

19 Sivan 5781  
May 30, 2021



Yoma Daf 49

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

Rav Sheishes had ruled that one may bring the blood to the Altar with his left hand. The Gemora asks on this from a *Baraisa* which rules that a non-Kohen, an *onein* (one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet), one who is intoxicated, or one with a blemish who receives the blood, brings it to the Altar, or sprinkles it disqualifies the sacrifice. One who performs the service sitting or with his left hand also disqualifies it. This is indeed a refutation (for we see that a non-Kohen who brings the blood disqualifies the sacrifice)!

The Gemora asks: How could this have happened, when Rav Sheishes himself quoted this *Baraisa*; for Rav Sheishes once said to the speaker of Rav Chisda: Ask Rav Chisda what is the *halachah* regarding a non-Kohen bringing the blood? Rav Chisda replied that it is valid and a Scriptural verse supports me: *And they slaughtered the pesach offering, and the Kohanim sprinkled the blood from their hand (from those who slaughtered it, referring to the non-Kohanim), and the Levites skinned them.* Rav Sheishes challenged him from a *Baraisa*: A non-Kohen, an *onein* (one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet), one who is intoxicated, or one with a blemish who receives the blood, brings it to the Altar, or sprinkles it disqualifies the sacrifice. One who performs the service sitting or with his left hand also disqualifies it. This is indeed a refutation (for we see that a non-Kohen who brings the blood disqualifies the sacrifice)! The Gemora answers: After he learned it (from those who refuted him), he quoted it as a refutation to Rav Chisda. The Gemora asks: But Rav Chisda quoted a Scriptural verse!? The Gemora answers: It means that the non-Kohen acted like

a post (a Kohen received the blood and gave it to the non-Kohen, who held it until another Kohen took it from him and brought it to the Altar). (48b – 49a1)

Rav Pappa inquired: If another Kohen took his hands-full (of the ketores) and placed it into the Kohen Gadol’s hands, what is the *halachah*? Is what we require that it be ‘his hands-full’ which we have here, or is it required that he both ‘take his hands-full’ and ‘bring it in,’ which was not the case here? The question is left unresolved. (49a1)

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi inquired: If he had taken his hands-full and then died, may someone else enter the Holy of Holies with the first one’s handfuls? Rabbi Chanina said: This is a question of the older generation! The Gemora asks: Shall we say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi was older? But Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi had said: Rabbi Chanina permitted me to drink the juice of a cress on the Shabbos (and it is not regarded as taking a remedy, which is forbidden on Shabbos)? [Evidently, R’ Chanina was older!]

The Gemora asks: You say ‘to drink’ (is permitted)? That is obvious, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: A man may eat any kind of food as a remedy, and drink any beverage? The Gemora answers: Rather, to grind and to drink the juice of a cress on the Shabbos. The Gemora analyzes the case: What case do you mean? If it is referring to a case of danger, surely it is allowed; and if there is no mortal danger, it surely is forbidden? The Gemora answers: In truth the case referred to is one where there is mortal danger, and this is what the question was: Does cress in

fact cure, so that one may for this purpose desecrate the Shabbos, or does it not effect a cure, so that one may not desecrate the Shabbos in connection with it? And why was it asked of Rabbi Chanina? It is because he was an expert regarding medicine, for Rabbi Chanina said: No one has ever consulted me for a case of a wound from a white mule and has recovered. The *Gemora* asks: But don't we see people who do recover from it? The *Gemora* answers: He meant that we never see that the wound has healed. The *Gemora* asks: But do we not see cases where the wound has healed? The *Gemora* answers: He was referring to a wound inflicted by a mule with tips on its feet. The *Gemora* returns to its original question: At any rate we learn from here that Rabbi Chanina was the older one!? The *Gemora* answers: Rather, this is what he said: This is a question of the older generation (referring to himself)!

The *Gemora* asks: But did Rabbi Chanina express such a view (of uncertainty in the case where the Kohen Gadol died); didn't Rabbi Chanina say: *With a bull*, i.e., but not with the blood of a bull (and if the Kohen Gadol died, the new Kohen Gadol must bring another bull; he cannot use the blood from the first one)? And furthermore, was it not Rabbi Chanina who said: If he took the hands-full of the incense before the slaughtering of the bull, he has done nothing? The *Gemora* answers: This is what Rabbi Chanina said: Since he (R' Yehoshua ben Levi) asks the question, the inference is justified that he holds 'with a bull' includes also 'with the bull's blood. Now, according to this view, his question is like the question of an older generation.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the conclusion? Rav Pappa said: If we say that he fills the handful first (before entering) and then must fill it again (after he is inside the Holy of Holies), then his fellow may enter with his chafinah, because the chafinah is still carried out (by filling his hands inside the Holy of Holies); but if we say that he fills the handfuls once, but does not fill them again, then your question arises. Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rav Pappa: On the

contrary! If we say that he performs the chafinah twice, a fellow Kohen should not enter with his chafinah, because it is impossible that the second will not fill either a bit less than the handfuls of the first or a bit more; but if we say that he performs only one chafinah, your question does arise. The *Gemora* states: For the question had been raised: Must he perform the chafinah twice, or not? The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from our Mishna, which states: and such was its measure. Now, does that not mean that just as the measure in the outside chafinah (was the required amount), so too was it in the chafinah within the Holy of Holies (proving that he must perform a second chafinah inside)? The *Gemora* rejects the proof: No, perhaps the meaning here is that if he wanted to make a measure (a utensil) he could do so, or perhaps it means that he must not fill his hands with either more or less (than the exact measure of his cupped hands).

The *Gemora* resolves it from the following Baraisa: How does he do it (when he has entered the Holy of Holies)? [He places the shovelful of coals on the ground.] He takes hold of the ladle (of incense) with his fingertips, and according to some, it is with his teeth, and pulls it (upward) with his thumb until it (the handle) reaches his elbows, then he turns it over and pours the incense into his cupped hands. He piles it on the coals, in order that its smoke may come up slowly; some say that he scatters it on the coals, in order that its smoke may come up fast; and this is the most difficult service in the Temple. The *Gemora* asks: This, and none other? Was there not the *melikah* (the manner of "slaughter" a bird in the Temple) and the *kemitzah* (the scooping of the flour)!? [It is mentioned by both of these services that they indeed are very difficult services in the Temple!]? The *Gemora* answers: The *Baraisa* meant that this was one of the most difficult services in the Temple. The *Gemora* concludes: At any rate, we see from here that he had to perform the chafinah twice. (49a1 – 49b1)



The question was raised: If the Kohen Gadol slaughtered the animal and died, may someone else enter with its blood? Do we say 'with a bull' includes even 'with the blood of the bull,' or only 'with a bull,' but not with its blood? Rabbi Chanina said: 'With a bull,' but not with its blood. Rish Lakish said: 'With a bull,' and even with its blood. Rabbi Ammi said: 'With a bull,' but not with its blood. Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha said: 'With a bull,' and even with its blood.

Rabbi Ammi raised the following objection to Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha from a Mishna: They may become partners or withdraw from the *korban* (pesach) until it was slaughtered? Now, if that view were correct (that an animal is referred to as a bull or a lamb or a kid), this should read as follows: Until he throws the blood. The Gemora answers: There it is different, because it is written: *miheyos misseh*, i.e., as long as the lamb or the kid is alive.

Mar Zutra raised the following objection: [The verse says that one can redeem a first born donkey with a sheep.] The *Mishna* lists animals which are not included in the category of sheep for this purpose: A calf; a beast; a slaughtered sheep; a *terifah* – animal with anatomical defect; *Kila'im* – cross breed of a ram and sheep; *Koy*, which may be an animal or a beast. [Evidently a slaughter sheep is not regarded as a "sheep."] The Gemora answers: There it is different, because the meaning of "sheep" is inferred from 'sheep' mentioned in connection with the *korban pesach*. The Gemora asks: Then just as that must be male, without blemish, and one year old, this too ought to be male, without blemish, and one year old? The Gemora answers: To prevent such interpretation, the Torah states: You shall redeem . . . you shall redeem, to include both. The Gemora asks: If the repetition of 'you shall redeem' means to include, then all ought to be

included? The Gemora answers: What value would the word 'sheep' have in that case?! (49b1 – 49b2)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Taking Vitamins On Shabbos*

The *Mishna* states that a person may eat any foods for healing. The reason for this is because it is referred to as food and not medicine. An example of this is *yoezer* that is eaten in conjunction with seven white dates and is effective for one who has worms of the liver, which comes from eating raw meat, etc. Although this food also has medicinal value, one is still permitted to eat the food on *Shabbos*.

The question arises regarding taking vitamins on *Shabbos*. A vitamin in of itself is considered food, as a vitamin is to strengthen one's body. Nonetheless, vitamins are not considered food for the ill, as many healthy people take vitamins on a daily basis, such as Vitamin C and the like. Certainly one who is ill and takes vitamins for medicinal purposes on *Shabbos* has to be concerned that he is violating the *Shabbos*. It requires thought with regard to one who is healthy and takes vitamins on *Shabbos*.

The Mishnah Berurah<sup>1</sup> writes that one who normally eats something to strengthen his physique is forbidden to consume that substance on *Shabbos*, even if he is perfectly healthy. It would thus appear that one would be forbidden to take vitamins on *Shabbos*, as vitamins are to strengthen a person's body, and the Pri Megadim and Magen Avraham rule that this is forbidden even for one who is healthy.

Shmiras Shabbos Kihilchoso writes that there are those who are lenient if they are in an area where the custom is to take vitamins in conjunction with very meal.

<sup>1</sup> O. C. 328:20



Rav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l is quoted there as ruling that one is forbidden to take vitamins to strengthen his body. There are vitamins that serve as substitutes for food, like the vitamins that are taken by astronauts and those who travel in the desert. In lieu of food, they take pills that are vitamins and substitute for food. One would be permitted to take such pills on *Shabbos* as they are considered food and not medicinal.

### **Drunk Kohen**

The Gemora quotes a Baraisa that a drunkard is unfit to do the avodah in the Temple. Tosfos discusses the various opinions as to which beverages will one who consumes them be liable for death, and to which will there be only a transgression. He also discusses when the service is valid, and when it is not.

The Rambam in Hilchos Tefillah rules that a kohen who drinks wine is not allowed to perform the Priestly Blessing. The Lechem Mishnah asks that the Rambam rules like Rabbi Yehuda that for drinking wine and performing the service, he will be liable for death, and for other beverages that cause one to become intoxicated, there is a mere transgression. If so, by Hilchos Tefillah, he should mention that a kohen will not be allowed to perform the Priestly Blessing if he drinks other beverages as well?

My cousin, HaRav Sholom Shapiro answers this question by learning a different explanation in the Rambam in Bi'as HaMikdash. He does not rule in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, for if so the service should be invalidated, and the Rambam explicitly states that it is valid. (I do not know how the Lechem Mishnah would explain this.) The rationale of the Rambam is based on a Mishna in Bechoros that states that one who is drunk is not allowed to do the service, because it is considered a blemish, and a blemish which is only applicable to a person and not an animal, does not invalidate the korban. This explains why by the Priestly Blessing, the Rambam mentions only wine, for

that is derived from the Scriptural verse; however, a Kohen who drinks other beverages and is rendered a blemished Kohen, he would still be permitted to perform the Priestly Blessing.

DAILY MASHAL

### **Floating or Circling?**

The classical pshat in the kohanim receiving an atonement only *מקוביא* is that it is floating or hovering over the korban and not an actual *כפרה*. Rabbeinu Chananel learns it in a different way. He states that *מקוביא* is derived from the word *הקפה* - circle or surround. Therefore he learns that the kohanim are only considered partners from the time of *וידוי* - confession, when they all gather around to hear it. It comes out that after the *וידוי*, the kohen gadol would certainly not be allowed to make a *תמורה* from it, because by then everyone would be considered the *בעלים*.