

17 Kislev 5778
Dec. 5, 2017



Shevuos Daf 7

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Knowledge of Impurity

The *Mishna* stated that if one once knew that he was impure, and later remembered he was impure, but in between ate *kodesh* (sacrificial meat) or went into the *Mikdash*, he brings an *oleh v’yored* - sliding scale sacrifice.

The *braisa* discusses how we know that the sin was *kodesh* or *Mikdash*, since the verse mandating this sacrifice simply says that the person was impure. The *braisa* says that since we find that one who is impure is prohibited and punished in *kodesh* and *Mikdash*, and the verse mandates this sacrifice for one who is impure, we apply the *kodesh* and *Mikdash* parameters to the sacrifice as well.

The *Gemora* asks why we don’t apply the parameter of *terumah*, which someone impure is also prohibited from eating.

The *Gemora* answers that the punishment for *terumah* is not *kares* – cutting off life, but heavenly death, which never is associated with a sacrifice.

The *Gemora* objects that we only find that a standard *chatas* sacrifice is associated with *kares*, but this is an *oleh v’yored*, which is associated with non-*kares* prohibitions, such as withholding testimony and violating an oath.

The *Gemora* answers that the verse states that the

sacrifice applies to all impurities that one is impure *ba – in it*, qualifying the prohibition, and thus excluding *terumah*.

The *Gemora* asks why we do not exclude *kodesh* and *Mikdash* instead, requiring a standard *chatas* for their more severe prohibition. Rava says that Rebbe drew water in a deep pit – i.e., found a treasure of Torah after toil, as he learned this distinction in a *braisa* from two verses that refer to one who touches an impure animal – one by the *oleh v’yored*, and one by one who eats *kodesh* when impure. The common phrase used in both cases indicates that the *oleh v’yored* is also case where the impure person ate *kodesh*. Since the verse says that a woman who has given birth may not touch *kodesh*, nor enter the *Mikdash*, the two prohibitions are equated, extending the *oleh v’yored* to one who enters the *Mikdash* while impure.

The *Gemora* asks: We have found the source regarding *kodesh*; what is the source for *Mikdash*?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written: *She shall not touch any sacred thing, nor enter the Sanctuary*. Entering the Sanctuary is likened to sacred food.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, *terumah* also should be included for an *oleh v’yored* (if eaten while *tamei*), for it has been written: *She shall not touch any sacred thing*, and this includes *terumah*!?

The *Gemora* answers: No! The verse states that the sacrifice applies to all impurities that one is impure *ba – in it*, qualifying the prohibition, and thus excluding *terumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us say that the expression *ba – in it*, excludes entering the Sanctuary (*and not terumah*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is reasonable not to exclude the Sanctuary, because it has the same punishment – *kares* – as one who eats sacred food while *tamei*.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary, *terumah* should not be excluded, because the sin consists of eating, just as in the case of sacred food (*whereas in the case of the Sanctuary, it is entering it which is the sin*)?

Rather, Rava said: Why is the punishment of *kares* for eating *shelamim* (*while tamei*) mentioned three times in the Torah? Once for a general statement (*that there is a penalty of kares for one who eats from sacred food while tamei*); once for a specification (*that there is kares only for sacred food similar to the shelamim; i.e., sacrifices brought on the Altar*); and once for *tumah* written in the Torah without being defined, and I do not know what it means. [*We do not know which case of tumah this is referring to that one would bring an olah v'yored.*] You may say that it refers to the eating of sacred food while *tamei*, and since it is unnecessary to have another prohibition for this, for I deduce that from that which Rebbe taught, you may use the expression mentioned here for the prohibition of entering the Sanctuary while *tamei*.

The *Gemora* challenges this explanation: But this extra *kares* is required for that which Rabbi Avahu taught! For Rabbi Avahu said: Why is the punishment of *kares* for

eating *shelamim* (*while tamei*) mentioned three times in the Torah? Once for a general statement (*that there is a penalty of kares for one who eats from sacred food while tamei*); once for a specification (*that there is kares only for sacred food similar to the shelamim; i.e., sacrifices brought on the Altar*); and once for things which are not edible (*such as the wood on the altar, incense and frankincense*). And according to Rabbi Shimon who holds that things which are not edible are not punishable by *kares* if eaten while *tamei*, we still require the extra *kares* to deduce that the inner *chatas* offerings are included; for we might have thought that since Rabbi Shimon holds that sacrifices which are not offered on the outer Altar, such as the *shelamim*, are not subject to the law of *piggul* (*a korban whose avodah was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time*), therefore they are also not subject to the laws of *tumah*; the Torah (*by mentioning kares a third time*) therefore teaches us that they are. [*The third kares then, is necessary for this deduction; how then shall we derive that a tamei person entering the Sanctuary brings a korban olah v'yored?*]

Rather, the Nehardeans said in the name of Rava: Why is *tumah* by the eating *shelamim* (*while tamei*) mentioned three times in the Torah? Once for a general statement (*that there is a penalty of kares for one who eats from sacred food while tamei*); once for a specification (*that there is kares only for sacred food similar to the shelamim; i.e., sacrifices brought on the Altar*); and once for *tumah* written in the Torah without being defined, and I do not know what it means. [*We do not know which case of tumah this is referring to that one would bring an olah v'yored.*] You may say that it refers to the eating of sacred food while *tamei*, and since it is unnecessary to have another prohibition for this, for I deduce that from that which Rebbe taught, you may use the expression mentioned here for the prohibition of entering the Sanctuary while *tamei*.

The *Gemora* challenges this explanation: But this extra *tumah* is required, since the Torah had to write the extra *kares* for Rabbi Avahu's exposition, it therefore had to write also *tumah* a third time, for without it, it would be insufficient!?

Rather, said Rava: We derive (*that a tamei person entering the Sanctuary brings a korban olah v'yored*) from the following *gezeirah shavah*: It is written: *in any manner of "his tumah" here (by olah v'yored)*, and it is written: *he will be tamei, "his tumah" is still on him there (regarding one who entered the Sanctuary while being tamei from corpse tumah)*. Just as there it is referring to the *tumah* of *Mikdash*, so too here; it is referring to the *tumah* of *Mikdash*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, what is the expression *ba – in it*, coming to exclude?

The *Gemora* answers: It is coming to include a case where he became *tamei* by eating the carcass of a kosher bird (*which is a novelty that he becomes tamei in such a manner, and not in the usual way through contact; and if such a person enters the Sanctuary or eats sacred food, he must bring a korban olah v'yored*).

The *Gemora* asks: But you said that this expression is intended to exclude (*not to include*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: Precisely because it is an exclusion, it is superfluous (*and may therefore come to include*); for it is written: *Or if he shall touch* etc. This implies that only that which transmits *tumah* by touching is included (*in the bringing of the korban olah v'yored*), but that which does not transmit *tumah* by touching is not included. Then it is written the expression *ba – in it*, which implies another exclusion. We have, then, an exclusion after an

exclusion, and any case of an exclusion after an exclusion serves to include. (6b – 7b)

Goat of the Inner Altar

The *Mishna* had stated: If there was awareness in the beginning (*he knew that he became tamei*), but not in the end, the goat whose blood is sprinkled in the Holy of Holies (*on Yom Kippur*) and the Day of Atonement suspend his punishment (*and protects him from suffering in the meantime*) until he becomes aware of it; then (*when he becomes aware of it*) he brings the fluctuating offering.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: It is written (*regarding the goat brought on the inner Altar on Yom Kippur*): *And he shall effect atonement for the Sanctuary from the tumos of the children of Israel* etc. Perhaps this *korban* atones for three transgressions which are also referred to as *tumos*; namely: the *tumah* of idolatry, the *tumah* of illicit relations, and the *tumah* of bloodshed. The *Gemora* demonstrates how each one of these sins are referred to as *tumah*. Since the verse states: *from the tumos of the children of Israel* and not *all of its tumos*, we derive that it only atones for the *tumah* of the *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, which are *tumos* that the Torah has made distinct from other *tumos*. These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon said: This may be derived from the verse itself, which states: *And he shall effect atonement for the Sanctuary from the tumos* etc. We can derive from the juxtaposition of the words "*kodesh*" and "*tumos*" that it effects atonement only on sins dealing with the *Mikdash* and *kodesh*. The *braisa* continues that this *korban* only atones for those types of sins that otherwise will not have a liability to bring a *korban*. (7b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Gezeirah Shavah

Rava praises Rebbe for his connection of *olah v'yored* with the prohibition on an impure person eating *kodesh*, by a *gezeirah shavah* – a common phrase, since *behemah temai'ah* – non kosher animal is used in both sections. Tosfos Harosh (7a Doleh) asks why this is so praiseworthy, as one can only use such the textual device of *gezeirah shavah* if he learned it from his teacher. Therefore, Rebbe must have learned this from his teacher, and showed no innovation. Tosfos Harosh answers that all that one learns from his teacher is the common phrase of the *gezeirah shavah*, but it is up to the student to know which phrases to use, and what to learn. It is Rabbi's application of the *gezeirah shavah* which Rava praised.

*He is the teacher who quenches the thirst of the parched,
like flowing water-brooks.*

*The light of Israel, the strong hammer, cast solid as
lustrous bronze,*

Nasan the Kohen, a tzadik above chasidim and tzadikim.

*He is the great eagle who hovers over his nestlings, his
veteran students.*

*Wings of a dove coated in silver and its wings are like
brilliant green-gold*

And I am among the young, not from the seasoned,

*But from the fragile kids (Responsa Chasam Sofer, Y.D.
167).*

DAILY MASHAL

Rhymes Purer Than Gold

The Chasam Sofer revered his mentor – “the great eagle,” Rabbi Nasan Adler zt”l. We see his admiration in a poem he composed in his honor, whose beginning copies the style of our *sugya*, in which Rava praises Rebbe. The interesting rhymes are written in a style now unknown.

He draws water from deep wells

*From him they built eternal ruins; he establishes the
institutions of each generation.*

*His words raise those who falter and are sweeter than
honey and mead.*

*The master's mouth emits flashes of fire, desirable more
than refined gold.*

*The great Kohen – we shall seek Torah, judgment and
rulings from him.*