

17 Sivan 5781
May 28, 2021



Yoma Daf 47

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

Mishnah: They brought out to him the ladle and the shovel. [From the latter] he scooped up his two hands full [of incense] and put it into the ladle, a tall [Kohen Gadol] according to his size, a short one according to his size and thus was its measure. He took the shovel in his right [hand] and the ladle in his left [hand]. (47a1)

GEMARA: The shovel? But was it not taught: He took the shovel and went up to the top of the Altar, took out the burning coals, and went down? — There the reference is to the shovel of burning coals, here to the shovel of the incense. For it was taught: One brought out for him the empty ladle from the Chamber of Vessels, and the heaped shovel of incense from the Avtinas family Chamber. (47a1)

He scooped up his two hands full [of incense] and put it into the ladle, a tall [Kohen Gadol] according to his size, a short one according to his size and thus was its measure: For what purpose was the ladle on Yom Kippur necessary? Surely the Merciful One said: [And he shall take] his hands full and bring it? — Because [otherwise] it is impossible.¹ For how shall he do it? Shall he bring in [the shovel of burning coals] and then again bring in [the incense]? The Merciful One refers to one ‘bringing in’, not to two ‘bringings in’. — Shall he take the incense in his handfuls and place the shovel [of burning coals] on top of it, entering thus? Then when he comes [within the Holy of Holies] how shall he act? Shall he take it between his teeth and set the shovel [of burning coals] down? Now, if such procedure is unseemly in the presence of a mortal king,

how much less seemly is it before the Supreme King of Kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He? — Thus it is impossible and since it is impossible, we do it as we find it in connection with the [offerings of the] Nesiim. (47a1)

He took the shovel in his right hand and the ladle into his left hand. ‘The citizen below and the alien in the heavens above’? This one [the ladle] is small, the other [coal-shovel] large, and even where both are alike, as with Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimchis, the one is hot and the other cold. It was reported about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimchis that he was able to take four kabin in his two handfuls, saying: All women received *zered*; my mother received it to the roof.

Some interpret *zered* as referring to cereal, in accord with Rabbah bar Yonasan who said in the name of Rabbi Yechiel that cereal is very helpful to a sick person. Others say it refers to semen [she received], in accordance with what Rabbi Avahu asked. For he raised a contradiction: It is written: For you have girded me [vatatzreini with no ‘aleph’] with strength for the battle, but it is also written: You girded me [vatatzreini with an ‘aleph’] with strength for the battle; [to interpret the divergence thus]: David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, You have winnowed me and You have girded me. (47a1 – 47a2)

It was told of Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimchis that one day he talked in the market to an Arab, and a drop of saliva sprayed from [the Arab’s] mouth onto his garments,

¹ To perform the service without the ladle.

whereupon his brother Yesheivav entered and ministered (as Kohen Gadol) in his stead. Thus their mother saw two Kohanim Gedolim on one day.

Furthermore, it is told of Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimchis that he went out and talked with a certain lord in the market, and a drop of saliva sprayed from [the lord's] mouth onto his garments, whereupon his brother Yosef entered and ministered (as Kohen Gadol) in his stead. Thus their mother saw two Kohanim Gedolim on one day.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: Kimchis had seven sons and they all served as Kohanim Gedolim. The Sages said to her: What have you done to merit such [glory]? She said: Throughout the days of my life the beams of my house have not seen the braids of my hair. They said to her: There were many who did likewise and yet did not succeed. (47a2 – 47a3)

Our Rabbis taught: *with his komeitz*, that means that he must not make a measure for his fistful.

The question was asked: How about making a measure for his handfuls? Is it only there, since it is written, 'With his fist', whereas here where it is not written 'With his handfuls' but 'his hand full of fine incense,' the restriction does not apply, or does he derive [the meaning of] 'full' from [the word], full' [occurring in connection with] his komeitz? — Come and hear: And thus was its measure. Would you not say that it means: If he wishes to make a measure he may do so? — No, this is what it means: In the same manner would he take the hands full within the Holy of Holies. May you then conclude from this that he takes the handfuls [outside] and repeats it inside again! — [No], perhaps it means that if he wants to have a measure made, he may do so; or, that he must take neither less nor more. (47a3 – 47a4)

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: His komeitz. One might have assumed that it may come forth on both sides, therefore Scripture says: 'With his komeitz'. If it had only said 'with his komeitz' I might have inferred that he should just take some with his finger-tips, hence Scripture says: His komeitz', i.e., in the manner in which people take a fistful. How so? He closes three of his fingers over the palm of his hand and takes a fistful. And in the case of the [minchah-offering baked in a] flat pan and the [minchah-offering of the] deep pan, he smoothes it even with his thumb from above and with his small finger from below. And this was the most difficult service in the Sanctuary. [You say] 'this was'; and nothing else? Was there not melikah (the pinching of the bird's head) and was there not chafinah (the taking of the fistfuls)? - But say, rather, this was one of the difficult services in the Sanctuary. (47a4 – 47b1)

Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Uzaah asked: How about that which is between [the fingers of the fist]?² Rav Pappa answered: That which is inside needs no question for it surely belongs to the fistful. Concerning that which is on the outside, too, there is no doubt, it surely is considered a remainder. The question attaches only to such portions as are in between [the fingers]. How about these? — Said Rabbi Yochanan: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Uzaah had subsequently solved [the question] viz., concerning [the portion] in between, uncertainty prevails. How then shall he act? Rabbi Chanina said: He shall burn [as an offering] first the fistful and then the portions in between [the fingers]. For, if we were to burn up [the 'in between' portions] first, perhaps they are considered remainders, and it would thus be a case where the remainders became reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning [of it on the Altar], whereas the Master has said that if remainders became reduced

² Is it considered part of the fistful to be offered on the Altar, or the remnant which went to the Kohanim?

between the taking of the fistful and its burning no more fistfuls may be burnt up on their account! If that be so, then even now apply thereto the rule: Whatever had partly been used in fire offering must no more be burnt [as an offering]? Said Rabbi Yehudah, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazzi: He burns them [the remainders] up as wood, in accord with Rabbi Eliezer, for it was taught: Rabbi Eliezer said: For a satisfying aroma you must not bring them up but you may bring them up as fuel. - This will be in accord with Rabbi Eliezer, but what is there to be said in accord with the Sages? Rav Mari said: Fat Kohanim take the fistful. Now that you have come to this answer, according to Rabbi Eliezer, too, [there is a procedure which may be adopted] at the outset, viz., fat Kohanim should take the fistful. (47b1 – 47b2)

Rav Papa inquired: How about the middle [portions] ‘in between’ connection with the [two] hands full?³ — What is he inquiring about? If he derives [the meaning of the word] ‘full’ from ‘full’ [occurring] there it is the same [as the first question]. — This is what Rav Pappa asks: [Should we say that] we require that ‘he shall bring it his hands full’, which is the case here, or is it required that he take...bring in, which is not the case here? — The question remains unanswered. (47b3)

Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that ‘his komeitz means: In the manner in which people usually take a fistful, but Rav Pappa asked: If he had taken the ‘fistful’ with his finger-tips, what is the law then, or [if he took it] from below upward, or from the sides, what then? — The questions remain unanswered.

Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that the ‘handfuls’ are to be taken as men usually take them, but he asked: If he took the ‘handfuls’ with his finger-tips, what then? or from below upward, or from the side; or if he swept it with one

hand and with the other and then brought the hands together? — The questions remain unanswered. (47b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Should we Salt the Ketores?

It is interesting to note that our Mishna (or Gemora) makes no mention of the salting of the ketores of Yom Kippur. Every korban requires salt, before it is brought on the Altar. The ketores, which was burned regularly, had a melichah (salting), while it was still on the outside Altar.

The Minchas Chinuch (118) states that it is obvious that the Yom Kippur ketores also required salt, and that after the Kohen Gadol did the first chafinah (filling up his hands with the ketores), he would ascend the Altar and place salt on it.

The Mikdash Dovid (13) disagrees and holds that the regular ketores which was burned on an Altar required salting, however the Yom Kippur ketores, which was burned on the floor of the *Kodesh Kadashim*, is not included in the Scriptural verse. His proof is from the fact that there is no mention in the Mishnayot in Yoma for this.

The obligation of a woman to cover her hair

Our Gemora describes how Kimchis merited to have seven sons become Kohanim Gedolim, because the walls of her house never saw her hair.

It appears from the Gemora that this was not the *halachah*, but an act of piety beyond the letter of the law. This is the opinion of many poskim including Rav Moshe Feinstein. He was asked if a woman is required to cover her hair in front of her family, and he responded by saying

³ Sc. of incense offered on Yom Kippur.



that according to the law, it is not required. He quotes our Gemora.

The Chasam Sofer, however, quotes the Zohar which says that a woman's hair, no matter how small, much never show. He says that the community has accepted the ruling of the Zohar and therefore it becomes halachah. This is also the opinion of Rav Moshe Sternbuch.

This issue is connected to a Gemora in *Kesuvos*. The Gemora discusses two levels of head coverings. There is an extra head covering for the market place, and a minimal head covering, which the Gemora suggests that a woman must wear in her own courtyard. The Gemora questions this and says that if this indeed is the halachah, every woman would be in violation. The Gemora concludes that a woman must wear this minimal head covering when traveling between courtyards, but not in her own courtyard.

Tosafos points out that one could go without any head covering in her own courtyard.

The Yerushalmi, however, concludes that a woman is obligated to cover her hair in the courtyard. Many Poskim hold like this Yerushalmi including the Beis Shmuel in his commentary on Shulchan Aruch. Even according to those opinions, it could be that one may be more lenient in a house than a courtyard. (There is a disagreement as to the nature of the head covering required between courtyards. Some Poskim hold that some hair may be visible. Many, however, hold that it must cover the entire hair. They hold that although it covered the entire hair, it was the equivalent of an undergarment, and therefore, inappropriate for the market place).

DAILY MASHAL

Modesty has its Rewards

The Gemora states that Kimchis had seven sons who served in the position of Kohen Gadol. When questioned by the Chachamim what she did to merit such a great reward, she replied, "In all my days, the beams of my house did not see the braids of my hair."

Rashi quotes a Yerushalmi that states that it is written: *all her glory-the daughter of a king-is inside, her raiment is of golden settings*. This verse is interpreted to mean that a Jewish woman who conducts herself modestly will merit having a son who wears the vestments of a Kohen Gadol which has gold settings.

What is the deeper understanding of this Gemara? Why is it that Kimchis, who was so modest, merited seven sons who served as Kohanim Gedolim?

The answer is that although it appears that the glory of the Kohen Gadol was only external, the truth is that his glory emanated from his modesty. The Torah states: *you shall make vestments of sanctity for Aharon your brother, for glory and splendor*. Kavod, glory, is an external pride, where people see the beautiful vestments and are in awe of the stature of the Kohen Gadol. Tiferes, splendor, is an internal beauty.

It is said: *for the lips of the Kohen should safeguard knowledge, and people should seek teaching from his mouth; for he is an agent of HaShem, Master of Legions*. The Kohen reflects knowledge, which is internal, and this knowledge must be safeguarded. One can only safeguard knowledge if there is modesty, which was the trait that Kimchis exemplified. By conducting herself modestly, Kimchis was able to merit perpetual modesty through her sons, who served as Kohanim Gedolim.