

HALAKHA

**אי שישב בחתיית גחלים מהו? מכשירי מצוה – במצוה דמו, או לא? תיקו.**  
If he thought during the raking of the coals – **הישוב בחתיית גחלים**: If the priest had inappropriate thoughts while raking the coals for the incense, the rite is disqualified, as actions facilitating an offering are considered like the offering itself (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:27 and *Kesef Mishne* and *Lehem Mishne* there).

**הרגל של ימין בשמאל** – The right leg in his left hand – When the parts of the daily offering are carried to the ramp, the right leg is carried in the priest's left hand, with the place of the slaughter facing the priest (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:11).

NOTES

**Carrying the blood** – **הולכה**: There are four rites that must be performed by priests after the slaughtering of an offering, an act that can be done by anyone: Receiving the blood of the animal, carrying the blood in a bowl to the altar, sprinkling the blood on the altar, and burning the animal's fats and sacrificial parts on the altar. Carrying the blood differs in certain aspects from the other three tasks. For example, as Rashi states, the other three rites are commanded explicitly in the Torah, which states that they must be done by priests, whereas the act of carrying is not mentioned clearly in the text as a distinct rite. Furthermore, the *tanna'im* point out that whereas the other three acts are indispensable to the sequence of the service, carrying the blood may be omitted, as the animal can be slaughtered next to the altar and the blood sprinkled immediately after its collection in a bowl, without it being carried at all. For this reason, some authorities state that not all of the *halakhot* of the four rites apply to carrying.

**We learned it** – **תניתיה**: This phrase, which Rav Sheshet uses often, has a precise meaning: The question that you pose is answered by a well-known mishna and can be resolved by analyzing that mishna.

**אי שישב בחתיית גחלים מהו? מכשירי מצוה – במצוה דמו, או לא? תיקו.**

**בעי מיניה מרב ששת: הולכה בשמאל מהו? אמר להו רב ששת, תניתיה: נטל את המחנה בימיו ואת הכף בשמאלו.**

**ונשטו להו מהא דתנן: הרגל של ימין בשמאל, ובית עזרה לחוץ!**

**אי מהתם, הוה אמינא: הני מילי – הולכה דלא מעבבא כפרה, אבל הולכה דמעבבא כפרה – לא, קמשמע לן.**

What is the *halakha* if he thought invalidating thoughts during the raking of the coals?<sup>h</sup> Does this thought invalidate the incense? The Gemara elaborates: The question here is whether actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are considered like the mitzva itself. If so, merely raking the coals, which facilitates the mitzva of the incense, is like burning the incense itself; therefore, an improper thought would disqualify the incense. Or perhaps actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are not considered part of the mitzva itself. No answer was found for this question either, and the Gemara once again concludes: **Let it stand unresolved.**

**S** The Sages raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the *halakha* with regard to carrying the blood<sup>n</sup> in one's left hand? Is this action valid, or is carrying, like receiving and sprinkling the blood, an act that must be performed with the right hand? Rav Sheshet said to them: We already learned it;<sup>n</sup> there is an answer to this question from the mishna: He took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand. This proves that although the spoon is carried in the left hand to the place of the service, the rite is valid.

The Gemara asks: **And let us resolve this dilemma for them from that which we learned** in a mishna: The priest who is privileged to carry the head and the leg of the daily offering to the ramp carried the right leg in his left hand,<sup>h</sup> with its entire hide facing outward and the place of the slaughter on the neck facing the priest. This mishna also proves that carrying with the left hand is acceptable.

The Gemara rejects this contention: **If the proof is from there, I would have said: That applies only to a type of carrying that does not invalidate atonement**, as even if the limbs are not carried up to the altar, atonement is nevertheless achieved through the sprinkling of the blood. The rite is valid even if the limbs of the daily offering are not burned at all. **However, with regard to the type of carrying that does invalidate atonement**, e.g., carrying the blood to the altar, no, perhaps it must be done specifically with the right hand. Rav Sheshet therefore teaches us from the mishna that although carrying the spoon is necessary for the mitzva, the rite is nevertheless valid if it is carried in the left hand.

HALAKHA

**Those who are unfit to serve** – **הפסולים בעבודה**: A non-priest, a mourner on the first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest are all unfit for the rites of receiving the blood, carrying the blood, and sprinkling it. Likewise, these rites are invalidated if performed by a priest while sitting or with his left hand (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 9:15).

**מיתבי: זר, ואונן שיבור, ובעל מום, בקבלה ובהולכה ובזריקה – פסול. וכן יושב, וכן שמאל – פסול! תיבתא.**

**והא רב ששת הוא דאזתבה, דאמר ליה רב ששת לאמוריה דרב חסדא: בעי מיניה מרב חסדא: הולכה בזר מהו? – אמר ליה: כשירה, ומקרא מסייעני: 'וישחטו הפסח וזרקו ויהינם מידם והלוים מפשיטים'.**

The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: With regard to receiving, carrying, or sprinkling blood, if a non-priest, a mourner on his first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest,<sup>h</sup> performed the rite, it is disqualified. **And likewise** if the priest was sitting, and likewise if he performed one of these rites with his left hand, it is disqualified. This statement contradicts the ruling of Rav Sheshet. The Gemara concludes: This is indeed a **conclusive refutation**, and Rav Sheshet's opinion is rejected.

The Gemara asks: **But wasn't Rav Sheshet the one who objected** on the basis of this very *baraita*? **As Rav Sheshet said to the interpreter of Rav Hisda: Raise the following dilemma before Rav Hisda: What is the halakha with regard to carrying the blood performed by a non-priest? He said to him: It is valid, and a verse supports me: "And they slaughtered the Paschal offering and the priests sprinkled with their hand, and the Levites flayed"** (11 Chronicles 35:11). This verse indicates that the priests took the blood from the hands of the Levites, from which it can be inferred that the Levites carried the blood from the place of slaughtering to the place of sprinkling.

That they acted like benches – דְּעָבִיד מַעֲשֵׂה אֵיזְטָבָא – The Levites stood in a row stretching from the place where the animal was sacrificed to the place where the blood was sprinkled, and they passed the bowls of blood from one to the other without moving (Rabbeinu Hananel). Since this transfer is not considered carrying, it was permitted for the Levites to do so on Shabbat.

וּמוֹתֵיב רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: זָר, וְאוֹנָן, שׂוֹכֵר,  
וּבֵעַל מוֹם, בְּקִבְלָהּ וּבְהוֹלְכָהּ  
וּבְיִזְמָה – פְּסוּל, וְכֵן יוֹשֵׁב וְכֵן  
שְׂמָאל פְּסוּל!

And Rav Sheshet objected based on the aforementioned *baraita*: With regard to receiving, carrying, or sprinkling blood, if a non-priest, a mourner on his first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest, performed the rite, it is disqualified. This statement proves that carrying cannot be performed by a non-priest. Since Rav Sheshet himself cited this *baraita* in his objection, he was certainly familiar with it. How, then, could he issue a ruling in contradiction to the *baraita*?

בְּתַר דְּשָׁמְעָה הָדָר אוֹתָבָה. –  
וְהָא רַב חֲסִידָא קָרָא קְאָמְרִי!  
דְּעָבִיד מַעֲשֵׂה אֵיזְטָבָא.

The Gemara explains: After Rav Sheshet heard the *baraita* that was cited against his opinion, he objected to the ruling of Rav Ḥisda from that same *baraita*. At first Rav Sheshet was unaware of the *baraita*, which is why he ruled against it, but when he learned it, he relied upon it to object to Rav Ḥisda's statement. The Gemara asks: But didn't Rav Ḥisda cite a verse in support of his opinion? How can a *baraita* contradict a verse? The Gemara answers: The verse does not mean that the Levites walked with the blood, but rather that they acted like benches<sup>N</sup> and merely stood holding the bowls of blood in their hands.

בְּעֵי רַב פָּפָא: חָפֵן חֲבִירוֹ וְנָתַן  
לְתוֹךְ חֲפֵנָיו מֵהוּ? מִלֵּא חֲפֵנָיו  
בְּעֵינָן – וְהָא אֵיכָא, אוּ דִילְמָא  
“וְלָקַח וְהֵבִיא” בְּעֵינָן – וְהָא לֵיכָא?  
חֵיקוּי.

§ The Gemara returns to the issue of appropriate methods for taking handfuls of incense. Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the *halakha* with regard to a case where another priest scooped<sup>H</sup> and placed the incense into the hands of the High Priest? The Gemara clarifies the two sides of the question: Do we require: “His full hands,” and that is fulfilled here, as in practice the High Priest has a handful of incense? Or perhaps we require that the High Priest must fulfill the mitzvot: “And he shall take...and he shall bring” (Leviticus 16:12), and that is not the case here, as the High Priest did not scoop and take the incense himself? This question was also left unanswered, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

בְּעֵי רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי: חָפֵן וְנָתַן,  
מֵהוּ שְׂיִכְנִים אַחֵר בְּחִפְיָתוֹ? אָמַר  
רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: בָּא וּרְאֵה שְׂאֵלֹת  
הָרַאשׁוֹנִים.

§ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi raised a dilemma: If the High Priest scooped and died, what is the *halakha* with regard to the possibility that another High Priest may replace him and enter with his handful? May the second priest enter the Holy of Holies with the incense that the first priest scooped, or must he start from the beginning of the process? Rabbi Ḥanina<sup>P</sup> said to his students in excitement: Come and see that Sages from a later generation were able to ask a difficult question on par with the question of the earlier generations. Even I, Rabbi Ḥanina, asked this same question, which was posed by my elder, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi.

#### HALAKHA

Another priest scooped – חָפֵן חֲבִירוֹ: Although these cases are possibly permitted, the rite should not be performed in this manner *ab initio*, as the Gemara did not provide definitive rulings in these situations. The first doubtful case is that of another priest who takes a handful of incense and places

it in the hands of the High Priest. A second situation arises if the High Priest takes the handful and dies, whereupon a second priest takes the handful of the first one into the Holy of Holies (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:28).

#### PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Ḥanina – רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: This is Rabbi Ḥanina bar Ḥama, who lived in the transitional generation between the *tanna'im* and *amora'im*. Rabbi Ḥanina was born in Babylonia, but emigrated to Eretz Yisrael at a very young age, where he studied Torah from Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. His teacher was very fond of him, saying that Rabbi Ḥanina was not a human being, but an angel. Rabbi Ḥanina also studied under Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's greatest students, in particular Rabbi Ḥiyya. At the time of his death, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi appointed Rabbi Ḥanina as head of the yeshiva, but in his humility, Rabbi Ḥanina refused to accept the position during the lifetime of his older colleague, Rabbi Afas.

Rabbi Ḥanina lived in the city of Tzippori, where he dealt in the honey trade, from which he grew wealthy. He used his money to build a large study hall. Rabbi Ḥanina is considered one of the cleverest scholars of his generation and was also renowned for his righteousness and kindness.

Rabbi Ḥanina's halakhic and aggadic statements abound both in the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, and as he enjoyed a long and healthy life, he taught many students over several generations. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi was his student and colleague, and he was also privileged to teach Rabbi Yoḥanan for many years. The *amora* Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, was possibly his son.

BACKGROUND

White mule – פְּרֻדָּה לְבָנָה: The Gemara is apparently describing a particular breed of mule that was especially wild. This type of mule, which was well-bred and fast, was domesticated by wealthy people. These mules might have been the offspring of breeding donkeys with wild asses. The reference to the legs of the mules being white suggests the option that this is a reference to the African wild ass, *Equus africanus*.



African wild ass

HALAKHA

Medicinal foods on Shabbat – מֵאֲכָלֵי רְפוּאָה בַּשַּׁבָּת: Although the Sages prohibited taking medicines on Shabbat, all foods and drinks that healthy people normally eat may be ingested, despite the fact that they are being taken for their curative properties. However, it is prohibited to take foods and drinks that healthy people do not usually eat. This *halakha* applies to people who are in pain. Some commentaries maintain that healthy people may eat those foods that are not normally eaten, although this point is subject to debate among the early commentaries (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 328:37*).

לְמִימְרָא דְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי קָשִׁישׁ? וְהָאֵמֵר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי: לִי הִתִּיר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא לְשִׁתּוֹת שִׁחְלִיִּים בַּשַּׁבָּת!

לְשִׁתּוֹת?! פְּשִׁיטָא, דְתַנּוּן: כָּל הָאוֹכְלִין אוֹכֵל אָדָם לְרְפוּאָה, וְכָל הַמְשַׁקֵּין שׁוֹתֵה!

אָלָא: לְשִׁחּוֹק וְלְשִׁתּוֹת שִׁחְלִיִּים בַּשַּׁבָּת. הֵיכִי דְמִי? אִי דְאִיכָא סְבִנְתָא – מְשָׂרָא שְׂרִי, וְאִי דְלִיכָא סְבִנְתָא – מִיסָר אָסִיר! לְעוֹלָם דְאִיכָא סְבִנְתָא, וְהֵכִי קָא מְבַעֲיָא לִיה: מִי מְסִיא – דְנִחּוֹל עֲלֵיהּוּ שַׁבְתָּא, אוּ לֹא מְסִיא, וְלֹא נִחּוֹל עֲלֵיהּוּ שַׁבְתָּא.

וּמֵאִי קָא שְׁנָא רַבִּי חֲנִינָא? – מִשּׁוּם דְבָקִי בְּרְפוּאוֹת הוּא, דְאָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מִעוֹלָם לֹא שְׁאֲלַנִּי אָדָם עַל מַכַּת פְּרֻדָּה לְבָנָה וְחִיָּה.

וְהָא קָא תְּזִינן דְחִיָּי! אִימָא: וְחִיָּית. – וְהָא קָא תְּזִינן דְמִיתִסִּי! בְּסוּמְקוֹן אִינְהוּ, וְחִיּוּרֵן רִישׁ בְּרַעֲיָהּוּ קְאָמְרִינן.

מִכָּל מְקוֹם שְׂמַע מִינָהּ דְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא קָשִׁישׁ. אָלָא הֵכִי קְאָמַר: שְׁאֲלַתְּ – בְּשִׂאֲלָהּ שֶׁל רֵאשׁוֹנִים.

The Gemara analyzes this comment: **Is that to say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi was older than Rabbi Hanina**, which is why Rabbi Hanina referred to him as an early Sage? **But didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: Rabbi Hanina permitted me to drink cress juice on Shabbat** for medicinal purposes. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's deference to Rabbi Hanina shows that Rabbi Hanina was older than him.

Since it has been raised, the Gemara addresses the issue of cress juice on Shabbat: Did Rabbi Hanina permit him to drink cress juice? It is obvious that it is permitted to drink this juice; why would it be prohibited? **As we learned in a mishna: All types of food that healthy people eat may be eaten by people even for medicinal purposes,**<sup>H</sup> and one may likewise **drink all drinks** for medicinal purposes, as the Sages did not include these in their decree against taking medicine on Shabbat.<sup>N</sup>

Rather, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's question was: **Is it permitted to grind and drink cress on Shabbat?** The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances?** If it involves a situation where there is danger to life, and this is the prescribed cure, it is certainly permitted; and if it is a case where there is no danger, it is prohibited as labor on Shabbat. The Gemara answers: **Actually,** the question concerns a case where there is a life-threatening danger, and this is the dilemma that he raised before him: **Does this drink heal, which would mean that it is appropriate to violate Shabbat for it, or does it not heal, and therefore one should not violate Shabbat for it?**

The Gemara asks: **And** if this was not a halakhic question but a medical one, **what is different** about this question that led him to ask it specifically of Rabbi Hanina? The Gemara explains: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked Rabbi Hanina because **he is an expert in medicines, as Rabbi Hanina said: No man ever consulted me about a wound inflicted by a white mule<sup>B</sup> and recovered.** This shows that people came to Rabbi Hanina for medical advice.

The Gemara expresses surprise at this claim: **But we see that people who are kicked by mules do survive.** The Gemara answers that instead it should say: **No man ever consulted me about a wound of this kind and the wound survives, i.e., the wound never heals.** The Gemara challenges this statement as well: **But we see that it does heal.** The Gemara responds: **We say that the wound will never heal only when the mules are red and the tops of their legs are white.**

The Gemara returns to its previous question. **In any event,** one can learn from this discussion that Rabbi Hanina was older<sup>N</sup> than Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. Why, then, does Rabbi Hanina refer to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi as a member of an earlier generation? **Rather,** we must explain that **this is what he said, i.e.,** that Rabbi Hanina's statement should be understood as follows: **Their question is like the question of the early ones.**<sup>N</sup> In other words, Rabbi Hanina meant that this question, posed by a member of a later generation, is as difficult as that of the early Sages.

NOTES

Medicine on Shabbat – רְפוּאָה בַּשַּׁבָּת: The Sages prohibited any act of healing on Shabbat, including eating or drinking medicine, exercising or bathing. This restriction applies only when one is suffering pain that is not life-threatening. However, one's health overrides Shabbat in any situation where his life might be in danger, and in a case of this kind, all forms of treatment are permitted. The reason why healing was prohibited was due to the fear that medicines might be ground and prepared, which would be a violation of grinding, one of the principal

categories of labor on Shabbat. Due to this concern, all forms of healing were prohibited, including those that do not involve grinding.

That Rabbi Hanina was older – דְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא קָשִׁישׁ: Why does the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked Rabbi Hanina for his medical opinion prove that he was older? While this shows that he was a medical expert, he still could have been younger than Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. The answer is that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's answer refers to a request from a Sage for halakhic

permission. The phrase: He permitted me, is not generally used for medical advice (Ritva).

Their question is like the question of the early ones – שְׁאֲלַתְּ: Some commentaries suggest that Rabbi Hanina's students asked him this question, prompting him to respond: The students' question is like that of the early Sages. This early Sage is a reference to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who was greater than the students in age and wisdom, and who had already asked that same question (Rabbeinu Hananel).

ומי אמר רבי חנינא הכי? והאמר רבי חנינא: 'בפר' – ולא בדמו של פר.

The Gemara asks: **And did Rabbi Ḥanina actually say that this question, of one High Priest using the incense scooped by another, was difficult to answer? But didn't Rabbi Ḥanina say:** "With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull" (Leviticus 16:3); this means that the High Priest must enter with the offering of a bull and not with the blood of the bull? In other words, the High Priest himself must slaughter his bull. Should a different priest slaughter the bull, receive its blood, and then die, the priest who replaces him may not enter the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bull slaughtered by his predecessor. Instead, he must bring a new bull, slaughter it, collect its blood, and take that blood inside.

ואמר רבי חנינא: קטורת שחפנה קודם שחיטת הפר – לא עשה ולא בלום!

And likewise, **Rabbi Ḥanina said:** If the priest scooped the incense before the slaughtering of the bull, he did nothing, as the handful of incense must be taken after the slaughter of the bull. If so, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina, it is impossible for a priest to enter the Sanctuary with the handful taken by his fellow priest. The reason is that if the first priest died after the handful was taken, he certainly has not yet entered with the blood he collected from the bull. Consequently, his slaughter was not effective for the substitute priest, who must repeat the entire service from the slaughter onward.

הכי קאמר: מדקא מיבעיא ליה הא – מכלל דקסבר 'בפר' – ואפילו בדמו של פר, ולמאי דסבירא ליה – שאילתו בשאילת הראשונים.

The Gemara explains that **this is what Rabbi Ḥanina said:** From the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi raised this dilemma, it can be understood by inference that he holds that the verse "with a bull" means that the High Priest may enter the Holy of Holies even with the blood of a bull. This means that the second priest does not have to go back and slaughter a second bull. **And according to that which Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi maintains, his question is like the question of the earlier generations.** Although the question does not arise according to the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina himself, according to the ruling of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, the question is indeed a difficult one.

מאי הוי עילה? אמר רב פפא: אי חופן חוזר וחופן – תבירו נכנס בחפינתו, דהא מקיימא חפינה. אי אין חופן וחוזר וחופן – תבעי לך.

The Gemara asks: **What halakhic conclusion was reached about this matter?** What in fact is the ruling in a situation where the High Priest took a handful of incense and then died? May the newly appointed High Priest use the handful that has already been scooped, or does he require a new handful? **Rav Pappa said:** The resolution of this question depends on a different problem. **If the High Priest scoops** the handful when he takes the incense from the coal pan, and **again scoops<sup>n</sup>** a handful in the Holy of Holies, this would mean that **another** priest may enter with the handful of the first High Priest, as the mitzva of scooping the handful has been fulfilled. However, **if the High Priest does not scoop and again scoop, let the dilemma be raised.**

אמר רב חונה בריה דרב יהושע לרב פפא: אדרבה, אי חופן וחוזר וחופן – לא יכנס אחר בחפינתו, אי אפשר שלא יחסר ושללא יותר. ואי אין חופן וחוזר וחופן – תבעי לך.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rav Pappa: **On the contrary, if the High Priest scoops and again scoops, another priest should not be permitted to enter with his handful, as it is impossible that the new handful will be neither less nor more than the amount of the first handful, which means the handful will not have been taken properly. But conversely, if he does not scoop and again scoop, let the dilemma be raised, as the mitzva of taking a handful has already been fulfilled by the first priest, and the second priest has merely to place the incense on the coals.**

#### NOTES

And again scoops – חוזר וחופן: The question is whether the Torah's mitzva, "and he shall take... his hands full... and bring" (Leviticus 16:12), indicates that, ideally, the High Priest must bring the incense by hand. In practice, as he cannot carry the coal pan, he necessarily must place the incense in a vessel,

yet he should try to follow the verse's instruction as closely as possible. Alternatively, perhaps this requirement is not indispensable, and if he is unable to touch the incense by hand in the Holy of Holies, he has nevertheless fulfilled his obligation (*Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosafot HaRosh*).

דַּאיִבְעֵינָא לְהוּ: חוֹפֵן חוֹזֵר וְחוֹפֵן אוּ  
 לֵא? תָּא שְׁמַע: כִּךְ הִיְתָה מִדְּתָה.  
 מֵאֵי לָאוּ: בְּשֵׁם שְׁמִדְתָּה מִבְּחוּץ –  
 כִּךְ מִדְּתָה מִבְּפָנִים!

לֵא, דִּילְמָא שְׂאֵם רְצָה לַעֲשׂוֹת  
 מִדָּה – עוֹשָׂה. אֵי נִמְנִי: שְׂלֵא יַחֲסֵר  
 וְשְׂלֵא יוֹתֵר.

תָּא שְׁמַע:

The Gemara explains the background to this problem. As a dilemma was raised before the Sages: Does the High Priest scoop a handful from the incense once and again scoop a handful a second time in the Holy of Holies, or does he not scoop a second time? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from the mishna: This was the measure of the spoon. What, is it not correct to infer from the mishna that just as its measure is on the outside, so is its measure on the inside, i.e., there is no need to scoop another handful, as this is its fixed measure that he pours onto the coal pan.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, that is not necessarily the correct interpretation of the mishna. Perhaps it means that if he wants to measure a precise amount for his handful, he may measure with a utensil for this purpose. Alternatively, it could mean that he may take neither less nor more than the measure he initially took. Consequently, there is no proof from the mishna with regard to whether the High Priest must scoop a second handful.

The Gemara further suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from a baraita:

Perek V

Daf 49 Amud b

NOTES

How should he act – כיצד הוא עושה: According to most commentaries, after the High Priest placed the coal pan between the staves of the Ark poles or on the foundation rock, he held the spoon between his two hands. Using his thumbs, he slowly inched it toward him until he was able to turn it over into his hands. Conversely, the Rambam, presumably on the basis of a variant text of the Gemara, states that the High Priest used his thumbs to slowly empty the contents of the spoon into his hands.

If he slaughtered and died – שחט ומת: Since the second priest is the agent of the first High Priest, or the agent of the entire Jewish people, it is possible that he is allowed to continue to perform the action of the first priest (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

HALAKHA

The procedure for burning the incense in the Holy of Holies – דרך ההקטרה בקדש הקדשים: The High Priest holds the edge of the incense spoon with his fingertips or with his teeth and pours the incense into his hands a second time. Next, he heaps the incense onto the coals in the coal pan, as stated in the baraita cited here (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:1).

With a bull and even with its blood – בפר ואפילו בדמו: If the High Priest dies after he slaughtered the sin-offering bull on Yom Kippur, the priest who replaces him takes the blood of that bull into the Holy of Holies. The Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of Rav Ashi, as he is a later Sage (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:13).

כִּיצַד הוּא עוֹשֶׂה? אַחֲזֵה אֶת הַבִּזְוִי  
 בְּרֵאשׁ אֶצְבְּעוֹתָיו, וְיֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים:  
 בְּשֵׁינוֹ, וּמַעֲלָה בְּגוֹדְלוֹ, עַד שְׁמַנְגַעַת  
 לְבִין אֶצְלֵי יָדָיו. וְחוֹזֵר וּמְחַזְרֶיהָ  
 לְתוֹךְ חִפְנָיו, וְצוֹבְרָהּ, בְּדֵי שִׂיחָה  
 עֲשֻׂנָה שׁוֹהָה לְבוֹא. וְיֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים:  
 מְפֹרָה, בְּדֵי שִׂיחָה עֲשֻׂנָה מִמְהֵרָת  
 לְבוֹא.

וְזוֹ הִיא עֲבוּדָה קְשָׁה שְׁבִמְקַדְשׁ. זֶה  
 הִיא וְתוֹ לֵא? וְהָאֵיכָא מְלִיקָה,  
 וְהָאֵיכָא קְמִיצָה! אֵלָּא: זֶה הִיא  
 עֲבוּדָה קְשָׁה מִעֲבוּדוֹת קִשּׁוֹת  
 שְׁבִמְקַדְשׁ. שְׁמַע מִיְנָה: חוֹפֵן וְחוֹזֵר  
 וְחוֹפֵן, שְׁמַע מִיְנָה.

אִיִּבְעֵינָא לְהוּ: שְׁחַט וּמַת, מַה הוּא  
 שִׁיכֵס אַחֵר בְּדָמוֹ? מִי אִמְרִינן:  
 “בְּפֵר” – וְאִפְּלוּ בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל פֵר, אוּ  
 דִּילְמָא: “בְּפֵר” – וְלֵא בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל פֵר?

רַבִּי חֲנִינָא אוֹמֵר: בְּפֵר וְלֵא בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל  
 פֵר, וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: בְּפֵר וְאִפְּלוּ  
 בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל פֵר. רַבִּי אֲמִי אָמַר: בְּפֵר  
 וְלֵא בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל פֵר, רַבִּי יִצְחָק אָמַר:  
 בְּפֵר וְאִפְּלוּ בְּדָמוֹ שְׂל פֵר.

How should the High Priest act<sup>n</sup> in the Holy of Holies, when he needs to place the incense on the coals by taking a handful from the spoon and placing it in his hands? After he places the coal pan on the ground, he holds the front of the ladle, i.e., the spoon of incense, with his fingertips, and some say he holds it with his teeth. At this stage the handle of the spoon rests between his arms. And he pushes it and raises it up slowly with his thumb toward his body until it reaches between his elbows, which he then uses to turn it over. He then returns the incense into his palms, after which he pours it from his hands into the coal pan.<sup>h</sup> And he heaps the incense into a pile on the coals so that its smoke rises slowly. And some say he does the opposite, that he scatters it so that its smoke rises quickly.

And this taking of a handful of incense is the most difficult sacrificial rite in the Temple. The Gemara asks: This one is the hardest rite, and no other? But there is pinching, which is also considered extremely difficult; and there is taking a handful of a meal-offering, another complex rite. Rather, this taking of a handful of incense is one of the most difficult rites in the Temple, rather than the single most difficult one. In any event, you can learn from this that the High Priest scoops a handful and again scoops. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is so.

§ A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If a High Priest slaughtered the bull and died,<sup>n</sup> what is the halakha with regard to whether another High Priest may enter the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bull that his predecessor slaughtered? Do we say that the verse: “With this Aaron shall come into the sacred place, with a bull” (Leviticus 16:3) teaches that the priest must enter with the blood of a bull, but it need not necessarily be the blood of the bull he himself slaughtered, and in that case he may enter even with the blood<sup>h</sup> of a bull slaughtered by someone else? Or perhaps the verse should be interpreted precisely: “With a bull,” and not with the blood of a bull slaughtered by another?

The Sages disputed this matter. Rabbi Hanina says: “With a bull,” and not with the blood of a bull, which means that the newly appointed High Priest must slaughter another bull, as he can enter only with the blood of a bull he himself slaughtered. And Reish Lakish said: “With a bull,” and even with the blood of a bull. Likewise, Rabbi Ami said: “With a bull” and not with the blood of a bull; Rabbi Yitzhak said: “With a bull,” and even with the blood of a bull.

They may register and withdraw – נִמְנָנִים וּמוֹשְׁבֵינֵי יְדֵיהֶם: Until the Paschal offering is slaughtered, individuals are permitted to join groups or to withdraw from them and join others. Once the animal has been slaughtered, one may not withdraw from his group (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 2:14).

Redeeming a firstborn donkey – פְּדוּיֹן פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר: One may not redeem a firstborn donkey with a calf, an undomesticated animal, a slaughtered lamb, a *tereifa*, a crossbreed, or with a *koy*, but only with a lamb or a goat that is alive and unblemished (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Bekhorot* 12:8).

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ רַבִּי אָמִי לְרַבִּי יִצְחָק נִפְחָא: נִמְנָנִים וּמוֹשְׁבֵינֵי יְדֵיהֶן מִמְּנוּ עַד שֶׁיִּשְׁחַט, וְאִם אֵיתָא – עַד שֶׁיִּזְרוֹק מִיַּבַּעֵי לֵיהּ! –

Rabbi Ami raised an objection to Rabbi Yitzhak Nappaḥa, the smith: To join a group of people who arranged to partake together of a single Paschal offering, individuals may register as part of a group and they may withdraw<sup>HN</sup> from it and join another group until the offering is slaughtered. And if it is so, that the blood of an animal is considered part of the offering, this *tanna* who authored this statement should have said that they may withdraw until the blood is sprinkled. If, as you maintain, the blood of an offering is part of the offering itself, why can't a person register to or withdraw from a group of a Paschal offering until its blood is sprinkled?

שָׁנֵי הֵתֵם דְּכֹתִיב: "מִהֵיוֹת מִשָּׁה" – מִחֵיוֹתָהּ דְּשָׁה.

He answered him: It is different there, as it is written: "And if the household is too small for a lamb [*mehiyot miseh*], he and his neighbor who is next to his house" (Exodus 12:4). The phrase "*mehiyot miseh*" is read as *meihiyutei deseh*, from the life of a lamb. In other words, one can withdraw from a group only as long as the lamb is alive. If so, its blood is not considered part of the Paschal lamb by a special decree of the Torah, which does not apply to Yom Kippur.

מֵתִיב מַר זוּטְרָא: וְאִין פְּדוּיִן לֹא בַעֲגָל וְלֹא בְּחֵיָהּ, וְלֹא בְּשַׁחוּטָה, וְלֹא בְּטְרִיפָה, וְלֹא בְּכֻלָּאִים, וְלֹא בְּכוֹי, אֶלָּא בְּשָׁה! שְׂאֵנִי הֵתֵם, דְּלִיף שָׁה שְׁה מִפְּסַח.

Mar Zutra raised an objection: And one may not redeem<sup>HN</sup> a male firstborn donkey with a calf, nor with an undomesticated animal, nor with a slaughtered lamb, nor with an animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*], nor with the product of the prohibited crossbreeding<sup>N</sup> of a lamb and a goat, nor with a *koy*,<sup>N</sup> a kosher animal with characteristics of both a domesticated animal and a non-domesticated animal, but with a lamb. This proves that a slaughtered animal is not considered a lamb. The Gemara rejects this claim: It is different there, as that *tanna* derives a verbal analogy of "lamb" (Exodus 13:13) and "lamb" (Exodus 12:4) from the Paschal offering: Just as a slaughtered lamb cannot be used for a Paschal offering, the same applies to the case of a firstborn donkey.

אִי מַה לְהֵלֵן זְכָר תָּם וּבֶן שָׁנָה – אִף כָּאֵן זְכָר תָּם וּבֶן שָׁנָה? תְּלַמּוּד לְזִמְרָא: "תְּפָדָה" "תְּפָדָה" וְיָבָה.

The Gemara asks: If so, just as there, the Paschal offering must be male, unblemished, and a year old, so too here, for the redemption of a firstborn donkey, one should be obligated to use a male that is unblemished and a year old. Therefore the verse states: "And every firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb; and if you shall not redeem it, then you shall break its neck" (Exodus 13:13). The repetition of: "You shall redeem," "you shall not redeem," serves to amplify the definition of the offering and include other animals as acceptable for this redemption, not merely those fit for the Paschal offering.

אִי "תְּפָדָה תְּפָדָה" וְיָבָה – אֶפְיֻלוּ כּוֹלָהּ נִמְנָ! אִם בֵּן, "שָׁה" מֵאִי אֶהְיֶי לֵיהּ?

The Gemara asks: If the phrases "You shall redeem" "you shall redeem" serve to amplify, even all animals should also be fit for the redemption of a firstborn donkey, including a calf, undomesticated beast, a slaughtered animal, and the other exceptions listed above. The Gemara answers: If so, what purpose does the verbal analogy of "lamb" serve? Rather, it is evident that certain animals are included while others are excluded. In any case, it is clear that the *halakha* of the blood of the bull on Yom Kippur cannot be derived from here.

NOTES

They may register and withdraw – נִמְנָנִים וּמוֹשְׁבֵינֵי יְדֵיהֶם: The Paschal lamb was sacrificed in groups. Several men and women would register for a group that would sacrifice a single lamb. The people assigned to that group would eat the offering on the night of the Festival. Individuals could join or withdraw from these groups, and join other groups, whether or not they were members of the same family, provided that the animal had not yet been sacrificed.

addressing the issue of which kind of lamb is referred to here by the Torah.

Redeeming a firstborn donkey – פְּדוּיֹן פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר: The Torah states: "And every firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb" (Exodus 13:13), which means that a lamb must be given to a priest for every firstborn donkey. If the owner fails to do this, the donkey's neck must be broken. The Gemara is

Crossbreeding – כְּלָאִים: This is referring to a crossbreed of a sheep and a goat. Although both sheep and goats individually can be used to redeem firstborn donkeys, mixed offspring are not appropriate for this purpose.

Koy – כּוֹי: The *koy* features many times in talmudic discussions, due to the uncertainty of whether it is a domesticated or an undomesticated animal. Sometimes the *koy* is treated as distinct category of its own, neither fully domesticated nor non-domesticated. Here, however, as a lamb is required, the Gemara must be referring to a type of *koy* that is half a sheep and half non-domesticated.