

The World of the Tzitz - Dealing with Mortality in a Place of Immortality - Menachot 25a-b

Back on Shevuot 7b (insert link, please), we discussed the systemic problem of tum'ah meeting kedusha. We will use the case of the kohen gadol's diadem - the tzitz - to take a step back and examine the different ways that halakha handles the confrontation between tum'ah and kedusha.

Questions? Comments? Email dinanddaf@gmail.com

1. שמות כח:לו-לח

לו וְעָשִׂיתָ צִיץ זָהָב טָהוֹר וּפָתַחְתָּ עָלָיו פְּתוּחִי חֹתָם קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה:

You shall make a frontlet of pure gold and engrave on it the seal inscription: "Holy to GOD."

לז וְשָׂמַתָּ אֹתוֹ עַל-פְּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת וְהָיָה עַל-הַמִּצְנֶפֶת אֶל-מֹול פְּנֵי-הַמִּצְנֶפֶת יְהוָה:

Suspend it on a cord of blue, so that it may remain on the headdress; it shall remain on the front of the headdress.

לח וְהָיָה עַל-מִצַּח אַהֲרֹן וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת-עֹן הַקֹּדָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר יִקְדִּישׁוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְכָל-מִתְנַת קֹדְשֵׁיהֶם וְהָיָה עַל-מִצְחוֹ תָמִיד לְרָצוֹן לָהֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה:

It shall be on Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may take away any sin arising from the holy things that the Israelites consecrate, from any of their sacred donations; it shall be on his forehead at all times, to win acceptance for them before GOD.

2. משנה פסחים ז:ז

הַפֶּסַח שֶׁנִּזְרַק דָּמוֹ, וְאַחֵר כֶּךָ נֹדַע שֶׁהוּא טָמֵא, הַצִּיץ מְרַצָּה. נְטֵמָא הַגּוֹף, אֵין הַצִּיץ מְרַצָּה, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁאֲמַרוּ, הַנָּזִיר וְעוֹשֶׂה פֶסַח, הַצִּיץ מְרַצָּה עַל טִמְאַת הַדָּם, וְאֵין הַצִּיץ מְרַצָּה עַל טִמְאַת הַגּוֹף. נְטֵמָא טִמְאַת הַתְּהוֹם, הַצִּיץ מְרַצָּה:

In a case of a Paschal lamb whose blood was sprinkled and subsequently it became known that the meat or blood was ritually impure, the frontplate of the High Priest appeases God for the ritual impurity after the fact, and the owners are exempt from observing the second *Pesah*. If it became known later that the body of the individual who brought the Paschal lamb had become ritually impure, the frontplate does not appease God. The individual has not fulfilled his obligation to bring the Paschal lamb, and therefore he must observe the second *Pesah*. This is because the Sages said that with regard to the nazirite and one who performs the ritual of the Paschal lamb, the frontplate appeases God for both impurity of the blood and meat of the offering, but the frontplate does not appease God for impurity of the body of the individual bringing the offering. The mishna introduces a *halakha* with regard to ritual impurity of the deep, a term that refers to a source of impurity that is unknown to anyone and is discovered only after it has rendered someone impure. If it became known after the offering was brought that the person had become impure due to ritual impurity of the deep, e.g., if he was informed that there was a concealed grave under the place he had sat in a house where he had previously stayed, the frontplate appeases God and the offering is valid. (See also Mishnah Nazir 9:2 for more on tum'at tehom)

3. מנחות כה.

מתני' נטמא הקומץ והקריבו – הציץ מרצה...

MISHNA: If the handful became ritually impure and despite this the priest sacrificed it, the frontplate worn by the High Priest effects acceptance of the meal offering, and the remainder is eaten by the priests...

גמ' תנו רבנן: "ונשא אהרן את עון הקדשים" – וכי איזה עון הוא נושא? אם תאמר עון פיגול – הרי כבר נאמר "לא יחשב!" אם תאמר עון נותר – הרי כבר נאמר "לא ירצה!"

GEMARA: The Sages taught in a *baraita*: It is written with regard to the frontplate: "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, and Aaron shall bear the sin committed with the sacred items, which the children of Israel shall hallow, even all their sacred gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord" (Exodus 28:38). The Sages expounded: But which sin does he bear? If you say he atones for the sin of *piggul*, it is already stated: "It shall not be credited to him" (Leviticus 7:18). If you say he atones for the sin of *notar*, it is already stated in the same verse: "It shall not be accepted."

הא אינו נושא אלא עון טומאה, שהותרה מכללה בציבור.

Evidently, the High Priest wearing the frontplate bears only the sin of impurity in the offering of an individual. The frontplate is understood to atone for the sin of sacrificing an impure offering, as its general prohibition was permitted in certain circumstances, specifically in the case of the community, since in a situation where the entire community is impure it is permitted to sacrifice impure communal offerings *ab initio*.

...

רב אשי אמר: "עון הקדשים", ולא "עון המקדשין".

Rav Ashi said: "And Aaron shall bear the sin committed with the sacred items [*hakodashim*]," demonstrating that the frontplate atones for a sin inherent in the offering itself, and not for a sin committed by those who bring the offering [*hamakdashin*].

...

4. מנחות כה:

ורמינהי: על מה הציץ מרצה? על הדם ועל הבשר ועל החלב שנטמא, בין בשוגג בין במזיד, בין באונס בין ברצון, בין ביחיד בין בציבור.

And the Gemara raises a contradiction from another *baraita*: For what does the frontplate worn by the High Priest effect acceptance? It effects acceptance for the blood, for the flesh, and for the fat of an offering that became impure in the Temple, whether they were rendered impure unwittingly or intentionally, whether due to circumstances beyond one's control or willfully, whether in the case of the offering of an individual or in the case of a communal offering. In contrast to the statement of the previous *baraita*, this *baraita* teaches that the frontplate does effect acceptance in the case of an individual offering for blood that became impure and was sprinkled intentionally.

5. תוספות מנחות טו. ד"ה והכא

פי' הא אין הציץ מרצה על טומאת הגוף כדפי' בקונט' ודריש לקמן בהקומץ רבה (מנחות דף כה.) עון הקדשים הוא נושא ולא עון המקדישי' ובפרק שני דזבחים (דף כג.) נמי אמרינן בהדיא דאין הציץ מרצה על טומאת הגוף והא דאמר בפ' כיצד צולין (פסחים עז.) דלמ"ד טומאה דחוויה בעיא ציץ לרצויי היינו לטומאת בשר דמהני ציץ אבל לטומאת הגוף דלא מהני ציץ אפי' בלא ציץ:

The tzitz (diadem) does not gain acceptance over (sacrificing a korban with) ritual impurity of one's body, as Rashi explains. And it is expounded there in Menachot 25a - "he bears the burden of the sin of the consecrated materials, not the sin of the consecrators - i.e., those who give/sacrifice the offering," and in the second chapter of Zevachim we also say explicitly that the diadem does not gain acceptance for (sacrificing a korban with) ritual impurity of one's body. And that which is said on Pesachim 77a that according to the opinion that tum'ah is only overridden in cases of a communal korban (when most of the kohanim or most of the people are ritually impure), this refers to the ritual impurity of the meat, for which the diadem effects acceptance, but the diadema is unnecessary for the ritual impurity of the people, and it is fine even without the diadem.

6. רמב"ם הלכות ביאת המקדש ד:ו-ח

כֹּהֵן שֶׁעָבַד וְאַחֵר כֹּהֵן נֹדַע שֶׁהָיָה טָמֵא. אִם הָיָה טָמֵא הַיְדוּעָה כָּל הַקִּרְבָּנוֹת שֶׁהִקְרִיב פְּסוּלִין שֶׁהָיָה עֹבְדוֹתוֹ חָלִין. וְאִם הָיָה טָמֵא הַתְּהוֹם הַצִּיץ מֵרָצָה. וְכָל הַקִּרְבָּנוֹת שֶׁהִקְרִיב נִרְצוּ. וְאִפְּלוּ נֹדַע לוֹ שֶׁהוּא טָמֵא קִדְּם שִׁזְרַק הַדָּם וְזָרַק הַרְצָה. שֶׁהַצִּיץ מֵרָצָה עַל טָמֵא הַתְּהוֹם אֵף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא מִזִּיד. וְכִבֵּר בְּאֶרְנוֹ טָמֵא הַתְּהוֹם בְּנִזְרוֹת: [The following laws apply if] a priest performed service and afterwards, it became known that he was impure. If the source of impurity was known, all of the sacrifices that he offered are invalid, for his work is defiled. If, however, he became impure due to the impurity [likened to] the depths, the forehead plate brings about appeasement and all the sacrifices he offered are accepted. Even if he became aware of the fact that he was impure before the blood was sprinkled on the altar and then he sprinkled the blood, it brings about appeasement. For the forehead plate brings about appeasement for the impurity [likened to] the depths even though he [transgresses] intentionally. We have already explained the impurity [likened to] the depths in *Hilchot Nizirut*.

וְכֵן הַצִּיץ מֵרָצָה עַל טָמֵא דְּבָרִים הַקִּרְבִּין שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר (שמות כח לח) "וְהָיָה עַל מִצַּח אֶהֱרֹן וְנִשָּׂא אֶהֱרֹן אֶת עֹון הַקִּדָּשִׁים". אֲבָל אִינוּ מֵרָצָה עַל טָמֵא הַנֶּאֱכָלִין. וְלֹא עַל טָמֵא הָאֵדָם שֶׁנֶּטְמָא בְּטָמֵא הַיְדוּעָה. אֲלֵא אִם כֵּן הָיְתָה הַטָּמֵא הַדְּחוּיָה בְּצִבּוֹר שֶׁהַצִּיץ מֵרָצָה עָלֶיהָ:

Similarly, the forehead plate brings atonement if the objects being sacrificed are impure, as [Exodus 28:38] states: "And it shall be on the forehead of Aaron and Aaron will bear the sins of the sacred objects." It does not, however, bring about appeasement if the portions of the sacrifices that are eaten are impure or if the one [offering the sacrifice] is impure when he became impure because of a known source of impurity unless the impurity was superseded by a communal obligation, in which instance the forehead plate generates appeasement for it.

וְאִין הַצִּיץ מֵרָצָה אֲלֵא בְּזֵמַן שֶׁהוּא עַל מִצַּח שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר (שמות כח לח) "וְהָיָה עַל מִצַּח תִּמִּיד לְרָצוֹן לָהֶם לִפְנֵי ה'":

The forehead plate does not bring about appeasement unless it is on the High Priest's forehead, as [the above verse] continues: "It will be on his forehead at all times, for appeasement before God."

7. אבן האזל על רמב"ם הלכות ביאת המקדש ד:ז

מדברי הרמב"ם מבואר דגם בטומאת המקריבים הציץ מרצה... והוא תימה דהא בזבחים דף כ"ג ע"ב וכן במנחות דף כ"ה ע"א אמר בגמ' טומאת קדשים ולא טומאת המקדישים...

From the words of the Rambam it is understood that the diadem effectuates acceptance even for a korban brought when those offering are ritually impure... And this is surprising, for in Zevachim 23b and Menachot 25a, it says that the diadem is for the impurity of the sacrifice and not the impurity of the sacrificers...

והנראה בדעת הרמב"ם דבדין רצוי ציץ יש שני דינים א' הוא לרצות הקרבן שנעשה בטומאה וזהו והיה על מצחו תמיד לרצון להם לפני ד', ב' מה שהוא נושא עון הטומאה מה שאסור להקריב קרבן בטומאה וזהו ונשא אהרן את עון הקדשים, ושני הדינים הוצרכו, דבמה שנשא אהרן את עון הקדשים ונעשה ע"י הציץ כאילו אין כאן עבירה עוד לא יתכשר הקרבן, דלבד העברה הוא דין דעבודת טומאה בין בטומאת הקרבן בין בטומאת המקריב היא מחוללת, ולכן צריך רצוי הציץ שירצה הקרבן, ונשיאת העון ג"כ הוצרך דבמקום שיש עברה א"א שהקרבן ירצה ובגדר מצוה הבאה בעברה ולכן שני הגדרים הוצרכו.

And it seems that according to the Rambam, there are actually two legal layers: 1) to gain acceptance for the korban given in impurity - and that is from the clause "and it shall always be on his forehead for acceptance for them before God; 2) bearing the sin of impurity, namely that it is prohibited to sacrifice a korban in impurity - and that is from the clause "and Aharon shall bear the burden of the holy things. And both are necessary, because even by carrying the sin of the holy things, and the diadem making it as though there is no sin, that still does not make the korban itself valid; for besides the transgression, there is the ruling that worship done in impurity - whether the impurity of the korban or the one sacrificing it - is profaned. And therefore acceptance is needed, that the diadem will effectuate acceptance. And the carrying of the sin is also necessary, because if there is a sin (of offering the korban) it is impossible for the korban to be accepted - and it would be considered a mitzvah that is the result of sin - and therefore both layers are needed.

ועכשיו מבואר דמה דאמר בגמ' עון הקדשים ולא עון המקדישים זהו בדין נשיאת העון, אלא דממילא אם נשאר עון ע"כ הקרבן לא הורצה, אבל כל זה הוא בטומאת קרבן יחיד דאיכא עון, אבל בטומאת קרבן צבור דעון ליכא דטומאה דחוויה בצבור וכמו היתר דכלאים בבגדי כהונה או דכלאים בציצית דלא צריך לרצוי ציץ ה"נ דין טומאה דחוויה בצבור ג"כ לא צריך לרצוי ציץ, ומה שהוצרך לציץ בקרבן צבור הוא רק לרצות על הכשר הקרבן שלא יהי' מחולל בשביל שהוא בטומאה, ובדין רצוי קרבן שהציץ מרצה ליכא חילוק בין הקדשים ובין המקדישים דבקרא דלרצון להם לא כתיב הקדשים, ולכן שפיר דבטומאת קרבן צבור צריך רצוי ציץ ומהני הרצוי.

And now it is understandable - that which the Gemara states "the sin of the holy things and not the sin of those sacrificing," this only relates to bearing the sin - and then if there's a sin, then by default the korban cannot be accepted. But this is only in the case of an individual's korban, where there is a sin of offering it when one/the kohen is impure. But in the case of impurity relating to the communal offering, where there is no sin to bring the sacrifice to begin with because the tum'ah is overridden for the communal tum'ah and offering - like allowing wool and linen together in the kohen's clothing or in tzitzit (with techelet) which does not require the

acceptance by a diadem - likewise the law of tum'ah being overridden in the case of the communal offering and tum'ah, the diadem is not needed to make bringing the korban permissible. Instead, the diadem in that case is needed only to render the korban valid, so that it will not be considered profane because it is in impurity. And regarding the legal layer of the diadem gaining acceptance for a korban, there is no distinction between the "holy things" and "those who bring the sacrifice," for in the clause "for acceptance for them" the term "holy things" is not a qualifier. And therefore in the case of communal tum'ah and korban, the diadem renders the korban valid.

והנה באמת דברינו מוכרחים מדין טומאת התהום שהוא משנה מפורשת דנטמא טומאת התהום הציץ מרצה...לדברינו מבואר דדין טומאת התהום שהוא מהלכה הוא להתיר איסור של הטומאה, אבל מה דקרבן שקרב בטומאה דינו שהוא מחולל על זה צריך רצוי ציץ שהקרבן ירצה, ולכן מיושב שפיר שבטומאת התהום מרצה גם על טומאת הגוף, כיון דאיסור הטומאה הותר ולא צריך נשיאת עון הקדשים ורק רצוי הציץ, ובזה ליכא חילוק בין טומאת הקדשים לטומאת המקדישים וכמו שכתבנו.

And our approach is necessitated by the law regarding the impurity of the abyss, which is an explicit mishnah that the diadem effectuates acceptance...According to our explanation because the impurity of the abyss is already permitted in terms of bringing the korban, the diadem is needed to ensure only that the korban is accepted/valid. And thus it is resolved well that the diadem gains acceptance for impurity of the abyss even concerning the impurity of one's body, because given that that prohibition of sacrificing with this kind of tum'ah has been lifted, and there is no need for the "bearing of the sin of the holy things" but instead only the "acceptance of the diadem," and in that there is no distinction between the "impurity of holy things" and the "impurity of those offering the sacrifice," as we have written.

8. פסחים עז.

דַּתְּנוּ רִבְּנֵי: "וַיִּדְבֹּר מֹשֶׁה אֶת מַעֲדֵי ה'" — מָה תִּלְמֹד לֹמַר? לְפִי שְׁלֵא לְמַדְנוּ אֵלֶּא לְתַמִּיד וּפְסַח שְׁנֶאֱמַר בְּהוּ "בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ", "בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ" וְאִפִּילוּ בְּשַׁבָּת, "בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ" וְאִפִּילוּ בְּטוֹמְאָה.

It is as the Sages taught based upon the verse: "And Moses declared the appointed times of the Lord to the children of Israel" (Leviticus 23:44). What is the meaning when the verse states this phrase? This phrase is necessary because we had learned only that the daily offering and the Paschal lamb override Shabbat and ritual impurity, as it is stated with regard to them: In its appointed time, from which it is derived that each of them must be sacrificed in its appointed time and even on Shabbat, in its appointed time and even in ritual impurity.

שְׁאָר קִרְבָּנוֹת צִיּוֹר מִנִּין — שְׁנֶאֱמַר: "אֵלֶּה תַעֲשׂוּ לַה' בְּמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם".

With regard to the rest of the communal offerings, from where is it derived that they also override Shabbat and ritual impurity? As it is stated with regard to additional offerings that are brought on the Festivals: "These you shall sacrifice to the Lord in your appointed times" (Numbers 29:39).

מִנִּין לְרִבּוֹת עוֹמֵר וְהַקָּרֵב עִמּוֹ, שְׁתֵּי הַלֶּחֶם וְהַקָּרֵב עִמָּם — תִּלְמֹד לֹמַר: "וַיִּדְבֹּר מֹשֶׁה אֶת מַעֲדֵי ה' אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל", הַפְּתוּב קָבְעוּ מוֹעֵד אֶחָד לְכוּלָּן.

The *baraita* continues: From where is it derived to include the *omer* and the lambs that are sacrificed with it, the two loaves sacrificed on *Shavuot*, and the communal peace-offerings that

are sacrificed with them? The verse states: “And Moses declared the appointed times of the Lord to the children of Israel” after it lists Shabbat and the Festivals. This indicates that the verse established one time for all of them. All of these days are considered appointed times, and their offerings are not deferred.

9. יומא ו-ז.

איתמר, טומאת המת, רב נחמן אמר: הותרה היא בצבור, ורב ששת אמר: דחיה היא בצבור.
There is an amoraic dispute with regard to the effect of impurity imparted by a corpse on the conduct of the Temple service. It was stated with regard to impurity imparted by a corpse that Rav Nahman said: It is permitted in cases involving the public; e.g., when a majority of the Jewish people is impure, the service of a ritually pure priest is not preferable to that of an impure priest. The Temple service proceeds as though there was no impurity at all. And Rav Sheshet said: Impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden in cases involving the public, and service performed by a ritually pure priest is preferable.

היכא דאיכא טמאין וטהורין בהווא בית אב — כולי עלמא לא פליגי דטהורין עבדי, טמאין לא עבדי. כי פליגי לאהדורי ולאחרינא.

The Gemara restricts the scope of the dispute. In a case where there are both ritually impure and pure priests in that patrilineal family tasked with serving in the Temple on that day, everyone, even Rav Nahman, agrees that the pure priests serve and the impure priests do not serve. When they disagree, it is with regard to a case where the entire patrilineal family is impure. Is it necessary to seek out and bring pure priests from a different patrilineal family belonging to the same priestly watch, who are tasked with serving in the Temple on a different day that week?

רב נחמן אמר: היתר היא בצבור, ולא מהדרין. ורב ששת אמר: דחיה היא בצבור, ומהדרין.
Rav Nahman said: The prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public, and we do not need to seek out other priests. Since the Torah permitted the performance of the Temple service by priests impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, it is completely permitted and it is as though the service is performed in purity. Rav Sheshet said: The prohibition of impurity imparted by a corpse is overridden in cases involving the public, and wherever possible we seek out ritually pure priests.

איכא דאמרי: אפילו היכא דאיכא טהורין וטמאין בהווא בית אב פליגי רב נחמן, ואמר: עבדי נמי טמאין,
Some say that the dispute is slightly different: Even in a case where there are both ritually pure and ritually impure priests in that patrilineal family, Rav Nahman disagreed with Rav Sheshet and said that the priests serve even when they are impure,

דכל טומאת מת בצבור רחמנא שרייה.
as in all situations of impurity imparted by corpses in cases involving the public, the Merciful One permits those who are impure to perform the Temple service.

...

תא שמע: על מה הציץ מרצה, על הדם ועל הבשר ועל החלב שנטמא, בין בשוגג בין במזיד, בין באונס בין ברצון, בין ביחיד בין בציבור. ואי סלקא דעתך טומאה היתר היא בציבור — למה לי לרצוני?

The Gemara continues: Come and hear a different argument based on that which was taught in a *baraita*. For what does the frontplate worn by the High Priest effect acceptance? It effects acceptance for the blood, for the flesh, and for the fat of an offering that became impure in the Temple, whether it became impure unwittingly or whether it became impure intentionally, whether it was due to circumstances beyond his control or whether it was done willfully, whether it was in the framework of an individual offering or whether it was in the framework of a communal offering. And if it enters your mind that impurity is permitted in cases involving the public, why do I need the frontplate to effect acceptance? If the prohibition of impurity is permitted, no pardon is necessary.

אמר לך רב נחמן: כי קתני "הציץ מרצה" אדחיד. ואיבעית אימא: אפילו תימא בציבור, בהנהך דלא קביע לה זמן. The Gemara responds that Rav Nahman could have said to you: When the *baraita* teaches that the frontplate effects acceptance it is not referring to the entire list of items cited in the *baraita*; it is referring to an individual offering brought in impurity, not to a communal offering. The communal offering is mentioned only in the sense that in that case too, impurity is permitted, albeit for a different reason. Or if you wish, say instead: Even if you say that the frontplate effects acceptance for a communal offering, it is only for those offerings that lack a fixed time. Rav Nahman concedes that with regard to those communal offerings that have no specific time fixed for their sacrifice, the prohibition of performing the service in impurity remains in effect and requires the acceptance effected by the frontplate.

10. משנה שבועות א-ב-ז

כל שיש בה ידיעה בתחלה וידיעה בסוף והעלם בינתים, הרי זה בעולה ויורד. יש בה ידיעה בתחלה ואין בה ידיעה בסוף, שעיר שנעשה בפנים ויום הכפורים תולה, עד שיידע לו ויביא בעולה ויורד:

The mishna returns to the subject of defiling the Temple or its sacrificial foods. It elaborates on which offerings atone for different cases of defiling the Temple or its sacrificial foods: In cases in which one had awareness, i.e., he knew he was ritually impure and was aware of the sanctity of the Temple or foods involved at the beginning, i.e., before he transgressed, and had awareness at the end, i.e., after the transgression, but had a lapse of awareness of one of those two components in between, while he actually transgressed, this person is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering. For cases in which one had awareness at the beginning, transgressed during a lapse of awareness, and still had no awareness at the end, the goat whose blood presentation is performed inside the Sanctuary on Yom Kippur, and Yom Kippur itself, suspend any punishment that he deserves until he becomes aware of his transgression; and then to achieve atonement he brings a sliding-scale offering.

אין בה ידיעה בתחלה אבל יש בה ידיעה בסוף, שעיר הנעשה בחוץ ויום הכפורים מכפר, שנאמר (במדבר כט) מלבד חטאת הכפרים, על מה שזה מכפר, זה מכפר. מה הפנימי אין מכפר אלא על דבר שיש בו ידיעה, אף החיצון אין מכפר אלא על דבר שיש בו ידיעה:

For cases in which one did not have awareness at the beginning but had awareness at the end, the goat whose blood presentation is performed outside the Sanctuary, i.e., the goat of the additional offerings of Yom Kippur, and Yom Kippur itself, atone, as it is stated with regard to the offerings brought on Yom Kippur: "One goat for a sin-offering aside from the sin-offering of the atonements" (Numbers 29:11). The verse juxtaposes the internal and external goats together to teach that for that which this one atones, that one atones. Just as the internal goat, i.e., the one whose blood presentation is performed inside the Sanctuary, atones only for a case in which there was awareness of the components of the transgression at some point, i.e., at the beginning, so too, the external goat, i.e., the goat of the additional offerings of Yom Kippur, atones only for a case in which there was awareness at some point, i.e., at the end.

ועל שאין בה ידיעה לא בתחלה ולא בסוף, שעירי הרגלים ושעירי ראשי חדשים מכפרים, דבר רבי יהודה. רבי שמעון אומר, שעירי הרגלים מכפרין, אבל לא שעירי ראשי חדשים. ועל מה שעירי ראשי חדשים מכפרין, על הטהור שאכל את הטמא. רבי מאיר אומר, כל השעירים כפרתן שזה על טמאת מקדש וקדשיו. הנה רבי שמעון אומר, שעירי ראשי חדשים מכפרין על הטהור שאכל את הטמא, ושל רגלים מכפרין על שאין בה ידיעה לא בתחלה ולא בסוף, ושל יום הכפורים מכפר על שאין בה ידיעה בתחלה אבל יש בה ידיעה בסוף. אמרו לו, מהו שיקרבו זה בזה. אמר להם, יקרבו. אמרו לו, הואיל ואין כפרתן שזה, היאך קרבין זה בזה. אמר להן, כלן באין לכפר על טמאת מקדש וקדשיו:

And for cases in which one did not have awareness, neither at the beginning nor at the end, the goats brought as sin-offerings for the additional offerings of the Festivals and the goats brought as sin-offerings for the additional offerings of the New Moons atone. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Shimon says: The goats of the Festivals atone for cases in which one never had awareness of the transgression, but the goats of the New Moons do not. But if so, for what do the goats of the New Moons atone? They atone for a ritually pure person who unwittingly partook of ritually impure sacrificial food. Rabbi Meir says: With regard to all the goats offered as additional offerings, those of the New Moons, Festivals, and Yom Kippur, their atonement, i.e., the atonement that they effect, is the same; they all atone for the defiling of the Temple by entering it while impure, or for the defiling of its sacrificial foods by partaking of them while impure. Rabbi Shimon would say, delineating his opinion as the mishna expresses it above: The goats of the New Moons atone for a ritually pure person who unwittingly partook of ritually impure sacrificial food. And with regard to the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods, the goats of the Festivals atone for cases in which one did not have awareness, neither at the beginning nor at the end, and the goats of the additional offerings of Yom Kippur atone for cases in which one did not have awareness at the beginning but did have awareness at the end. The Rabbis said to him: What is the *halakha* with regard to whether goats consecrated for different days may be sacrificed, this one in place of that one? For example, if a goat was initially consecrated to be sacrificed as part of the Yom Kippur additional offerings, may it be sacrificed as part of the Festival additional offerings instead? Rabbi Shimon said to them: They may be sacrificed. They said to him: Since, according to you, their atonement is not the same, how could they possibly be sacrificed, this one in place of that one? Rabbi Shimon said to them: They can be interchanged, since ultimately all of them come to atone for the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods.

רבי שמעון בן יהודה אומר משמו, שעירי ראשי חדשים מכפרין על טהור שאכל את הטמא. מוסיף עליהם של רגלים, שמכפרין על טהור שאכל את הטמא ועל שאין בה ידיעה לא בתחלה ולא בסוף. מוסיף עליהם של יום הכפורים, שהן מכפרין על הטהור שאכל את הטמא, ועל שאין בה ידיעה לא בתחלה ולא בסוף, ועל שאין בה ידיעה בתחלה אבל יש בה ידיעה בסוף. אמרו לו, מהו שיקרבו זה בזה. אמר להם, הן. אמרו לו, אם כן, יהיו של יום הכפורים קרבין בראשי חדשים, אבל היאך של ראשי חדשים קרבין ביום הכפורים לכפר כפורה שאינה שלה. אמר להן, כלן באין לכפר על טמאת מקדש וקדשיו:

Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon a tradition of his opinion that differs from the way the mishna expresses it above: The goats of the New Moons atone for a ritually pure person who unwittingly partook of ritually impure sacrificial food. The goats of the Festivals exceed them, as they atone both for a pure person who partook of impure sacrificial food and also for cases of defiling the Temple or its sacrificial foods in which one did not have awareness, neither at the beginning nor at the end. The goats of Yom Kippur further exceed them, as they atone both for a ritually pure person who partook of ritually impure sacrificial food and for cases of defiling the Temple or its sacrificial foods in which one did not have awareness, neither at the beginning nor at the end; and they also atone for cases in which one did not have awareness at the beginning but did have awareness at the end. The Rabbis said to him: What is the *halakha* with regard to whether goats consecrated for different days may be sacrificed, this one in place of that one? Rabbi Shimon said to them: Yes, they can be interchanged. They said to him: If what you say is so, granted that the goats of Yom Kippur may be sacrificed on the New Moons, but how could the goats of the New Moons be sacrificed on Yom Kippur when they will need to effect atonement for that which they were not consecrated for? Rabbi Shimon said to them: They can all be interchanged, since ultimately all of them come to atone for the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods, even if each one atones for a different case.

ועל זדון טמאת מקדש וקדשיו, שעיר הנעשה בפנים ביום הכפורים מכפרין. ועל שאר עבירות שבתורה, הקלות והחמורות, הזדונות והשגגות, הודע ולא הודע, עשה ולא תעשה, כרתות ומיתות בית דין, שעיר המשתלח מכפר: And for the intentional defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods, both the goat whose blood presentation is performed inside the Sanctuary on Yom Kippur, and Yom Kippur itself, atone. The mishna delineates how atonement is effected for other transgressions: For all other transgressions that are stated in the Torah, whether they are the minor ones or the major ones, whether they were intentional or unwitting, whether one became aware of them before Yom Kippur or did not become aware of them until after Yom Kippur, whether they involve a positive mitzva or a prohibition, whether the transgressors are subject to excision from the World-to-Come [*karef*] or to one of the court-imposed death penalties, the scapegoat sent to Azazel on Yom Kippur atones.

אחד ישראלים, ואחד כהנים, ואחד כהן מיוחד. מה בין ישראלים לכהנים ולכהן מיוחד, אלא שדם הפר מכפר על הכהנים על טמאת מקדש וקדשיו. רבי שמעון אומר, כשם שדם השעיר הנעשה בפנים מכפר על ישראל, כך דם הפר מכפר על הכהנים. כשם שזדיו של שעיר המשתלח מכפר על ישראל, כך זדיו של פר מכפר על הכהנים: Israelites and priests and the anointed priest, i.e., the High Priest, achieve atonement from the scapegoat equally. What is the difference between Israelites, priests, and the anointed priest? The difference is only that the priests achieve atonement for their defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods through the bull that the High Priest offers on Yom Kippur, whereas the Israelites achieve atonement for defiling caused by them through the goats that are sacrificed

on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Shimon says: With regard to the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods, just as the blood of the goat, whose blood presentation is performed inside the Sanctuary, atones for Israelites, so too, the blood of the bull of the High Priest, whose blood presentation is also performed inside the Sanctuary, atones for the priests. And for all other transgressions, just as the confession made over the scapegoat atones for Israelites, so too, the confession made over the bull atones for the priests.