



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Abaye concludes his explanation of how the Mishnah could reflect the opinion of R' Yehudah.

Two expositions in the Beraisa are unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) Atonement for kohanim through the he-goat sent away

R' Yehudah's position that kohanim are atoned through the he-goat sent away is unsuccessfully challenged.

### הדרן עלך שבועות שתיים

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a further elaboration of the topic of the transgression of entering the Beis HaMikdash while tamei. The part of the Beis Hamikdash the tamei person must enter to be liable to the variable korban is discussed as well as the topic of expanding Yerushalayim and the courtyards of the Beis HaMikdash. The topic of one who became tamei while in the Beis HaMikdash is mentioned. The Mishnah concludes by recording different opinions as to when a person is liable to bring a variable offering.

### 4) The number of cases of tumah concealment

R' Pappa suggests that the Mishnah should have written that there are two cases that are six.

The reason he did not suggest that the Mishnah should have written that there are two cases that are eight is explained.

R' Pappa answers his own questions.

A second version of R' Pappa's response is recorded.

### 5) Awareness

R' Pappa inquires whether one is liable to bring a variable korban if the laws of tum'ah escaped his awareness.

After the Gemara clarifies the inquiry it is left unresolved.

R' Yirmiyah inquires about liability of a person from Bavel who loses track of the location of the Beis HaMikdash.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Who is included in the Kohen Gadol's "household"?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. What was the procedure for adding to Yerushalayim?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the point of dispute among Tanna Kamma, R' Eliezer, R' Akiva and R' Yishmael?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. How does the Gemara understand R' Pappas' inquiry related to one who forgets the laws of tum'ah?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### The inquiry of Rav Pappa

בעי רב פפא נעלמו ממנו הלכות טומאה מהו?

Rav Pappa presents an inquiry regarding the halacha in a case where a person knew that he touched a שרץ, but he was unaware that a שרץ is a source of tum'ah. We have been dealing with the classic case of the Torah of unawareness where the person knew that he was tamei, and he subsequently forgot that he was tamei, or he did not realize that he was entering into the Beis HaMikdash or eating meat from an offering. What is the halacha where he was not aware of the halacha that a שרץ is a source of tum'ah?

The Gemara probes to understand precisely the issue in Rav Pappa's question. The first suggestion is that the person touched a שרץ, but he was not sure whether it is a שרץ or a frog that the Torah declares to be tamei. The Gemara immediately rejects this explanation, because this information is available from any young student who studies the verses. This would not be considered to be a degree of unawareness at all, as Rashi says, the person should have simply asked someone whether a שרץ or a frog is tamei. It is therefore as if he knew the halacha. Tosafos adds that a person is held responsible to find out and discover information that is readily available.

The Gemara concludes that the question of Rav Pappa is in a case where a person knew that he touched the minimal legal size of a שרץ – an עדשה (lentil) – but he did not know that this size is enough to transmit tum'ah. On the one hand, this person realized that there are such things as שרצים in the world, and that they are a source of tum'ah, so in this regard he is aware. On the other hand, he was not aware that this miniscule size of an עדשה is enough to cause a problem, so we are lacking the awareness necessary at the beginning, and he would not be eligible for the קרבן עולה ויורד. The Gemara concludes without resolving this question of Rav Pappa.

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Mr. Richard Tresley in memory of his father  
 ר' יעקב בן ר' זאב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Alan Jay and Helene Gerber in memory of their mother  
 שבע שולה בת משה דב הלוי

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Rabbi & Mrs. Avrum Reifer in memory of his father  
 ר' צבי בן ר' שלמה דוד רייפער, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Mr. & Mrs. Meystel נשמת  
 מרת נחמה בת ר' יוסף לייב, ע"ה  
 Mrs. Emma Meystel

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Hataras Nedarim: First or last?

מוטב יבוא זכאי וכפר על החייב וכו'

Better that an innocent person should come and atone for a guilty person etc.

The Gemara relates that the Kohen Gadol would first confess for his own sins and the sins of his family and then he would confess for the rest of the kohanim. The reason the confessions followed this sequence is based on the principle that an innocent person should atone for a guilty person rather than a guilty person atoning for another guilty person. Based on this, Teshuvos B'tzeil Hachochmah<sup>1</sup> was asked whether one should make an effort to be the last person to do hataras nedarim so that the other, "innocent," judges will release him from his vows rather than to be amongst the first and have "guilty" judges release him from his vow. On the other hand, perhaps it is better to go first so that he could be the "innocent" one who will release other "guilty" people from their vows similar to a ruling of Rav Yaakov Emden<sup>2</sup> that one should do kaporos for himself before doing it for other members of the family.

B'tzeil Hachochmah answered that one should make an effort to be last for hataras nedarim rather than first. In the case of the Kohen Gadol or kaporos, it is the individual who will confess or rotate the chicken over his own head. As such, it doesn't matter whether he confesses or rotates the chicken over his own head first or last since anyways he will be doing it for himself, so the first time he performs kaporos, whether for himself or for others, there will be someone "guilty" taking care of someone "guilty." Consequently, he should go first so at least others should be able to be taken care of by someone who is innocent. In the case of hataras nedarim, the person does not release himself from his vow; he is released by others. As such, it is preferable for him to be amongst the last so that the judges who are already "innocent" will release him from his vow.

(Overview...continued from page 1)

After the Gemara clarifies different dimensions of the inquiry it is left unresolved.

### 6) Adding to the Beis HaMikdash

R' Shimi bar Ashi identifies the source for the Mishnah's prerequisites for extending Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash courtyards. ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Rashi explains that Rav Pappa's question was regarding the ידיעה בתחילה, whether the person is considered to be aware of his initial condition of tum'ah. Rabeinu Chananel, however, learns that this inquiry was regarding the העלמה—the state of forgetting after one was originally aware that he was tamei. This means that the person knew that he had touched a שרץ, but then some element of uncertainty entered his mind. He then entered into the Beis HaMikdash with this degree of unawareness. The Gemara clarifies that if the person was wondering whether the שרץ he touched was the one which the Torah declares to be tamei, or whether it is a frog which is tamei, he should have asked someone, and he cannot claim to be experiencing העלמה. Rather, the case is where he touched a small piece of a שרץ, and he knew that a שרץ causes tum'ah. He now was wondering whether this size of כעדשה was enough to make him tamei. ■

After this explanation he notes that his response was written in accordance with the thinking of the questioner that hataras nedarim is the same as kaporos and the confession of the Kohen Gadol. The truth is that they are not the same since hataras nedarim is not an issue of "guilty" or "innocent" as are the examples of hataras nedarim and the confession of the Kohen Gadol. As such, when it comes to hataras nedarim it makes no difference whether one is first or last since the principle as recorded in our Gemara does not apply. ■

1. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ה סי' ס"ה.

2. סידור היעב"ץ סדר כפרות אות י"ד. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## "A Strange Fire"

"או ששהה בכדי השתחוואה חייב..."

Our sages compare every person to an entire world. The Shem MiShmuel explains how this teaching applies to our Divine service. "Every person is a mini-world. His heart can be likened to the mikdash and the azarah. If illicit thoughts enter into his heart, he must immediately remove them without allowing them to remain for even an instant.

"Just as we find on Shevuos 14 that a defiled person who remains in the mikdash for the time it takes to bow is liable for allowing defilement to remain in the mikdash, the same is true regarding negative thoughts. If one allows them to fester even for the time it takes to bow, he is liable for defiling the mikdash."<sup>1</sup>

The Nefesh Hachaim, ז"ל, explains similarly, "When one dwells on negative thoughts, he is like a person who did the worst sins in the kodosh hakodashim. Although Titus did so physically in this world, a Jew who focuses on negative thoughts does much worse. One who gets

angry or focuses on illicit desires brings an eish zara into his heart, and he unfortunately fulfills the verse, 'בית קדשנו — ותפארנו אשר...היה לשריפת אש The house of our sanctuary and glory...was consumed in fire.'

He concludes, "Yet we must also remember that the opposite is also true. Even merely thinking about doing a mitzvah immediately makes an indelible impression on high, which draws down immense holiness and enables the person to complete the mitzvah..."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. שם משמואל, פנחס, ע' תקמ"ח

2. נפש החיים, שער א' ■