

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Washing the Kohen Gadol's hands and feet (cont.)

The Gemara explains why, according to Rabanan, there are ten sanctifications.

A Baraisa identifies one of the pesukim of the Yom Kippur section as being out of order.

The reason, R' Chisda explains, is that there is a tradition that there should be five immersions and ten sanctifications. If the pesukim were followed in order there would be three immersions and six sanctifications.

A long araisa is cited that records different sources for the five immersions, the five different services performed by the Kohen Gadol, and the source for the ten sanctifications.

The Gemara elaborates on the positions held by R' Yehudah and Rebbi.

The source for the ten sanctifications is explained.

R' Chisda asserts that Rebbi differs from Rabanan and R' Meir as far as the timing for the sanctifications because in Rebbi's opinion the sanctifications take place while the Kohen Gadol is undressed.

R' Acha bar Yaakov presents a different understanding of Rebbi's opinion.

### 2) Making an incision קרצו

Ulla translates the word קרצו to mean "incision."

R' Nachman bar Yitzchak offers a verse that supports this translation.

Ulla, R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish state that the Kohen Gadol slaughtered a majority of the two pipes (i.e., trachea and esophagus) himself.

As a side note to Reish Lakish's explanation, the Gemara clarifies that the shechitah is completely valid, even Rabbinically, after the incision made by the Kohen Gadol and the reason the second kohen completes the incision is to allow the blood of the offering to flow freely. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Which part of the Yom Kippur avodah does not follow the order presented in the Torah?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the source for ten sanctifications?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What are the five services performed by the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. How large was the cut that the Kohen Gadol made on the neck of the animal?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Finishing the shechita begun by the Kohen Gadol

מאי קרצו—אמר עולא לישנא דקטלא הוא וכו'

Several of the commentators refer to the fact that the Mishnah uses the term קרצו rather than the more familiar term שחיטה.

The Mechaber (Y.D. #266) discusses milah on Shabbos, and he rules that the mohel must perform all the aspects of the milah (מילה, פריעה, מציצה) himself. No one else would be permitted to do any of these individual acts on Shabbos, because violating Shabbos for only part of the milah does not push off Shabbos. Rema, however, questions this, for we find that many kohanim participated in the service of the Beis HaMikdash on Shabbos. On the one hand, each service in the Beis HaMikdash was a separate mitzvah, thus each kohen was allowed to function, because his work on Shabbos was not doing half of a job, but a full service. The problem is, however, from our Gemara, where the Kohen Gadol cut enough of the neck to be an adequate shechitah, and the second kohen finished the job. On the one hand, we see, therefore, that even part of a mitzvah is also allowed on Shabbos. Yet the role of this second kohen is puzzling, because his cutting the part of the neck which is not essential should, in fact, not be allowed. This is parallel to a mohel who cut the milah minimally, but he did not cut some pieces of skin which are not essential for the mitzvah (ציצין שאין מעכבין). The halachah is that although if it would be on a weekday, these should be cut, on Shabbos the mohel can only cut them during the initial procedure, but not as a secondary follow-up. Why, then, can the second kohen finish the shechitah, if it was already done adequately by the Kohen Gadol?

One answer is that unlike milah, which is completed at this point, the tamid is still in progress, as there are many procedures remaining. This is why the cutting by the second kohen is allowed.

Minchas Chinuch (מלאכת שוחט) holds that after the initial cut, the second kohen is only cutting meat from a dead animal, and this did not constitute a melachah. The expression קרצו indicates this aspect. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Completing the shechitah process

הביאו לו את התמיד קרצו [שהכה"ג שוחט את רוב השני סימנים ועי"ז שוב כשר אפילו מדרבנן, ומ"מ] מירק אחר שחיטה על ידו וכו', למה לי למרק מצוה למרק

*They brought him [the Kohen Gadol] the Tamid and he made an incision [i.e., the Kohen Gadol performed a minimum shechitah of the trachea and esophagus thus qualifying as a valid shechitah but nonetheless] another Kohen completed the slaughter for him ... because a there is a mitzvah to complete the slaughter [to allow the blood to flow out freely.]*

Rishonim<sup>1</sup> disagree whether the Rabbinic obligation for another Kohen to complete the slaughter of the animal is unique to Yom Kippur or perhaps it applies to all offerings. One could argue that it applies only on Yom Kippur when Hashem is seen as a King and there is a unique obligation to accord greater honor to the King (ברב עם הדרת מלך). On the other hand, one could propose that the mitzvah applies to all offerings because it is helpful for extracting the blood of the korban. A difference<sup>2</sup> between these two approaches is whether it is permitted for a second kohen to complete the slaughtering of an animal in the Beis HaMikdash on Shabbos. If the Rabbinic edict applies only on Yom Kippur it would be pro-

hibited for a second kohen to complete a slaughter that already meets the minimum requirement of a valid shechitah.

The above discussion relates specifically to sacred service. When it comes to general slaughtering, Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup> states that ideally, לכתחילה, one should sever the entire width of the trachea and esophagus, regardless of whether it is a mammal or a bird. If, however, one severed a majority of the trachea and esophagus and stopped, and the animal is slow to die<sup>4</sup>, one should not finish the shechitah but rather he should hit the animal on its head. The reason one should not finish the shechitah is the concern that pausing in the middle of shechitah renders the animal a tereifah. ■

1. תוס' חולין כ"ט ב' ד"ה למה, כתבו שכמו שבחולין מצוה לשחוט את כל הב' סימנים כך בקדשים. [וע"ש בדף כ"א ע"ב בתוד"ה ואינו, שבחולין כ"ה אפילו בעופות, וא"כ כשבדף כ"ט ב' הנ"ל תוס' כתבו שקדשים כחולין, ר"ל שבין בבהמה ובין בעופות דקדשים, מצוה בכל הב' סימנים] ועי' ב"י או"ח סימן תרכ"א. ובפמ"ג שם בא"א ס"ק ד' כתב שכ"ה גם לטעם רש"י (גם בחולין שם וגם כאן בתחילת העמוד הבא) שהמצוה למרק הוא להוציא דמו וזה הרי שייך בכל הקרבנות. [וע"ע רש"י שם כ"א ב' ד"ה שדומים, ושם בדף קכ"ג ב' בד"ה עולת וברשב"א שם בדף כ"ט ט' בד"ה ורבי אלעזר] והפמ"ג הנ"ל דייק שלרמב"ם [בפסולי המוקדשין פ"ה ה"ח] בקדשים אפילו לכתחילה א"צ אלא רוב. ושכ"ה לפי הפירוש [שרש"י בחולין שם דחה] שהמצוה למרק הוא דרוב עם הדרת מלך, שטעם זה רק ביה"כ שהוא מידת מלך. עכ"ד
2. פמ"ג שם
3. שו"ע יר"ד סימן כ"א ס"א. ולרש"י חולין כ"ז א' הוא מחשש שמא יטעה ולא ישחוט רובו (ויש עוד דעות בזה) ומ"מ לפי"ז י"ל שבמקדש, שמבקום זריזין לא גזרו בכך
4. כן דעת הרמ"א שם סימן כ"ג ס"ה. והכף החיים [שם ס"ק מ"ה ובשם המנח"י] כתב שכ"ה גם לספרדים ודלא כשו"ע שם שכתב להחמיר כן רק לכתחילה ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Loving rebuke

תמיד של שחר בבגדי זהב, עבודת היום בבגדי לבן

On today's daf we see that the Kohen Gadol changed his garments in accordance with the demands of the avodah. Rav Hirsch, zt"l, explains that the golden garments, their splendor and rich color, represent the realization of the potential moral perfection that is inherent within every Jew. They contrast with the white garments that are worn for the lofty service of Yom HaKippurim, the service of deep introspection and admission of our faults. Their whiteness is like

a blank canvas that shows up how far we have to grow until we actualize our true potential, until we can wear our "golden garments." How can we wear these "white garments" in our own avodah? By being open to learning what our shortcomings are. All those who attained Torah greatness and true piety had a deep love of hearing the truth of their failings. They loved to be chastened and to be guided to the right path.

Rav Yeruchem Levovitz, zt"l, returned to Slabodka to visit with his first Rebbi, Rav Nosson Tzvi Finkel, zt"l, only to be reprimanded by the Alter about his approach with his students, with which he disagreed. Rav Yechezkel Sarna, zt"l, was a young student at the time, and was witness to part of this sharp dressing-down, one that lasted many hours. Although Rav Yeruchem listened patiently

and did not even try to defend himself, Rav Yechezkel was sure that after being upbraided so forcefully, the distinguished visitor would leave Slabodka at the earliest opportunity.

Much to his surprise, Rav Yeruchem appeared before the Alter the following day, and again sat through hours of lecturing, but this time the criticism was even sharper! The only observable difference was that Rav Yeruchem asked the Alter questions to elicit further clarification. Once again, Rav Yechezkel was sure that Rav Yeruchem would depart on the next train, but was again surprised to see him the following day. This went on for a full week—Rav Yeruchem was literally moseir nefesh to hear his own shortcomings! ■

