

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying R' Eliezer's view (cont.)

The Gemara explains why R' Eliezer does not disagree in the case of bloods that are applied inside that become intermingled with bloods that are applied outside.

### 2) The dispute between R' Akiva and Chachamim

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel offers a parable to explain R' Akiva's position.

R' Huna tha son of R' Yehoshua rejects this parable and offers another source for R' Akiva's position.

The Gemara clarifies R' Yosi HaGalili's position cited in the Beraisa.

**3) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion regarding korban blood taken out of its designated place. The next topic in the Mishnah revolves around the disqualification of bringing the outer chattas into the Sanctuary and concludes with an explanation of how the tzitz effects acceptance of invalid korbanos.

### 4) Receiving Chatas blood in two cups

A Beraisa presents a discussion between R' Yosi HaGalili and Chachamim whether one cup of chattas blood that is brought into the Sanctuary disqualifies the other cup.

The Gemara records two follow-up questions and answers to this Beraisa.

### 5) Korban meat taken out of its correct location

A Beraisa discusses the halacha of korban meat taken out of its proper location or into the Sanctuary.

### 6) Korban blood brought into the Sanctuary

A Beraisa teaches that korban blood brought into the Sanctuary becomes invalidated.

Rava explains the rationale behind the exposition by citing another Beraisa that presents a similar exposition.

Abaye challenges Rava's explanation and offers an alternative explanation.

Rava challenged Abaye's exposition and offered another explanation.

Rava inquires about the status of the communal error bull or he-goat for idolatry whose blood was brought into the Holy of Holies. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The analogy of the student pouring wine for his teacher*

לתלמיד שמזג לרבו בחמין ואמר לו: מזוג לי. אמר לו: במה? אמר לו: לא בחמין אנו עסוקין, עכשיו בין בחמין בין בצונן.

The Mishnah (81b) discussed the halacha of a mixture of bloods from offerings with varying procedures. If blood that was supposed to be applied inside the Sanctuary mixes with blood which was supposed to be applied to the Altar in the courtyard, the mixture must be disposed of by pouring it into the canal which flows in the Beis HaMikdash. If the kohen, without asking, first took the blood inside and applied it, and then he took it outside and applied it outside, the Chachamim say it is valid, except for a chattas, and R' Akiva rules that the outside application of the blood is not valid for any offering.

The Mishnah explains that Chachamim and R' Akiva disagree regarding their interpretation of the verse (Vayikra 6:23) which states, "And any chattas of which the blood is brought to the Tent of Meeting...shall not be eaten." The verse teaches that the blood of a chattas which is brought into the Sanctuary becomes disqualified. Chachamim understand that the verse is teaching a law regarding chattas, but no other offering. R' Akiva says that although the verse speaks only of chattas blood which is brought in to the Sanctuary, this law applies to all offerings, and not only to chattas.

In our Gemara, R' Yehuda in the name of Rav brings an analogy to explain the view of R' Akiva. A student was sitting in front of his teacher, and blending wine for him to drink. The cup he was preparing contained hot water. The teacher asked for another cup, and he said, "Mix for me another cup with hot water." The student asked, "What kind of water should I use?" The teacher responded, "Until now

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva?
2. What type of invalid blood is made acceptable by the tzitz?
3. What is the status of korban meat brought into the sanctuary?
4. Explain the phrase בא זה ולימד על זה.

## HALACHAH Highlight

*"Yehoshua who is called Heshel"*

אמר לו בחמין אנו עסוקין עכשיו בין בחמין בין בצונן

*He answered, "Have we not been dealing with hot? Now I mean either hot or cold."*

There was once a גט which recorded the name of the husband as, "Yehoshua who is called Heshel." The husband's friends called him "Yehoshua" and when he was called to the Torah or when he signed his name he used both names together, "Yehoshua Heshel." Therefore, in the גט his name should have been written, "Yehoshua Heshel." The question was whether adding the phrase, "who is called" invalidates the גט since it gives the impression that his real name is "Yehoshua" but he is called by his friends, "Heshel." The other possibility is that adding the phrase "who is called" should not be understood to mean that he is not called Yehoshua as well.

Maharsham's<sup>1</sup> initial reaction was that the גט is invalid and he cited our Gemara as proof to this position. The Gemara presents a parable of a student who mixed a hot drink for his rebbi and then his rebbi asked him to mix a hot drink. The student inquired whether he wants hot or cold. The rebbi responded, "I was just drinking something hot, why then did I mention a hot drink? It must be that I mentioned hot in order to indicate that I am willing to take hot in addition to something else, i.e. a cold drink<sup>2</sup>." This indicates that it was only because he mentioned hot that it was to be understood that he would take hot or cold but if he would have asked for a cold drink his request would not have implied that he wants hot or

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

were you not blending the cup with hot water? Now, you may use either hot or cold water."

Rashi seems to have a text where the teacher specifically asked for hot water. Now, it would have been obvious that hot water was meant, because that was what the student had been using until then. By asking for hot water, the teacher is indicating that he would accept even hot water, or cold water if the student wishes. Accordingly, the Torah was discussing the laws of chattas. In that same paragraph, the Torah states that the blood of a chattas may not be brought into the Sanctuary. It would have been obvious that we are dealing with chattas, as that was the topic of that episode. R' Akiva understands that the Torah's specifically mentioning chattas therefore teaches that this halacha applies not only to chattas, but to all other offerings also.

Tosafos says that the teacher's instructions themselves were unnecessary, as the student was already involved in preparing a drink. The extra expression itself indicated this added request. ■

cold even though he was drinking something hot. Similarly in our case of the get since the name "Yehoshua" was mentioned and then he is referenced as "one who is called Heshel" the implication is that the second clause is separate and distinct from the first clause. His final ruling, however, was that since the wording could be understood either way the get is not invalid if the alternative is that the woman would not be able to remarry (במקום עיגון). ■

1. שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"א סי' כ"ו.

2. ע"י רש"י ד"ה ל"א בחמין. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

*Kal VaChomer*

"קל וחומר טרח וכתב לה קרא..."

The Sifsei Tzadikim, ז"ל, recounted, "When I once spoke to the Chiddushei HaRim, ז"ל, he praised the Sefer Hayashar from Rabbeinu Tam very highly. 'Rabbeinu Tam says that the Torah goes out of its way to teach us that man's intelligence is important. In it, we find validated many things that our intellect independently dictates is correct behavior. This validation is expressed in our being commanded outright to do things that we would naturally feel bound to

do. For example, human reason also directs us to honor our parents just like the Torah. The Torah is supernal wisdom that transcends human reason, and the numerous areas where they overlap show us that there are correlations between lower human wisdom and God's wisdom. This is the opposite of the philosophers who only appreciate the Torah inasmuch as it corresponds to and can be proven by their limited intellect.'

"The Chiddushei HaRim concluded, 'The lesson here is that we should not follow our intellect. Rather we should live according to the Torah which teaches a person true understanding. It imparts how to live a Godly life in every detail and enables him to avoid stum-

bling in the many traps of this earthly world, chas v'shalom."

The Imrei Emes, ז"ל, used the above to explain a statement on today's daf. "On Zevachim 82 we find that the verse makes the effort of writing what we could learn from a kal vachomer. But we may well wonder why. After all, the other middos such as gezeirah shava and hekesh are not written explicitly. What is different about kal vachomer?

"The reason is that kal vachomer is a method of logic. The Torah writes what we can learn explicitly to teach us not to rely too much on our own reason and instead to follow its guidance of our reason."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. ליקוטי יהודה, ח"ב, ע"י מ' ■

*Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center for Torah and Chesed, under the leadership of HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"a*

*HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rov; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.*

*Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.*