

28 Sivan 5781
June 8, 2021



Yoma Daf 58

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 *Mishna* had stated: He placed the full vessel into the empty one.

Rami bar Chama inquired of Rav Chisda: If he (a Kohen) placed one (receiving) bowl into another and received the blood (in this manner), what is the law? Is a matter of the same kind considered an interposition or not?

He answered: You have learned that already in our *Mishna*, which stated: He placed the full vessel into the empty one. Does this mean that (after mixing the blood of the bull with the blood of the he-goat) he placed the full bowl into the empty one (proving that matters of the same kind are not regarded as an interposition)?

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: No, it means that he poured the full vessel into the empty one.

The *Gemora* asks: But the first part (of the *Mishna*) already states: He poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the he-goat?

The *Gemora* answers: It (the pouring into another bowl) is repeated in order to mix it very well indeed.

The *Gemora* attempts another proof: It was taught in a *Mishna*: If he (a Kohen) stood upon any vessel, or upon the foot of his fellow (while performing a service), it is invalid (proving that matters of the same kind, such as his fellow’s foot, are regarded as an interposition)!

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: It is different with his fellow’s foot, because his fellow does not abandon it (to him, and therefore it still imposes an interposition; by bowls, however, one can be consigned to the other for the time of the service, and therefore, they would not be regarded as an interposition).

There were those who related the inquiry as follows: Is such (one bowl inside of another) the proper manner of ministrations or not?

The *Gemora* proves that this is indeed valid from a *braisa* taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: *And they shall take all the service vessels that they used for service in the holy place.* It would seem that there are two vessels, but one service. (58a1 – 58a2)

Rami bar Chama inquired of Rav Chisda: If he deposited palm bast in the bowl and he received the blood with it, what is the law? Is a different kind of matter considered an interposition, or not? Is it not considered an interposition, since it is porous, or is there no difference?

He replied to him: We have learned in a *Mishna*: He (when there is a sponge in the vessel in which the purification water is being prepared) empties out the water until the sponge is reached. [Evidently, the

sponge itself, due to it being porous, is not regarded as an interposition.]

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: It is different with water, because it is very thin (unlike blood, which does not flow freely through the bast).

There were those who said that the inquiry was resolved as follows: In the case of the blood (which is a liquid) it is valid (for it can pass through the holes of the bast), but in the case of the fistful (where the flour is a solid) it is invalid. (58a2 – 58a3)

MISHNAH: *And he shall go out to the Altar that is before Hashem.* That is the Golden Altar (in the *Heichal*). Then he begins to daub (the blood) downward (on the corners of the Altar). From where does he commence? It is from the northeast corner (of the Altar), then the northwest, then the southwest, and then the southeast. At the place where he commences applying (the blood of an ordinary chatas during the year) on the Outer Altar, there he completes (the Yom Kippur applications) on the inner Altar.

Rabbi Eliezer said: He remained in his place and daubed. And he would daub on every corner from bottom to top (in an upwards motion), with the exception of the corner at which he was standing, which he would daub from top to bottom.

Then he sprinkled upon the “purity” (top) of the Altar seven times, and he poured out the remainder of the blood at the western base of the Outer Altar. And for the remainder of the blood (from other sacrifices) sprinkled on the Outer Altar, he poured out at the southern base. Both mingled in the canal and flowed into the Kidron Valley, and they were sold to gardeners

as fertilizer, and by using them one transgresses the law of me’ilah. (58b1)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *And he shall go out to the Altar.* What does that mean to teach? Rabbi Nechemiah said: Since we find that, in connection with the bull offered up for any of the commandments (the Kohen Gadol’s chatas), the Kohen stands outside the Altar (between the incense Altar and the entrance to the *Heichal*) and sprinkles towards the Curtain, one might have assumed that here (when he sprinkled the mingled-blood of the bull and the he-goat) the same would take place; therefore the Torah said: *And he shall go out to the Altar*; therefore, he must have been found on the inner side of the Altar (between the Altar and the Curtain). (58b1 – 58b2)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *Before Hashem.* What does that mean to teach? Rabbi Nechemiah said: Since we find with the sprinkling of the bull and he-goat of Yom Kippur that the Kohen Gadol stands on the inner side of the Altar and sprinkles towards the Curtain, one might have assumed here (by the Kohen Gadol’s bull) the same would be the case; therefore the Torah writes: *The Altar where incense is burned before Hashem, which is in the Tent of Meeting.* That implies: the Altar before Hashem, but not the Kohen before Hashem. How is that? He stands outside the Altar and sprinkles. (58b2)

The *Mishna* had stated: Then he begins to daub (the blood) downward (on the corners of the Altar).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Then he begins to daub (the blood) downward (on the corners of the Altar). From where does he commence? It is from the southeast corner (of the Altar), then the southwest, then the northwest, and then the northeast; these are the words

of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yosi HaGelili said: He commences from the northeast corner (of the Altar), then the northwest, then the southwest, and then the southeast. At the place where, according to Rabbi Yosi HaGelili, he commenced, there according to Rabbi Akiva, he stopped. And at the place where Rabbi Akiva would have him start, there R Rabbi Yosi HaGelili would have him stop.

The *Gemora* notes: At any rate, all agree that he does not start at the point he first comes to (since he is coming from the west, he will encounter one of the western corners first). What is the reason? Shmuel said: The Torah said: *And he shall go out to the Altar*, i.e., only after he has passed the whole Altar. (58b2 – 58b3)

The *Gemora* asks: But according to Rabbi Akiva, he ought to circle to the right (during the applications; why is he moving towards his left)? Shall we say then that they are disagreeing regarding a teaching of Rami bar Yechezkel? For Rami bar Yechezkel said: The pool which Shlomo made (*placed in the Courtyard, to be used as a mikvah for the Kohanim*) stood upon twelve oxen, three turned toward the north, and three turned toward the west, and three turned toward the south, and three turned toward the east. This teaches us that every turning which you make (*while performing a service in the Temple*) must be rightward and to the east. Will you say that one Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) agrees with Rami bar Yechezkel, whereas the other Master (R' Akiva) disagrees?

The *Gemora* answers: No, all agree with the view of Rami bar Yechezkel, and the matter of dispute here is as follows: One Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) holds that the regulations inside (the Sanctuary) are derived from those outside (in the Courtyard), whereas the other

Master (R' Akiva) maintains that we do not derive the regulations of inside from those outside.

The *Gemora* asks: But according to Rabbi Akiva, granted that he does not derive inside from outside, let him be permitted to do it one way - if he so chooses, or the other way - if he so chooses?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Akiva will tell you: In truth, he ought to start at the corner to which he had encountered first, for Rish Lakish has said: One must not pass over the occasion for performing a mitzvah; and the reason why he does not do so is because of that which the Torah said: *And he shall go out to the Altar*, i.e., only after he has passed the whole Altar. Therefore, as soon as he has applied the blood on this corner (i.e., the southeast corner), he ought to return to the corner with which he should have started from in the beginning (and to accomplish this, he must turn towards the left).

Alternatively, you can say: If we hold that the applications on the Inner Altar was done by walking around, they all would agree that we derive inside from outside, but the dispute here rests on this: One Master (R' Akiva) holds that the applications were done by circular movements of the hand (and it is not similar to the walking of the outside; therefore the inside is not derived from the outside); whereas the other Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) maintains that the application was done by walking around.

Alternatively, you can say that all agree that the applications on the inner Altar was done by circular movements of the hand, and the point of dispute here is as follows: One Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) maintains that we may derive the regulations of hand movement from those governing the foot, whereas the other



Master (R' Akiva) holds that we do not derive the hand from the foot.

The Gemora asks: But does Rabbi Yosi HaGelili hold that the applications was done by circular movement of the hand? Surely, since the second part of the *Mishna* states: Rabbi Eliezer said: He remained in his place and daubed; it follows that the first Tanna did not hold so?

Rather, it is clear, as we have answered before: One Master (R' Akiva) holds that the applications were done by circular movements of the hand (and it is not similar to the walking of the outside; therefore the inside is not derived from the outside); whereas the other Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) maintains that the application was done by walking around.

Alternatively, you can say that all agree that the dispute is as follows: One Master (R' Yosi HaGelili) maintains that the phrase 'around' mentioned in connection with the Inner Altar signifies the same as 'around' mentioned in connection with the Outer Altar (and he circles by walking), whereas the other Master (R' Akiva) holds that the whole of the Inner Altar occupied as much space as one corner of the Outer Altar (and he can therefore stand in the same place during all the applications). (58b3 – 59a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Which First?

In Shulchan Aruch, it is stated clearly that if one picks up his *tefillin shel rosh* first, he must put them down and don the *shel yad* first.

The Magen Avrohom explains that even though there is a rule that we do not pass over a *mitzvah*, there is

a *possuk* in the Torah that says the *tefillin shel yad* should be worn first.

The Ohr Hayoshor brings a proof to this reasoning from our Gemora. In truth, the kohen should place the blood on the corner of the mizbeach that he reaches first, however the verse teaches us that he should pass by the mizbeach completely and then sprinkle the blood. It is evident from here that a derivation from a verse takes precedence over the rule of passing over a mitzvah.

DAILY MASHAL

Kiddush

The Gemora has an inquiry regarding a kohen who put one basin inside another in order to receive the blood; is this considered a proper manner of performing the *avodah* or not. The Gemora concludes that it is.

In Sheorim Metzuyanim b'Halachah, he wants to teach a novel law according to this. The *halachah* is that one is obligated to hold the cup while reciting *kiddush*. If one holds the tray which is holding the cup, that would be sufficient, based on the conclusion of our Gemora. The Gemora in Chagiga compares the table of a person to the Beis Hamikdash, so it should follow that the *halachos* are similar.