

1 Tammuz 5781
June 11, 2021



Yoma Daf 61

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

Ulla said: If he slaughtered the he-goat before sprinkling the blood of the bull, he has done nothing.

The *Gemora* asks from our *Mishnah*: If he sprinkled the blood of the he-goat before the blood of the bull, he must start over again, sprinkling the blood of the he-goat after the blood of the bull. Now, if Ulla’s view were correct, the *Mishnah* should read: He shall start over again and slaughter (a he-goat)?

The *Gemora* answers: Ulla explained this to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary (in a case where the he-goat was slaughtered at its proper time); and thus also Rabbi Afes explained it to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. (61a1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Likewise in matters of the Sanctuary and the Golden Altar.

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *And he shall atone for the Holy of Holies* - this means (for any “*tumah*” sin committed in) the Holy of Holies; *and the Tent of Meeting* - this refers to the Sanctuary; *and the altar* - this is to be understood in its literal sense; he shall atone - this refers to all “*tumah*” sins committed in the Courtyard. The *Baraisa* continues by saying that the full list of atonement enumerated by the verse – *al hakohanim* – to the *Kohanim*; *kol am hakahal* refers to the whole nation; *he shall atone* – this means the *Levi'im* - teaches that they are all equally atoned for general transgressions by the goat sent to Azazel (but not for the transgressions of entering the *Mikdash* while impure, for the bull *chatas* atones for the *Kohanim* and the

inner *chatas* atones for the non-*Kohanim*); these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon says that just as the blood of the “inner” goat (*whose blood applications are performed inside the Sanctuary*) provides atonement for Israelites for all *tumah* sins of the Temple and its holy things, so does the blood of the bull provide atonement for the *Kohanim* for all *tumah* sins of the Temple and its holy things; and just as the confession of sin pronounced over the goat sent to *Azazel* provides atonement for Israelites for other sins, so does the confession of sin pronounced over the bull provide atonement for *Kohanim* for other sins. (61a1 – 61a2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *And when he has finished atoning for the holy place*; this refers to the Holy of Holies; *the Tent of Meeting* refers to the Sanctuary; *the Altar*, in its literal sense. This teaches us that each of these (blood) applications provide an independent atonement. Therefore they said: If he performed some of the sprinklings inside, and the blood spilled out, he must bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings inside. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say: He shall start, but from the place where he stopped.

[The *Tanna Kamma* continues:] If he has completed the sprinkling due inside and the blood spilled out, then he shall bring other blood, and he shall start from the beginning with the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. If he had sprinkled some of the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and the blood spilled out, he must bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due in the

Sanctuary. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say: He must start, but from the place where he had stopped.

[The Tanna Kamma continues:] If he had completed the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and then the blood spilled out, he must bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinkling due on the Altar. If he had made some of the sprinklings due on the Altar and the blood spilled out, he must bring other blood and he shall start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due on the Altar. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say: He shall not start except from the place where he had stopped.

[The Baraisa continues:] If he had completed the sprinklings due on the Altar and the blood spilled out, all agree that this is not essential (to pour the remaining blood on the base of the Altar).

Rabbi Yochanan said: Both derive it from one Scriptural verse: *With the blood of the chatas of atonement . . . once a year*. Rabbi Meir holds: I (God) have spoken to you of one chatas (whereby to obtain one atonement), not of two chatas offerings (therefore, he must begin again with a new chatas); Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon maintain: I have spoken of one sprinkling, not of two sprinklings. (61a2 – 61a3)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: Rebbe said: Rabbi Yaakov taught me a distinction with regard to the *lugin* (of oil of the metzora process). [With regard to the *lugin* of oil used for the purification of the metzora, Rabbi Yaakov had taught that unlike the sprinklings of Yom Kippur, there was no dispute concerning the question here where one must start again after a service had been performed out of order, and R' Elozar and R' Shimon agree to R' Meir that if the oil spilled, the process must be repeated.]

The *Gemora* asks: But is there no dispute? Surely it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: If he made some of the sprinklings inside (the Sanctuary), and the oil spilled out,

he must bring another *log* (of oil) and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due inside. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say: He starts again from the place where he had stopped.

[The Tanna Kamma continues:] If he had completed the sprinklings due inside (the Sanctuary) and the *log* spilled out, he must bring another *log* and start again from the beginning with the application on the thumbs and toes. If he had made some of the applications on the thumbs and toes and the *log* spilled out, he must bring another *log* and start over again from the beginning with the applications on the thumbs and toes. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say: He must start where he had stopped before.

[The Baraisa continues:] If he had completed the applications due on the thumbs and toes and the *log* spilled out, they all agree that the applications on the head (of the metzora) are not essential. [Evidently, there is a disagreement – even by the case of a metzora!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather say that Rabbi Yaakov taught me the dispute concerning the *log*. (61a3 – 61a4)

The Master had said: The applications on the head are not essential. What is the reason for that? Shall I say because Scripture says: And what remains over of the oil, but then [when it says]: But that which is left of the meal-offering etc., would you say that there, too, it is not essential? — It is different there because it is written: 'And the rest' and 'what remains over'. (61a4)

Rabbi Yochanan said: If the *asham* of a *metzora* had been slaughtered not for its own purpose, in that we find a dispute between Rabbi Meir, and Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Meir, who said he must bring another one and start all over from the beginning, would here consistently hold that he must bring another (animal as) *asham* and slaughter it, whereas Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon, who say that he must start at the place he had

left off before, would hold that here there is no remedy. [R' Meir, who maintains that part of a service that has not been completed is disregarded, would similarly regard this incomplete asham as not offered and would require another asham; whereas R' Elozar and R' Shimon, who do not disregard that part of the service which had been performed, would hold that he cannot bring a new asham, as the Torah explicitly states: 'one lamb for an asham,' and not two.]

Rav Chisda asked them: Surely it is written: "it" (as an asham can be offered; implying that no other can be offered)?

The *Gemora* notes: This indeed is a difficulty.

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa* which supports Rabbi Yochanan: If the *asham* of a *metzora* was slaughtered not for its own sake, or if the *Kohen* did not apply the blood upon the thumb and toe of the *metzora*, it is nevertheless offered upon the altar, and it still requires the libations; but he must bring another *asham* offering to render him permitted (*that he may enter the camp*).

Rav Chisda, however, will answer you that it means that he is required to offer another one, but he has no remedy to get it.

The *Gemora* asks: Would a Tanna state "required," but mean that there is no remedy?

The *Gemora* answers: yes! The *Gemora* proves from the following *Baraisa* that a Tanna would indeed talk in such a manner: Beis Shammai says that a bald *nazir* is required to pass a razor over his head. Beis Hillel holds that this is not required. And Rabbi Avina explained: When Beis Shammai said that "he is required," he meant that he has no remedy (*for it is useless for him to pass a razor over his bald head*).

The *Gemora* notes that this is in contrast to that of Rabbi Pedas, for Rabbi Pedas said that Beis Shamai and Rabbi Eliezer both say the same thing. Beis Shamai – we have already mentioned. Rabbi Eliezer said in a *Baraisa*: A *metzora* that does not have a thumb (*on his right hand*) or a big toe (*on his right foot*) can never become *tahor* (*for his purification process involves the Kohen sprinkling blood from the korban asham on his thumb and big toe*); these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Shimon says: If the blood is applied on his left hand, he will have discharged his obligation. (61a4 – 61b2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *And he will take*. One might think he will take this blood with a vessel. The verse states: *And he will place (the blood on the metzora)*. This teaches us to compare the taking to the placing of the blood. Just as the placing is done with the hand of the *Kohen*, so too the taking is done with the hand of the *Kohen*. One might think that he also accepts the blood that is meant to be sprinkled on the Altar with his hand. The verse states: *For like a chatas is the asham*. Just as the *chatas* requires a vessel for accepting the blood, so too the *asham* requires a vessel for accepting the blood. In conclusion, this means that two *Kohanim* accept the blood from an *asham metzora*. One does so with his hand, the other does so with a vessel. The one who does so with a vessel does the sprinklings on the Altar, and the one who does so with his hand places the blood on the *metzora*. (61b2 – 61b3)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: All of them (all the bulls and he-goats mentioned in our Mishnah, in connection with blood that spilled before the completion of the individual atonement or the entire service in question, and for which substitutes are necessary, must be burned outside the three camps, and they) render the garments *tamei*, and are to be burned in the place where the ashes are deposited; these are the words of Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon. The Sages say: They do not render the garments *tamei*, and they are not to be burned in the place where

the ashes are deposited, except the last one, because with that he completed the atonement.

Rava asked the following question of Rav Nachman: How many he-goats is he to send away to Azazel; seeing that the lottery needed to be repeated)?

He answered: Should he perhaps send his entire flock away?

Rava said to him: And does he not burn his entire flock?

The *Gemora* answers: How can the two cases be compared? There, it is written 'it,' here, 'it' is not written. (61b3 – 62a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The *Gemora* states that it is necessary to have 43 total sprinklings from the goat and the bull in total, however they do not all have to be from the same animal. If the blood spilled after the *avodah* in the Kodosh Kodoshim, that does not have to be repeated. He can start from the sprinklings in the Heichal (on the peroches).

The Brisker Rov proves from here that the 43 total sprinklings which are mandated are not to permit the *korbanos* to be brought (for if so, it would be required to have from the same animal), rather it is an obligation for the day and could be fulfilled through different animals.

The Chazon Ish states that this *halacha* is only true by the *korbanos* of Yom Kippur. However, by other *korbanos*, such as a communal bull, or any *korban* which mandates sprinklings in two places (the *peroches* and the *mizbeach*), it must be done from the same animal.

DAILY MASHAL

Velo K'lum (again)

The *Gemora* states that if the kohen gadol slaughtered the goat before he sprinkled from the blood of the bull, “lo asah velo k'lum” - it is not valid and he must bring another goat.

We learned yesterday that ‘velo k'lum’ means that he did not commit a transgression either (besides not fulfilling a *mitzvah*). Isn't slaughtering the goat on Yom Kippur with no positive result considered a desecration of Yom Kippur?

The Steipler Gaon explains by the *ketores* that even if it was burned for no reason, it is not a violation of Yom Kippur, for he ruined the *ketores* and it is deemed to be mekalkel, so too says the Sheorim Metzuyanim b'Halachah here, we can say that slaughtering the goat does not create any benefit, for there is a prohibition to have pleasure from it, and therefore it would not be a constructive labor, and hence he would not be liable.