

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

23 Tammuz 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 8

July 5, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for her neshamah and may her soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Explaining the Braisa

The *Gemora* had cited 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* asks: What is the case of idolatry that the *braisa* is referring to? If it was done deliberately, he will be liable for death (*and a korban will not provide atonement*), and if it was done inadvertently, he is liable to bring an ordinary *korban (chatas)*!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is referring to a case where he did it deliberately, but he was not warned, or alternatively, he did it inadvertently, but he was not aware of what he had done.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the case of illicit relations that the *braisa* is referring to? If it was done deliberately, he will be liable for death (*and a korban will not provide atonement*), and if it was done inadvertently, he is liable to bring an ordinary *korban (chatas)*!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is referring to a case where he did it deliberately, but he was not warned, or alternatively, he did it inadvertently (*i.e. he thought it was his wife*), but he was not aware of what he had done.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the case of bloodshed that the *braisa* is referring to? If it was done deliberately, he will be liable for death (*and a korban will not provide atonement*), and if it was done inadvertently, he must flee to a city of refuge!

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is referring to a case where he did it deliberately, but he was not warned, or alternatively, he did it inadvertently, but he was not aware of what he had done. Alternatively, it is one of the cases where he killed inadvertently, but he does not flee to a city of refuge (*i.e. if he killed with an upward swing, as stated in Makkos 7a-b*).

The *braisa* had stated: 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.

The *Gemora* asks: In what manner are these *tumos* distinct from all others? It must be because one is liable to bring a *korban olah v'yored* for transgressing this inadvertently, as opposed to an ordinary *chatas*. Idolatry is also different, as one brings a goat and not a sheep for the *korban*!?

Rav Kahana answers: The *tumos* of the *Mikdash* is singled out leniently, as opposed to idolatry that is singled out in a stringent fashion (*that one must bring only a goat*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we say this refers to a woman giving birth, who also brings an *olah v'yored*?

Rav Hoshaya says: The verse says: *for all of their sins*, not for all of their impurities (*without sin*).

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai who says a woman giving birth is considered a sinner, how do we know the verse is not referring to a woman giving birth? [*She is considered a sinner because she swears that she will not have relations with her husband due to the pain of the childbirth.*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon holds this is obvious, and therefore does not require the derivation regarding differentiating (*between types of impurities, as explained below*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we say this refers to a *metzora*?

Rav Hoshaya says: The verse says: *for all of their sins*, not for all of their impurities (*without sin*).

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini who says that *tzara'as* comes because of seven different sins, why don't we say this applies to a *metzora*?

The *Gemora* answers: A *metzora* receives atonement through his receiving *tzara'as*. His *korban* is only brought in order to allow him to be

part of the community again (*to enter the Mikdash and to eat kodesh*).

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps this is referring to a *nazir* who became impure, as he is different, as he brings a bird sacrifice?

Rav Hoshaya says: The verse says: *for all of their sins*, not for all of their impurities (*without sin*).

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Elozar HaKapar who says that a *nazir* is a sinner, why don't we say this applies to a *nazir*?

The *Gemora* answers: He holds like Rabbi Shimon (*above*) who does not require the derivation regarding differentiating (*between types of impurities*).

The master had stated: 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 *Gemora* asks: Rabbi Shimon seems to have a valid point! [*Why do we need this teaching regarding differentiating?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yehudah will say that this verse teaches us that in the same manner that the *Kohen Gadol* sprinkled the blood on *Yom Kippur* in the Holy of Holies, he should also sprinkle the blood in the Sanctuary.

The *Gemora* asks: Where does Rabbi Shimon know this from?

The *Gemora* answers: This is derived from: *And so he will do*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why doesn't Rabbi Yehudah derive this from there?

The *Gemora* answers: If we would derive from there, the implication would be that we should also have to bring another bull and goat and sprinkle their blood. This is why the verse (*and he will atone*) teaches us that this is not so (*that the previous korbanos are used to atone here, and new ones are not brought*).

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Shimon say to this claim?

The *Gemora* answers: *And so it should be done for the Tent of Meeting* implies that one pair of *korbanos* suffices for both.

The master had stated: One might think that this goat atones on all *tumos* of *kodesh*. This is why the verse states: *from their negligence for all of their sins*.

The *Gemora* seeks to clarify the *braisa's* meaning: What is this? It cannot be that he was aware before and afterwards, as such a person brings a *korban*! [*He does not need the korban of Yom Kippur to atone for him.*]

The *Gemora* answers: This is necessary for someone who only found out that he inadvertently sinned right before nightfall on the eve of *Yom Kippur*. One might think that this *korban* protects him from suffering until he brings his *korban*. The verse above teaches this is incorrect.

The *braisa* had stated: How do we know that if a person originally knew something was forbidden, and then never found out that he had sinned, that this goat atones for his sin?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the *braisa's* difficulty? [*One cannot bring a korban for this, as he never found out that he sinned. Doesn't this fit the description of what this should atone for?*]

The *Gemora* answers: This is the difficulty. Now that we say that sins are compared to negligence (*i.e. purposeful sins*), we perhaps should say that

just as negligent sins do not warrant bringing a *korban*, so too this only atones for sins that do not warrant bringing a *korban* (*even if one would find out about it afterwards*)! [*This is clearly not the case. However, how can we compare sins and negligence in order to understand why the Torah stated them in relation to this korban?*] Perhaps we should say that just as one never brings a *korban* for sins committed with negligence, so too this only atones for sins for which one would never bring a *korban*! This refers to a case where a person had no idea before he inadvertently sinned that this was forbidden for him to do, and he found out about it only afterwards. However, if he knew about it beforehand and did not know afterwards, being that he knew, he technically has to bring a *korban*. [*In other words, the accidental sin was committed due to his not being careful from what he knew was forbidden, and he merely never found out he had been lax.*] It is possible that the punishment for this is not protected by the *korban*. [*This is why the braisa has to state that it is protected.*]

The *Gemora* continues: If you will say that for a sin where there was no prior knowledge but there was knowledge afterward, the goat brought on the outer Altar and *Yom Kippur* atone, I would think perhaps this should be reversed. [*The inner goat should atone for this sin, and for sin where there was only prior knowledge, the outer goat should atone.*] This is why the verse says: *for all of their sins*.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps the bringing of this *korban* should serve as a complete atonement (*and the people that commit them should not have to bring a chatas when they find out*)?

The *Gemora* answers: If it would say, *from their sins*, it would be true. Now that the verse says *for all of their sins*, the implication is that it atones for sins that will eventually cause their owners to bring their own *korban chatas*.

The *Gemora* asks: If it does not atone, why does it protect? [In other words, what practical benefit does it provide? The person is still considered to have sinned!]

Rabbi Zeira answers: If the person dies before he finds out that he committed this sin, he is considered to have died without sin.

Rava asked: If he dies, clearly death will purge this sin anyway!?

Rather, Rava answered: This protects him from affliction. (7b – 8b)

Yom Kippur Goats

The *Mishna* had stated: If there was no prior knowledge but there was knowledge afterward, the goat brought outside and *Yom Kippur* atone.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us analyze this. The two goats are compared to each other. Accordingly, let us say that the inner goat also atones for what the outer goat atones! The practical difference would be if an outer goat did not end up being brought one year.

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says *one*. This implies that the inner goat only provides one type of atonement, and not two.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us say that the outer goat also atones for what the inner goat atones! The practical difference would be that if impurity occurred between the bringing of the inner goat and the outer goat, it would be atoned with the bringing of the outer goat!

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says: *once a year*. This implies that the atonement of the inner goat only happens once a year. (8b – 9a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Abstaining from Wine

Ben Yehoyadah explains why one who deprives himself from wine or any food is regarded as a sinner. Portions of one's soul are contained within foods and drinks. When one recites a blessing before eating these foods, he can cause a remedy for those parts of the soul, and through his blessing, they will be able to go to their rightful place. It emerges that one who declares himself to be a *nazir* and therefore refrains from eating grapes or drinking wine, is sinning regarding his soul, for now his soul will remain deficient.

Furthermore, there are many *mitzvos* where wine is required, such as *kiddush* on *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov*, *havdalah*, *birkas hamazon*, *bris milah* and *sheva brochos*. Chazal established the *mitzvos* in this manner in order to rectify the sin of Adam Harishon, which was with wine. One who vows to be a *nazir* and therefore abstains from drinking wine causes anguish to his soul.

Why a Tish on Tu BiShvat?

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

In our *sugya* Rabbi Elozar HaKapar says that a *nazir* is defined as a sinner because he refrains from wine, as a person need not afflict himself. The Yerushalmi (Kiddushin, end of Ch. 4) cites Rav, that “a person will have to give account for everything that he has seen and not eaten.” As a result, Rabbi Elozar (ibid) would save money to buy food that he had not yet tasted at least once a year, to pronounce a *berachah* on it and praise Hashem for creating such tasty fruit. *Pri 'Etz Hadar* (in his preface) writes that it could be that Rabbi Elozar's practice is the source for the custom to eat many different fruits on Tu BiShvat. (see *Magen Avraham*, 131, S.K. 16, and *Kaf HaChayim*, ibid, os 97)