

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Identifying the author of the Mishnah

The Gemara asserts, based on the statement of the Mishnah that the area between the Ulam and the Altar is considered north of the Altar, that our Mishnah reflects the opinion of R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon.

The Gemara demonstrates that the Mishnah may also be consistent with Rebbi's opinion.

### 2) The position of the bull

Rav explains that the body of the bull was aligned north-south but its head was turned to the west towards the Sanctuary. The reason the body was not aligned east-west was the fear the animal would relieve itself towards the Altar.

### 3) The confession

A Baraisa describes the confession made by the owner of a korban and a dispute between R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva whether a Korban Olah atones for the sins of *שכחה ופאה לקט*.

R' Yirmiyah and Abaye offer different suggestions for the point of dispute between R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva.

### 4) The Kohen Gadol's confession

A Baraisa presents a dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim regarding the correct order of the different sins mentioned in the confession.

The Gemara rules in accordance with the opinion of Chachamim.

A related incident is cited.

A Baraisa presents two proofs that the Kohen Gadol's confession is done verbally rather than with the blood of the korban.

The Gemara explains why two proofs were necessary to prove its point. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in loving memory of  
Norman Lieberman — נחום בן חיים  
by his children*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben  
in memory of their parents  
ר' אברהם וואלף בן ר' בערל ז"ל  
ר' חיים שלום בן ר' בנדיט מאיר ז"ל*

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The order of the sins in the יידי—confession*

תנו רבנן כיצד מתודה—עויתי פשעתי וחטאתי וכו'

The Gemara elaborates and explains the order of the confession of the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur. Rambam (מעשה הקרבנות ג:ט"ו) rules that the expressions taught here are the same which were used whenever an offering was brought for atonement. Meiri learns that this order was used only when an olah was brought.

The three different categories of sin which are noted here (in the order of the confession in our Mishnah) are intentional sins (עונות) rebellious sins (פשעים) and unintentional sins (חטאים). The Mishnah features the opinion of R' Meir, the minority opinion in this issue, but we rule according to Rabbanan of the Baraisa, who list the sins in increasingly severe levels (unintentional, intentional, and rebellious). HaRav Elyashiv, זט"ל, in his notations to our Gemara, points out that the order of the sins in our Mishnah does not seem to follow any logical order. If we were listing the sins from less severe to more severe, the unintentional sins should have been first, not last.

The order of R' Meir is explained by Siach Yitzchok. A person can begin by dealing with the most obvious and blatant sins he has committed, beginning with those that were intentional and then facing the fact that some were even "rebellious." The teshuvah process is difficult, but a person can admit when he makes a major mistake. It is easy to realize that these must be corrected. It is finally after confessing these sins that a person can also face the fact that he has made small mistakes, errors which he might have otherwise wished to overlook, and either ignore or even deny that they happened.

Furthermore, a person can readily deal with intentional sins, as he is fully aware of the times he succumbed to the yetzer. However, unintentional sin often eludes a person's awareness. Yet, after he has confessed the more severe sins, he is willing to honestly consider even areas of doubt which should be corrected. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The order of the Vidui—Confession

ת"ר כיצד מתודה עויתי פשעתי וחטאתי וכו' דברי רבי מאיר וחכמים אומרים וכו' חטאתי ועויתי ופשעתי לפניך אני וביתי. וכו' א"ר ב"ש אמר רב הלכה כחכמים

The Rabbis taught: How does he [the Kohen Gadol] confess? [He should say] עויתי פשעתי וחטאתי - These are the words of R' Meir. Chachamim say: חטאתי ועויתי ופשעתי. Rabbah bar Shmuel in the name of Rav ruled in accordance for Chachamim

The order of the confession as expressed by Chachamim is the way it is printed in the Avodah section of the Machzor. Accordingly, Acharonim raise a number of questions regarding the language of different tefilos. For example, in Avinu Malkeinu we say אבינו מלכנו מכה והעבר פשעינו וחטאתינו מנגד עיניך. The difficulty is that it is clear from our Gemara that a פשע – intention to rebel against Hashem – is a more severe transgression than a חטא which only constitutes an inadvertent transgression, and one is supposed to enumerate his sins starting with the less severe transgressions and move towards those that are more severe. This, in fact, is the ruling of the Mishnah Berurah and Aruch HaShulchan<sup>1</sup> who change the language of the prayer to read מכה והעבר חטאינו , which is not the way it appears in siddurim. Similarly<sup>2</sup>, one should say סלח ומחל since מחילה is greater than סליחה. A third example can be found in the

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the three opinions regarding the area identified as “north of the Altar”?
2. How was leaning (סמיכה) on the head of the korban performed?
3. Translate עון, פשע, חטא.
4. How do we know that atonement is accomplished by confession?

חטא. According to some opinions<sup>3</sup> the correct reading should be בסתר ובגלוי and בשגגה ובזדון in order to move from the less severe to the more severe. Matah Ephraim<sup>4</sup>, however, maintains that one should not deviate from the way it is printed in siddurim because it is not worthwhile to remove oneself from the community by reciting the prayer differently. ■

1. מ"ב סימן תקפ"ד ס"ק ג'. ובערוה"ש שם ס"ב
2. כ"ב באה"ט שם ס"ק ב', וע"ש בשע"ת. וכ"ה שם בלבוש. ופירש הא"ר ס"ק ו', וז"ל כי מחילה גדולה מסליחה, דסליחה הרחבת הזמן הוא [ומחילה לגמרי משמע] והא דאמרין כתבנו בספר מחילה וסליחה, כתב מהרי"ל דהספר ניקרא [בשמים] מחילה וסליחה. מט"מ. עכ"ל
3. כ"ב המ"ב סימן תר"ז ס"ק י"א בשם דה"ח
4. ג"ז הובא במ"ב שם ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Perfecting the King's service

עולה מכפר על עשה

Why should there be a need for an olah that atones for missed opportunities, when the tamid of the morning and evening atoned for all the sins of the prior night and day? The Eretz HaTzvi, Hy"d, explains that sin brings on two simultaneous negative effects. One is its impact on the collective loving relationship between the Jewish people and Hashem, embodied in the Beis HaMikdash itself; the second is

the personal blemish that affects the soul of the sinner. Although the tamid had the power to restore perfection to the loving relationship between the collective soul of the Jewish people and Hashem, only the olah of an individual had the power to correct the flaw at the personal level. This cleaning of both “slates” is a removal of any foreign element that could make our avodah unseemly to the King. Although we can no longer offer sacrifices, we still can achieve this aim through sincere repentance.

Once, during his meal, the Alter of Kelm, zt"l, discovered a splinter embedded in his portion of bread. Although Pharaoh's baker suffered severely for a similar oversight, the baker of

Kelm was not even reprimanded by the Rav.

“The difference between them is obvious,” explained the Alter. “The baker described by the Torah caused distress and offense to the king, while ours merely inconvenienced a regular citizen. The former's carelessness is clearly a capital crime—but the latter's is just an oversight!”

The Alter mused, “Our every act comes before the King of Kings, and the good acts we do are like sacrifices. What is the bad? The splinter lodged inside! It may be small, but it still has no place in the King's meal, so to speak!” ■

