

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A single blood application (cont.)

The Baraisa's source that a single blood application on the outer altar is sufficient is unsuccessfully challenged.

Two additional unsuccessful challenges to this derivation are presented.

An inconsistency regarding the position of R' Yishmael is noted.

The inconsistency is resolved with the assertion that there are two versions of R' Yishmael's position.

2) The dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Yosi HaGalili

The Gemara digresses to discuss the dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Yosi HaGalili regarding the exposition of the verses in Bamidbar 18: 17-18 and begins with an unsuccessful challenge to R' Yosi HaGalili's position.

R' Yishmael's exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara identifies how these Tannanim know that a single blood application is sufficient if they use the phrase דם זבחיך ישפך for another exposition.

3) The dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel

R' Huna cites the source for Beis Shammai's position that two blood applications for a Chatas are essential.

Beis Hillel's response is recorded.

Beis Hillel's exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

An alternative explanation of Beis Hillel's position is presented.

This explanation is challenged. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is the obligation to throw blood fulfilled by pouring the blood?

2. What are the two versions of R' Yishmael's position?

3. What is the source that exchanges of Maaser and Pesach are not offered?

4. What is the source that the Shel Rosh must contain four compartments?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Placing, splashing, and pouring the blood

מנין שניתנין בזריקה שנתנין בשפיכה

A Baraisa analyzed the phrase (Devarim 12:27) "וּדְם זִבְחֶיךָ יִשָּׁפֵךְ"—and the blood of your offerings shall be poured—and it learns from it that although the blood of an offering should be placed upon the altar two or four times, it is minimally acceptable if the blood of an offering is placed on the altar once.

There is another Baraisa which learns a different lesson from this verse. That lesson is regarding offerings that usually require that the kohen stand away from the altar and splash the blood against the side of the altar. This is referred to as "זריקה—splashing." If, instead, the kohen walked up to the altar and gently poured the blood against the wall of the altar on a spot which is above the base, this is valid. This is called "שפיכה—pouring." This is determined from this phrase, which indicates that for any offering — "your offerings" — pouring the blood is acceptable. Nevertheless, the author of the first Baraisa disagrees with this lesson, as he holds according to the view of R' Akiva who says that splashing and pouring are two different procedures, and they may not be interchanged. Accordingly, he uses this verse to teach the lesson that a single placement of blood on the altar is minimally acceptable.

We see from the second Baraisa that it is best for the blood to be splashed against the side of the altar, but the procedure of pouring the blood is acceptable only if it was already done in that manner (בדיעבד). Rambam also rules (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 2:2) that if the blood was poured on the altar the offering is acceptable. The Gri"z asks why the procedure of pouring of the blood should only be acceptable after the fact. The Baraisa seems to say that "splashing is included in pouring," and the two processes should be interchangeable.

Chiddushei R' Chaim explains that these two procedures are not the same. We find regarding splashing or placing the blood on the top corners of the altar that there are distinct rules. Some offerings require two placements applied to four corners, while others require four placements which are applied to the four corners. Pouring does not have any of these details. The blood must be poured on the wall of the altar on a spot which is above the base. Once we find that pouring satisfies the need to place

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Should one study foreign languages?

טט בכתבי שתיים פת באפריקי שתיים

"Tat" in Kaspi means two and "Pot" in Afriki means two

The Gemara Menachos (65a) teaches that members of Sanhedrin knew all seventy languages. It is also well known that part of the salvation of the Jewish People in the Purim story was due to Mordechai's knowledge of foreign languages. Accordingly, people wonder whether one should make an effort to study other languages based on the precedent set by Sanhedrin. Teshuvos Mishnah Halachos¹ rejects the premise that the behavior of Sanhedrin would serve as precedent for everyone else to study seventy languages. Sanhedrin needed to know all seventy languages so that they could understand witness testimony in whatever language the witnesses speak but those who do not listen to testimony have no need to study foreign languages. Additionally, he rejects the notion that when people were chosen to serve on Sanhedrin they already knew seventy languages. It is just as likely that Torah scholars were chosen to serve on Sanhedrin because of their wisdom in Torah and then they were taught all the different foreign languages.

Sefer Tiv Gittin² writes that members of the Sanhedrin did not dedicate time to formally study the seventy languages. Their knowledge of Torah was so broad and deep

(Insight...continued from page 1)

blood on the altar, when the blood is poured once, this satisfies the requirement of placing the blood, whether it was to be four times or two times.

This explains the ruling of Rambam. Initially, it is better not to pour the blood on the altar, because the Torah instructs that the blood be placed in several stages, and not just in one pouring. Although the pouring of the blood satisfies the need to place it, the distinguishing of placing it in stages would be lacking. ■

that they were able to understand the seventy languages as a derivative of their Torah knowledge. Sefer Peirush Agados of R' Azriel ben Shlomo³ also writes that Sanhedrin's knowledge of the seventy languages was the result of their Torah knowledge and he proved this principle from our Gemara. The Gemara relates that the word טט in Kaspi means two and the word פת in Afriki means two and when combined together the words indicates that the Shel Rosh should contain four compartments. This supports the notion that other languages are alluded to in the Torah. This is consistent with what Shelah⁴ writes about foreign languages. He writes that other languages contain elements of Lashon Kodesh and that is why we find examples of "foreign" languages in the Torah. ■

1. שו"ת משנה הלכות ח"ב סי' קל"ד.
2. ספר טעב גיטין שמות אנשים אות יוד ס"ק ט"ז.
3. פירוש האגדות לר' עזריאל בן שלמה לברכות נ"ה.
4. שלי"ה תושבע"פ מסכת פסחים אות שמ"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Wild Bird

"לחמי תודה..."

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, gives an inspiring explanation of a famous parable of our sages. "The wise men and philosophers of the nations had a very deep understanding of the strengths of the human psyche. Nevertheless, there is a vast difference between our understanding and the way they see things. One reason for this is that they do not understand the strength of the drive towards negative behavior within every person.

"This is the meaning of the parable of our sages: 'This is like a person who gave a צפור דרוור, a wild bird, to his

servant to guard. He said, "Although you will be rewarded if we are vigilant to watch it, you must guard it with your very life, since lack of vigilance will cost you your life." "

"A wild bird requires only an instant's lack of vigilance to slip out of one's hands. So too, we each have a propensity to do evil which springs out the moment one lets down his guard. Once evil takes hold of him, he can never know to what lows he will be brought. But we also see from here the power of every mitzvah, since the same is true in the inverse. Once one accustoms himself to good he can never know to what heights this will take him. We must always be vigilant to guard ourselves from sin, while continuing to strengthen our-

selves to do whatever good we can."

The Sifsei Tzaddik, zt"l, gives a similar explanation regarding the lachmei todah brought on today's daf. "The reason why there are specifically forty challos of lachmei todah is to allude to the forty days of gestation of every human embryo, since this sacrifice teaches that every person has hope. We bring challos from chametz too, since we must internalize that no man is only good. As the verse states, 'There is no righteous man who always does good and never sins.' Therefore, although most of the lachamim are matzah, there is also chametz. We must be mostly good, and minimize the evil."² ■

1. מובא בבית קלם, מידות ע"י ע"ר, ורע"א
2. שפתי צדיק, אמור, אות כ"ה ■