A RUBEN SHAS KOLLEL PUBLICATION
DAF YOMI DIGEST
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR THOUSANDS OF DAF YOMI LEARNERS WORLDWIDE

Shabbos, January 4, 2014 ■ ג' שבט תשע"ד

יומא נ"ז

CHICAGO CENTER FOR Torah & Chesed

בס"ד

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The sprinklings towards the paroches (cont.)

The methodology of the Baraisa to derive the number of sprinklings is challenged.

Two acceptable answers are presented.

A Baraisa teaches about the dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Elazar the son of R' Yosi whether the blood landed on the paroches.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges the proof presented by R' Elazar the son of R' Yosi.

A similar discussion is recorded regarding the blood of the communal-error bull.

2) Mixing the bloods

Rava and R' Yirmiyah dispute the proper course of action if the blood from the bull and goat become mixed together. According to Rava one application set is performed, whereas according to R' Yirmiyah two sets are performed.

The Gemara inquires what should be done if the bloods become mixed after the bull's blood was applied once above.

R' Pappa thought of one solution but it was rejected

by Rava in favor of an alternative suggestion to R' Yirmiyah's approach above.

The Gemara inquires about what should be done if the two cups of blood become unidentifiably mixed.

The Gemara states that the blood will have to be applied three times.

What should be done with the leftover blood if some of the bull's blood and goat's blood became mixed in a third utensil, but the rest remained separate and the correct applications were performed? Is the mixed blood poured onto the base of the Altar or is it considered rejected and poured into the canal?

R' Pappa maintains that the blood is rejected and must be poured into the canal, whereas according to R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua it can be poured onto the base of the Altar.

A Baraisa that forms the foundation of their disagreement is cited.

3) Applying blood to the horns of the Altar

It is noted that the Mishnah is consistent with the opinion that the blood of the bull and goat were mixed before they were applied to the Altar, as opposed to the dissenting opinion that the bloods were not mixed before they were applied to the Altar.

The Gemara unsuccessfully attempts to identify the author of each position. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
The Chicago Center for Torah and Chesed
לעילוי נשמת העלמה שרה לאה בת הרב יוסף, נ"י
הנאהבים והנעימים בחייהם ובמותם לא נפרדו
נולדה שבת כ"ז חשון תשמ"ז
נפטרה שבת ג' שבט תשס"א

Distinctive INSIGHT

Multiple blood sprinkling when the bowls are mixed up

נתערבו לו כוסות בכוסות נותן וחוזר ונותן וחוזר ונתן שלשה פעמים

The Gemara presents the problem where the containers of the blood of the bull and that of the goat became confused with each other. The kohen must sprinkle the blood of the bull before that of the goat, but now that we do not know which bowl has the blood of the bull and which has the blood of the goat, we have a dilemma. Therefore, the solution is that the Kohen Gadol must first take from one bowl, sprinkle from it, and then sprinkle from the second bowl. He then goes back to the first one and sprinkles from it again. If the first was, in fact, the blood of the bull, the mitzvah was done with the first and second sprinkling. If the first bowl had the blood of the goat, then sprinkling from it before applying the blood of the bull was ineffective. However, the mitzvah is accomplished with the sprinkling from the second and the third bowl (the second sprinkling from the first bowl again).

Ritva explains the intention of the Kohen during this procedure. The original sprinkling from the first bowl should be done having in mind that it is the blood of the bull. When sprinkling the third sprinkling, again from the first bowl, he should intend that it is the blood of the goat. When sprinkling from the second bowl, he should be cognizant of the uncertainty, and intend that if the first bowl had the bull's blood, this is that of the goat, and the atonement is being completed. If the first was of the goat, and this is that of the bull, he should realize that the atonement will be achieved only with the later sprinkling of the third placement. Even if, in fact, the atonement was completed after the second sprinkling, this third placement of blood is not in violation of בל תוסיף, however, because once the mitzvah has been completed, the time framework of atonement is expired, and the violation of בל תוסיף does not apply once the mitzvah action has been completed.

Rambam writes that when the bowls become confused, the Kohen must sprinkle not three times, but a total of four times. He sprinkles from one bowl, then the next. He then repeats this, for a total of four applications. Kesef Mishnah explains that this must have been a misprint, as our Gemara clearly points out that three sprinklings are adequate. He suggests to erase this error from the text of Rambam. See מהרי קורקוס who explains that Rambam holds that sprinkling from the second bowl with two intentions to cover for the doubt, as Ritva explained, is unacceptable. Therefore, a fourth application is needed. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Superfluous mitzvah observance

אלא אמר ר' ירמיה נותן א' למעלה ושבעה למטה לשם הפר וחוזר ונותן א' למעלה ושבע למטה לשם השעיר

Rather, R' Yirmiyah said: [The Kohen Gadol] places one application above and seven below for the sake of the bull and then one above and seven below for the sake of the goat.

Tosafos Yeshanim[1] asks why the prohibition against adding to the Torah (בל תוסיף) is not violated when the Kohen Gadol follows R' Yirmiyah's suggestion. They answer that the prohibition is not violated when one adds to a mitzvah as a response to a circumstance of doubt. Other Rishonim[2] dispute this contention and maintain that the prohibition against adding to the Torah is violated even if the addition is performed as a function of doubt.

Rav Moshe Shik[3] ruled that if a person is uncertain whether a mezuzah is supposed to be affixed on the right or left of a doorway he should not affix mezuzos on both sides out of doubt. This is because he is of the opinion that this may violate the prohibition against adding to the mitzvah, even though it is done out of doubt. Rav Betzalel Stern[4], on the other hand, rules leniently. He addressed a case of a person who purchased a home and affixed mezuzos on the doorways. Subsequently, the person discovered that the previous owner had already affixed mezuzos on some of the doorways. One of the questions addressed was whether there was a violation of the prohibition against adding to the mitzvah by affixing additional mezuzos because one is uncertain of the kashrus of the existing mezuzos. Rav Stern followed the lenient opinions that adding to a mitzvah because of doubt does not violate the prohibition[5]. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the difference between the Yom Kippur blood sprinkled on the paroches and the communal-error blood sprinkled on the paroches?

   _____

2. What reason did R' Yirmiyah give for the "dark teachings" of the Babylonians?

   _____

3. Where do they spill leftover blood and rejected blood?

   _____

4. How is the blood applied to the corner of the golden Altar?

   _____

1. באמצע ד"ה נותן וז"ל "ומשום בל תוסיף ליכא שלא נאמר בל תוסיף אלא כשהוא בעצמו וכו'' ועוד דספיקא הוא"
2. ע' שדי חמד פאת השדה כללים מערכת ב' סי' ל"ה בשם הטור והמרדכי ע"ש
3. שו"ת מהר"ם שיק יו"ד סי' רפ"ז שכתב, "אבל לעשות ב' מזוזות לא נראה לפי ענ"ד דלאו שפיר דמי למיעבד הכי דאית ביה חשש דבל תוסיף...אבל כאן דהמזוזות שניהם כשרים אלא שאין צד מזוזות שמאל חייב במזוזה ולכך אם הניח גם בצד שמאל אפשר דעובר על בל תוסיף"
4. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ד סי' קס"ה
5. ע' בשו"ת שאילת יעב"ץ ח"א סי' א' שדן בענין מקום קביעת מזוזה שכתב וז"ל, "ולכן מתילה... ושוב נמלכתי וצויתי לעשות מזוזה שניה בימין כניסה מהחצר וכו' והצרכתיו כמו כן ב' מזוזות מפני הספק הנ"ל וכו'," וכן הביא בעל בצל החכמה שם מעשה רב מהרב בעל מנחת אלעזר הנזכר בספר דרכי חיים ושלום אות תתקס"ה ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Illumination from the darkness

בבלאי טפשאי משום דדיירי בארעא דחשוכא אמרי שמעתא דמחשכן

The statement that the Babylonians "live in a dark land, so their wisdom was dark," seems at first glance to be a criticism. But Rav Tzaddok HaKohen from Lublin, zt"l, explains it differently. The Torah of Bavel was generated in the confused (mevulbal) darkness of exile, and so Talmud Bavli can only be grasped through much pain and effort. As the Zohar HaKadosh relates: "The only true illumination is that which comes from the darkness"—through toil and suffering.

Rav Yisroel Salanter, zt"l, writes: "Don't refrain from learning Torah even if you will have to give it up soon to go into business. Torah learning is different from other types of learning. With secular studies, the outcome of the study is what counts. But in Torah, the main thing is the effort that one expends. Each and every single day of learning is its own goal. Consider yourself like a day-laborer. Don't worry about finishing the building—you work on a daily wage, and your main goal is to find paying work every single day."

Rav Yerucham Levovitz, zt"l, once said: "If you were to place all the good ever done without difficulty on one side of a scale, and on the other side one small thing done with difficulty, the small thing would outweigh all the rest!" Sometimes people would approach the Steipler, zt"l, for a berachah, that they should be relieved of their difficulties and challenges so they could learn with ease. He would respond, "It is impossible to really succeed without difficulties. The secret of success is overcoming the difficulties!" This is the true illumination that comes from the darkness. ■