

13 Iyar 5781  
April 25, 2021



Yoma Daf 14

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: [The Kohen Gadol was sequestered for seven days before Yom Kippur, and since only he could perform the Yom Kippur service, it was necessary for him to be familiar with the service so he could perform it properly on Yom Kippur.] Thus, all seven days that the Kohen Gadol was sequestered, he would throw the blood of the tamid offerings.<sup>1</sup> The Kohen Gadol would also burn the ketores which was divided into two equal portions and burned once in the morning and once in the evening. The Kohen Gadol would also prepare the lamps.<sup>2</sup> The Kohen Gadol would also bring the head and the hind leg of the tamid offerings.<sup>3</sup> On all other days he offers only if he so desires; for the Kohen Gadol is first in offering a portion and has first place in taking a portion. (14a1-14a2)

GEMARA: Who is the Tanna that taught our Mishnah? Rav Chisda said: it is not in accord with Rabbi Akiva, for if it would be Rabbi Akiva, why, he said that if the sprinkling of water (containing the ashes from the parah adumah) fell upon a tahor person, he becomes tamei; accordingly, how could he [the Kohen Gadol] perform the services (after he was sprinkled)? For it was taught in a Baraisa: It is said regarding the purification waters of the Parah Adumah *the tahor shall sprinkle it upon the tamei*. From the extra word *tamei*, Rabbi

Akiva maintains that we derive that one is only tahor when he sprinkles the purification waters on one who is tamei, but if he sprinkled the purification waters on a person who is actually tahor, then that person will become tamei. The Chachamim, however, maintain that the word *tamei* teaches us that the protocol of sprinkling that the Torah describes is only applicable to things that are susceptible to tumah contamination.<sup>4</sup> What is this (the law which emerges from the Chachamim’s statement)? It is that which was taught in a Mishnah: If one intended to sprinkle the purification waters of the Parah Adumah on an animal and instead he sprinkled the waters on a person, if there is some waters remaining on the hyssop branch that was used for sprinkling, he can then use that mixture again.<sup>5</sup> If, however, he intended to sprinkle the ash water on a person and instead he sprinkled it on an animal, if there is some of the ash-mixture remaining on the hyssop branch, he cannot use that remaining mixture again because it has become invalidated.<sup>6</sup> [Rabbi Akiva maintains that the ashes of the Parah Adumah only act as a purifying agent if they are sprinkled on one who is tamei, but if he sprinkled the purification waters on a person who is actually tahor, then that person will become tamei.] What is the reason of Rabbi Akiva? Let the Torah write ‘And the tahor

<sup>1</sup> There were two tamid offerings brought, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, and the Kohen Gadol would throw the blood during the seven days that he was sequestered so he would be familiar with the service on Yom Kippur.

<sup>2</sup> Which involved removing the ashes and the old wicks from the lamps of the menorah, and this was part of the daily service performed every morning in the Bais HaMikdash.

<sup>3</sup> This process was performed by the Kohen Gadol standing on top of the ramp of the mizbeich and the limbs of the offering were brought up to him. He placed his hands on the limbs and then he cast them into the fire on the mizbeich.

<sup>4</sup> If the sprinkling of the ash-mixture was performed on something that was not susceptible to tumah, then it is not deemed to be sprinkling. The rule is that the Parah Adumah or its ashes cannot be used for work purposes. If

they are subjected to work purposes, then they become invalid for use in purifying one who has corpse tumah. If one dips some ash-mixture with the hyssop branch and the act is not deemed to be sprinkling, it is viewed as work and any ash-mixture remaining on the hyssop branch becomes invalidated.

<sup>5</sup> The sprinkling on the person was not valid, because the person doing the sprinkling did not intend that the waters should be sprinkled on that person. Since the sprinkling was done on a person, however, the ash-mixture does not become invalidated and one can sprinkle with the mixture again without dipping the hyssop branch again into the vessel contaminating the purification waters.

<sup>6</sup> The reason for this is because when he sprinkled the mixture on the animal, the sprinkling is deemed to be “work” and the hyssop branch must be dipped again before it can be used to purify people or vessels.

person shall sprinkle upon him', what is the meaning of 'upon the tamei,'? Infer from this that [if sprinkled] upon the tamei, he becomes tahor, and [if sprinkled] upon the tahor, he becomes tamei. And [what is the reason for the view of] the Chachamim? — These words emphasize that [sprinkling is valid] only upon matter susceptible to tumah. But this case can be deduced through a kal vachomer: If sprinkling the purification waters on one who is tamei renders him tahor, then certainly when the purification waters are sprinkled upon one who is already tahor, certainly he should remain tahor. And Rabbi Akiva? — It is with reference to this that Shlomo HaMelech said: *I said I would become wise; but alas, it is still beyond me.*<sup>7</sup> And the Chachamim? They maintain that Shlomo HaMelech was amazed that both the one who sprinkles the waters and the one upon whom they sprinkled the waters are tahor whereas the one who touches the waters is tamei. But is he who sprinkles tahor? Surely it is written: And he that sprinkles the water of sprinkling shall wash his clothes? — 'Sprinkles' here means 'touches'. — But the text reads 'sprinkles' and also mentions 'touches'; furthermore, he who 'sprinkles' must wash his clothes, whereas he who 'touches' need not wash his clothes? — Rather 'sprinkles' here means 'carries' — Then let the Torah write 'carries', why is 'sprinkles' written? — That [is meant] to let us know that there must be a quantity sufficient for the sprinkling.<sup>8</sup> The Gemara asks: That will be correct according to the one who holds that a definite minimum is necessary in the sprinkling, but according to he who holds there is no required minimum in the sprinkling, what is there to be said? The Gemara answers: Even according to the one who holds there is no required minimum [it will be right], for that refers only to the back of the man, but in the vessels there must be a definite quantity, as we have learned in a Mishnah: How much water is necessary to be sufficient for the sprinkling? Enough for dipping the tips of the stalks that are on top of

the hyssop stalks into the water and be able to have sufficient water to sprinkle.<sup>9</sup> Abaye said: [The Mishnah] may be in accord even with Rabbi Akiva: He [the Kohen Gadol] officiates all day, [and] in the evening is he sprinkled, then he takes the immersion and awaits the sunset. (14a2 – 14b1)

We learned in the Mishnah that when the Kohen Gadol was sequestered for seven days before Yom Kippur, he would burn the ketores and prepare the lamps. The Gemara infers from this statement that the order of events was that first the ketores was burned and then the lamps were prepared. A Mishnah in Tamid, however, states that the Kohen who won the privilege of clearing the ashes from the inner mizbeiach etc. and the Kohen who won the privilege of preparing the lamps etc. and the Kohen who won the privilege of burning the ketores etc. From these excerpts in Tractate Tamid it appears that first the lamps were prepared and then the ketores was burned. Rav Huna answers that the Tanna who taught Tractate Tamid was Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpah, who is an individual, whereas our Mishnah represents a majority opinion. - But surely we have learnt exactly the opposite?<sup>10</sup> For we have learnt: As he [the Kohen] came to the northeastern corner [of the altar], he throws the blood on that northeast corner, then he came to the southwestern corner and he throws the blood on that southwest corner. And with reference to this [Mishnah] it was taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpah change this procedure with regard to the tamid offering: As he came to the northeastern corner he throws the blood on that northeast corner, then he came to the southwestern corner, and he places the blood on the western side and afterwards on the southern side.<sup>11</sup> — Rather, said Rabbi Yochanan: Who is the authority for the order [given] in [the Tractate] Yoma? Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpah.

<sup>7</sup> Although Shlomo HaMelech was exceedingly wise, he was still unable to explain why a mixture that renders one tamei can have the reverse effect on one who is already tahor.

<sup>8</sup> For rendering the one who carries the water tamei; that is indicated by expressing 'carrying' in terms of 'sprinkling'.

<sup>9</sup> This is because the hyssops can absorb a certain amount of water. Thus, there must be enough water in the vessel so that after the tips of the stems

become saturated with water, there will still be enough on the surface of the stems to sprinkle on the tamei.

<sup>10</sup> We find some teachings of Rabbi Shimon of Mitzpah that are opposite of Mishnayos taught anonymously in Tractate Tamid.

<sup>11</sup> Rabbi Shimon insists that two separate applications had to be made from the southwestern corner, one on the west and another on the south, and thus opposes the order given in Tamid; hence he could not be an authority for the Tractate.

But here is a contradiction between the order [given] in [the Tractate] Yoma and the order [given] in another passage in Yoma; for it was taught in a Mishnah: The second casting of lots determines who slaughters the tamid offering, who will throw the blood of the tamid on the mizbeich, who will clear the ash from the inner mizbeich, who will clear the ashes from the Menorah, and who brings the limbs of the tamid onto the ramp of the mizbeich. [After the second lottery was completed, the Kohanim would disperse and then a little later they would be summoned to participate in a third lottery which would determine which Kohen would burn the Ketores. Only Kohanim who had never been involved in burning the Ketores previously were allowed to participate in the third lottery.] The third lottery would be heralded with the announcement, “those who are new to the service of the Ketores should come and draw lots.”<sup>12</sup> Abaye said: This is no difficulty. The one case speaks of the preparing of the five lamps, the other of the preparing of the two lamps.<sup>13</sup> - Shall we say that the Ketores interrupted the preparing of the lamps? But Abaye was recounting the order [of the daily Temple service] in the name of a tradition and he has the preparing of the lamps interrupted by the blood of the regular tamid offering? — I will tell you: This is no difficulty, the one refers to the [order of the daily Temple service] in accord with Abba Shaul, the other in accord with the Sages, for it has been taught in a Baraisa: He should not prepare the lamps and after that burn the ketores, but he should offer the ketores first and then prepare the lamps. Abba Shaul says: He should first prepare and then offer [the ketores]. What is the reason for Abba Shaul's view? — For it is written: Every morning, when he prepares the lamps, and afterwards [it says], he shall bring [the ketores] up in smoke. — And according to the Sages, what is the Torah saying here? It is that at the time the lamps are being prepared there shall be a burning of the ketores. For, if you would not interpret thus,

<sup>12</sup> There was a tradition that one who burned the Ketores would become wealthy, so efforts were made to ensure that as many kohanim as possible would have a chance in their lifetime to perform the burning of the Ketores. From here it is seen that Ketores was offered after the lamps, which contradicts our Mishnah here.

<sup>13</sup> There were seven lamps, the preparing of which, according to this answer, was interrupted by the offering of the ketores, so that five lamps

[how will you account for ‘afternoon’], as it is written: And when Aaron lights the lamps in the afternoon, he shall bring [the ketores] up in smoke. Would you say here too that he shall first light the lamps and afterwards cause the afternoon ketores to burn? And if you will say, ‘Indeed, so it is,’ but has it not been taught in a Baraisa: ‘From evening to morning,’ i.e., provide a sufficient quantity [of oil] that it may burn all night from evening to morning; or, according to another interpretation: ‘From evening to morning’, i.e., there is no service which is proper [to be performed] ‘from evening to morning’ except this. What then the Torah intends is that at the time of the lighting there shall [still] be a burning of the ketores. Here also: at the time of the preparing there shall [still] be a burning of the ketores. And Abba Shaul? It is different there, because the Torah says: *oso* [it].<sup>14</sup> (14b1 – 15a1)

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### *Uniqueness of the Parah Adumah*

The Gemara states that Shlomo HaMelech was amazed at the contradictions that are inherent in the laws of the Parah Adumah. What is so unique about Parah Adumah that even the wisest of all men was puzzled by its contradictory laws?

Perhaps the idea is that the Parah Adumah comes to purify a person from corpse tumah, which is itself a paradox. On the one hand, because of the sin of Adam HaRishon eating from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, death was decreed upon humanity. Yet, one can be purified from the tumah that is generated from a dead person, and this rite of purification essentially elevates man to the level that Adam HaRishon was on prior to sinning. Thus, even Shlomo HaMelech expressed his bewilderment that the greatest sin in history can still be rectified through ash and water.

were prepared, then the ketores offered, after which the last two lamps of the seven-branched Menorah were prepared.

<sup>14</sup> Only this (‘it’) may be done from evening to morning and no other work, so that you are compelled to give this interpretation to the text, but with regard to the verse dealing with the preparing, no such necessity arises.