

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Touching sacred food (cont.)

Reish Lakish's exposition is challenged by Reish Lakish's use of the same pasuk to teach another halacha.

The Gemara explains how both halachos could be derived from the same phrase.

2) A tamei person who eats from the korban before the blood is thrown

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan disagree whether a tamei person who eats from the korban before the blood is thrown is liable to lashes.

Abaye asserts that the dispute relates to when a tamei person eats from a korban but when a tahor person eats from a korban that is tamei all opinions agree that he is subject to lashes.

Abaye cites support for his explanation.

Rava maintains that if the korban is tamei all opinions agree that he is not liable to lashes.

Rava's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Limbs of a non-kosher animal

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan disagree whether one who puts limbs of a non-kosher animal on the altar is liable to lashes.

Each Amora explains the rationale behind his position.

R' Yirmiyah successfully challenges Reish Lakish's opinion which forces the Gemara to revise its understanding of the dispute.

Rava successfully challenges Reish Lakish's position.

4) A disqualified person who receives the blood

Reish Lakish asks R' Yochanan whether a disqualified person who receives the blood renders the remaining blood into remnants.

R' Yochanan responded that it does not.

A second version of this discussion is recorded.

A third version of this exchange involving Abaye and Rabbah is presented.

A related Baraisa is recorded.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the disagreement between Abaye and Rava concerning the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish about a tamei eating a korban before the throwing of the blood?
2. What is the disagreement between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan about offering an undomesticated animal as a korban?
3. Explain the question פסול מהו שיעשה שירים.
4. What step was taken on Erev Pesach to assure that the blood of everyone's korban was applied to the altar?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 בהודאה על כל החסד שעשה ה' עמנו
 דוד ודבורה אסתר מייעל

Distinctive INSIGHT

Pieces of wood and לבונה are prohibited to be eaten

דאמר מר והבשר לרבות עצים ולבונה דלאו בני אכילה נינהו ואפילו הכי רבינהו קרא

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish discussed the halacha of one who is tamei who eats from meat of an offering before its blood splashed upon the altar. Reish Lakish contends that this person is liable for lashes, while R' Yochanan says that there are no lashes in this case. Abaye explains that this disagreement is only in a case where the person was tamei. However, if the person is tahor, and it is the meat of the offering which is tamei, all opinions would agree that lashes are to be administered. The reason for this halacha is based upon the verse (Vayikra 7:19), which states the word "והבשר—and the meat" twice in the same verse which teaches that meat from an offering that has been touched by someone who is tamei may not be eaten. The second mention of this word comes to teach that this halacha applies not only to edible parts of the offering, but it also applies to the wood on the altar and the לבונה-spice which became tamei'im, although they are not edible. Just as someone is liable for lashes for eating these non-edible items, so too are lashes given for eating an offering which has become tamei before the splashing of its blood on the altar.

In his Chiddushim on Rambam (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 18:12), Rabeinu Chaim HaLevi asks how Abaye can compare the cases of wood and לבונה to that of the meat from an offering. Wood and לבונה are not lacking any process to permit them; they are just inedible. Meat from an offering which is tamei is not allowed even for a person who is tahor, and the rule is that "something that is not permitted for one who is tahor is not additionally prohibited for one who is tamei." Rashi explains that the comparison is between items which are not fit to eat and meat of an offering which is not permitted to be eaten. Just as wood is prohibited although it is not edible, so too should there be a special prohibition against eating meat of an offering before its blood is applied to the altar.

Rashi (ד"ה לרבות) explains that the message of the verse which teaches that eating these items is a negative commandment is that "the cherished nature of being sanctified promotes their significance," and although they are not edible, they are treated as such regarding the prohibition to eat them if they are tamei'im. In general, the concept of the "cherished nature of being sanctified" is found in two contexts. One is here, where it means that although these items are not edible, the "cherished nature of being sanctified" elevates them to a status of being like food. We also find (Chagiga 24b) that food usually must come into contact with liquid before it may be susceptible to tum'ah. However, consecrated items have this cherished status, and they may contract tum'ah even without ever coming into contact with liquid. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 The Muskat and Lindner families
 In loving memory of their father, grandfather and great grandfather
 ר' יונה בן ר' חיים דוד ע"ה
 Dr. Joseph Weiss

HALACHAH Highlight

Is it obligatory to wear a head covering?

כי פליגי בחיה

About what do they disagree? About [offering] an undomesticated animal

Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that a person should not walk four *amos* with his head uncovered. Poskim debate whether it is prohibited to walk with one's head uncovered or whether it is just a pious practice. Maharshah² was asked by someone who was suffering from headaches whether he is permitted to sit and eat with his head uncovered. Maharshah answered that he does not know the source that prohibits one from making a beracha with an uncovered head. If not for the respect he has for the Torah scholars of previous generations who indicate that it is obligatory, he would rule leniently that one could make a beracha and even recite Krias Shema with his head uncovered. He cites a Midrash³ as support for this position. The Midrash relates praise of Hashem in that He does not demand His nation to uncover their heads when they recite their pledge of allegiance to Hashem in contrast to other kings that demand that their subjects uncover their heads when reciting their pledge of allegiance.

Birkei Yosef⁴ cites authorities who reject Maharshah's proof. The same Midrash mentions that Hashem related that he created ten categories of animals, three are found in a person's possession and seven are not in a person's possession, i.e. undomesticated animals. After listing the ten categories of animals Hashem declares that He did not demand that the Jewish People climb mountains in order to obtain the undomesticated animals. Since the language of the Midrash regarding head covering and the offering of undomesticated animals is the same, it would emerge that Hashem does not demand that we obtain undomesticated animals for korbanos but if one wants to offer an undomesticated animal as a korban it would be acceptable. The difficulty with this is that R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish disagree

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The exposition of the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains why the Mishnah presented all the different examples of one who properly received the blood and then did something improper.

The Gemara seeks to clarify why the blood in the cases of the Mishnah is not rejected.

Ravina asserts that the Mishnah follows the position of Chanan the Mitzri.

The Baraisa that presents the opinion of Chanan the Mitzri is introduced.

R' Ashi suggests another explanation for why the blood in the Mishnah is not rejected.

R' Shaya presents support for R' Ashi's assertion.

6) Blood that spilled on the floor

R' Yehudah relates that a kohen would fill a cup of blood on Erev Pesach so that any korban whose blood spilled on the floor would be gathered and applied to the altar but Rabanan disagreed.

The response of Rabanan is challenged and as a result the Gemara revises what they answered. ■

whether one who offers an undomesticated animal as a korban violates a positive command. Since the halacha follows R' Yochanan that offering an undomesticated animal violates a positive command one would be forced to conclude that the Midrash follows the rejected position of Reish Lakish. It is preferable to assume the language is not literal (לא דוקא) than to assume that the Midrash is not consistent with halacha. Consequently the language regarding the head covering should also not be taken literally and the Midrash does not prove that wearing a head covering is optional. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' ב' סעי' ו'.

2. שו"ת מהרש"ל סי' ע"ב.

3. ויקרא רבה כ"ז:.

4. ברכי יוסף או"ח סי' ב' סק"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Hidden Spark

"כל שבידו לא הוי דיחוי"

Rav Tzvi Yitzchak Abramowitz, zt"l, taught a deep lesson about teshuvah while answering a question based on today's daf. "The Chida, zt"l, wondered how teshuvah can genuinely rectify a person so that he will be viewed by Hashem as he was before he sinned. After all, the rule is that a sacrifice that was נדחה, that was unacceptable for some reason, cannot be brought even if the problem no longer applies.

"The Chida finds an answer to this question in Zevachim 34. There we find that if it was in a person's hands to remove the obstacle at any time so that the offering could be brought, this is not נדחה. But this seems very difficult to understand since Tosafos there asks

why we find earlier in Zevachim that a Jew who set aside a sacrifice and converted to another religion has disqualified his sacrifice. After all, the Jew can always do teshuvah! Tosafos explains that this is not called having had the solution 'in hand' since, although he could have done teshuvah, he has no interest in returning.¹ It seems that according to this, the answer is not valid."

He continued, "We find in the Ya'aros D'vash that although King Chizkiyah did not wish to marry, Hashem sent Yeshayah HaNavi to insist that he change his ways. Yeshayah told him: 'בהדי כבשי דרחמנא למה לך' — That which is hidden and known to Hashem should not determine your choices.' Although Chizkiyah saw that his future child Menashe would become a רשע, he could not fathom that Menashe would do teshuvah, and so he did not want to marry. Teshuvah is such a hidden, intangible path that it cannot be grasped even with ruach

hakodesh. The Imrei Emes, zt"l, explains that there is a קיסטא דחיותא a tiny life force from which a person's body will be resurrected in times to come. Similarly, even after one sins, a trace of the strength to resist sinning before one fell remains to enable one to return. This spark is deeply hidden.

Rav Abramowitz concluded, "Once we know this, we see that this there is no question at all. Tosafos is discussing how we view one who has converted. From our point of view, his sacrifice is נדחה since he apparently has no intention of returning. But from Hashem's viewpoint, there is always a תשובה which can be fanned into life. Hashem discerns this hidden truth, so from His point of view we are never truly pushed away."² ■

1. כך הוא פירוש התוספות ע"פ הגהות השטמ"ק

2. טעם הצבי, ח"ה ע' רל"א ■

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.