

Daf Digest for Chodesh Iyar is dedicated
In memory of Israel Isser Ben Tzion ben Yaakov

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Kohen Gadol who is an אונן (cont.)

Rava concludes that R' Yehudah in the Baraisa meant to rule that although the Torah permits the Kohen Gadol who is an אונן to offer korbanos, he should not do so because of the fear that he may come to eat from a korban.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the activities performed by the Kohen Gadol during the week he is sequestered and how it differed from the rest of the year.

3) Identifying the author of the Mishnah

R' Chisda asserts that the Mishnah is inconsistent with the opinion of R' Akiva. R' Akiva and Chachamim disagree about the consequence of sprinkling on something that is not susceptible to tum'ah. Since according to R' Akiva a t'hor person becomes contaminated by the Parah Adumah waters how could the Kohen Gadol perform the service during his sequester week if he will become tamei?

The Gemara examines the dispute between R' Akiva and Chachamim.

Abaye explains that the Mishnah could, in fact, be consistent with R' Akiva's position.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What right does the Kohen Gadol have regarding meat from a korban?
2. Why, according to R' Akiva, is there seemingly an issue to sprinkle Parah Adumah ashes on the Kohen Gadol during the week he is sequestered?
3. How does Abaye explain the Mishnah consistent with R' Akiva's opinion?
4. Explain the dispute between Abba Shaul and Rabanan.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
by Mr. and Mrs. Boruch Weinberg
in loving memory of their grandmother
Gella bas Zalman Shevach ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

The concern that the Kohen not officiate when he may not eat

ומי גזר רבי יהודה שמא יאכל?

If the wife of the Kohen Gadol dies, this would render the Kohen an אונן. Our Gemara points out that although the Kohen is technically allowed to continue to serve, according to R' Yehuda we do not permit him to actually serve, because we are afraid that he might eat from the offering over which he officiates, and eating from a korban is not permitted for an אונן. This is true all year long. Magen Avraham (O.C. 612: #6) points out that on Yom Kippur we allow the Kohen Gadol to serve and we are not concerned that he not serve in order to avoid the possibility that he might eat, which is prohibited on this day. In both cases the Kohen may not eat from the offering. On Yom Kippur we allow him to continue to serve, but when his wife dies on any other day of the year we do not. What is the difference?

Maharatz Chiyos explains that we find a similar situation regarding shofar. While it may be sounded on Rosh HaShana which occurs on a weekday, the Rabbis decreed that on Shabbos the shofar is not blown. מהר"ם פדווא points out that in general, we do not allow musical instruments to be played on Shabbos or Yom Tov, for the Rabbis were concerned that a person may come to repair or adjust the instrument if it needs to be fixed. Yet we have no such rule about shofar on Rosh HaShana on a weekday. Why not? And why did the Rabbis decree not to sound shofar on Shabbos due to the fear that we might carry the shofar in the street? The answer is that if we were to be concerned about fixing the shofar, there would be no mitzvah of shofar at all. No matter what day of the week, and in every year, this decree would undermine the entire mitzvah of sounding shofar on Rosh HaShana. Rosh HaShana on Shabbos happens only occasionally. The decree not to sound shofar on those years would not undermine the mitzvah as a whole (also see אפרים י"ד).

The service of Yom Kippur must be performed. If we were to disallow it as a precaution that the Kohen Gadol might eat, we would be canceling the mitzvah totally. However, we can have a rule regarding the Kohen on the day his wife dies. We can implement a rule for that one day that he not officiate as a precaution lest he eat, for the service can still continue without him. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

The service of preparing the lamps of the Menorah

אמר אביי לא קשיא כאן בהטבת שתי נרות כאן בהטבת חמיש נרות וכו' לא קשיא ההיא לאבא שאן הא לרבנן

This is not a problem for one case refers to the preparation of two lamps and one refers to the preparation of five lamps ... There is no difficulty, for one follows Abba Shaul and the other follows Rabanan.

According to the Gemara's conclusion there is a dispute between the Mishna in Yoma and the Mishna in Tamid. Abaye explains that according to the Mishna in Yoma one prepares five lamps and then interrupts before finishing the last two. Tannaim dispute how the interruption should be made. According to Abba Shaul they would interrupt with the blood of the Tamid offering. Only after the last two lamps were prepared would they offer the incense. Rabanan, however, hold that the blood of the tamid offering was thrown first. Afterwards, the order was to prepare the five lamps, burn the incense and then prepare the last two lamps. **בדיעבד** all opinions would agree that even if they are set up in a different order, it would not have to be redone.

There is a dispute which opinion is accepted as halachah. Rambam² rules according to the Rabanan while the Tur³ rules according to Abba Shaul. The Tur explains that his ruling is based on how Abaye explained the Gemara in favor of Abba Shaul, thus indicating that the halachah follows his opinion. The Chafetz Chaim⁴ writes that when reciting korbanos before P'sukei D'zimra, one should follow the order of Abba Shaul according to Abaye. ■

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

4) The correct order for preparing the lamps and burning the incense

The Gemara notes that our Mishnah, which lists the incense first and then the lamps, contradicts a Mishnah in Tamid which presents these events in the reverse order.

R' Yochanan explains that the Mishnah here reflects the view of R' Shimon Ish HaMitzpah.

A contradiction is noted between two Mishnayos in Yoma regarding the correct order of the service.

Abaye resolves the contradiction by distinguishing between the preparation of the first five lamps and the preparation of the last two lamps.

A secondary contradiction is noted whether it is the ketores or the blood of the tamid that interrupts the preparation of the lamps.

Abaye explains that the two views reflect the opinions of Abba Shaul and Rabanan.

The Gemara begins to explain the basis of these respective opinions. ■

1. כ"כ הח"ח בלקוטי הלכות על הגמ' להלן בדך ל"ג ב' ל"ד א' (בלקוטי הלכות דף י"א ע"ב)
2. הרמב"ם בהלכות תמידין פ"ו ה"ג. וכן דייק הב"י (באו"ח מ"ח ס"א) מהסמ"ג בסימן קצ"ב
3. הטור באו"ח סימן ח"ח. ובלקוטי הלכות הנ"ל ביאר שנחלקו במחלוקת רש"י ותוס' בדף ל"ד ע"א, בד"ה לעולם רבנן היא. ומאידך הפרישה באו"ח סימן מ" ס"ק ב', פירש שנחלקו בפירוש "דמשמיה דגמרא", שרש"י פירש וז"ל משמיה דגמרא. דבר מקובל מכל בני הישיבה שקיבלו מרבותיהם. עכ"ל. שלפ"י מסתבר כטור. משא"כ הערוך פירש וז"ל משמיה דגמרא לא אמרה משום חכם אלא בסתם. עכ"ל
4. בלקו"ה שם ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The mystery of the Red Cow

אמרתי אחכמה והיא רחוקה ממני

The Likutei Halachos, zt"l, brings the Midrash about the Red Cow, "Let the mother come and clean up after her child." The offspring of the cow is the golden calf, the paradigm of willful sin, and the cleansing from the impurity of death symbolizes the internal cleansing of teshuvah. This is achieved by focusing on our good points and returning to our real identity, which makes the negative fall aside. Just as the red cow is completely unblemished, the good within us is absolutely unsoiled by whatever bad we

may have done.

However, focusing on the good is double-edged; like the ashes of the cow, it can defile the pure even as it purifies the impure. Seeking out our good points is appropriate at a time we are feeling discouraged and far from Hashem, for a positive outlook ensures that we won't falter. However, when we are in a good state, such a focus can easily lead to arrogance. Knowing when to focus on the good in ourselves and when to focus on how far we have to go is a great challenge. Perhaps this is what Shlomo HaMelech referred to when he said that although he had tried to understand it, the mystery of the red cow remained, "far from me."

One Motzei Shabbos, Rav Isser Zal-

man Meltzer, zt"l, spoke in his Yeshivah, the famous Yeshivas Etz Chaim. When they heard his moving words, his listeners could not help but cry along with him.

"When a Sefer Torah is found to be pasul, the law is that we put a belt on its outside so that everyone will know that it is invalid. This will keep people from reading from it, because to do so would be a sin."

At this point the Rav himself burst into tears. "Since this is the case, who knows how many belts I need to bind around myself, so that people will know that I am pasul? How will they otherwise be warned to guard from learning from me?" ■