

# Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

24 Tammuz 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 9

July 6, 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](mailto:aneinu@gmail.com)

## Daily Daf

### *Awareness of Tumah*

The *Gemora* asks: And according to Rabbi Yishmael who maintains that even if there was no awareness in the beginning (*that he was tamei*) but there was awareness at the end (*that he ate kodesh*), he is liable to bring a *korban (olah v'yored)*, what does the goat which was done outside atone for?

The *Gemora* answers: It atones for a case where he had no awareness in the beginning or the end.

The *Gemora* asks: But don't the goats brought on the Festivals and *Rosh Chodesh* atone for that?

The *Gemora* answers: He holds like Rabbi Meir, who says that all the goats (*the goat brought on the Outer Altar on Yom Kippur, those brought on Rosh Chodesh and the Festivals*) atone equally for impurity with respect to the Sanctuary and sacrificial food.

The *Gemora* asks: Then, what *halachah* is derived from the *hekesh* between the outer one and the inside one?

The *Gemora* answers: We learn as follows: Just as the inside goat does not atone for other sins (*except for tumah of the Mikdash and kodesh*), so too, the outside goat does not provide atonement for any other sins.

The *Mishna* had stated: Where there was no awareness either in the beginning or in the end (*he never knew that he became tamei at all*), the goats offered up on the

Festivals and *Rosh Chodesh* provide atonement; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: Rabbi Yehudah's reasoning is based upon the following verse: *And one goat for a chatas to Hashem*. This goat shall atone for a sin which is known only to Hashem.

The *Gemora* asks: But is this verse not required for that which Rish Lakish taught, for Rish Lakish said: Why is the *Rosh Chodesh* goat different in that the expression "to Hashem" is stated in connection with it? It is because the Holy One, Blessed be He, said: This goat shall provide atonement for my diminishing the size of the moon!

The *Gemora* answers: If it was just for that deduction, the text could have said: "*for Hashem*"; why did it say: "*to Hashem*"? It must be for our teaching as well.

The *Gemora* asks: Then perhaps it is solely for this teaching?

The *Gemora* answers: If so, the text could have said: "*chatas Hashem*"; why did it say: "*to Hashem*"? It must be for both teachings.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps the goats brought on *Rosh Chodesh* atone for other sins as well?

The *Gemora* answers: It was taught in the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael that since the outer goat of *Yom Kippur* comes at a fixed time in the year, and the *Rosh Chodesh* goat also comes at a fixed time in the year; then, just as the outer goat atones only for the *tumah* of the *Mikdash*

and *kodesh*, so too the *Rosh Chodesh* goat atones only for the *tumah* of the *Mikdash* and *kodesh*.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that this is true by the Festival goats as well?

The *Gemora* notes that we cannot answer that it is derived from that which was taught in the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael, for we cannot compare it to the goats of *Rosh Chodesh*, for those goats are brought constantly (*more frequent than those brought on the Festivals*), and we cannot compare it to the outer goat of *Yom Kippur*, for its atonement is greater (*for it atones for all sins*). And if you will ask that we did not use this logic when we were learning the laws of the goats of *Rosh Chodesh* from those brought on *Yom Kippur*, it may be said in reply that with reference to the *Rosh Chodesh* goat, atonement is explicitly mentioned in the text, and what we were trying to learn from *Yom Kippur* is merely its limitations (*that only the unknown sins connected with the Mikdash and kodesh are intended*); but here it may be said that the entire law (*that the Festival goats provide atonement*) cannot be derived.

Rather, the source is as Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said elsewhere: The verse could have said: “*a goat*,” but it said: “*and a goat*”; so here also, it could have said: “*a goat*,” but it said: “*and a goat*.” This teaches us that the Festival goats are likened with the *Rosh Chodesh* goats: just as the *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone only for sins where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end, so too the Festival goats atone only for sins where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end.

The *Gemora* inquires: When Rabbi Yehudah had stated that the *Rosh Chodesh* and Festival goats atone for sins where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end, does this statement apply only to a sin which will always remain unknown (*for there was no one else there when he became tamei*), but a sin which might eventually become known is regarded as if there was awareness at the end, and consequently, the outer goat of *Yom Kippur* together with the day of *Yom Kippur* will provide atonement; or perhaps his statement includes even a sin which might eventually become known, since presently, at this moment, it is a sin which is known only to Hashem?

The *Gemora* resolves this from a *braisa*: For sins where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the

end, and for a sin which might eventually become known, the Festival and *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone. These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon says: The Festival goats atone, but not the goats of *Rosh Chodesh*. [*For what do the goats of Rosh Chodesh atone? They are for a person who was tahor who inadvertently ate sacrificial food that was tamei (even though it is not a sin where the transgressor is subject to kares).*]

Rabbi Elozar said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya: What is Rabbi Shimon’s reason? It is written: *And it He gave to you to bear the sin of the congregation*. This verse refers to the *Rosh Chodesh* goat; and we learn with a *gezeirah shavah* of “*the sin*,” “*the sin*” from the *tzitz* (*Kohen Gadol’s headplate*). Here it says “*the sin*,” and there it is written “*the sin*.” Just as there it refers to the sacrificial food that was *tamei* (*and the tzitz makes the korban acceptable*), so too here it refers to the sacrificial food that was *tamei*.

But, the *Gemora* asks: Since we learn one from the other, let us say that just as there it only accomplishes that the *korban* which was brought on the Altar (*while tamei*) becomes acceptable, so too here it will only provide atonement for things that go up on the Altar (*but it will not atone for any sin*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written: the sin of the congregation. [*Evidently, the Rosh Chodesh goat does provide atonement for a sin; the specific sin is derived from the tzitz.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Since we learn one from the other, let the *Rosh Chodesh* goat atone for its own (*for a person who was tahor who inadvertently ate sacrificial food that was tamei*), and also accomplish that what the *tzitz* does (*that the korban which was brought on the Altar while tamei becomes acceptable*), and the practical application of this would be when the *tzitz* would be broken (*the Rosh Chodesh goat would make the korban acceptable*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says: *the sin*. It can bear one sin, but not two.

The *Gemora* asks: Let the *tzitz* provide atonement for its own and for that for which the *Rosh Chodesh* goat atones, and the practical application of this would be that there would be atonement for a *tumah* which occurred between this *Rosh Chodesh* and the next (*through the tzitz*)?

The Gemora answers: The verse says: *And it (He gave to you to bear the sin of the congregation)*. It (*Rosh Chodesh*) may bear this sin, but no other can bear this sin.

Rav Ashi said: Here (by *Rosh Chodesh*) it is written: *the sin of the congregation*. It bears the sin of the congregation, not that of the sacred offerings. And there (by *the tzitz*) it is written: *the sin of the sacred offerings*. It bears the sin of the sacred offerings, not that of the congregation.

The Gemora asks: How do we know that the Festival goats atone for the sins where there was no awareness in the beginning or the end?

The Gemora answers: Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said elsewhere: The verse could have said: “*a goat*,” but it said: “*and a goat*”; so here also, it could have said: “*a goat*,” but it said: “*and a goat*.” This teaches us that the Festival goats are likened with the *Rosh Chodesh* goats: just as the *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone for matters involving sacred things, so too the Festival goats atone for sins involving sacred things (where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end).

And if you should ask: Let the Festival goats provide atonement for that which the *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone for (for a person who was *tahor* who inadvertently ate sacrificial food that was *tamei*); we would reply that it is written: *the sin*. It can bear one sin, but not two.

And if you should ask: Let them atone for that for which the outer goat of *Yom Kippur* atones for (where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end); we would reply that the verse says: *once a year*. This implies that the atonement of the outer goat only happens once a year.

For what, then, do the Festival goats atone for? If for a case where there was awareness at the beginning and at the end, the transgressor must bring a *korban olah v'yored*? If for a case where there was awareness at the beginning but not at the end, this is a case where the inner goat and *Yom Kippur* suspend the punishment? If for a case where there was no awareness at the beginning but there was at the end, for this the outer goat and *Yom Kippur* atone? Evidently, the Festival goats atone for a case where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end. (9a – 10a)

# INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

## *Lesser of the Luminaries*

It is brought in the sefer Peninim Mi'shulchan HaGr" a that once when the Vilna Gaon was travelling in Europe, he was hosted by a man well-versed in Torah learning. The man showed the Gaon what his deceased father had written on the margin of his Chumash regarding the verse in Breishis [1:16]: And Hashem made the two great luminaries: the great luminary to rule the day and the lesser luminary to rule the night, and the stars. Written on the margin was the following abbreviation: גועשאנ"ק. Many people had attempted to decipher the meaning of this, but to no avail. The Gaon took a glance at the word and explained as follows: The abbreviation stands for the following: גדול וסומך על שולחן אביו נקרא קטן - an adult who is dependent (for support) on his father's table is regarded as “a minor.” The explanation was now self-evident. His father was bothered why the moon was referred to as “the lesser luminary.” The answer was that since the moon has no light of its own, because it has no significant internal source of energy, it is referred to as “the lesser luminary” because its secondary light is produced by what it reflects from the sun.

Rashi cites from Chazal that they were both created the same size, but the moon complained and said that two kings cannot use the same crown and therefore the moon was diminished. The question is asked: It is well known that the moon does not have any intrinsic light source of its own, but rather it is only reflecting the sun light. What is the meaning that they were created equally?

Reb Aryeh Tzvi Frummer answers that that this was precisely the punishment to the moon; the moon did not decrease in size but rather its retribution was that it will not contain its own light and it will only provide light that it receives from the reflection of the sun. Initially, the sun and the moon were both *gedolim* since they both had an intrinsic light source; afterwards, the moon became a *katan* because it could not provide light by itself. The Zohar in Breishis seems to explain in an identical manner.

The Beis Yosef (O" C 31) cites the Zohar in Shir Hashirim that Chol Hamoed is akin to the moon; it does not have its own sanctity but rather it receives kedushah from the Yom Tov.