuary.

The mishna states: And similarly in the Sanctuary, 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,ⁿ 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,ⁿ 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.

מִכָּאן אָמְרוּ: נִתְּן מִקְצֵת מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻפָּנִים וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – יָבִיא דָם אַחֵר, וְיִתְחִיל בְּתַחֲלֵהּ בְּמִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻפָּנִים. רַבִּי אֱלֶעָזָר וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: אֵינוֹ מִתְחִיל אֲלָא מִמְּקוֹם שֶׁפָּסַק. גָּמַר אֶת הַמִּתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻפָּנִים, וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – יָבִיא דָם אַחֵר, וְיִתְחִיל בְּתַחֲלֵהּ בְּמִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻהֵיכָל.

נִתְּן מִקְצֵת מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻהֵיכָל וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – יָבִיא דָם אַחֵר וְיִתְחִיל בְּתַחֲלֵהּ בְּהֵיכָל. רַבִּי אֱלֶעָזָר וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: אֵינוֹ מִתְחִיל אֲלָא מִמְּקוֹם שֶׁפָּסַק.

גָּמַר מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻהֵיכָל וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – יָבִיא דָם אַחֵר וְיִתְחִיל בְּתַחֲלֵהּ בְּמִתְּנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ. נִתְּן מִקְצֵת מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – יָבִיא דָם אַחֵר, וְיִתְחִיל בְּתַחֲלֵהּ בְּמִתְּנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ. רַבִּי אֱלֶעָזָר וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: מִמְּקוֹם שֶׁפָּסַק הוּא מִתְחִיל. גָּמַר מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם – דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל לֹא מְעַבְבִּי.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: וְשִׁנְיָהֶם מִקְרָא אֶחָד דְּרִשׁוּ: "מִדָּם חֲטָאת הַכִּפּוּרִים אֶחָת בְּשָׁנָה."

רַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר: חֲטָאת אֶחָת אִמְרֵתִי לָךְ, וְלֹא שְׁתֵּי חֲטָאוֹת. רַבִּי אֱלֶעָזָר וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן סָבְרוּ: חֲטָוִי אֶחָד אִמְרֵתִי לָךְ, וְלֹא שְׁנֵי חֲטָוִיִּין.

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,^h 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.

If he finished the presentations in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled,^h he brings other blood and begins at the start of the presentations at the altar, as he has already achieved the atonement of the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. If he presented some of the presentations at the altar and the blood spilled, he brings other blood and begins at the start of the presentations at the altar, as the atonement of the altar has yet not been completed. In this case, too, Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon say that he begins from the place where he stopped. If he finished the presentations at the altar and the blood spilled^h before he poured the remainder of the blood at the base of the outer altar, everyone agrees that the remainders are not indispensable, and he need not slaughter another offering for this mitzva.

Rabbi Yohanan said: And both of them, meaning the first *tanna*, i.e., Rabbi Meir, the accepted author of unattributed *mishnayot*, 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.

HALAKHA

He finished the presentations inside and the blood spilled – גָּמַר אֶת הַמִּתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻפָּנִים וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם: 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 – גָּמַר מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻהֵיכָל וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם: 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 – גָּמַר מִתְּנוֹת שְׂבֻמִּזְבֵּחַ וְנִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם: 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 Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:8).

Rabbi Ya'akov – רבי יעקב: Rabbi Ya'akov's full name was Rabbi Ya'akov ben Kurshai, a Sage from the last generation of *tanna'im*. Rabbi Ya'akov was highly proficient in the Torah of the *tanna'im* and was apparently one of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's teachers, teaching him a great deal of halakhic material. Rabbi Ya'akov's halakhic and agadic teachings appear in the Mishna and Gemara. Some commentaries surmise that Rabbi Ya'akov was the maternal grandson of Elisha ben Avuya, also known as Aher.

NOTES

The purification of the leper – טהרת המצורע: The *halakhot* of the purification of a leper after he has been healed from his affliction are stated in the Torah (see Leviticus 14:1–32). Part of the procedure is performed outside the Temple, e.g., shaving his hair and cutting his fingernails. The leper brings to the Temple a lamb for a guilt-offering and a *log* of oil that is waved by the priest. After the sacrifice of the guilt-offering, the priest applies some of the animal's blood to the earlobe of the leper, his right thumb, and his right big toe. Next, the priest takes some of the oil in his hand and sprinkles seven times. Some of the remaining oil is placed on the earlobe of the leper, his thumb, and his big toe. Finally, some of the leftover oil is placed on the head of the leper. When all this has been done, the leper sacrifices a lamb, or a bird if he is poor, as a sin-offering, and a second lamb or bird as a burnt-offering.

The *log* spilled, etc. – נשפך הלוג וכו': The early commentaries sought the source for the opinion of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon with regard to the oil. Some suggest that Rabbi Meir interprets the phrase “and a *log* of oil” (Leviticus 14:10) as indicating that only a single *log* may be used for each presentation, similar to his explanation with regard to the inner altar. Meanwhile, Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon derive their opinion by analogy from the *halakhot* of Yom Kippur, as the High Priest sprinkles from the point where he stopped if the blood spills in the middle of the service (*Siah Yitzhak*).

תנא, אמר רבי: לי חלק רבי יעקב בלוגין.

ולא? והתנאי: נתן מקצת מתנות שבפנים ונשפך הלוג – יביא לוג אחר, ויתחיל בתחילה במתנות שבהיכל. רבי אלעזר ורבי שמעון אומרים: ממקום שפסק הוא מתחיל.

גמר מתנות שבהיכל ונשפך הלוג – יביא לוג אחר, ויתחיל בתחילה במתנות שבפנים, נתן מקצת מתנות בבהונות ונשפך הלוג – יביא לוג [אחר], ויתחיל בתחילה במתנות שבבהונות. רבי אלעזר ורבי שמעון אומרים: ממקום שפסק הוא מתחיל. גמר מתנות שבבהונות ונשפך הלוג – דברי הכל מתנות הראש לא מעבבות.

אימא: לי שנה רבי יעקב בלוגין.

אמר מר: מתנות הראש אין מעבבות. מאי טעמא? אילימא משום דכתוב: “והנותר מן השמן” – אלא מעתה “והנותרת מן המנחה” הכי נמי דלא מעבבי?

שאני התם דכתוב: “ומיטר” “והנותר”.

אמר רבי יוחנן:

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Rabbi Ya'akov⁹ differentiated for me with respect to *lugin*. 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 leperⁿ 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,^{9H} 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 *lugin*. 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:

HALAKHA

He presented some of the presentations of oil that he sprinkles inside and the *log* spilled – נתן מקצת מתנות שבפנים ונשפך הלוג: 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 Meḥusrei Kappara* 5:5).

אֲשֶׁם מְצוּרַע שֶׁשָּׁחַטוּ שְׁלֵא לְשִׁמוֹ –
בְּאֵנוּ לְמַחְלוּקַת רַבֵּי מֵאִיר וְרַבֵּי אֶלְעָזָר
וְרַבֵּי שִׁמּוֹן. רַבֵּי מֵאִיר דָּאָמַר יִבְיֵא
אַחַר וְיִתְחַיֵּל בְּתַחֲוֵילָהּ – הֵכָא נִמְי
יִבְיֵא אַחַר וְיִשְׁחוּט.

וְלַרְבֵּי אֶלְעָזָר וְרַבֵּי שִׁמּוֹן שְׂאוּמְרִים
מִמְקוֹם שֶׁפָּסַק מִשָּׁם הוּא מִתְחַיֵּל –
הֵכָא אֵין לוֹ תִּקְנָה.

מִתְקִיף לֵיהּ רַב חֲסִידָא: וְהָא "אוֹתוֹ"
בְּתִיב! קְשִׁיָּא.

תֵּנִי מִכּוֹתֵיהּ דְּרַבֵּי יוֹחָנָן: אֲשֶׁם מְצוּרַע
שֶׁשָּׁחַטוּ שְׁלֵא לְשִׁמוֹ, אוֹ שְׁלֵא נָתַן
מִדְּמֹ לְגַבֵּי בְּהוֹנוֹת – הֲרֵי זֶה עוֹלָה
לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ וְטֵעוּן נִסְכִּים, וְצָרִיךְ אֲשֶׁם
אַחַר לְהַכְשִׁירוֹ. וְרַב חֲסִידָא אָמַר לָךְ:
מֵאִי צָרִיךְ – צָרִיךְ וְאֵין לוֹ תִּקְנָה.

וְתַנֵּי תַנָּא צָרִיךְ וְאֵין לוֹ תִּקְנָה? אֵין,
וְהִתְנַיֵּא: נְזִיר מְמוּרָט, בֵּית שְׁמַאי
אוֹמְרִים: צָרִיךְ הֶעֱבַרְתָּ תַעֲר, וּבֵית הִלֵּל
אוֹמְרִים: אֵין צָרִיךְ הֶעֱבַרְתָּ תַעֲר. וְאָמַר
רַבֵּי אֲבִינָא: כְּשִׂאוּמְרִים בֵּית שְׁמַאי
צָרִיךְ – צָרִיךְ וְאֵין לוֹ תִּקְנָה.

With regard to a leper's guilt-offering^N that was slaughtered not for its own sake^{NH} 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 Yohanan 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.

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 difficult^N for Rabbi Yohanan.

Even so, it was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan: 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,^H 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.^N 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.

HALAKHA

A leper's guilt-offering that was slaughtered not for its own sake – אֲשֶׁם מְצוּרַע שֶׁשָּׁחַטוּ שְׁלֵא לְשִׁמוֹ – If a leper's guilt offering was slaughtered not for its own sake, or if the priest did not place its blood on the individual's thumbs, the offering is still burned on the altar and requires libations. Nevertheless, the leper has not fulfilled his obligation with it, and he must bring another guilt-offering (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Mehuserei Kappara* 5:5).

Bald nazirite – נְזִיר מְמוּרָט: Since the act of shaving is not in-

dispensable, a bald nazirite may bring his offerings and be released from his vow. In light of the Gemara in *Nazir* 46b, where the opinions are reversed and the lenient opinion is that of Beit Shammai, the Rambam apparently rules in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, a ruling that puzzles the *Kesef Mishne* and the *Lehem Mishne*. However, it is possible that the Rambam relies on the version of the text that appears in the Gemara here, in which the lenient opinion is that of Beit Hillel (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

NOTES

A leper's guilt-offering, etc. – אֲשֶׁם מְצוּרַע וכו' – 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 Rabbeinu 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 Ari*).

That was slaughtered not for its own sake – שֶׁשָּׁחַטוּ שְׁלֵא לְשִׁמוֹ: 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 – קְשִׁיָּא: Although the Gemara immediately proceeds to cite a *baraita* in support of the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, at this stage of the discussion the challenge still stands (*Kashot Meyushav*).

The passing of a razor – הֶעֱבַרְתָּ תַעֲר: 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.

לקיחה בעצמו של כהן – Taking with the priest's own body: *Tosafot* raise a difficulty against this proof, as the Torah also states with regard to other offerings: "And the priest shall take of its blood with his finger and place it" (Leviticus 4:30), and there is no insistence that the priest use his hand in those cases. Some commentaries resolve this problem by pointing out that the word "finger" is written there between "take" and "place," which indicates that the two actions are not equivalent (*Korban Aharon*).

וכולן מטמאים – And all render ritually impure the garments – בגדים: 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 sprinklings 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*).

מטמאים ונשרפין – Render ritually impure and are burned: 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).

כמה שעירים משלח – How many goats does he send away: 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, as 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*).

ופליגא דרבי פדת, דאמר רבי פדת: בית שמאי ורבי אלעזר אמרו דבר אחד. בית שמאי – הא דאמרן, רבי אלעזר – (דתניא) אין לו בודהן יד ובוהן רגל – אין לו טהרה עולמית, רבי אלעזר אומר: נותן על מקומו ויוצא. רבי שמעון אומר: אם נתן על של שמאל – יצא.

תנו רבנן: "ולקח מדם האשם" יכול בבלי – תלמוד לומר: "ונתן, מה נתינה בעצמו של כהן – אף לקיחה בעצמו של כהן.

יכול אף למזבח בן – תלמוד לומר: "כי בחטאת האשם הוא" מה חטאת טעונה בלי – אף אשם טעון בלי. נמצאת אתה אומר: אשם מצורע שני בהנים מקבילים את דמו, אחד בידי ואחד בבלי. זה שקיבל בבלי – בא לו אצל מזבח. וזה שקיבל בידי – בא לו אצל מצורע.

תנן התם: וכולן מטמאים בגדים, ונשרפין אבית הדשן, דברי רבי אלעזר ורבי שמעון. וחכמים אומרים: אין מטמאין בגדים ואין נשרפין אבית הדשן אלא האחרון, הואיל וגמר בו כפרה.

בעא מיניה רבא מרב נחמן: כמה שעירים משלח? אמר ליה: וכי עדרו משלח? אמר לו:

The Gemara comments: And Rabbi Avina, in his interpretation of this matter, **disagrees with Rabbi Pedat. As Rabbi Pedat said: Beit Shammai and Rabbi Elazar said the same thing**, i.e., they have the same opinion in this regard. The opinion of Beit Shammai is that **which we said**, that a bald nazirite must pass a razor over his head. The opinion of Rabbi Elazar is as it was taught in a mishna: A leper who **has no thumb^h or big toe** on which to sprinkle can never attain ritual purity. **Rabbi Elazar says:** The priest puts it on the spot where the thumb was, and he thereby fulfills his obligation. **Rabbi Shimon says: If he put it on the left hand or foot, he has fulfilled his obligation.** According to Rabbi Pedat, Rabbi Elazar and Beit Shammai both maintain that even if the rite cannot be performed in the precise manner, one fulfills his obligation regardless.

§ **The Sages taught:** "And the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall put it upon the tip of the right ear of him who is to be purified, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the big toe of his right foot" (Leviticus 14:14). One might have thought that he should take it in a vessel; therefore, the verse states: "And put." **Just as putting means with the priest's own body, so too, taking means with the priest's own body.^N**

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.^h**

§ 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^N 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^N 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.^h**

Rava inquired before Rav Nahman: **How many goats does he send away?^N** If the blood of the goat presented inside is spilled, the High Priest must bring an additional pair of goats and perform a new lottery. This might even happen several times, which would mean that one goat is offered on the altar while several goats are designated for sending away. What should be done with those goats? **He said to him: Does he send away his flock?** In other words, the Torah said to send only one goat, not an entire flock. **Rava said to him:**

HALAKHA

A leper who has no thumbs – מצורע בלא בהונות: A leper who has no right hand, no thumb on his right hand, no right foot, no big toe on his right foot, or no right ear, can never be ritually purified, in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Mehusei Kappara* 5:1).

Collecting the blood of a leper's guilt-offering – קבלת דם:

אשם מצורע: 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 *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Mehusei Kappara* 4:2).

אלו מן – הקרבנות מטמאים בגדים: 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 Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:9).