



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

***Verses about Parah***

The Gemora continues to explain the verses about the *parah adumah* – red heifer, using the methods of contrary implication, or continuing implication.

The verse says that he will slaughter *osa* – it, teaching that he may not slaughter another animal with it. The verse says that he should slaughter it *lefanav* – in front of him [Elazar]. Rav learns from this that he may not lose his focus on it, while Shmuel learns that even a non-kohen may slaughter it, in the presence of a kohen.

The verse says that Elazar the kohen will take from its blood with his finger. Shmuel, who says that a non-kohen can slaughter it, says that this verse is necessary to teach that the sprinkling must be done by Elazar. Rav, who says that only a kohen may slaughter it, considers the prior verse and this one consecutive limiting verses, which are therefore inclusive, teaching that any kohen may slaughter it.

The verse says that the kohen will take cedar wood, a hyssop, and red wool. Shmuel, who says that Elazar must receive the blood, says that this teaches that any kohen can take these items, while Rav says that this verse is necessary, since we may have thought

that this step does not need a kohen, since it isn't done on the *parah* itself.

The verse says that the kohen will wash his clothes, which teaches that the kohen must be wearing his kohen garments while performing the services of the *parah*.

The verse says that the kohen will be impure until the evening, repeating the word kohen to teach that a kohen is necessary for the *parah* for all generations.

The Gemora says that this is valid according to the opinion that future *paros* can be done by any kohen, as he can learn it from this verse. However, according to the opinion that all *paros* must be done by a kohen gadol, why is this verse written?

The Gemora answers that the verse wrote something, even though we already knew it logically.

The verse says that *ish tahor* - a pure man will gather the ashes of the *parah v'hiniach* - and [he will] place them. The word *ish* – man includes a non-kohen, the word *tahor* includes a woman, and the word *v'hiniach* excludes a *cheresh* – deaf-mute, *shotech* - mentally unstable person, and *katan* - child, as they do not the proper understanding to intentionally place the ashes.

## Child vs. woman

The Gemora cites a Mishna which cites a dispute about who may put the water onto the ashes. The Sages say that anyone except for a cheresh, shoteh, and katan may put it, while Rabbi Yehuda says that a child may put it, but a woman or an androgen may not.

The Gemora explains that they dispute how to read the verses about taking the ashes and mixing in the water. The verse says *v'lakchu latamai* – and they will take for the impure one from the ashes of the parah, *v'nasan alav* – and he should put on it freshwater onto a vessel. The Sages say that the first part of the verse continues the prior one, teaching that only those who can gather the ashes can put them in, while Rabbi Yehudah says that the plural form teaches that even someone who is invalid for gathering the ashes (i.e., a child) is valid for mixing them with the water. Since the verse concludes by using the singular male form (and he should put), Rabbi Yehudah says that a woman is excluded. The Sages say that the verse switches from plural to singular to teach that even if one takes the ashes and two mix them with the water, it is valid. If the verse used singular in both, we would have thought that the same person must do both steps, while if it used plural in both, we would have thought that two were needed for each step.

The verse continues to say that *ish tahor* – a pure man will take a hyssop, and dip it in the water. The Sages, who say that the prior verse included a woman and excluded a child, say that the *ish* excludes a

woman, and the word *tahor* includes a child. Rabbi Yehudah, who says that the prior verse included a child and excluded a woman, says that the word *ish* excludes a child and the word *tahor* includes a woman.

The Gemora cites a braisa to challenge this extension of the dispute to the step of sprinkling. The braisa says that all may sprinkle the *parah* water, except for a *tumtum* – one whose genitals are hidden, androgen, woman, but a child of any age may sprinkle, even if a woman supports him. Since Rabbi Yehudah is not cited as disputing, this implies that he agrees to the Sages about sprinkling. Abaye deflects this, since we know the methods of explaining the verse about *parah*, it is obvious that Rabbi Yehudah will read the verse about sprinkling opposite from the Sages, and there is no need for the braisa to explicitly state this.

The verse says that the pure one will sprinkle on the impure one, which can be read that one pure one who was just impure will sprinkle, teaching that the *parah* may be done by someone on the same day that he immersed in the mikveh.

Rabbi Asi says that when Rabbi Yochanan and Raish Lakish learned about *parah*, they only were able to glean a little bit, like a fox gets dust from walking through a plowed field. They said that sometimes the verses have contrary implications to the prior one, and sometimes the same implications.

## Non-kohen slaughtering a parah

A tanna taught in front of Rabbi Yochanan that all slaughtering of sacrifices may be done by a non-kohen, except for the slaughtering of the *parah*.

Rabbi Yochanan told him to teach this outside the bais medrash, as we never find slaughtering of a non-kohen which is invalid.

The Gemora says that not only did Rabbi Yochanan not listen to this tanna, he didn't even listen to his own teacher, as he cited Rabbi Shimon ben Yehotzedek saying that if a *parah* is slaughtered by a non-kohen, it is invalid, but then said that he himself says it is valid, since we never find a non-kohen's slaughtering which is invalid.

### ***Second confession on bull***

The Mishna stated that the kohen gadol came back to his bull to confess again. The Gemora asks why he mentions his fellow kohanim only in the second confession, and answers it from the braisa of Rabbi Yishmael that it is appropriate for him to first confess for himself, cleansing him, and only then atone for the kohanim.

### ***Slaughtering the bull and preparing the ketores***

The Mishna says that the kohen gadol slaughtered his bull, received its blood in a utensil, and then gave it to someone who would stir it on the fourth row in the sanctuary, to keep it from congealing. He then took the pan, went to the top of the altar, moved the coals aside, and filled the pan from the consumed coals further inside. He went down and placed the pan on the fourth row in the courtyard.

The Mishna lists the differences between the service on Yom Kippur and every other day's service:

1. On a regular day, he would scoop coals in a

silver utensil and pour it into a gold one, but on Yom Kippur he would scoop the coals in a gold vessel, which he would bring inside for the ketores.

2. On a regular day he would scoop in a vessel holding 4 kav, and pour it into one holding 3 kav, but on Yom Kippur he would scoop in a 3 vessel kav, and bring it inside. Rabbi Yossi says that on a regular day he would scoop with a 2 seah (6 kav vessel).
3. On a regular day, the pan was heavy, but on Yom Kippur it was light.
4. On a regular day, the pan's handle was short, but on Yom Kippur it was long.
5. Rabbi Menachem says that on a regular day, the pan was made from green gold, but on Yom Kippur it was made from red gold.
6. On a regular day, he would offer half a maneh in the morning, and half in the afternoon, but on Yom Kippur he offered an extra fistful inside.
7. On a regular day, the ketores was finely ground, but on Yom Kippur it was extra fine, as they ground it another time.
8. On a regular day, the kohanim would go up and down the ramp of the altar on their right (up on the east and down on the west), but on Yom Kippur they would go up and down the middle of the ramp. Rabbi Yehudah says that the kohen gadol would always go up and down the middle of the ramp.
9. On a regular day, the kohen gadol would wash his hands and feet from the kiyor – sink, but on Yom Kippur he would was from a golden basin.
10. Yom Kippur had an extra pyre on the altar.

Rabbi Meir says a regular day had 4, Rabbi Yossi says it had 3, and Rabbi Yehudah says it had 2.

The Gemora asks how the person stirring the blood could be in the fourth row of tiles in the sanctuary, as the verse says that no one may be in the sanctuary when the kohen gadol performs the inner service. Rav Yehudah says that we must amend the Mishna to say “the fourth row of the sanctuary”, i.e., the fourth row outside of the sanctuary.

## INSIGHT TO THE DAF

### *Ketores on Yom Kippur*

The Mishna lists many differences between the *preparation* of the ketores on Yom Kippur and the rest of the year.

The Gevuros Ari comments that these differences apply by the regular ketores which is brought on Yom Kippur, as well. He explains that the reasons for these variations are due to the weakness of the kohen gadol on Yom Kippur and therefore the distinctions apply also by the ketores of the heichal.

He is bothered by the fact that in the piyutim which we say on Yom Kippur, it states that the regular ketores was done in the identical manner as the rest of the year.

The Mikdash Dovid asks from a Tosefta that states explicitly that a kohen hedyot is the one who performs the service of the regular ketores on Yom Kippur?

The Reshash (and others) bring that it is actually an argument between the Rambam and the Ramban as to who would do the avodas haketores in the heichal on Yom Kippur.

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Kal Vachomer*

The Gemora states that something which may be derived through a *kal vachomer* (literally translated as light and heavy, or lenient and stringent; an a fortiori argument; it is one of the thirteen principles of biblical hermeneutics; it employs the following reasoning: if a specific stringency applies in a usually lenient case, it must certainly apply in a more serious case), the Torah may anyway take the trouble to write it explicitly.

The Bnei Yissoschar explains the reasoning for this: A *kal vachomer* is based upon logic. One might say that the reason this *halacha* (derived through a *kal vachomer*) is correct is because it is understandable to me; it makes sense. The Torah therefore goes out of its way to write it explicitly in order to teach us that the *halacha* is correct because the Torah said so; regardless of whether it is understood or not.

The Ra”n in *Nedarim* (3a) notes that this concept is applicable by a *hekesch* (when the halachos from one topic are derived from another one) as well. The Gemora in *Bava Metzia* (61a) states that it also applies to a *gezeirah shavah* (one of the thirteen

*principles of Biblical hermeneutics; it links two similar words from dissimilar verses in the Torah).*

According to the explanation of the Bnei Yissoschar, we could say that the concept should only apply to a *kal vachomer*, for that is based upon logic. The Torah would not find it necessary to state explicitly a *halacha* which is derived through a *hekesh* or *gezeirah shavah*, for they are not based upon logic at all, and it would be superfluous to write it.

The Yad Malachei writes that if the Torah does explicitly write a *halacha* which was derived through one of the thirteen principles of Biblical hermeneutics, we must treat it more stringently than an ordinary *halacha*. This is comparable to a Rabbinical prohibition, which has a slight support from something written in the Torah. Tosfos in Eruvin (31b) rules that such a prohibition is stricter than an ordinary one, which does not have any Scriptural support.