

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) מצליף (cont.)

R' Yehudah demonstrates the meaning of the word מצליף.

A Baraisa rules that blood does not hit the kapores and explains the correct hand position for sprinkling the blood.

The Gemara identifies the source of the Baraisa's ruling that the blood does not hit the kapores.

2) The number of sprinklings

A Baraisa identifies the relevant sources that teach how many different sprinklings are made with the blood of the bull and the goat.

3) Counting the sprinklings

A Baraisa teaches the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yehudah regarding the correct way to count the sprinklings.

The Gemara notes that there is no dispute and each Tanna is merely expressing the way numbers are counted in their respective towns.

R' Elazar and R' Yochanan disagree why the first sprinkling must be counted together with each of the seven subsequent sprinklings.

The difference between these two explanations is identified

4) Collection boxes for obligatory bird korbonos

R' Yehudah states in a Mishnah that there were no collection boxes for obligatory bird korbonos because of the fear of mixing.

R' Yosef suggests that the concern was that they would mix up the obligatory and donated bird korbonos with one another.

Abaye successfully challenges R' Yosef's explanation by suggesting that they could mark each box to avoid confusion.

R' Dimi, therefore, explained that the concern was that if we were to see someone donate money in the box and the person would then die, all the money in the box would be prohibited.

It suggested that in this case some money from the box could be removed and destroyed.

The Gemara explains and begins to demonstrate that R' Yehudah does not follow the principle of retroactive clarification (ברירה). ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How did the Kohen Gadol hold his hand when he sprinkled the blood?
.....
2. What does the word פני connote?
.....
3. What are the two reasons for counting the first sprinkle together with the other seven?
.....
4. Is there a concern that a person may die at a particular moment?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

Counting the one upward and the seven downward sprinklings of blood

שלא יטעה בהזאת

While standing in the Kodesh Kodoshim, the Kohen Gadol sprinkled the blood of the bull and then the blood of the goat toward the kapores, and later, while in the Sanctuary, he sprinkled the blood of each animal towards the paroches. For each event, he would direct one sprinkle of blood upwards, and seven downwards. As the Mishnah reports, the Kohen Gadol counted as he sprinkled these eight applications of blood. "One. One and one. One and two. One and three, etc." He continued to mention the one upward sprinkle as he proceeded to count the seven downward motions. Rabbi Yehuda explains that this is based upon a verse, but Rabbi Eliezer explains that it was in order that the kohen not become confused. How did this method of counting avoid confusion? Rashi explains that it gave the Kohen Gadol a moment of extra time to think about what number he was about to count. Tosafos Yeshanim and Ritva explain that the count was designed so that the Kohen not confuse counting the one upward movement with the seven which were downward. Although simply counting up to eight would seem to solve this problem, this is not an acceptable suggestion because the above and below blood applications are not one extended service, and it would not be proper to combine them. Tosafos HaRosh explains that it is in reference to the goat that the Torah teaches that there is one sprinkle upwards, and the verse of the bull is where we find the number seven mentioned in reference to the lower blood applications. We see, therefore, that these are two distinct actions, and counting them as one extended count (one to eight) is inappropriate. The Yerushalmi points out that we want the second, downward set, to end with the number seven, and not with the number eight.

Rambam (הל' עבודת יוה"כ פ"ג ה"ה) also rules that the counting is done in this manner to avoid confusion. Lechem Mishnah is bothered that Rambam is ruling according to Rebbe Eliezer, and not according to the accepted opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. He answers that this is due to the text found in the Yerushalmi, where the reason of "avoiding confusion" is brought in the name of Rabbi Yehuda. It seems, therefore, that everyone holds that this reason is valid, leading Rambam to rule accordingly. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

The way to make it count

ת"ר אחת, אחת ואחת אחת ושתים וכו' דברי רבי מאיר. ר' יהודה אומר אחת, אחת ואחת, שתיים ואחת, שלש ואחת, ארבע ואחת. ולא פליגי—מר כי אתריה ומר כי אתריה

Our Rabbis taught: One, one and one, one and two, etc. these are the words of R' Meir. R' Yehudah says: One, one and one, two and one, three and one etc. They do not disagree, [rather one] master [expressed the way they count] in his town and [the other] master [expressed the way they count] in his town.

Rashi¹ explains that in R' Meir's town people counted compound numbers by mentioning the general number (כלל) before the specific number (פרט), for example, the number 21 would be expressed "twenty and one" rather than "one and twenty." In R' Yehudah's town people counted by listing the specific number before the general number, e.g., the number 21 would be expressed as "one and twenty." Rav Yosef Karo² cites different opinions regarding the practice for counting. Rav Yitzchak ben Yosef of Corbell (סמ"ק) maintains that when counting years and days, upon reaching the number twenty, one should put the general number first, e.g., "twenty and one." Kol Bo seemingly takes the opposite position, as he puts the specific number first, e.g., "one and twenty." Rav Karo³ notes that the wording of Tur indicates that when counting days the specific number comes first, e.g., "one and twenty days of the month," and when counting

years the general number comes first, e.g., "five thousand, seven hundred, seventy and four years since creation." R' Yaakov Molin⁴ writes that the Yerushalmi cites pesukim that support each position. Therefore, if a sofer wrote a get using a different way of numbering, the get is acceptable.

Rav Chizkiyah de Silva⁵ writes that R' Meir's position should be followed since the Mishnah is consistent with R' Meir's opinion. He cites several pesukim that places the general number first as further evidence that in practice one should follow R' Meir's position and concludes that when counting sefiras haomer one should say, "twenty and one days of the omer." Rav Shmuel Feivish⁶ disagrees, based upon the ruling of Rema, and writes that for sefiras haomer one should count the specific number first, "one and twenty days of the omer." Mishnah Berurah⁷ rules that one should say the specific number first, but he adds that it is only an issue of using nicer language. ■

1. ד"ה מר כי אתריה
2. בית יוסף אה"ע סי' קכ"ו ד"ה כתב ה"ר פרץ
3. שם זו"ל "ומדברי רבינו נראה דבימים מנין המועט קודם ובשנים מנין המרובה קודם וכו'"
4. ספר מהרי"ל הל' גיטין סע' י"ט
5. פרי חדש לאה"ע סי' קכ"ו ס"ק י"ב וז"ל "אע"ל דר"מ ור"י הלכה כר"י מ"מ הכא עדיף לן טפי לתפוס סברת ר"מ כיון דסתם לן תנא כותיה... והכי חזי לן למימני בעומר כלל תחלה ואח"כ פרט, כגון עשרים ואחד וכו' ועלמא לא דייק בהכי"
6. בית שמואל שם ס"ק ט"ו וז"ל "מנין המועט קודם. וכן הוא בספירת עומר"
7. מ"ב סי' תפ"ט סק"ט ונראה שדבריו הם ע"פ המג"א שם סק"ה וז"ל "יאמר לעולם מנין המועט קודם כגון אחד ועשרים יום ע' בא"ע סי' קכ"ו מיהו ביומא דף נה איתא דהכל לפי מנהג המדינה בחשבונם ובמדינתנו אף בלשון חול מזכירין מנין המועט קודם" ■

STORIES Off the Daf

One and seven

אחת אחת ואחת אחת ושתים אחת ושש אחת וארבע אחת וחמש אחת ושש אחת ושבע

Rama¹ explains the deeper meaning of the pattern of the sprinklings performed by the Kohen Gadol. "One above" represents the Almighty One above, while the "seven below" represent the evil inclination. The Sages called the yetzer hara by seven different names, to allude to its way of always springing back at a person with a new tactic. The force of purity, on the other hand, is one. By sprinkling the blood in this way, it is as though the Kohen Gadol is saying sym-

bolically: "How can we be expected to serve You, Hashem, when the single force of purity has to withstand seven different forces of impurity?" When performing the service on behalf of the Jewish people, the Kohen Gadol sought to emphasize the challenges that we face.

This concept is embodied by the Midrash that states that Moshe Rabbeinu took a different stance depending on whom he was addressing. When he spoke to Hashem, he said, "Why should Your anger be kindled against Your people?" To the Jews, on the other hand, he said, "You have sinned greatly!" This can be compared to a king who became angry with his queen and banished her. The courtiers heard what happened and approached each

party separately. To the king they said, "Your Majesty, is this how one treats his wife?" But to the queen they said, "How long will you continue to anger the king?"

Rav Kahanaman, the Ponevizher Rav, zt"l, would likewise take two different stances depending on his purpose. When he was trying to inspire the bochurim to learn with greater diligence, he would exhort: "The bochurim must learn more! At the present pace, I feel that this yeshivah is only going to produce a crop of amei ha'arezt!" But when he went to solicit the donors for help, he would say, "Your investment is safe with us—the yeshivah is putting out a new group of Torah giants and community leaders!" ■

