



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Yoma, Daf מל – Daf נד

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf מל--48-----

- A Mishna says, if the blood of an animal falls to the floor without ever having been in a keili, it is passul. If it was caught in a keili and then spilled onto the floor, it is valid. A Braisa explains that we learn this by darshening the pasuk of “v'lakach m'dam hapar” as if it says “v'lakach dam m'hapar” – the blood must be caught in a keili.
 - **Q:** Based on the above, **R' Pappa** asked, if the ketores falls out of the Kohen Gadol's cupped hands, is that like blood that falls to the floor from the animal's neck, or is it like blood that falls from a keili? **A:** **TEIKU**.
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, if the Kohen Gadol has intent to offer the ketores after its proper time, does that create a situation of piggul? **A:** **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, a Mishna says that **R' Akiva** says the ketores is subject to invalidity for being even partially touched by a t'vul yom. Presumably, this would also include ketores in the invalidity of being left overnight. Presumably this would extend further and invalidate ketores if there was intention to offer it after the time it is supposed to be offered.
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, what if this intention happened during the shoveling of the coals, which is only a preparatory act for the ketores? Is it invalidated through that as well? **A:** **TEIKU**.
 - **Q:** It was asked of **R' Sheishes**, if the Avodah of holacha (carrying the blood to the Mizbe'ach) is done while carrying the blood in the left hand, is that valid? **A:** He answered, our Mishna says that the spoon of ketores is carried in the left hand. We see that holacha in the left hand is valid.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he answer from the Mishna which says that certain limbs of the Tamid are carried to the Mizbe'ach in the left hand!? **A:** We would think that is allowed because carrying and burning of the limbs are not essential for kapparah. However, carrying of the blood may only be done in the right hand. That is why he answered from the Mishna of ketores, whose carrying and burning is also essential to the kapparah.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that holacha done in the left hand is passul!? **A:** **TEYUFTA**.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Sheishes** himself was aware of this Braisa, because he used it to ask a question to **R' Chisda**!? **A:** At the time of his statement above, he was not yet aware of it.

-----Daf נד--49-----

- **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, if a Kohen (other than the Kohen Gadol) originally took the cupped handfuls of ketores, and the Kohen Gadol then brought the ketores into the Kodosh Hakodashim, is that valid, or must it be the same Kohen who originally takes the handfuls? **A:** **TEIKU**.
- **Q:** **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** asked, what is the halacha if a Kohen Gadol did the chafina and then died? May his replacement use that chafina, or must another one be done?
 - **R' Chanina** was excited to hear that a question that he himself posed was already posed by earlier Chachomim (i.e. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**).
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** asked **R' Chanina** whether he was allowed to drink “shachlayim” on Shabbos for medicinal purposes (**R' Chanina** was a medical expert and was asked whether the shachlayim was effective for medicinal purposes). This shows that **R' Chanina** must have been older than **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**!? **A:** **R' Chanina** was originally excited that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** had asked the same question as himself (**R' Chanina**), who was from the “earlier Chachomim”.
 - **Q:** How could **R' Chanina** have asked this as a question? We find that he holds that if a Kohen Gadol were to die after the shechita of the ox, the replacement could not use the blood of that ox, but would have to shecht a new ox. We find that he further holds, that the chafina must be

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

done after the shechita of the ox. Based on these statements, a replacement Kohen Gadol may never use the chafina of any previous Kohen Gadol!? **A: R' Chanina** meant to say, based on the fact that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** asked whether the replacement Kohen Gadol may use the earlier Kohen Gadol's chafina, it must be that he darshens the pasuk to allow a later Kohen Gadol to use the blood of an ox shechted by an earlier Kohen Gadol. That way of darshening is how the "earlier Chachomim" (who argue on **R' Chanina**) darshen.

- With regard to answering **R' Yehoshua ben Levi's** question, **R' Pappa** said, if the Kohen Gadol must fill his hands with the ketores when measuring it out originally, and then must pour the ketores from the spoon back into his hands in the Kodesh Kakodashim (which is a question dealt with later on in the Gemara), then he can surely use the chafina of the earlier Kohen Gadol, because he is anyway making a chafina on his own later on in the Kodesh Hakodashim. If he does not need to put the ketores from the spoon back into his hands, then there is the question whether he can use the chafina of the earlier Kohen Gadol.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, it should be just the opposite!? If he needs to empty the spoon into his hands, he should surely not be allowed to use the earlier Kohen's chafina, because the amount of the earlier chafina will not exactly fill this new Kohen Gadol's hands. However, if he need not refill his hands from the spoon, then we can consider whether the original chafina will suffice!?
 - Regarding the question of whether he must empty the spoon of ketores into his hands, we may be able to answer that from our Mishna which said "kach huysa midasah", which suggests that he must refill his hands with the ketores.
 - It may be that the Mishna means to say that the Kohen may use a measure for the chafina measurement, or that the measure must be exactly that of his handfuls.
 - A Braisa describes the process of the ketores in the Kodesh Hakodashim and clearly says that the ketores is emptied from the spoon back into the cupped hands of the Kohen Gadol. **SHEMA MINA** that this must be done.
- **Q:** If a Kohen Gadol shechts the ox and then dies, may his replacement use the blood of that ox for the Avodah or must he shecht a new ox? Do we say that the word "b'par" in the pasuk means to include even the blood of the ox (of the previous Kohen Gadol), or does it only refer to a complete ox? **A: R' Chanina** said that the blood of the previous Kohen may not be used. **Reish Lakish** said that it may be used. **R' Ami** said that it may not be used, and **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** said that it may be used.
 - **Q: R' Ami** asked, if "b'par" even refers to an animal that is already shechted, why must the group to be included with a particular Korbon Pesach be determined before the shechita of the sheep? Even after its shechita, it should still be considered a "sheep" and joining a group at that time should still be allowed!? **A:** The pasuk by Korbon Pesach says "m'hiyos miseh", which teaches that the sheep must still be alive at the time of joining the group.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra** asked, a Mishna says that redeeming a first born donkey must be done with a live sheep, not one that has already been shechted. We see that a shechted sheep is not called a sheep (and the same should hold true with a shechted ox being called a "par")!? **A:** We learn from a gezeirah shava from Korbon Pesach that the sheep must be alive.
 - **Q:** If there is such a gezeirah shava, the other halachos of Korbon Pesach should apply as well (it should need to be a male, in its first year, without a mum)!? **A:** The pasuk says "tifdeh" twice, to teach that these other limitations do not apply.
 - **Q: R' Yitzchak Nafcha** asked, the pasuk says "v'hotzi es kol hapar", which refers to the shechted ox, and we see that it is referred to as a "par"! **A:** The pasuk means that the entire dead animal should be removed.
 - **Q:** The pasuk, referring to the shechted animals says "v'es par hachatas v'es se'ir hachatas"! **A: R' Pappa** said, all agree that the bulk of even a dead animal is called an animal ("par"). The machlokes is only whether the *blood* of an animal is referred to as an animal as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk says “b'zos yavo Aharon ehl Hakodesh, b'par”. This pasuk refers to the blood and clearly calls it “par”.
 - The other shita will explain this to mean that Aharon prepares himself to walk into the Kodesh Hakodashim with a par for a chatas (the pasuk is not referring only to the blood).

-----Daf 50-----

- **Q:** How can we say that the replacement Kohen Gadol should bring the chatas of the Kohen Gadol who died? The halacha is that a chatas whose owner has died must itself be left to die!? **A: Ravin bar R' Ada** said, this chatas is considered to be the chatas of the tzibbur, which is not left to die. We find that this is the shita of the **T”K** in a Mishna. In that Mishna, **R' Meir** says to the **T”K** (who said that only a korbon tzibbur overrides Shabbos and tumah, but a korbon yachid does not), “The par of Yom Kippur is a korbon yachid, and yet it overrides Shabbos and tumah”. We see that the **T”K** must hold that it is considered to be a korbon tzibbur.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Braisa which is a continuation of the conversation in that Mishna, says that **R' Yaakov** said to the **T”K**, we find that the “par helam davar” of the tzibbur does not override Shabbos or tumah! Does that mean that the **T”K** holds that this korbon is a korbon yachid? That can't be! The same holds true for the conversation between **R' Meir** and the **T”K**. Rather, what they are saying is that the **T”K**'s general rule as to when a korbon overrides Shabbos and tumah is incorrect. The correct general rule should be, that if a korbon has a fixed time in which it must be brought, then it overrides Shabbos and tumah, even if that korbon is a korbon yachid. If a korbon does not have to be brought at a fixed time, it does not override Shabbos and tumah, even if it is a korbon tzibbur.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that the par and goat of Yom Kippur are each considered to be a korbon tzibbur. How could **Rava** say that it is not? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the par helam davar which is clearly of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says “of Yom Kippur”!? **A:** That is referring to the goat, not the par.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the par of Yom Kippur is lost and replaced, if the original one is found, **R' Yehuda** says it is left to die and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say it is left to get a mum and then sold, because the chatas of the tzibbur is not left to die!? **A:** The Mishna should be read as saying that it is not left to die because it is considered to be a chatas of *partners*.
 - **Q: R' Elazar** once asked, according to the shita that the par of Yom Kippur is a korbon yachid, is it subject to temurah or not? We see that there is a shita who says that the par is considered to be a korbon tzibbur, not like **Rava**!? **A: Rava** would say, from that question we can only see that there is a shita which says that it is considered to be the korbon of partners, not necessarily the korbon of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** Why did **R' Elazar** question whether the Yom Kippur par is subject to temurah? Was he unsure whether, for temurah purposes, we follow the person who was makdish the animal (in this case, the Kohen Gadol, who is an individual and therefore could have his animal subject to temurah), or the persons receiving a kapparrah through the animal (in this case, all the Kohanim, which would make this a korbon belonging to partners, and therefore not subject to temurah)? That can't be, because we have learned that **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** clearly says that we follow those receiving the kapparrah!? **A:** His question was whether the kapparrah of the other Kohanim is considered to be part of the main kapparrah offered by the korbon (in which case they are considered partners in it), or whether their kapparrah is a “by-product” of the kapparrah for the Kohen Gadol (in which case the korbon is considered to be his alone, and therefore subject to temurah).
 - We can try and answer **R' Elazar's** question from a Braisa. The Braisa says that an animal that was initially made kodesh as a korbon is more stringent than an animal made kodesh through temurah, in that it applies to korbon yachid and tzibbur, it overrides Shabbos and tumah, and can create temurah. On the other hand, a korbon that is made kodesh through temurah is more stringent than a korbon that is made kodesh initially in that it takes effect even on an animal that has a permanent mum (which will then be redeemed, but may never be sheared, or worked with). Now, which korbon that became initially kodesh is the Braisa referring to (the Gemara

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

now assumes that the Braisa is referring to a specific example). It can't be a korbon yachid, because then it would not override Shabbos or tumah. It can't be a korbon tzibbur, because then temurah would not apply. It therefore must be referring to the par of Yom Kippur, which overrides Shabbos and tumah because it must be brought at a fixed time, and may create temurah because it is considered to be a korbon yachid. This can answer **R' Elazar's** question!

- **R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa may be referring to the ram brought by Aharon, which is not brought on behalf of the other Kohanim, and is truly a korbon yachid. In fact, the Braisa cannot be referring to the par, because as a chatas, the temurah would be the temurah of a chatas, regarding which the halacha is that it must be left to die!
 - It may be that the Braisa is referring to the par. True, the temurah of the par would have to be left to die, but the Braisa is referring to the category of temurah, not the temurah for this particular korbon.
 - **Q:** Based on this answer, maybe when the Braisa refers to a korbon that became kodesh initially it also does not refer to a specific example, but rather the category as a whole!? **A:** It clearly does not refer to this category as a whole, because within this category there are korbanos on which initial kedusha takes effect even with a permanent mum, namely a bechor and animal ma'aser. Therefore, the Braisa that says initial kedusha does take effect on animals with a permanent mum cannot be referring to the category as a whole.
 - **Q:** Why does **R' Sheishes** suggest that the Braisa refers to the ram of Aharon? Why not suggest that the Braisa refers to a Korbon Pesach, which overrides Shabbos and tumah, and can create temurah because it is truly a korbon yachid!? **A:** He holds that a Pesach may not be brought for one individual (it must be brought for a group and will therefore not be subject to temurah).
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he suggest that it refers to Pesach Sheini, which may be brought for an individual!? **A:** Pesach Sheini does not override tumah.

-----Daf נ]--51-----

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, why does the Mishna mentioned previously, consider the Pesach to be a korbon yachid, but considers the Chagigah to be a korbon tzibbur? It can't be because the Chagigah is brought by many people at the same time, because the Pesach has that characteristic as well!? **A:** The Mishna's mention of Pesach includes Pesach Sheini, which is not brought by many people at the same time, and therefore is not considered to be a korbon tzibbur.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that "Pesach" overrides Shabbos and tumah. If, as was just said, "Pesach" includes Pesach Sheini, it should override tumah as well, and we find that it does not!? **A:** The Mishna follows the shita of **R' Yehuda**, who holds that Pesach Sheini actually does override tumah.
- **Q: R' Elazar** should consider the par of the Kohen Gadol to be a korbon yachid based on the fact that the Torah says 3 times regarding the par, "asher lo" – it must be his and his alone!? **A:** Although he has to pay for the animal, the other Kohanim clearly have some share in the animal, because they receive a kappara from this korbon. Therefore, it is possible that they have a share for temurah purposes as well, and make the animal to be considered the animal of partners.

MISHNA

- When walking with the ketores to the Kodesh Hakodashim, the Kohen Gadol would walk through the Heichal until he reached the 2 curtains (which were an amah apart) that separated the Heichal from the Kodesh Hakodashim. **R' Yose** says, based on a pasuk, that there was only one curtain.

GEMARA

- The **Rabanan** say, the pasuk of **R' Yose** refers to the Mishkan. During the first Beis Hamikdash there was a wall, which was an amah thick, between the Heichal and the Kodesh Hakodashim. For the second Beis Hamikdash,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

which didn't have this wall, the **Rabanan** were unsure whether the amah of thickness where the wall should have gone was to be part of the Heichal or of the Kodesh Hakodashim. Therefore, they made 2 curtains, with that amah of space in between.

- A Braisa says: **R' Yehuda** says, the Kohen Gadol would walk through the Heichal to the south of the Mizbe'ach, would then walk between the Shulchan and the Menorah, and would then walk to the southern wall of the Beis Hamikdash, where he would enter to the area between the curtains. **R' Meir** says, he walked to the north of the Mizbe'ach, and then between the Shulchan and the Menorah, and then back to the north wall. **Others say**, he would walk the entire way along the northern wall of the Beis Hamikdash.
 - **Q:** Who is the "Others"? **A: R' Chisda** said, it is the shita of **R' Yose**, who says that the entrance to the Kodesh Hakodashim was on the north side.
 - **R' Yehuda** held as he did, because he held that the entrance was on the south side.
 - **Q:** Who does **R' Meir** hold like? If he holds the entrance was on the south, he should say that the path of the Kohen Gadol was as **R' Yehuda** says!? If he holds like **R' Yose**, he should say it was as the **Others** say!? **A:** He holds like **R' Yose**, but he says that the ten Shulchanos that Shlomo made were lined up from north to south in the Beis Hamikdash (from the northern wall), thus not allowing passage along the northern wall. **A2:** He may even hold that the Shulchanos were lined up east to west, but he held it is not proper respect to walk directly to the entrance of the Kodesh Hakodashim, and therefore a roundabout path was taken.
 - **R' Yose** held that taking a direct path showed how beloved the Yidden were by Hashem, that their messenger did not have to take a roundabout path, and was allowed to enter directly.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, why doesn't he walk the entire way along the southern wall? **A:** The southern wall was black from the smoke of the Menorah, and would have made the Kohen Gadol's clothing black if he would walk along it.

-----Daf 52-----

- **R' Nosson** said, the **Chachomim** were unsure whether the amah wide area where the wall once stood belonged to the Heichal or the Kodesh Hakodashim.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, is this uncertainty based on the fact that when the pasuk gives the measurements for the Beis Hamikdash, we are not sure in which measurements this amah belonged (whether in the 40 amos of the Heichal or the 20 amos of the Kodesh Hakodashim)? The measurements of the psukim are likely only of the open spaces, not of the walls. Therefore, the amah-wide space of the wall actually belonged to neither the Heichal nor the Kodesh Hakodashim!? In fact, a Mishna delineates the measurements of the Beis Hamikdash and counts that amah-wide space as not being part of the 40 amos of the Heichal or the 20 amos of the Kodesh Hakodashim!? **A:** The **Chachomim** were unsure whether that amah-wide space is to get the *kedusha status* of the Heichal or that of the Kodesh Hakodashim.
 - **R' Yochanan** said that **Yosef Ish Hutzal** had the same uncertainty, based on the grammatical makeup of the psukim (whether the area of the wall had the kedusha of the Heichal or of the Kodesh Hakodashim).
 - **Q:** How can we say that **Yosef Ish Hutzal** had uncertainty as to the meaning of the pasuk? We find a Braisa in which **Isi ben Yehuda** (who is the same person as **Yosef Ish Hutzal**) says, that there are 5 pesukim in the Torah whose grammatical makeup make their interpretation unclear (none of the 5 being the pasuk dealing with the dividing line between the Heichal and the Kodesh Hakodashim)!? **A:** He only had 5 such pesukim in the Torah, but had others in the Nevi'im (where the pasuk regarding the dividing line is found).
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Chisda** had another pasuk in the Torah whose interpretation was uncertain based on its grammatical makeup!? **A: Isi ben Yehuda** did not have uncertainty regarding that pasuk.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The outer curtain was pulled back to create an opening on the south side. The inner curtain was pulled back to create an opening on the north side. He walked between the curtains from south to north. When he entered the Kodesh Hakodashim, he would turn to the south and walk along the curtain until he reached opposite the Aron. At that point, he would place the shovel of coals between the poles of the Aron and would pile the ketores on top of the coals, causing the entire room to fill with smoke. He would then walk out backward, following the same path as when he entered. He would say a short tefilla in the Heichal, making sure not to make it long, so as not to worry the Yidden.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna can't be discussing the first Beis Hamikdash, because it had a wall that separated the Heichal from the Kodesh Hakodashim, not a curtain!? Our Mishna can't be discussing the second Beis Hamikdash, because there was no Aron at that time (it was hidden by Yoshiyahu, at the end of the first Beis Hamikdash)!? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing the second Beis Hamikdash, and the Mishna means, when the Kohen Gadol reached the *place* of the Aron (but not the actual Aron).
 - **Q:** The Mishna says he put the shovel "between the poles of the Aron"!? **A:** It means he put it in the place that used to be between the poles of the Aron.

TZAVAR ES HAKETORES AHL GABEI GECHALIM

- The Mishna follows the view that the ketores was piled onto the coals (rather than spread out evenly over the coals, which is the subject of a machlokes).
- **Q:** One Braisa says that he began placing the ketores on the coals closer to the Aron and made his way to the coals further from the Aron. Another Braisa says that the opposite was done!? **A: Abaye** says, it is a machlokes Tanna'im as to the proper procedure.
 - **Abaye** said, the view that he begins with the coals closer to the Aron (which are further from him) seems to be correct, because we find that the ketores brought every day would be placed on the Mizbe'ach beginning further away from the Kohen, so as to prevent him from getting burned. The same would seem to hold true for this ketores Avodah as well.

-----Daf 53-----

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says, "v'nasan es haketores ahl ha'eish lifnei Hashem". This teaches that the ketores must be placed on the coals inside the Kodesh Hakodashim. This is in opposition to the Tzedukim who would say that the ketores must be put on the coals before entering the Kodesh Hakodashim, based on the pasuk of "ki be'anan eira'eh ahl hakapores". The **Rabanan** explained, that pasuk teaches that the "maleh ashan" grass must be used in the ketores as well. The Braisa continues and asks, how do we know that maleh ashan grass should be used? We learn it from the pasuk of "v'chisa anan haketores es hakapores". This teaches, if maleh ashan wasn't used, or if any of the other ingredients weren't used, he is chayuv misah.
 - **Q:** He should be chayuv misah for walking into the Kodesh Hakodashim for no purpose, so why is there a separate death penalty for bringing the ketores inside with missing ingredients? **A: R' Sheishes** said, it is needed for a time when he enters the Kodesh Hakodashim b'shogeig, in which case he would not be chayuv misah for that, but would be chayuv misah for bringing the deficient ketores. **A2: R' Ashi** said, it is needed for a case where he purposefully walked in, and offered 2 portions of ketores, one complete portion and the other missing some ingredients. He would not be chayuv for walking in, because he offered ketores. He would be chayuv for offering the deficient portion.
 - **Q:** The Braisa brings 2 pesukim to teach that maleh ashan must be used!? **A: R' Yosef** said, the second pasuk teaches that not only may the leaf of the maleh ashan plant be used, rather even the root of the plant may be used as well.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa seems to say that the root is what was more typically used (**R' Yosef's** explanation seemed to suggest that the leaf was more commonly used)!? **A: Abaye** said, the first pasuk actually teaches that the root is used. The second pasuk teaches that the leaf may be used as well. **A2: R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa means to say that the second pasuk teaches that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the maleh ashan must be used not only on Yom Kippur in the Mishkan of the Midbar, but rather it must be used in the Mishkan Shiloh and in the Beis Hamikdash as well.

- **Q:** We learn that all the Avodah of Yom Kippur remains the same in all these places from the pasuk of “v’chein yaseh l’ohel moed hashochein itam”!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that the first pasuk teaches that maleh ashan must be used on Yom Kippur. The second pasuk teaches that it must be used during the rest of the year as well. **A2: R’ Ashi** said, one pasuk teaches that it should be used, and the second teaches that if it is not used, the Avodah is passul even b’dieved. **A3: Rava** said, one pasuk acts as the warning against offering the ketores without it, and the other pasuk teaches the punishment for doing so.
 - A Braisa says, **R’ Eliezer** says, the pasuk of “v’lo yamus” teaches the penalty for not including maleh ashan, and the pasuk of “ki b’anan eira’eh” is the warning. A simple reading of the psukim would suggest that both these psukim were said before the death of Aharon’s sons, the pasuk therefore says “acharei mos shnei bnei Aharon”. We would think they were both said after their deaths, the pasuk therefore says “ki b’anan eira’eh ahl hakapores”. It must be that the warning was said before their deaths and the penalty was said after their deaths.
 - **Q:** If the penalty wasn’t said until after their death, why were they punished? **A: R’ Eliezer** said in a Braisa, they were punished for deciding a halacha in the presence of their rebbi (Moshe Rabbeinu).

YATZA U’VA LO DERECH K’NISASO

- **Q:** From where do we learn that he should walk out backwards? **A: R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R’ Yonason** said, we learn from the psukim that Shlomo walked backwards when leaving the Bamah at Givon, as a sign of respect. Even a talmid leaving his rebbi should walk away backwards as well. We find that **R’ Elazar** did this when taking leave of **R’ Yochanan**, and **Rava** did this when taking leave of **R’ Yosef**.
- **R’ Alexandri in the name of R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, (for this reason) one must take 3 steps back after completing shemonah esrei, and then says shalom to others. **R’ Mordechai** said, after taking 3 steps backs, he should stay there for a bit before stepping forward again, as a sign of respect.
 - A Braisa says, if one does not take 3 steps back, he would have been better not to have davened at all. In the name of **Shmaya** it was said, after the 3 steps he should say shalom to the right, then to the left. **Rava** understood this to mean, that the order is to the “right and left” of Hashem (who he is then facing), which would mean to the person’s left and then right.

UMISPALÉL TEFILLA KETZARA BABAYIS HACHITZON

- In the name of **Rav** it was explained, in this tefilla, he would ask Hashem, that if the coming year was to be a hot one, there should be sufficient rain to offset the effects of the heat. In the name of **R’ Yehuda** it was added, he would ask that the leadership should stay with Shevet Yehuda, that the Yidden should not have to rely even on each other for parnassah, and that the tefillos of travelers who don’t want it to rain, should not be accepted by Hashem.
 - **R’ Chanina ben Dosa** was once travelling and asked Hashem to have the rain stop, and the rain stopped. When he reached his house, he asked Hashem that the rain should start again, and it did. **R’ Yosef** said, the tefilla of the Kohen Gadol was no match for the tefilla of **R’ Chanina ben Dosa**.
- A Kohen Gadol once davened a longer tefilla before emerging from the Heichal, to the point that the Kohanim went in to see if he was alright. He said to them, are you not happy that I davened a longer tefilla for you!? They answered, it is still not proper, because the Yidden remain outside, nervously wondering whether all went ok.

MISHNA

- After the time when the Aron was taken away, there was a stone in its place, from the times of the early Nevi’im. The stone was called the “Ehven Shesiya”. It was 3 fingers high off the ground, and the ketores would be placed on it.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Kohen Gadol would then take the blood of the par which was being stirred, would return to the same place in the Kodesh Hakodashim as he stood before and would sprinkle from the blood towards the Aron, once above and 7 times below. He did not intend to sprinkle above or below, but would do so like a “matzlif”. He would count as he sprinkled, “One” (the one sprinkle above), “one and one” (as he sprinkled the first sprinkle below), “one and two”, etc., until “one and seven”. He would then exit and put the blood on the golden stand in the Heichal.
- He would then shecht the Chatas goat, and would return inside with its blood, following the same procedure as above. He would then exit and place the bowl of blood on the second golden stand in the Heichal. **R’ Yehuda** says there was only one stand, so at this point he would take the par’s blood from it and replace it with the goat’s blood.
- He would then sprinkle the par’s blood on the paroches, from the Heichal’s side, using the same procedure as the sprinkling inside the Kodesh Hakodashim. He then did the same with the goat’s blood. He would then pour the par’s blood into the goat’s blood, and pour the mixture back into the empty keili.

-----Daf 71-----54-----

GEMARA

- The Mishna says that the Aron was “taken away”, not that it was hidden. This follows the shitos of **R’ Eliezer and R’ Shimon ben Yochai** in a Braisa, who say (based on pesukim) that the Aron was taken into Bavel when the Yidden were sent there to galus. **R’ Yehuda** argues in the Braisa, and says, based on the pasuk that the Aron was in the Kodesh Hakodashim “vayihyu sham ahd hayom hazeh”, the Aron was hidden someplace in or beneath the Kodesh Hakodashim.
 - The Braisa argues on **Ulla**, who says that **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** held that the Aron was hidden in its place, based on the pasuk and drasha of **R’ Yehuda** in the Braisa.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, how can we say that when the pasuk says “ahd hayom hazeh” it means forever? We find pesukim that say “ahd hayom hazeh” and clearly cannot mean forever!? **A: Ulla** answered, the pasuk regarding the Aron also says the word “sham”, which is why it can mean forever.
 - **Q:** We find a pasuk that says “sham” and “ahd hayom hazeh” which clearly does not mean forever!? **A: TEYUFTA.**
 - **R’ Nachman** said that the Aron was hidden under the Chamber of Wood.
 - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, we see this from a story in a Mishna in Shekalim. The Mishna says, a Kohen once noticed that a stone on the floor of the Chamber of Wood was different than the rest. He went to tell his friend (that that must be the place the Aron was hidden). Before he had a chance to say anything, he died. People then realized that that must be the place where the Aron was hidden.
 - A Braisa says, the hammer of a Kohen slipped from his hand and actually hit that different stone, and a fire came out and burned him.
- **R’ Yehuda** posed a contradiction. The pasuk suggests that the poles of the Aron were seen in the Heichal, but the pasuk then says that they were not seen in the Heichal. He answers, the poles pushed into the paroches, so that their form was seen sticking out, but the actual poles were not visible in the Heichal.
 - **R’ Katina** said, when the Yidden would be oleh regel, the Kohanim would roll up the paroches to show them that the keruvim were hugging each other, symbolizing the great love between Hashem and the Yidden.
 - **Q: R’ Chisda** asked, we have learned that the Levi’im were not even allowed to look at the Aron when preparing it for travel. How can it be that the paroches was rolled up for all to see? **A: R’ Nachman** said, this is comparable to a bride. While still living in her father’s house (compared to when the Yidden were still in the Midbar) she is shy in front of her groom. Once she moves in with her husband (compared to when the Yidden were in Eretz Yisrael), she becomes more comfortable.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Chana bar R' Katina** asked, the story with the Kohen who was killed for trying to uncover the Aron happened well after the Yidden were in Eretz Yisrael!? **A:** After the first Churban, the Yidden returned to the status of the bride who is still shy in front of her groom.
- **Q:** If this happened during the first Beis Hamikdash, there was a wall, no paroches!? If this happened during the second Beis Hamikdash, there was no Aron!? **A:** Even during the first Beis Hamikdash, the entrances were covered with curtains. **A2: R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, the keruvim referred to are not the ones of the Aron, they are other keruvim that were drawn or etched onto the walls of the Kodsh Hakodashim.
 - **Reish Lakish** said, when the goyim found these hugging keruvim, they took them out to the street and said, look what the Yidden are busy with (they thought it depicted the love of a man and woman, not realizing it was symbolizing the love of Hashem for the Yidden). They then destroyed them.

U'SHESIYA HUYSIA NIKREIS

- A Braisa says, it was given this name because it was the foundation of the world.
- Our Mishna follows the shita of the **Chachomim** in a Braisa, who say that Creation of the world began in Tzion.