

4 Sivan 5781
May 15, 2021



Yoma Daf 34

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 minchah precedes the chavitin (minchah offering of the *Kohen Gadol*), for the Torah says olah (and the minchah naturally comes with it) and then chavitin.

The chavitin precede the libations, for the chavitin are also designated as a minchah (and therefore they are offered immediately after the minchah of the Tamid).

The libations precede the Mussaf offering, for the Torah writes, “a sacrifice and its libations” (indicating that no other offering should interrupt the sacrifice and the libations). (34a1)

The Mussaf offering precedes the spoons (of frankincense). The *Gemora* asks that this contradicts a different *braisa* which states that the spoons precede the Mussaf offering. The *Gemora* answers that it is indeed a Tannaic dispute.

Abaye explains that each opinion has a Scriptural source explaining their viewpoint. The view that the Mussaf offerings precede the [frankincense] spoons seems more logical, for did you not say that the words ‘in the morning, in the morning’ imply that it is to receive preference before all, thus do the words ‘on the day . . . on the day’ indicate that it is to be [offered up] last [in the day]. What is the reason of the one who holds that the [frankincense] spoons come before the Mussaf offerings? — He infers it from the identical expression ‘statute’ which occurs with the chavitin. If he infers it from there, let him do so complete?¹ — Here [the words] ‘on the day . . . on the day’ come in to intimate that

they [the frankincense spoons] are offered up last [in the day]. (34a1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: The morning incense was offered up between the blood and the limbs. The *Gemora* asks: Who is the Tanna of this *Mishna*? If it is the Rabbis, he should have said that it (the incense) was offered up between the blood and the (cleaning of the) lamps, and if it is Abba Shaul, he should have said that it (the incense) was offered up between the (cleaning of the) lamps and the (burning of the) limbs!? The *Gemora* answers: It is the opinion of the Rabbis, but the *Mishna* was not being precise in the order. (34a1 – 34a2)

The *Mishnah* had stated: The afternoon (incense) was offered up between the limbs and its libations. From where do we know this? Rabbi Yochanan says: It is written: As the minchah-offering of the morning, and as its libations, you shalt present it; the afternoon *minchah* should be similar to the morning *minchah*. Just as in the morning, the incense precedes the *minchah*, so too in the afternoon, the incense should precede the *minchah*. The *Gemora* then asks that perhaps just as the incense precedes the limbs in the morning, it should precede them in the afternoon. The *Gemora* answers that the verse says the afternoon *minchah* should be as the morning. It does not say the afternoon limbs should be as the morning. (34a2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: It is written: And its libation is a quarter of a hin (which would amount to three luggin). We derive (the libation and minchah offering) of the morning (Tamid offering) from that of the evening. Rebbe says: We

¹ That the frankincense spoons should have precedence over the libations as well.

derive (the libation and minchah offering) of the evening (Tamid offering) from that of the morning.

The Gemara asks: It is understandable according to the Rabbis, for that is written [specifically] in connection with the tamid offering of the evening, but what is the grounds for Rebbe's statement? — Rabbah bar Ulla said: Scripture said: 'For the one lamb'. Now which is the lamb in connection with which the word echad [one] is used? Say: It is the lamb of the tamid offering of the morning. And what do the Rabbis [reply]? — 'Echad', i.e., the unique, the best of the flock. And [what is] Rebbe's [answer]? — He infers that from: And all your choice vows. And the Rabbis? — One speaks of freewill-[offerings], the other of obligatory [offerings] and both need special mention. (34a2 – 34b1)

The *Mishnah* stated: If the Kohen Gadol was either old or of delicate nature, warm water would be prepared for him and poured into the cold (water of the mikvah), to mitigate its coldness.

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: They would heat iron bars on Erev Yom Kippur, and they would place it into the cold (water of the mikvah), to mitigate its coldness. The *Gemora* asks: But (by placing the hot iron into the water) was one not thereby hardening them (which is forbidden to do on Shabbos or Yom Kippur, for by strengthening the utensil, he is in essence fixing it)? Rav Bibi said: The iron did not reach the hardening point (the degree of heat necessary to strengthen it).

Abaye said: Even if we assume it did reach the hardening point, a forbidden act which was produced unintentionally, is permitted. The *Gemora* asks: But did Abaye say that? Has it not been taught in a *braisa*: From the extra word flesh in the verse that states: *on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be removed*, we learn that one can remove *tzaraas* from the circumcision area; these are the words of Rabbi Yoshiyah. And the *Gemora* asked: What is the necessity for the verse? Removal of the *tzaraas* is an unintentional act, and that is normally permitted? And Abaye answered: Nonetheless, we need the verse to teach us that even

according to Rabbi Yehudah, who forbids one to perform an unintentional act on *Shabbos*, one is permitted to remove the *tzaraas* while in the process of circumcision. The *Gemora* answers: That applies only to forbidden things on a Biblical level, but here, hardening is forbidden only by Rabbinic ordination. (34b1 – 34b2)

MISHNAH: They brought him to the Parvah Chamber, which was on consecrated ground. They spread a sheet of linen between him and the people. He sanctified his hands and his feet and undressed. Rabbi Meir said: He undressed, sanctified his hands and his feet. He went down and immersed himself, came up and dried himself. Afterwards, they brought him white vestments. He put them on and sanctified his hands and his feet.

In the morning he put on Pelusian linen, worth twelve maneh, and in the afternoon, he wore Hinduyin linen, worth eight hundred zuz. [Each maneh equaled one hundred zuz.] These are the words of Rabbi Meir. The Sages, however, say: In the morning he put on vestments worth eighteen maneh, and in the afternoon, he wore linen worth twelve maneh; altogether thirty maneh. All that (expense came) at the charge of the public; and if he wanted to add more of his own money, he could do so. (34b2)

INSIGHT TO THE DAF

Which Mitzvah Takes Precedence?

The *Gemora* learns out the obligation of *nesachim* - the wine libations, by the two Tamid offerings, which were brought every day. There is an argument there if we learn the morning Tamid from the afternoon or vice-versa.

Tosfos comments that there would be a difference l'halachah if they would have only enough *nesachim* for one korban, which Tamid should have the *nesachim*. Is the primary Tamid the one offered in the morning or the afternoon.

Rabbeinu Chananel says that there is no difference l'halachah; it's just a matter as to how we expound the verses.

The Sfas Emes asks on Tosfos that the halachah should be clearly that whichever *mitzvah* one is holding by, that is the one he should perform, and if one is ready to bring the morning Tamid, he should bring the *nesachim* with that one, even if the afternoon Tamid is the primary one?

This actually is an argument between the Radvaz (187) and the Chacham Tzvi (106) regarding a person who was in jail and he did not have the ability to perform any mitzvos, and his captors gave him one day that he can choose to be released and perform the mitzvos of that day, which day should he choose. The Radvaz says he should choose the first opportunity that he has and the Chacham Tzvi disagrees and holds that one should wait until there is a *mitzvah* of great prominence.

The Biur Halacha (109) has a question if one davens normally a long Shemoneh Esrei and he will certainly miss kedushah, should he daven with the tzibur and fulfill the *mitzvah* of tefilah b'tzibur, or should he wait and fulfill the *mitzvah* of reciting kedushah?

An action which wasn't intended

Our *Gemora* speaks of Rabbi Yehudah's opinion if a prohibition might unintentionally result from an action, the entire action becomes prohibited. According to Rashi's interpretation of the *Gemora's* answer, Rabbi Yehudah only holds this way when the resultant prohibition is a Biblical one, and not when it is Rabbinic. The strengthening of metal is not a Torah prohibition, because it is not a utensil. The completion of a usable utensil is prohibited from the Torah. To strengthen a plain piece of metal, however, is only prohibited Rabbinically. Tosafos disagrees with Rashi's interpretation. Tosafos asks from a *Gemora* which seems to imply that Rabbi Yehudah holds that even if an action would inadvertently cause a Rabbinic prohibition, it is prohibited. According to Tosafos, Abaye was suggesting that Rabbi Yehudah's prohibition concerning an inadvertent act is only rabbinic and even Rabbi Yehudah would agree that on a Torah level, it is permitted to perform an act with an unintentional forbidden consequence. Putting the metal in the *mikveh*, therefore, would be a mere Rabbinic prohibition, since the intention wasn't to strengthen the metal. Being that this act constituted only a Rabbinic prohibition, in the

Temple it was entirely permitted. This leniency is based on the principal that Rabbinic safeguards are not applicable in the Temple. The *Gemora* then asks how Abaye can consider Rabbi Yehudah's ruling only Rabbinic when he himself taught that it is Biblically forbidden to cut off leprous skin, even if the intent was merely to fulfill the *mitzvah* of circumcision, and not to remove the skin. The *Gemora* answers that in all other areas of the Torah, Rabbi Yehudah holds that it is prohibited from the Torah to perform an act which unintentionally produces an *issur*. With regards to the laws of Shabbos and Yom Tov, however, it is only Rabbinic. This distinction is due to the fact that by Shabbos, the Torah prohibited only *Melech Machsheves* -thoughtful work. An unintentional result cannot be considered as being done thoughtfully, and therefore, cannot be considered prohibited from the Torah.

DAILY MASHAL

Tenth of Teves

The Chasam Sofer (Orach chaim 9) asks on our *Gemora* that the verses are clear that there are *nesachim* by the morning Tamid and the afternoon as well. One verse is explicit that the primary *nesachim* is in the morning. He comments that there are many that asked these questions without finding a satisfactory answer. Look there how he answers it. The Chasam Sofer ends the responsa by signing his name and dating it Sunday, the 11th of Teves, 5578. Was the Tenth of Teves on Shabbos that year?

In the Likutei Heoros on the Chasam Sofer, he comments that the Tenth of Teves cannot fall out on Shabbos, and in the year 5578 it happened to be a Friday, so there seemingly is a printer's mistake, and it should say Sunday, the 12th of Teves.