

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Me'ilah (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its unsuccessful challenge against R' Yochanan's drosha.

The reason is given why three drashos are necessary to teach that blood is excluded from the prohibition against me'ilah.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that the order of the Yom Kippur service must be followed. A dispute is recorded what should be done if the blood spills in the middle of one of the applications. Tanna Kamma maintains that one must start that application from the beginning whereas according to R' Elazar and R' Shimon one resumes exactly where he left off.

### 3) Performing the service out of order

A Baraisa teaches the dispute between R' Yehudah and R' Nechemyah concerning performance of the Yom Kippur service out of order. According to R' Yehudah only the service performed in the Kodosh Kodoshim out of order is disqualified. R' Nechemyah maintains that all service performed while wearing the white garments are disqualified if performed out of order.

R' Yochanan explains how both opinions derive their position from the same verse.

This explanation is successfully challenged and R' Yochanan is forced to partially change his explanation.

R' Yochanan's explanation of R' Nechemyah is successfully challenged from another statement R' Yochanan made to explain R' Nechemyah's opinion.

### 4) Scooping the ketores before slaughtering the bull

R' Chanina ruled that if the Kohen Gadol scooped the ketores before he slaughtered the bull he must scoop the ketores again.

The Gemara explains how this ruling could be consistent even with R' Yehudah's opinion.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why are three pesukim needed to teach that blood is not subject to the prohibition against me'ilah?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. From what place does the Kohen Gadol resume the service if some of the blood spills out?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. According to R' Yehudah, which steps do not become disqualified if performed out of order?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. Why could R' Yehudah agree that a second scooping of ketores is required if performed out of order?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### The worn out garments of the Kohanim

והניחם שם מלמד שטעונים גניזה

The Mishnah in Sukkah (51a) teaches that worn out garments of the kohanim were shredded and made into large wicks for the torches which lit up the courtyard. Minchas Chinuch (מצוה צ"ט ט') discusses exactly which of the garments of the regular kohen would be used for this purpose. Rambam (הל' כלי המקדש פ"ח ה"ה) rules that the used and worn clothing of the Kohen Gadol from year-round use and the garments of the Kohen Gadol from Yom Kippur could not be used for any other purpose. These garments had to be buried (גניזה).

Mishnah l'Melech cites a Yerushalmi which reports that the used clothes of the Kohen Gadol were used to make wicks for the Menorah, inside the Sanctuary, and the worn clothes of the regular kohanim were used to make wicks for the torches which illuminated the outer courtyard. Nevertheless, Rambam is of the opinion that the used clothes of the Kohen Gadol were not to be used for any purpose, and they had to be buried.

Minchas Chinuch points out that Rambam would not rule against a Yerushalmi, and it must be that Rambam found a Baraisa upon which he based his ruling. ספר קרית ספר suggests that Rambam understood that although our Gemara only states that the special, four linen garments which the Kohen Gadol wore on Yom Kippur had to be buried, this law also applies to linen garments which the Kohen Gadol wore all year long.

The גר"ז suggests that Rambam considers the garments of the Kohen Gadol which become worn out in the same category as any consecrated utensil (כלי שרת) which becomes worn out or ruined. The general halachah is (Zevachim 88a) that such utensils are to be buried.

Aruch HaShulchan learns that the requirement to bury the worn out year-round clothes of the Kohen Gadol is not a Torah law. The verse only prescribes this treatment of the Yom Kippur clothes he wears. Nevertheless, Rambam learned that there is a Rabbinic requirement to discard them in this respectful manner. This is just another way of distinguishing the role of the Kohen Gadol. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The correct order for replacement tefilos

תנן אם עד שלא גמר מתנות שבפנים נשפך הדם יביא דם אחר ויחזור ויזה בתחילה מבפנים ואם איתא יחזור ויחפון מבעי ליה? בקטורת לא קא מיירי

*The Mishnah taught: If the blood spilled before the Kohen Gadol completes the blood applications he must bring other blood and start the applications from the beginning. If, however, [R' Chanina is correct,] he should have to retake the incense, is what it should say? The Mishnah is not discussing the ketores.*

A person who missed davening Shabbos Minchah should make up the missing tefilah by reciting the Maariv amidah twice<sup>1</sup>. If he then forgot to include havdalah in either Shemone Esrei, this would not obligate him to repeat Shmone Esrei.<sup>2</sup> However, if he ate before he recited havdalah this triggers an obligation to repeat Shemone Esrei.<sup>3</sup> When he reads Shemone Esrei does he have to recite the make-up amidah (תשלומין) as well or not? On the one hand one could say that the make-up tefilah should be repeated because once the obligatory tefilah is disqualified it emerges that the make-up tefilah precedes the obligatory tefilah which is not allowed<sup>4</sup>. On the other hand, one could argue that it is unnecessary to repeat the make-up tefilah because at the time it was recited correctly and had he not eaten before reciting havdalah there

would not be an obligation to repeat Shemone Esrei.

R' Yechezkel Kochli<sup>5</sup> suggests that this issue could be resolved from our Gemara. Our Gemara rules that if the Kohen Gadol followed the correct order of taking the incense while the blood of the bull was extant and then the blood spilled, necessitating the slaughter of a second bull, the incense must be taken again<sup>6</sup>. The reason is that although at the time the incense was taken it was done according to the correct procedure, nonetheless, based on the present circumstance it turns out that the ketores was taken out of order. Similarly, even though when initially recited the make-up tefilah was recited correctly, nonetheless, at this point it would emerge that it is preceding the obligatory tefilah, and therefore it must be repeated. Rav Kochli adds that to be cautious one should stipulate that if, in fact, he is not obligated to repeat the make-up tefilah it should count as a voluntary tefilah (תפילת נדבה). The Mishnah Berurah<sup>7</sup>, however, writes that it is not necessary to repeat the make-up tefilah since it was originally recited correctly. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' רצ"ד סע' א'
2. שו"ע או"ח סי' ק"ח סע' א'
3. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' י"ח ודע די"א דבעל שו"ת תורה לשמה אינה הרב יחזקאל כחלי אלא דנכתב ע"י הרב יוסף חיים מבאגדאד בעל הבן איש חי
4. כל שה הוא לפי פרש"י שם אולם נראה דהרבמ"ם בפ"ה מהל' יו"כ ה"ח פירש באופן אחר, ע' כס"מ שם
5. מ"ב סי' ק"ח ס"ק ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The invalid Avodah

כל מעשה יוה"כ תאמור על הסדר אם הקדים מעשה לחבירו לא עשה כלום... רבי נחמיה אומר בד"א בדברים הנעשים בבגדי לבן בין מבפנים בין מבחוץ

While Rabbi Yehudah says that the avodah done out of order is only disqualified if it pertains to the Kodesh Kodoshim and the Kohen Gadol is wearing the white garments, Rabbi Nechemiah disagrees. He holds that any part of the avodah done out of order is disqualified provided that the Kohen Gadol was wearing the white garments. The Ramak, ז"ל, explains that each of the four white linen garments represents a letter of the שם הוי"ה. Each of those letters represents a different middah that needs to be cor-

rected, as we find in the in the Sha'arei Kedushah. In order to rectify these deeply entrenched characteristics from within the Jewish people, the Kohen Gadol needed to be completely focused on his task. If he was too preoccupied to maintain the proper order, the avodah could not have been performed as completely as required. It was for this reason that the avodah done out of order (in the bigdei lavan in particular) was invalid according to Rabbi Nechemiah. Rabbi Yehudah's opinion regarding the Kodesh Kodoshim is another way of expressing the same idea—if the Kohen Gadol lost sight of

his task even in the holiest place, he could not have effected the proper rectifications. On Yom Kippur itself, how careful we all must be not to allow our character flaws to put our avodah completely "out of order!"

Once, on Yom Kippur in Slutsk dur-

ing the time of the Beis HaLevi, ז"ל, a certain wealthy man suddenly felt faint. He began to get hysterical and insisted that he must have water immediately. It seemed to be a case of פיקוח נפש where we permit that which is normally forbidden even when we are in doubt. To clarify the matter, members of the community immediately approached the Beis HaLevi for a halachic decision.

The Beis HaLevi, ז"ל, replied, "Of course, he is allowed to drink because of the possibility of it being פיקוח נפש. But, just to make certain that this man really understands the severity of his act, he will have to pay a very large sum of money for each sip that he drinks."

When the wealthy man heard this, he felt "miraculously" restored. "I'm sure I can wait until the end of the fast!" he said. ■