

12 Sivan 5781  
May 23, 2021



Yoma Daf 42

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

When Rav Dimi came [from Eretz Yisroel] he said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: I heard of: three [different] straps, one, that of the [red] heifer,<sup>1</sup> the other, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away,<sup>2</sup> the third of the metzora;<sup>3</sup> one having a weight of ten zuz, the other a weight of two sela's, the third a weight of one shekel, and I cannot explain which is which. When Ravin came, he explained it in the name of Rabbi Yonasan: That of the heifer had the weight of ten zuz, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away had the weight of two sela's, and that of the metzora weighed one shekel. Rabbi Yochanan said: About the [strap used in connection with] the heifer, Rabbi Shimon ben Chalafta and the Sages are disputing, one saying it weighed ten shekels, the other it weighed but one shekel. And your mnemonic is: 'Whether one gives much, or one gives little'.<sup>4</sup> — Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti said to Ravina: They are not disputing in regard to [the strap of] the heifer, but in regard [to that of] the he-goat-to-be-sent-away; and on the day [of their dispute] Ravya bar Kisi died, and as a sign to remember this coincidence they uttered: [The death of the righteous], Ravya bar Kisi, obtains atonement, even as the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. (41b4 – 42a1)

Rabbi Yitzchak said: I heard of two slaughterings, one of the [red] heifer, the other of his bull, one being permissible to a non-Kohen, the other being invalidated if performed by a non-Kohen, and I do not know which is which. It is reported: Concerning the slaughtering of the heifer and of his bull, [there is a dispute between] Rav and Shmuel, one holding the heifer to be invalidated [if slaughtered by a non-Kohen], but that his bull [so slaughtered] is fit, while the other holds that his bull is invalidated [if a non-Kohen slaughtered], but [so slaughtered] the heifer is fit. It may be ascertained that it is Rav who holds that [the slaughtering of] the heifer [by a non-Kohen] renders it invalid. For Rabbi Zeira said: The slaughtering of the heifer by a non-Kohen is invalid and Rav said regarding it: 'Elozar' and 'Statute' we learned in connection with it. — But as for Rav, what is the difference between [the law] in the case of the heifer, because 'Elozar' and 'Statute' is written in connection with it, when also in connection with 'his' bull 'Aaron' and 'Statute' is written? The slaughtering is not [regarded as a Temple] service. Then this ought to apply to the heifer as well? — It is different with the heifer, because it is [in the category

<sup>1</sup> When one burns the *parah adumah*, (a red cow which was burnt and whose ashes were mixed with water; the mixture was used to purify one who had come in contact with a corpse) he is required to throw a cedar branch and a hyssop plant tied with a red strip of wool into the fire.

<sup>2</sup> The Yom Kippur service required a strip of red wool to be tied to the horns of the goat which was sent out to the wilderness.

<sup>3</sup> When one has become afflicted with *taraas* (leprosy) and is healed, he must bring certain sacrifices. The *Kohen* who is

purifying him must dip a cedar branch and hyssop plant, tied with a strip of red wool, into the blood and sprinkle the blood onto the *metzora*.

<sup>4</sup> The usual meaning: Whether one gives much or little, the main matter is that he direct his heart to our Father who is in heaven, is irrelevant here, the accent being put, for mnemonic reasons, on: the one (stands for) much, the other for little, i.e., one of the disputants ascribes the maximum of the three, the other the minimum weight.

of] offerings for Temple repair.<sup>5</sup> — So much the more then! — Rav Shisha son of Rav Idi said: It is the same as with the [inspection of] appearances of tzaraas, which is not a service, yet requires a Kohen's service.

Now according to Shmuel, who holds the slaughtering of 'his' bull by a non-Kohen is invalid, what is the difference [in law] in the case of 'his' bull, in connection with which 'Aaron' and 'Statute' are written, when also in connection with the heifer 'Elozar' and 'Statute' are written? — It is different there, because it is written: And he shall slaughter it before him, which means that a non-Kohen may slaughter and Elozar should watch it. And [how does] Rav [explain this]? — [It means] he must not divert his attention from it. Where does Samuel know that he must not divert his attention from it? — He infers that from: And the heifer shall be burnt in his sight. And [why the repetition according to] Rav? — One refers to the slaughtering, the other to the burning; and it was necessary to mention both. For if the Merciful One had written it concerning the slaughtering [alone, I would have said]: There [attention is necessary] because it is the beginning of the service, but with the burning [one could] say: 'No [attention is necessary]' therefore it was necessary [for the Merciful One] to mention [it also regarding burning]. And if the Merciful One had written it [only] regarding the burning, one would have said [attention is necessary there], because just now the heifer is being made ready, but [during] slaughtering no [attention is necessary]. Therefore, it was necessary [for the Merciful One] to mention [that too]. — What does this exclude? If you say it is to exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting in of the ashes? Surely Scripture says: [And it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel] for a water

<sup>5</sup> The heifer is not offered up on the altar, as any other sacrifice, hence there is no distinction as to the services to be performed in connection with it, and all alike require a Kohen.

of sprinkling? — Rather it excludes the casting in of cedarwood, hyssop, and red wool, because they are not part of the heifer itself. (42a1 – 42b1)

It was reported: If the heifer was slaughtered by a non-Kohen, Rabbi Ammi said it is valid. Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha said it was invalid. Ulla said it is valid, while some there are who say [that he said] it was invalid.

Rabbi Yehoshua bar Abba raised an objection in support of Rav: I know only that the sprinkling of its water is not valid if performed by a woman, as [when done] by a man; and that it is valid only [if done] by day. From where do I know that the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedarwood, hyssop, and red wool [may not be done by night]? To teach us that Scripture said: [This is the statute of] the law. I might have assumed that this should include also the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of the ashes, to teach us that Scripture said: 'This'. — What causes you to include those, and to exclude these? — Since Scripture both extends and limits, say, we shall infer everything from the [regulations regarding] the sprinkling of its water: Just as the sprinkling of its water is not proper if done by a woman, as it is [if performed] by a man, and not valid except if done by day, thus include also the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedarwood, hyssop, and red wool. Since these [functions] may not be performed by a woman, so may they be performed only by day; but I exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of its ashes, which, since they may be performed by either man or woman, therefore may also be performed by night. But how is this

a refutation? Will you say that because [the slaughtering is stated to be] invalid [if performed] by a woman, it must be invalid, also, if performed by a non-Kohen? There would be as counterproof the sprinkling of its waters, which, while invalid [if performed] by a woman, yet may be done by a non-Kohen! Said Abaye: This is the refutation: Why is the woman excluded [from the slaughtering], because [Scripture said]: ‘Elozar’, [implying] but not a woman; that [must be applied to] the non-Kohen also, for [the analogue inference]: ‘Elozar’ [the Kohen], [implies] but not a non-Kohen. (42b1 – 42b2)

Ulla said: In that whole section [of the red heifer] there are [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent [of preceding or following] implications: And you shall give her unto Elozar the Kohen [implies] only this one to Elozar, but not [the heifers] in later generations to Elozar; some say: In later generations [you shall give it] to the Kohen Gadol, others: In later generations to an ordinary Kohen. It is quite right according to the one who holds that in later generations [the heifer is to be handed over] to an ordinary Kohen, but where does he infer who holds that in later generations [it is to be given] to the Kohen Gadol? — He infers it from [the identical word] ‘Statute’, ‘Statute’, used [also] in connection with Yom Kippur: And he shall bring it forth [implies] that he must not bring forth another one with her, as we have learnt: If the heifer refused to go forth, one may not send a black one with her, lest people say: They slaughtered a black [heifer], nor may another red heifer be brought forth with her, lest people say: They slaughtered two. — Rabbi Yosi said: It is not for this reason, but because it is written: [And he shall bring it forth]; ‘it’, [implies] by itself. And the [anonymous] first Tanna [surely wrote] ‘it’. — Who is this first Tanna? It is Rabbi Shimon who ‘interprets the reason of biblical law’. What is the difference between them? — There is a difference if one should bring forth a donkey with her. (42b2 – 43a1)

## INSIGHT TO THE DAF

### ***Kohen Gadol is a “Kohen Hedyot Plus”***

The *Gemora* states that the first *parah adumah* was done by Elozar, who was the *Segan Kohen Gadol*, but all future ones will either be done by a *Kohen Gadol* or a *Kohen Hedyot*.

The Rogitchover Gaon explains why the first *parah* could not have been done by Aaron. The *halachah* is that even if a *Kohen Gadol* prepares the *parah adumah*, it must be done with the four vestments, and not the eight that the *Kohen Gadol* usually wears. This would signify that immediately, at that time, the *Kohen Gadol* is performing as a *Kohen Hedyot*, and not as a *Kohen Gadol*. The only way a *Kohen Gadol* can act like a regular *Kohen* is if he was once a regular *Kohen*, however Aaron HaKohen was never a regular *Kohen* - he was appointed a *Kohen Gadol* immediately, and therefore he could not perform the *parah adumah*, for it was not possible for him to wear only the four vestments and be like a *Kohen Hedyot*. [There are those that say that every *Kohen Gadol* must be a *Segan* first - if so, Aaron must have been an exception.]

### ***Comparing Parah Adumah to the Seeing of Nega'im***

There is one opinion in the *Gemora* that the *shechitah* of the *parah adumah* cannot be done by a *Yisroel*. The *Gemora* asks from the derived concept that *shechitah* is not considered an *avodah* and hence would be valid with a *Yisroel*. The *Gemora* answers that this is similar to the seeing of *nega'im*. Just like there, it must be done by a *Kohen*, and only a *Kohen* can pronounce that the person has a *nega*, and therefore *tamei*, even though it is not an *avodah*, so too by the *shechitah* of the *parah adumah*, it must be performed by a *Kohen*. Tosfos Yeshanim comments that according to this opinion, the *Kohen* must be wearing his Priestly vestments when he is performing the *shechitah*.

The Mishna in Parah states that the *shechitah* would be invalid if the *Kohen* would not be wearing his Priestly vestments, or if he would not have washed his hands and feet beforehand, like any other *avodah*. The Steipler Gaon (Minachos 1) asks that this is not true by the seeing of *nega'im*? There, it is not necessary to wear the Priestly vestments? He is forced to say that the Mishna is referring to the services after *shechitah*, however by the *shechitah*, he would not need to wear the Priestly vestments. This is contrary to the Tosfos Yeshonim.

It is interesting to note that the Tiferes Yisroel in his introduction to Kodoshim seems to hold that the *Kohen* must wear his Priestly vestments when he is looking at a נגע. (It would seem that ultimately, he does not hold of this למעשה.)

Rav Moshe Mordechai Shulzinger says that according to the Steipler, one would wonder what the *din* is regarding a *chalal* (the son of a *Kohen* who married a divorcee) by the *shechitah* of the *parah*. The Rambam holds that a *chalal* is prohibited to look at a *nega* and decide if it's *tamei* or not, even though he could perform a regular *avodah*, but a *Kohen* with a blemish would be allowed. This is the exact opposite of what the *halachah* is by a regular *avodah*. What would be the *din* by the *parah adumah* according to those that say that a *Kohen* is needed? Could a blemished *Kohen* perform the *shechitah*?

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### ***A Biblical Prohibition Due to a Decree***

The *Gemora* states a *halachah* that one should not take out another red cow together with the *parah adumah*. This is learned from the words in the Torah “and he should take it out” and not another. The reason given is because people will say that he is slaughtering two of them, and that would render it invalid.

The Nezer Hakodesh says that this *Gemora* proves that there are mitzvos in the Torah that are given solely as an injunction for something else. The Kesef Mishna explains similarly the prohibition of not cooking meat and milk together. He says that this is because the Torah did not want us to eat them together.

Are there other cases like this?