



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

### **Who Gets a Portion?**

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

Rish Lakish answers: The verse states, *the kohen who sprinkles the blood will eat it*. This teaches that the *Kohen* who sprinkles the blood eats it, as opposed to a *Kohen* who did not sprinkle the blood.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this a rule?! Doesn't the entire *mishmar* (group of *Kohanim* serving at that time) divide the sacrifice amongst themselves, even though only of them sprinkled the blood?

The *Gemora* answers: It means that only *Kohanim* who could have sprinkled the blood receive a part of the sacrifice.

The *Gemora* asks: A minor is not able to sprinkle the blood, yet he is allowed to eat from the sacrifice!

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: *Will eat it* means that he will split it. If someone could sprinkle the blood, he gets a portion (and his children can also eat from it). If he cannot sprinkle the blood, he does not get a portion.

The *Gemora* asks: A *Kohen* with a blemish cannot sprinkle the blood, yet he receives a portion!

The *Gemora* answers: The Torah included a *Kohen* with a blemish, as the verse states, *all male Kohanim* in order to include him.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps this verse was meant to include a *tevul yom* (who just has to wait until nightfall to become pure) as having a share in the sacrifice?

The *Gemora* answers: It is more likely that the verse includes a *Kohen* with a blemish, as he can clearly eat *kodashim*.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps a *tevul yom* is included, as he is completely pure at night?

The *Gemora* answers: At the time the sacrifice is offered the *tevul yom* is not fit (and it is therefore logical to include the *Kohen* with a blemish).

Rav Yosef says: *Will eat it* means that he will split it. Why, then, didn't the verse merely say he will split it? It must be that *will eat it* teaches that someone who is fit to eat it can split it (and receive a portion).

Rish Lakish asked: Does a *Kohen* with a blemish who is impure receive a portion? Do we say that even though he is unfit to serve, being that the Torah included him in receiving a portion he should always receive a portion,



even if impure? Or do we say that he should only receive a portion if he is fit to eat the sacrifice?

Rabbah answers this question from a *braisa*, which states: A *Kohen Gadol* sacrifices even if he is an *onein* (*his close relative died that day*), but he does not eat from the sacrifices, nor take a portion of the sacrifices of the day to eat at night (*when he is no longer an onein*). This clearly indicates that one must be able to eat from the sacrifices in order to take a portion of the sacrifices.

Rav Oshaya asked: Does a *Kohen* who is impure receive a portion of the sacrifices of the public? Do we say that the verse merely states, *the one who will sprinkle it*, and being that he could also technically sprinkle the sacrifice (*as the law is that an impure Kohen could also be used to sacrifice a public sacrifice*) he should get a portion? Or do we say that only one who can eat receives a portion?

Ravina answers this question from a *braisa*, which states: A *Kohen Gadol* sacrifices even if he is an *onein*, but he does not eat from the sacrifices, nor take a portion of the sacrifices of the day to eat at night (*when he is no longer an onein*). This clearly indicates that one must be able to eat from the sacrifices in order to take a portion of the sacrifices. (99a)

### **Onein**

The *Mishna* had stated: An *onein* can touch but cannot offer the sacrifices.

The *Gemora* asks: Can an *onein* touch the sacrifices? Doesn't the *Mishna* in Chagigah (21a) state that an

*onein* and one who has not yet brought required atonement (*in certain cases, such as a woman after giving birth*) must immerse in a *mikvah* for sacrifices?

Rabbi Ami says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This is not difficult. Our *Mishna* is discussing a case where the *onein* already immersed, as opposed to the *Mishna* in Chagigah which is discussing a case where they had not yet immersed.

The *Gemora* asks: If they immerse, how does this help? They are still an *onein*! This is as Rabbah bar Rav Huna says that if an *onein* immerses, his status of an *onein* merely returns.

The *Gemora* answers: This is not difficult. The case in Chagigah is where the *Kohen* did not continue to guard himself from becoming impure, as opposed to our case where he did guard himself from being impure.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't a lack of guarding oneself from becoming impure require that he be sprinkled with the water containing the ashes of the red heifer on the third and seventh day (*of his impurity*)? This is as Rabbi Yustai the son of Masun says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: A lack of guarding oneself from becoming impure requires that one be sprinkled with the water containing the ashes of the red heifer on the third and seventh day.

The *Gemora* answers: This is only if he does not guard himself when he is impure from a dead person, not when he is impure from touching a dead *sheretz*.

The *Gemora* asks: Someone who is impure is from a *sheretz* is also impure to the point where he requires

waiting for nightfall to become pure! Additionally, he should have to stay away from *terumah*. If we are equating an *onein* to a person impure from a *sherez*, why does the *Mishna* in Chagigah say that he only requires immersion for *kodesh* but not *terumah*?

Rabbi Yirmiyah says: The case is where a person says that he was careful not to become impure (*which would require waiting until nightfall*), but he was not careful about becoming invalid (*which only affects kodesh*).

The *Gemora* asks: Can a person be considered as guarding himself halfway from impurity?

The *Gemora* answers: Yes. The *braisa* states: If after the basket was on his head and the metal instrument used for dividing the figs was in the basket, he says that he intended to watch the figs from becoming impure but not the metal instrument, the basket is considered pure but the metal instrument is not (*regarding use with kodesh*).

The *Gemora* asks: Let the metal instrument make the basket impure!

The *Gemora* answers: A vessel does not make another vessel impure.

The *Gemora* asks: Let the metal instrument make the figs in the basket impure!

Rava answers: The case is where he says that he was careful that the instrument would not make the figs impure, but he was not careful about the figs becoming invalid.

This question from the *Mishna* in Chagigah came before Rabbi Abba bar Mamal. He said: Didn't you hear that Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rav that if someone eats *terumah* that was a *shelishi* he cannot eat *terumah*, but he can touch *terumah*. This indicates that the Rabbis only established this law regarding eating, not touching. (*Our Mishna is discussing touching, while the Mishna in Chagigah says he must immerse before he is able to eat kodashim after he is no longer an onein.*)

The *Mishna* says that he does not take a portion of the sacrifices of the day.

The *Gemora* asks: The *Mishna* indicates that while he cannot demand a portion, if his fellow *Kohen* invites him to eat with him, he may do so. However, the *Mishna* in Pesachim (31b) states that an *onein* can immerse and eat his *pesach* sacrifice on *pesach* night, but not *kodashim*. (*This indicates he is forbidden from eating kodashim!*)

Rav Yirmiyah from Difti answers: There is a difference between *pesach* and the rest of the year. One *pesach*, being that he is allowed to eat the *pesach* sacrifice, he can also eat other *kodashim*. During the rest of the year, he cannot eat other *kodashim* at all. When the *Mishna* in Pesach states, "but not *kodashim*" it means that he cannot eat *kodashim* during the rest of the year, but he may on *pesach* night.

Rav Assi answers: This is not difficult. One case (*the Mishna in Pesachim*) is when his relative died and was buried on the fourteenth of Nisan (*which is why he cannot eat kodashim at night*), and the other when his relative died on the thirteenth, and was buried on the



fourteenth. This is because the day of burial does not make a person become an *onein* for the night after.

The *Gemora* asks: Who is the one who states that the status of *onein* on the night after the death of a relative is Rabbinic in nature?

The *Gemora* answers: It is Rabbi Shimon. This is as the *braisa* states: The law of *onein* at night is a Biblical law; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon says: *Onein* is not a Torah concept, but rather a Rabbinic concept. This is evident from the law that an *onein* can immerse and eat his *pesach* sacrifice at night, but not *kodashim*.

The *Gemora* asks: Does Rabbi Shimon really hold that being an *onein* at night is a Rabbinic concept? Doesn't he say that an *onein* cannot send his sacrifices to be offered, indicating that he cannot even send his *korban pesach* to be offered?

The *Gemora* answers: No, he means he cannot send other sacrifices.

The *Gemora* asks: The *braisa* states that Rabbi Shimon says that one can only bring a *shelamim* sacrifice when he is whole, not when he is lacking. This indicates that an *onein* cannot offer a *shelamim*. How do we know he cannot bring a *todah* either? This is because it is supposed to be eaten happily like a *shelamim*. How do we know that he cannot bring an *olah* either? This is because it is brought as a vow or donation like a *shelamim*. How do we know he cannot bring a *bechor*, *ma'aser*, or *pesach*? This is because they are not offered due to a sin, just as a *shelamim* is not offered due to a sin. How do we know that he cannot offer a *chatas* or

*asham*? This is derived from the extra word *zevach* (regarding a *shelamim*). How do we know that he cannot bring birds, flour offerings, wine, wood, and frankincense? The verse states: *His sacrifice is a shelamim*. This teaches that he can only bring sacrifices when whole, not when he is an *onein*.

The *Gemora* continues: This *braisa* clearly states that Rabbi Shimon holds an *onein* cannot offer a *pesach*!

Rav Chisda answers: The *pesach* was mentioned as an aside, but does not belong in the *braisa*.

Rav Sheishes answers: The *pesach* referred to in the *braisa* is the *shelamim* brought along with the *pesach* (known as the "*chagigas yud daled*").

The *Gemora* asks: The *braisa* already stated that he cannot bring a *shelamim*!

The *Gemora* answers: One is referring to *shelamim* that are brought because they are *shelamim*, and one is referring to *shelamim* that are brought due to the *pesach*. If it would not have listed this separately, one would think that being that they are brought because of the *pesach*, he can bring them just as he can bring the *pesach*. This is why it stated both types of *shelamim*. (99a – 99b)