



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Sent goat – how does it atone?

The *Gemora* explains that Rebbe and the Sages dispute the verse which refers to these three sins:

The *Mishna* stated that the goat that was sent atoned on all transgressions.

Rav Yehudah explains that this includes all – whether lenient (i.e., generic positive or negative commandments) or severe (i.e., those punished by kares – cutting off life or capital punishment), done on purpose or by accident, and whether or not the sinner realized his error.

The *Gemora* asks what purpose the goat serves for one who transgressed a positive prohibition: if he has not repented, the sacrifice should be considered *zevach reshaim* – a sacrifice of the wicked, which is an abomination (which will not atone), while if he has repented, he is immediately forgiven, as the *Gemora* proves from a braisa.

Rabbi Zeira answers that the case is one who has not repented, yet the goat atones, following the opinion of Rebbe, who says that *Yom Kippur* atones for all transgressions - whether the sinner has repented or not - except for the severe sins of one who removes the yoke of Heaven, mocks the words of Torah, or breaks the covenant of *milah*, by not circumcising, for which one must repent for atonement.

Verse	Meaning	Transgression
<i>Ki dvar Hashem baza</i>	<i>For the word of Hashem he disgraced</i>	Removing the yoke of Heaven
<i>V'es mitzvaso haifar</i>	<i>And His commandment he betrayed</i>	Mocking Torah words Breaking milah covenant

The verse continues to say that such a person's soul:

Hikarais – will be cut off
Tikarais – will be surely cut off
Avona va – its sin is in it

Rebbe says the first phrase punishes before *Yom Kippur*, the second phrase extends it to after *Yom Kippur*, and the last phrase qualifies it to a case where the sin is still “in it”, but not if he repents. The Sages say that the first phrase punishes in this world, the second phrase in the world to come, and the last phrase qualifies, teaching that if the sinner repented, his death atones for the sin.

The *Gemora* objects that the *Mishna's* author is not Rebbe, since the end of the *Mishna*, which says that all – *Kohanim* and non-*Kohanim* alike – are atoned for by the



sent goat, is Rabbi Yehudah's position, indicating that the full *Mishna* was authored by Rabbi Yehudah.

Rav Yosef answers that the *Mishna* was authored by Rebbe, and he agrees with Rabbi Yehudah that all are included in the atonement of the sent goat.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef why he said the author was Rebbe – was it because Rabbi Yehudah does not agree with Rebbe, or was it simply because it is inappropriate to say that the senior author (Rabbi Yehudah) agrees with the junior author (Rebbe)?

Rav Yosef answered that Rabbi Yehudah does not agree with Rebbe, so he had to say the author was Rebbe. He proves this from a braisa from the *sifra* (which is always assumed to be Rabbi Yehudah's opinion), which says that although *Yom Kippur* atones for intentional transgressions, it does not atone if one has not repented, since the verse qualifies it with the word *ach – but*.

The *Gemora* cites a contradictory *sifra*, which says that *Yom Kippur* atones even if one did not fast, did not commemorate it, and did work, since the verse categorically states *yom kippurim hu – it is Yom Kippur*.

Abaye says that this second *sifra* was authored by Rebbe, and differs with the first one, authored by Rabbi Yehudah. Rava says that Rebbe agrees that *Yom Kippur* does not atone for the transgression of *Yom Kippur* itself, unless one atones. Thus, the first *braisa* is also authored by Rebbe, and refers to atonement for the transgressions of *Yom Kippur*.

Rava says that Rebbe must agree to this limitation because otherwise one could never be punished for the sin of the day of *Yom Kippur*, since right after he transgressed, he would be atoned.

The *Gemora* rejects this proof, since one can choke on the food he ate, or eat at the last moment of the day, leaving no time after his transgression for atonement. (12b – 13b)

Kohanim vs. Others

The *Mishna* said that the sent goat atones for all – the *Kohen Gadol* (High Priest), the *Kohanim* (priests), and all of Israel.

The *Gemora* asks how this is consistent with the continuation of the *Mishna*, which describes the difference between the *Kohanim* and non-*Kohanim*.

Rav Yehudah explains that the *Mishna* is equating all in the atonement by the sent goat for all other transgressions, but distinguishes between *Kohanim* and others in atonement by the other sacrifices of the day for transgressions of entering the *Mikdash* when impure. The *Mishna* follows Rabbi Yehudah, who says that the full list of atonement enumerated by the verse – *al hakohanim – on the Kohanim* and *kol am hakahal – the whole nation*, teaches that they are all equally atoned for general transgressions by the sent goat, but not for the transgressions of entering the *Mikdash* while impure. For *Mikdash* transgressions, the blood of the *chatas* goat atones for non-*Kohanim*, while the blood of the bull atones for the *Kohanim*. Rabbi Shimon says that just as they are split for *Mikdash* transgressions, they are also split for general transgressions: the confession on the sent goat atones for non-*Kohanim*, while the confession on the bull atones for the *Kohanim*.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Shimon says that the verse lists all together – *Kohanim* and non-*Kohanim* – since all are atoned for, but by different parts of the

service. Rabbi Shimon says that since the verse refers to the two goats (*chatas* and sent) together, it teaches that just as the *chatas* goat does not atone for the *Kohanim*, so the sent goat does not. Rabbi Yehudah says that this just teaches that the two goats must be equivalent in appearance, height, and purchase price.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, asking who its author is. The *braisa* says that the verse that refers to the *chatas* goat as *asher la'am* – that is of the nation teaches that the *Kohanim* are not included. The *braisa* suggests that they be atoned for by the bull of the *Kohen Gadol*, but objects, since the verse refers to his bull as *asher lo* – that is his, excluding the *Kohanim*. This would leave the *Kohanim* without atonement, but the verse says that the *Kohen Gadol* will atone for the *Kohanim*. The *braisa* says that it is preferable to add them to the bull of the *Kohen Gadol*, which is already extended beyond the *Kohen Gadol* himself to include *baiso* – his house, as opposed to the goat, which is not extended in any way beyond the nation. The *braisa* concludes that if there are any further challenges, this can be resolved with the verse which refers to *bais aharon* – the house of Aharon and *bais laivi* – the house of Laivi. Just as *bais laivi* refers to all *Levi'im*, so *bais aharon* refers to all *Kohanim*.

Rabbi Yirmiyah says that this *braisa's* author is not Rabbi Yehudah, since it says that the *Kohanim* would have no atonement if not assigned to the bull or *chatas* goat, but Rabbi Yehudah says that they are atoned by the sent goat. Rava further clarifies that the author is Rabbi Shimon, who excludes the *Kohanim* from atonement by the sent goat.

Abaye says that the *braisa's* author may be Rabbi Yehudah, but the *braisa* simply meant that the *Kohanim* would have no atonement for *Mikdash* transgressions, while the verse says that the *Kohen Gadol* will atone for

all – *Kohanim* and non-*Kohanim*. Just as the *Kohanim* are atoned for other sins, they are atoned for *Mikdash* sins as well.

The *Gemora* explains the conclusion of the *braisa*. The *braisa* was preempting an objection that the verse which includes atonement for the house of the *Kohen Gadol* explicitly excludes other *Kohanim*, who are not members of his house. To that the *braisa* responds that the verse states that the *Kohanim* are indeed called the house of Aharon, the *Kohen Gadol*. (13b-14a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Sent Goat and Yom Kippur

The *Gemora* discusses who is the author of the *Mishna*, which says that the sent goat atones for all sins, apparently even without repentance. The *Gemora* concludes that Rebbe is the author, as Rebbe says that *Yom Kippur* atones for all sins, except for three very severe ones, even without repentance.

The commentators note that Rebbe does not make any direct mention of the sent goat, but only of the day of *Yom Kippur*, which seems to be at odds with the *Mishna*. A number of answers are offered to this question:

1. The day atones partially, and the sent goat achieves full atonement (Tosfos 13a d'ovad)
2. The day atones, but the repentance requirement is waived only if the goat is sent (Ritva)
3. The sent goat atones, but its atonement is due to the power of *Yom Kippur* day (Tosfos, Rashba)
4. The day atones, but when there is a Bais Hamikdash, it depends on the sent goat being brought (Minchas Chinuch 364)

The *Gemora* had objected that if one did not repent, the

goat cannot atone, as it is a sacrifice of the wicked, which is an abomination.

The Ritva explains that Rebbe says that the goat is an exception, and the rule of a sacrifice of the wicked applies only to other sacrifices.

The Rashba suggests that since the goat only completes the atonement of the day (following the first explanation above), it is not simply a sacrifice of the wicked, and therefore is effective.

The *Gemora* introduces a *sifra* which states that the day of *Yom Kippur* atones even if the sinner did not commemorate it. The *Gemora* says that this *sifra* implies that *Yom Kippur* atones even without repentance.

The Ramban explains that if *Yom Kippur* needs repentance, it is like any other sacrifice, e.g., *chatas*, which is not effective if the sinner denies its effectiveness.

Rava says that Rebbe agrees that *Yom Kippur* does not atone for infractions of the day without repentance. Rava says this must be so, since otherwise there would be no case of one being punished for *Yom Kippur* prohibitions, since the day itself would atone for them. The *Gemora* objects, and provides two cases where the day would not atone for the transgression, even if repentance is not generally necessary:

1. The person died choking on food he ate, leaving no time after the transgression for atonement
2. The person ate at the end of the day, leaving no part of the day to atone

Tosfos (13a d'ovad) notes that the goat atones even for sins committed later on the day of *Yom Kippur*, since otherwise the *Gemora* should have suggested that the

case is one who ate after the goat was sent. Some texts of the *Gemora* continue by citing a *braisa*, comparing the atonement of the goat and the day. The *braisa* states that the goat has the advantage of atoning right away, while the day atones only at the end. The day has the advantage of atoning without a sacrifice, while the goat atones only with a sacrifice.

Rashi cites this text and rejects it, noting that it is incompatible with the answers provided by the *Gemora*, which both imply that any part of the day would atone, not just the end.

The Ramban and Rabbeinu Chananel keep the text, and the Ramban explains that this is an alternate answer offered by the *Gemora*. According to this approach, only the end of the day atones, and therefore one would be liable for violating *Yom Kippur* if he died before the end of the day.

The Rashba offers two explanations of the advantage of *Yom Kippur* cited in the *braisa*:

1. The “sacrifice” refers to sending the goat off the azazel cliff. The *braisa* refers to this as a “sacrifice” since it is considered a sacrifice like standard ones, and follows its rules.
2. The “sacrifice” refers to the *chatas* goat whose blood was sprinkled inside the mishkan. The *braisa* is stating that the atonement of *Yom Kippur* is independent of this sacrifice, while the sent goat only atones if this sacrifice is also brought.

These two explanations seem to differ as to whether the sent goat is considered a standard sacrifice or not. The answer cited by the Ritva for how the goat atones without repentance seems to consider it a standard sacrifice, while the fact that the goat atones for sins committed later seems to indicate it is not.

The Rambam (Teshuva 1:2) rules that the sent goat atones on all lenient prohibitions (i.e., generic positive and negative commandments) even without repentance, but on all others only with repentance.

The commentators attempt to explain the Rambam's source for this ruling, since the *Gemora* presents the opinions of the Sages, who require repentance, and Rebbe, who does not, with no indication of a middle position.

The Lechem Mishneh says that the Rambam rules like the Sages, but attempts to limit the extent of the dispute between Rebbe and the Sages. The *braisa* in which they differ on the explanation of the verse mandating *kares* is discussing only severe prohibitions, and only in that case do we find the Sages explicitly requiring repentance.

The Rambam therefore says that the Sages agree with Rebbe that the sent goat atones for lenient transgressions without repentance.

The Meshech Chochmah (Vayikra 16:30) explains the Rambam based on the *Gemora* in Yoma (85b), which says that Rebbe holds that *Yom Kippur* atones for severe transgressions without repentance, but repentance does not atone for them without *Yom Kippur*. From here we see that *Yom Kippur* is more potent than repentance alone. Therefore, the Sages, who say that repentance alone atones for lenient prohibitions, surely say that *Yom Kippur* alone atones for these.

Sifra's Authorship

The *Gemora* states that an anonymous *sifra* is Rabbi Yehudah, and therefore proves that Rabbi Yehudah requires repentance for the atonement of *Yom Kippur*.

The *Gemora* then cites another *sifra*, which indicates that repentance is not required. Abaye answers that the first *sifra* is Rabbi Yehudah, while the second is Rebbe. The Ritva asks how Abaye can offer this answer if the *Gemora* stated that an anonymous *sifra* is Rabbi Yehudah. He offers two answers:

1. The two *sifras* are different opinions of Rabbi Yehudah's position. Thus, both follow Rabbi Yehudah, but differ on what Rabbi Yehudah holds on this point.

The rule of authorship is a general rule for most *sifras*, but has exceptions. Similarly, the *Gemora* identifies anonymous *Mishnas* as Rabbi Meir, since most are, but there are many exceptions to this rule.