

24 Iyar 5781
May 6, 2021



Yoma Daf 25

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The *Gemora* cited a disagreement regarding the clothing the Kohanim wore during the casting of the lots. Rav Nachman said that it was done in non-sacred garments, whereas Rav Sheishes said that it was done in sacred garments. Rav Nachman cites a *Mishnah* as proof to his opinion: The *Mishnah* states: The Kohanim (after the casting of lots) were given over to the attendants. They removed their garments from them, and they left only their breeches on them. Is the *Mishnah* not referring to those who “won” the lottery (and evidently their non-sacred garments were removed in order to change into their sacred garments). Rav Sheishes said: No, it refers to those who had not “won” the lottery. This explanation appears reasonable, for if it were to refer to those who “won” the lottery, how could it be stated that they left on their breeches only; surely it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: How do we know that nothing must be donned before the breeches? It is from the verse: *And the linen breeches shall be upon his flesh*. Rav Nachman would explain the *Mishnah* as follows: While they still wore their non-sacred garments, they put on the holy breeches, and after that, they removed the non-sacred garments and left them with the holy breeches.

Rav Sheishes cites a *Baraisa* as proof to his opinion: The Chamber of the Hewn Stone was built in the style of a large basilica. The lots were cast in the eastern side, with the elder sat in the west, and the Kohanim stood in a circle in the form of a brooch. The appointed one

came and took the mitzneses (hat) from the head of one of them. They would know then that the lots would start from him. Now, if it would enter your mind that the Kohanim came to the lottery in non-sacred garments, is there a mitzneses in common dress? The *Gemora* answers: Yes, there is, as Rav Yehudah or, as some say, Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah reported a *Baraisa*: A Kohen for whom his mother made a tunic (and it was donated to the Temple), could officiate wearing it at an individual (but not communal) service. (24b4 – 25a1)

Abaye said: We can infer from this the Chamber of Hewn Stone was located half on consecrated ground (inside the Courtyard), half on non-sacred ground; that the Chamber had two doorways, one opening into consecrated ground, the other opening into non-sacred ground. For, if it should enter your mind that the whole of it was on consecrated ground - how could the elder sit to the west; hasn't a master stated that one is not permitted to sit in the Temple Courtyard unless he is a king from the House of David? Furthermore, if you could think that the whole Chamber was outside sacred ground, how could the lottery take place on its eastern side; is it not required: In the House of God we walked with excitement, and this would not be the House of God! Rather, it is evident that it was located half on consecrated ground, half on non-sacred ground. And if it should enter your mind that the Chamber has but one door opening into sacred ground, how could the elder sit to the west, as we have learned in a *Mishnah*:

Chambers which were built on non-sacred ground (*on the Temple Mount*) and open into sacred ground (*of the Courtyard*); their inside is holy? And if it would enter your mind that it opened into non-sacred ground, how could the lottery take place in the eastern part of the Chamber; have we not learned in a *Mishnah* that if they are built on consecrated ground and open into non-sacred ground, their space within is non-sacred?! Therefore it is evident that the Chamber had two doors, one opening into consecrated ground, the other into non-sacred ground. (25a1 – 25a2)

MISHNAH: The second casting of the lots determines the following: who will slaughter the animal (*the tamid offering*), and who will throw the blood, and who will clear the ashes from the Inner Altar, and who will clear the ash from the *Menorah*, and who will bring the limbs (*of the tamid*) onto the ramp. The *Mishnah* now elaborates on the limbs: [One *Kohen* would bring up] the head and the right hind leg; [another *Kohen* would bring] the two forelegs; the tail and the left hind leg; the chest and the neck; the two flanks; the intestines; the fine flour (*for the minchah*); the *chavitin* (*the minchah offering brought daily by the Kohen Gadol*); and the wine (*for the libation*). There were, in total, thirteen services involved in the second lottery. Ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: It (*the tamid*) was offered up in the way it walked (when it was alive). (25a2 – 25a3)

The *Gemora* inquired: When they cast lots, do they do so for one service (*and the twelve Kohanim to his right performed the next twelve services*) or do they do it for each individual task? The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the previous *Mishnah*: Four lots were cast there (each day). Now, if it should enter your mind that there was a separate casting of lots for each task, there would be many more than four lots! Rav Nachman bar

Yitzchak said: This is what the *Mishnah* means: Four times they went in for the casting of the lots, and on each occasion there were many lots.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *Baraisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: There was no lots for the shovel (to carry the coals to the Inner Altar for the burning of the incense), but the *Kohen* who had obtained the task of [burning] the incense said to the one next to him: Obtain with me the privilege of carrying the shovel. [It would seem that the casting of lots was effective for more than one service.] The *Gemora* rejects the proof: It is different with the shovel and the incense, because they form together one service.

The *Gemora* cites an alternative version of the above discussion: This is the case only with the shovel and incense, because they form one service, but all other tasks require individual lots! The *Gemora* rejects this argument: With regard to the shovel it is necessary to inform us (that no separate lot is required), for one might have thought that because it takes place infrequent (for the *ketores* is offered twice a day, but there is never any voluntary *ketores* offerings; this is in contrast to the *tamid*, where there are many voluntary offerings brought every day) and enriches (as those who are involved with the offering of the *ketores* are blessed with wealth); therefore a special lot should be arranged for it. This is why we are taught that it is not so.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *Baraisa* which Rabbi Chiya taught: There was no lots for each individual task; rather, the *Kohen* who secured the task of the slaughtering of the *tamid*, twelve other *Kohanim* were drawn along with him. This proves it. (25a3 – 25b1)

The *Gemora* inquires: Who receives the blood? Do we say that he who slaughtered it receives it, for if you were to say that the one who throws the blood receives it, perhaps in his enthusiasm (to throw the blood), he may not receive the whole blood; or does the thrower receive it, for if you were to say that he who slaughters the animal receives the blood, occasionally a non-Kohen slaughters the animal? The *Gemora* resolves this from the following *Baraisa*: Ben Katin made twelve spouts for the *Kiyor*, so that his twelve brethren, the *Kohanim*, who are involved with the tamid offering, may simultaneously wash their hands and feet. Now, if you were to think that he who slaughters the animal also receives its blood, there would be thirteen. Must we not therefore infer from there that he who throws the blood receives the blood? This indeed proves it. Rav Acha, the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: We have also learned this in a *Mishnah*: He whose lot it was to slaughter it, slaughtered it; he whose lot it was to receive the blood, received it, and then he came to throw it. This indeed proves it. (25b1 – 25b2)

Ben Azzai said before Rabbi Akiva, etc.: Our Rabbis taught: What is ‘the way of its walking’? The head with the right hind-leg, the breast with the neck, the two forelegs, the two flanks, the tail with the left hind-leg. Rabbi Yosi says: It was offered up in the order in which it is skinned. Which is the order of its being skinned? The head with the right hind-leg, the tail with the left hind-leg, the two flanks, the two forelegs, the breast with the neck. Rabbi Akiva says: It was offered up in the order in which it was dissected. Which is the order of the dissection? The head with the right hind-leg, the two forelegs, the breast with the neck, the two flanks,

¹ This shows that the thigh (the hind-leg) and the shoulder (the foreleg) are among the best pieces, whereas here they are mentioned last.

the tail with the left hind-leg. Rabbi Yosi HaGelili says: It was offered up in the order of its best parts. Which is the order of its best parts? The head with the [right] hind-leg, the breast with the neck, the two flanks, the tail with the [left] hind-leg and the two fore-legs.

But is it not written: All the good cuts, the thigh and the shoulder?² — That refers to a lean animal.²

Rava said: Both our Tanna and Rabbi Yosi HaGelili follow the order of quality of the meat, but one takes into consideration the size [of the limbs], the other the fatness.

Why does the head go together with the [right] hind-leg? Because the head has many bones; one attaches the [meaty] hind-leg to it.

All agree at any rate that the head is offered up first. From where do we derive this rule? Because it has been taught: From where do we know that the head and the fat come before all other parts [of the animal]? To teach us that, it says: He shall lay it in order with its head and its fat. And as to the other ‘fat’, what does it signify? [It has its meaning] in accordance with what has been taught: How did he do it? He placed the fat upon the open throat and offered it up thus, that being done as a sign of respect for the Most High. (25b2 – 26a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The prohibition of sitting in the Temple Courtyard

Our *Gemora* establishes a prohibition to sit in the Temple Courtyard except for King from the house of

² The verse speaks of the wicked in Israel who plunder the poor and consume the good pieces of their animals which at best could only be lean, whereas the daily sacrifices were offered from the best.



David. Rashi on the *Gemora* in Sotah explains that it is not respectful to Hashem to sit in the Temple. Hashem specifically desires to honor David and therefore, makes an exception to this rule.

There is a question whether this is a prohibition from the Torah or derabanan. The Mishnah Lamelech proves from the Tosafos on our *Gemora* that it is a Torah prohibition. Tosafos asks how is it possible that the Kohanim sat when they ate the sacrifices. They answer the prohibition doesn't apply when the Kohanim are engaged in the actual Temple service and eating constitutes part of the service. Tosafos also gives a second answer. The pasuk describes the privilege of eating korbanos as a sign of greatness given to the Kohanim. This demonstrates Hashem's desire to honor the Kohanim and, as mentioned, Hashem's bestowal of honors allows one to sit in the Temple. The fact that Tosafos is using pasukim to explain the exceptions to the rule is a clear indication that they view this prohibition as being from the Torah.

Tosafos in Sotah brings a Midrash which says that the Kohen Gadol can also sit in the Temple Courtyard. This is against the opinion of our *Gemora*. The Ohr Sameyach explains according to this opinion, it wasn't that the Kohen Gadol had a blanket heter to sit. When the Kohen Gadol was wearing the Tzitz on his head he was carrying the name of Hashem and only then was he allowed to sit in deference to the name of Hashem. We see, therefore, that the permission of the Kohen Gadol to sit is not similar to that of the king. In the case of the king it was a sign of honor for the king himself but with the Kohen Gadol it was a sign of honor for the name of Hashem which he wore.

DAILY MASHAL

Sitting Before Hashem

Only the kings descended of David HaMelech were allowed to sit in the courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash.

The Sefas Emes explains that the privilege of sitting in the presence of Hashem is a great honor, which could endanger a person with falling into the trap of arrogance. David HaMelech did not run this risk, however, since his heart was contrite with teshuva.

The Gemara (Avodah Zarah 4b) tells us that David HaMelech was the paradigm of teshuva, whom we must all use as a role model. Through fasting and prayer, he defeated his yetzer hora, such that his heart became purely devoted to Hashem. For this reason, he was granted this special privilege, for himself and for his descendants. The same privilege is extended to the entire Jewish people after Yom Kippur, after we have become *baalei teshuva* by humbling ourselves before Hashem in prayer and fasting. We are then invited to sit before Hashem in the holy Sukka, where the Divine Presence is felt. There is no concern that this great honor might lead us to arrogance, since we have already made our hearts contrite before Him (Sefas Emes, Sukkos 5642).