

29 Sivan 5781
June 9, 2021



Yoma Daf 59

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* cites a *braisa*: Rabbi Yishmael said: Two Kohanim Gedolim had survived the First Temple. One said: I had done the applications on the Inner Altar by circular movement of my hand; the other said: I had done the applications by walking around the Altar. The *Gemora* notes: The first gave a reason for his procedure, and so did the second. The first said: The phrase ‘around’ mentioned in connection with the Inner Altar signifies the same as ‘around’ mentioned in connection with the Outer Altar (and he circles by walking), whereas the second one that the whole of the Inner Altar occupied as much space as one corner of the Outer Altar (and he can therefore stand in the same place during all the applications). (59a1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Rabbi Eliezer said: He remained in his place and daubed. [And he would daub on every corner from bottom to top (in an upwards motion), with the exception of the corner at which he was standing, which he would daub from top to bottom.]

The *Gemora* notes: With whom does our Mishnah agree? It is with Rabbi Yehudah, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Meir said: Rabbi Eliezer said: He remained in his place and daubed. And all the applications (on the corners) he made from top to bottom (in a downward motion, for otherwise he would dirty his vestments), with the exception of the one diagonally across from him, which he made from top to bottom (for otherwise,

it would be difficult to reach). Rabbi Yehudah said: Rabbi Eliezer said: He remained in his place and daubed. All the applications he made from bottom to top, with the exception of this one right before him, which he made from top to bottom, in order to prevent his vestments from becoming sullied. (59a2)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Then he sprinkled upon the “purity” of the Altar seven times.

The *Gemora* asks: What does “purity” mean?

Rabbah the son of Rav Shila said: It refers to the middle of the Altar (on its wall), as people say: “The day became bright” – when it is in the middle of the day.

An objection was raised from a *braisa*: As he sprinkles (on the Inner Altar), he does not sprinkle upon the ashes, nor upon the coals, but rather, he removes the coal to both sides and sprinkles?

Rather, said Rabbah the son of Rav Shila: It means the cleared surface of the Altar, as it is written: *And it was like the appearance of the heavens in purity.* (59a2)

It was taught in a *braisa*: Chanania said: He would apply the blood on the north side (of the Altar). Rabbi Yosi said: He would apply it on the south side.

The *Gemora* explains the rationale for their dispute: One Master (Chanania) holds that the entrance was through the Curtain on the south (and therefore, he would begin the applications on the first corner he encountered, i.e., the southeastern corner; he would therefore conclude on the northeastern corner, and that is where he would perform the seven sprinklings), whereas the other Master (R' Yosi) maintains that it was on the north side.

The *Gemora* notes: At any rate, all agree that on the place where he completed the applications on the corners, there (on that side) is where he would sprinkle on the top. What is the reason for this? It is based on that which is written: *And he shall purify it...and sanctify it*; i.e., where he sanctified it, there shall he purify it. (59a2 – 59a3)

The *Mishnah* had stated: And for the remainder of the blood (from other sacrifices) sprinkled on the Outer Altar, he poured out at the southern base. For Scripture said: And all the remaining blood of the bull shall he pour out [etc.], and as he comes forth [from the Sanctuary] he meets this [side of the Altar base] first. (59a3)

The *Mishnah* had stated: And that of the outer Altar he poured on the southern base. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which provides the source for this. You say it is the southern base. But perhaps it is not so, but rather the western base? I will tell you: We derive the procedure of the *Kohen's* descent from the ramp from his leaving the Sanctuary (*after applying the blood of the inner chatas offerings*). Just as his leaving from the Sanctuary, the blood was spilled at (*the base which was on*) the nearest side to him (*the western base*), so too after his descent from the ramp, the blood was spilled at (*the*

base which was on) the nearest side to him (*the southern base*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Rabbi Yishmael said: Both this (*the inner chatas offerings*) and that (*the outer chatas offerings*) were spilled on the western base. Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai said: Both this and that were spilled on the southern base.

The *Gemora* explains the reasoning for their respective opinions. It is reasonable according to Rabbi Yishmael, for he holds that one may derive that concerning which no details are given (outer chatas) from that which is defined (the inner chatas), but what is the reason of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai?

Rav Ashi said: He holds that the (entire) entrance to the Sanctuary was at the south (of the Altar, and therefore he encountered the base at the southern side of the Altar first).

A *braisa* of the school of Rabbi Yishmael was taught in the school of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai: In both cases (the outer and inner sacrifices), it was the southern base. As a mnemonic (to remember this): The men (of R' Shimon ben Yochai) drew the man (R' Yishmael to their teacher's position). (59a3 – 59a4)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Both mingled in the canal and flowed into the Kidron Valley, and they were sold to gardeners as fertilizer, and by using them one transgresses the law of *me'ilah*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The law of *me'ilah* applies to blood (*on a Rabbinic level after the service has been performed*); these are the words of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon; but the Sages say. *Me'ilah* does not apply at all (*with blood*).

The *Gemora* notes (according to *Tosfos' text*): They only argue on a Rabbinic level, but they all agree that sacrificial blood is not subject to Biblical *me'ilah*.

The *Gemora* cites several sources for this law (that *me'ilah* does not apply to blood).

Ulla says: It is written: *and I have assigned it for you (upon the Altar to provide for atonement)*. This teaches us that it shall be yours (and not subject to the laws of *me'ilah*).

In the academy of Rabbi Shimon it was taught that it is written: *to provide for atonement*. This teaches us that it was given to provide for atonement and not subject to the laws of *me'ilah*.

Rabbi Yochanan says: It is written: *for it is the blood that atones for the soul*. This ('it is') teaches us that it has the same status before the atonement as it does after the atonement. Just as it is not subject to the laws of *me'ilah* after the atonement, it is not subject to the laws of *me'ilah* before the atonement.

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbi Yochanan: Perhaps the reverse is true! Just as it is subject to the laws of *me'ilah* before the atonement, it is subject to the laws of *me'ilah* after the atonement!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is nothing that is subject to the laws of *me'ilah* once its function has been performed.

The *Gemora* asks: And is that true!? But there is *terumas hadeshen* (the removal of the ashes from the Altar in the morning; it is forbidden for benefit even after it was placed on the floor of the Courtyard)!?

The *Gemora* answers: That is because the *terumas hadeshen* and the limbs of the goat that is sent to *Azazel* (where they are prohibited for benefit even after the mitzvah was performed) are two Scriptural verses which come for the same purpose, and wherever two verses come for the same purpose, they do not teach (their common law) to other cases.

The *Gemora* asks: That is well according to the Rabbis who maintain that the limbs of the goat that is sent to *Azazel* are prohibited for benefit; but according to the view who maintains that they are permitted, what is there to say?

The *Gemora* answers: That is because the *terumas hadeshen* and the priestly vestments (of the *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur*, which are forbidden for benefit after they are used) are two Scriptural verses which come for the same purpose, and wherever two verses come for the same purpose, they do not teach (their common law) to other cases.

The *Gemora* asks: That is well according to the Rabbis who maintain that, when the Torah writes: *and leave them there*, this teaches us that they must be permanently stored away; but according to the view of Rabbi Dosa, who holds that they are permitted to an ordinary *Kohen*, and it is only that the *Kohen Gadol* is prohibited from using them on another *Yom Kippur*, what is there to say?

The *Gemora* answers: That is because the *terumas hadeshen* and the *eglah arufah* (the law is that upon finding a corpse, and being unable to solve the murder, the leaders of the city closest to the corpse are required to bring a calf to an untilled valley, decapitate it, wash their hands over it, and then they must recite a verse,

declaring publicly that they did not kill the person; the calf is then forbidden for benefit) are two Scriptural verses which come for the same purpose, and wherever two verses come for the same purpose, they do not teach (*their common law*) to other cases.

The *Gemora* asks: That is well according to the opinion that they do not teach to other cases; but what can be said according to the view that they do teach to other cases?

The *Gemora* answers: Two exclusionary words are written: here it is written: *the calf that was decapitated*; while there it says: *and he shall place them*. [*This teaches us that it is only in these cases that the substance is forbidden for benefit even after its function has been performed.*] (59a4 – 60a2)

The *Gemora* asks: Why do I need three verses in connection with blood (*to exclude it from the laws of me'ilah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: One verse excludes it from the laws of *me'ilah*, another from *nossar*, and a third from *tumah*. But, the *Gemora* notes: no verse is required for *piggul*, for we learned in a *Mishnah*: whatever has that which renders it permissible, whether for man or for the Altar - one is liable on its account for *piggul*, and blood is itself a permitter (*it is therefore excluded from piggul*). (60a2)

DAILY MASHAL

Prosecutors and Defenders do not Mix

The *Gemora* learns from a passuk that blood is given for atonement and not for *me'ilah* (using *hekdesch* for your own purpose).

There is an argument in the *Rishonim* if this is only an exclusion for the obligation to bring a *korban*, yet there will be a transgression, or it is excluded completely.

Reb Yosef Engel brings a *Meiri* that explains this halachah. Sprinkling of the blood on the *mizbeach* is a defender for *Klal Yisroel*. The sin of *me'ilah* is akin to a prosecutor, and hence the two cannot mix.

Sheorim Metzuyanim b'Halachah brings a similar illustration to this. The *Gemora* stated above (20) that in a year there are 365 days and *ha-Satan* has a numerical value of 364 to signify that the *Satan* does not have permission to prosecute or act against *Klal Yisroel* on *Yom Kippur*, which is the ultimate day of atonement. The two cannot mix.