

21 Sivan 5781
June 1, 2021



Yoma Daf 51

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

Said Rav Sheishes: No, the reference here is to the ram of Aaron. Thus, indeed, does it also appear logical. For if we were to assume the reference is to the bull, [the question would arise, is it] that the substitute of the bull does not override the Shabbos or the laws of tumah, but on a weekday it can be offered; surely is it not the temurah of a chatas, and ‘the temurah of a chatas is left to die?’ - No! in truth, [the reference here is to] his bull, and what does temurah mean here? [That which goes by] the name of temurah. — But, if so, sacrifice here, too, should mean [that which goes by the name of] an original sacrifice? — No, he does not deal with [whatever goes by the name of] an original sacrifice. From where is that? - Since it states: ‘There are restrictions in the law regarding temurah animals, in that even a permanently blemished animal is affected, and it cannot be made available for ordinary use either to be shorn or put to work. Now if the thought should arise in you that the word ‘sacrifice’ here meant [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrificial animal, surely there is the bechor and the ma’aser, the laws of which affect even a permanently blemished animal, and which are not available [on redemption] for ordinary use to be subjected to shearing or work. Hence [you must say] he does not deal with [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrifice. Why is it different with temurah animals? — The temurahs all have uniform rules, whereas the original sacrificial animal includes bechor and ma’aser.

Now, as to Rav Sheishes, why does he refer the teaching to the ram of Aaron, let him rather refer to the pesach sacrifice, which overrides the laws of the Shabbos and of tumah and can have a temurah because it is an individual's sacrifice? - He holds that a pesach sacrifice is never offered for one individual. Then let him put the case as dealing with the

pesach sheini? — Is that able to override the laws of tumah? (50b3 – 51a1)

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rava: Why does the Tanna designate the korban pesach as an individual's sacrifice and the chagigah offering as a community sacrifice? Would you say it is because the latter is offered up in assemblage; the korban pesach is also offered in assemblage!? Rava responds: There is the pesach sheini, which is not offered up in assemblage. Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: If so, it ought to override the laws of Shabbos and those of *tumah*? He answered: Yes, he holds in accordance with the one who maintains that it overrides them, for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Pesach sheini overrides the Shabbos, but not the laws of *tumah*. Rabbi Yehudah says: It overrides the laws of *tumah* as well.

The *Gemora* explains the reason for the view of the first Tanna? He will tell you: You have postponed it (the korban pesach) only because of tumah, how then shall it override the laws of *tumah*? Rabbi Yehudah would explain as follows: The Torah says: According to all the decrees of the (first) pesach shall they keep it (pesach sheini); i.e., even in tumah. The Torah gave him an opportunity to do it in taharah, but if he was not privileged to do so, let him do it even in a state of *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: But let him infer it (that it is regarded as an individual's sacrifice) from the words of the Torah: ‘*his own*,’ i.e., he (the Kohen Gadol) shall bring it (the chatas bull) from what belongs to him (his own money)? For it was taught in a *Baraisa*: ‘*His own*,’ i.e., he brings the bull from his own funds, and he does not bring it from the people's funds. I might think that he does not bring it from the people's funds,

because they do not achieve atonement with it, but he may bring it from the funds of his brothers the *Kohanim*, for they achieve atonement with it, therefore the Torah says: *that is his*. I might think that he should not bring it from the funds of his brethren, but if he does, it is still valid; therefore, the Torah says once more: *that is his*. The verse repeats itself in order to teach us that this condition is essential. The *Gemora* replies: But according to your own reasoning - if his fellow brothers, the *Kohanim*, have no part in it, how can they achieve atonement? Rather, you must say that it is different with regard to the ownership of Aaron, for the Torah has declared it "ownerless" to his fellow *Kohanim*; therefore, also with regard to the question of a *temurah*, we say that the ownership of Aaron is different, since the Torah has declared it "ownerless" to his fellow *Kohanim*. (51a1 – 51b1)

MISHNAH: [The *Mishnah* continues with the procedure of the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur.] He went through the *Heichal* (while holding the shovelful of coal and the spoon of incense) until he came to the place between the two curtains which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies, and between which there was a separation – the space of one cubit. Rabbi Yosi said: There was only one curtain, as it is written: *and the curtain shall divide for you between the Holy and the Holy of Holies*. (51b1 – 51b2)

The *Gemora* asks: Rabbi Yosi gave a proper response to the Rabbis (by citing that Scriptural verse)!? The *Gemora* explains the Rabbis: They will tell you that the verse applied to the Mishkan, but in the Second Temple, since there was lacking the amah-thick partition wall which had been in the first Temple — and the Sages were doubtful as to whether its sanctity (the space which was occupied by that wall) partook of the character of the Holy or the Holy of Holies, they made two curtains. (51b2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: He walked between the (Inner) Altar and the Menorah; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Meir says: Between the Shulchan (the Table) and the Altar. [The Shulchan was placed next to the northern wall, the Menorah next to the southern wall, and the Golden

Altar between them. According to R' Yehudah, the Kohen Gadol walked toward the Holy of Holies between the Altar and the Menorah - that is on the southern side. According to R' Meir, he walked between the Shulchan and the Altar, i.e., on the northern side.] And there are those who say: Between the Shulchan and the wall.

The *Gemora* asks: Who are the 'some'? Rav Chisda said: It is Rabbi Yosi, who said: The entrance was to the north. [R' Yosi maintained that there was but one curtain, clasped on the north side, and since the entrance was on the north side, he naturally walked on that side.] The *Gemora* notes that Rabbi Yehudah will tell you that the entrance was to the south. The *Gemora* asks: According to whose view was that of Rabbi Meir? If he agreed with Rabbi Yehudah's opinion, let him enter as Rabbi Yehudah stated (for R' Yehudah also agreed that the immediate entrance into the Holy of Holies had to be on the northern side, but he maintained that there were two curtains, with the outer one clasped to the southern side, through which the Kohen Gadol first entered; therefore, he was walking along the southern wall until he reached the outer entrance, then he walked along between the two curtains towards the north until he reached the second entrance leading immediately into the Holy of Holies), and if he agreed with Rabbi Yosi, let him enter as Rabbi Yosi stated!?! The *Gemora* answers: In truth he agrees with Rabbi Yosi, but he will tell you that the (ten) Tables (that King Shlomo made) were placed between north and south, therefore, they would interrupt his walk, preventing him from entering (along the northern wall). [King Shlomo made ten tables arranged in two rows of five tables, to the left and right of the Shulchan, which contained the showbread. The Sages discuss if these tables were placed lengthwise from south to north, or from east to west. R' Meir held the former view, so that all the tables were placed in the northern half of the Sanctuary. Now the width of the Sanctuary was twenty cubits, its northern half ten cubits; the length of a table two cubits, so that each row of five tables filled the northern half of the Temple hall, without any free space between tables and wall. It emerges that the tables would block the Kohen Gadol on his walk between the table and the wall.]



Alternatively, you might say that, in truth, the tables were placed from east to west, but it does not seem proper for the Kohen Gadol to go straight ahead (to its entrance). Rabbi Yosi, however, maintains that the Jews are so beloved that the Torah does not wish to send a messenger (and since he himself is beloved, he may proceed directly). The *Gemora* explains that according to Rabbi Yehudah, the Kohen Gadol cannot walk between the Menorah and the wall, for his clothing would be blackened. (51b2 – 52a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Open, Shut them

A student of the Rosh brings from his Rebbe that they used to fold over the end of the curtain on Erev Yom Kippur to enable the Kohen Gadol to enter into the Kodosh Kodoshim on Yom Kippur. The rest of the year it remained closed, so the Kohanim should not see that area (between the other curtain), for that might have the sanctity of the Kodosh Kodoshim.

Rabbi Meir holds that this is the reason why the Kohen Gadol would walk between the Shulchan and the Altar, and not by the wall, for then he might feast his eyes on the Kodosh Kodoshim (Rashi).

Reb Dovid Meyers in his *Sefer Mileches Hamishkan* brings a proof to this from a Mishna in *Menochos* which states that there were Kohanim on both sides of the Shulchan placing the lechem hapanim and the bezichin onto the Shulchan. If the curtain was opened all year, why weren't we concerned that they might gaze at the Kodosh Kodoshim? Obviously, it was closed during the year.

Kedushah of a Temurah

Tosfos *Yeshanim* (printed on 52a) brings a *Gemora* in *Pesachim* which implies that a *temurah* (exchange animal) from a *korban Pesach* is valid for the *Pesach*. If so, he asks, then it should override *Shabbos*? He answers that one cannot

fulfill his obligation for the *korban*, for there is a rule stating that an obligation *korban* can only be brought from *chulin* and the *temurah korban* received its sanctity from the original animal. The meaning of the *Gemora* in *Pesachim* is that it must be eaten as if it would be a *Pesach*.

There is a famous *chakirah* by *temurah*. Where does the sanctity come from? Is it from the original *korban*, meaning that the owner actually transferred the sanctity from the initial *korban* onto the second, and the Torah placed the sanctity back to the first one. Or do we say that the owner accomplished nothing by making a *temurah*, however, the Torah placed sanctity on the second one.

According to the former, it is understood why one cannot fulfill his obligation with a *temurah korban*, for the sanctity did not come from *chulin*, rather, it came from the first animal; however, according to the latter explanation, the sanctity did not come from the first one, rather, the Torah gave it sanctity when he tried to make a *temurah* - if so, why can't he fulfill his mitzvah of bringing a *korban Pesach* with the *temurah*?

DAILY MASHAL

On the Right: From the Direction of the Kodesh HaKodashim

The Table stood on the north side of the Temple and the Menorah was to the south. The Menorah was then to the left of those entering, contrary to what we would expect, that the Menorah, which symbolizes wisdom and Torah, should be put on the right, the more important side. The masters of *musar* pay attention to this fact and say that indeed this is true. He who enters from outside, the mundane street, sees the Menorah to his left. But he who comes from the direction of the *kodesh hakodashim* encounters the Menorah to his right...