



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The three non-essential blood applications (cont.)

A Baraisa is cited that supports the Gemara's earlier understanding of R' Nechemiah's position.

The Gemara's understanding of the Baraisa is challenged.

Numerous alternative explanations of the Baraisa are suggested and rejected and thus according to the conclusion of the Gemara there is no proof to R' Pappa's contention.

Ravina suggests another interpretation of the Mishnah cited earlier by R' Pappa.

R' Tachlifa bar Gaza unsuccessfully challenges this interpretation.

### 2) Blood applications of the inner altar

A lengthy Baraisa is cited that teaches that the blood applications of the inner altar are all essential. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. When is one liable for offering blood outside of the Beis Hamikdash?  
 -----
2. How many of the sprinklings towards the paroches are essential?  
 -----
3. How do we know that the Rosh Chodesh goat offering is not an "inner" offering?  
 -----
4. For what sins does the Rosh Chodesh goat atone?  
 -----

## HALACHAH Highlight

*Atonement when one is unaware of his transgression*  
 שאין מכפרין על עבירת מצוה ידועה

*For they do not atone for known transgressions*

The Gemara teaches that the goat that was offered on Rosh Chodesh atoned for sins for which one is lacking awareness of the violation altogether. Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains that this korban atones for tum'ah violations of entering the Beis HaMikdash or touching sacred items in a cir-

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Leaning on the animal and pouring the blood are not essential*

וכפר אף על פי שלא סמך ונסלח אף על פי שלא נתן שירים

The Torah presents the law of the bull of the Sanhedrin which issued a mistaken ruling and where the community sinned based upon this ruling (Vayikra 4:13-21). The verses describing this offering conclude with instructions that this bull be brought "just as the bull of Chattas." (v. 20) The Baraisa explains that this means that the bull offering of the Sanhedrin should be similar to the earlier case of the bull of the Kohen Gadol, which was listed prior to this episode (verses 4-12). Nevertheless, nothing new is learned from the bull of the Kohen Gadol, as the laws of the bull for the Sanhedrin are detailed and complete. Rather, the entire verse is extra, and each phrase in the verse comes to teach us a lesson. The word "וכפר—and he shall atone" teaches that even if the elders did not lean their hands on the head of the bull, atonement is nevertheless achieved. Furthermore, the word "ונסלח—and they will be forgiven" teaches us that even if the remaining blood of the offering is not poured upon the base of the outer altar, the Sanhedrin and the people will be forgiven.

Shitta Mikubetzes notes that the Gemara earlier (38a) taught that the word "ונסלח" which is written in reference to the outer Chattas is not an extra word, and the only reason the Gemara derives its lesson is due to the combination of the two words "וכפר – it shall atone, ונסלח—and it bring forgiveness" which stand out as redundant. Our Gemara, however, seems to derive a separate lesson from each word.

Shitta Mikubetzes explains that, in fact, the word "ונסלח" is not extra, and no special lesson is learned from it. The limitations that leaning on the animal and pouring the remaining blood are actions that are not essential are both learned from the word "וכפר." The reason both lessons can be derived from one word is that the leaning and the pouring of the blood are not essential in regard to other offerings, so to extend this rule to the bull of the Sanhedrin can be done with one word.

Tosafos (ד"ה ונסלח) points out that there does not seem to be a need for a verse to teach that the pouring of the blood is not essential for the bull of the Sanhedrin.

(Continued on page 2)

(Highlight...Continued from page 1)

cumstance in which the violator was unaware that he was tamei and is still unaware that he did something wrong. Ayeles HaShachar<sup>2</sup> notes that this Gemara indicates that a person who commits a transgression but is completely unaware of the transgression, nevertheless, requires atonement. He then references Teshuvos Rav Akiva Eiger<sup>3</sup>. Rav Akiva Eiger discusses whether people are obligated to restrain a person from committing a transgression if the transgressor is completely ignorant of the fact that he is violating a prohibition. The question revolves around the question of whether someone who is preoccupied (מתעסק) has committed a transgression but is not punished for that transgression or perhaps it is considered as though he has not committed a transgression altogether. Our Gemara's reference to the Rosh Chodesh Korban indicates that it is indeed considered a transgression.

אור הרש"י<sup>4</sup> contends that this discussion sheds light on something that is written in Chovas HaLevavos. Chovas HaLevavos writes that a person must calculate every one of his movements. Seemingly such behavior is reserved for the pious and yet he seems to mandate this behavior for everyone. אור הרש"י explains that the goat offered on Rosh Chodesh is intended to atone for certain transgressions that are committed without any awareness whatsoever. Why should atonement be required for some-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The Gemara notes that this procedure is not critical for the bull of the Kohen, as is taught in the Gemara later (52a), based upon the wording of the verse in Vayikra 4:7. We should be able to learn that this same law applies for the bull of the Sanhedrin due the association (היקש) between these laws to each other.

Shitta Mikubetzes answers this question by explaining that if we were to use the association between the paragraphs to learn lessons from the bull of the Kohen to that of the Sanhedrin, we would only be able to learn the strict rules from one to the other. However, we would not be able to learn the law that we may dispense with the pouring of the blood, which is a leniency. ■

one who is completely ignorant of the fact that he sinned? It must be that a person is obligated to oversee every one of his actions. If someone touches something he has to know what he touched and why he touched it. The fact that he was not paying attention and during that lapse came in contact with tum'ah and then entered the Beis HaMikdash or touched a sacred item itself necessitates atonement. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה שמכפרין.
2. אילת השחר ד"ה שמכפרין.
3. שו"ת רעק"א מהדו"ק סי' ח'.
4. אור הרש"י ויקרא מאמר שע"ג. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Reconnecting to the Source

”ונסלח אע"פ שלא נתן שיריים...”

Someone once asked the Ohr Ha-Chaim Hakadosh, ז"ל, a very painful question. “If someone fell and did a sin for which the punishment is kareis, why should he continue to keep Torah law? After all, since he has uprooted his entire nefesh from Hashem, how can keeping Torah and mitzvos help him?”

The Ohr Hachaim explained that this man had a great misconception. “You should never think that if you did one evil act that is chayav kareis—or even many such sins—that he has

completely uprooted his nefesh from Hashem. This is a fallacy. Every Jew has many roots that extend on high, corresponding to all the mitzvos of the Torah. When he violates something which entails kareis, this cuts him off only regarding the branch which relates to that mitzvah, not completely, chas v'shalom. So, of course, keeping Torah helps him regarding the rest of his nefesh even if he never does teshuvah.

“In addition, even if he has ripped out one spiritual limb's connection through sin, there remains a trace of holiness which still extends to the kisei hakavod. It is incumbent on every Jew to teshuvah, thereby undoing the kareis and restoring his connection to

what it was before the sin.”<sup>1</sup>

Rav Hirsch, ז"ל, explains similarly regarding the blood of sacrifices poured on the foundation of the altar which is discussed on today's daf. “Kareis entails uprooting oneself from his spiritual source. The foundation of the altar alludes to reconnecting to our foundation, to our fellow Jews and Toras Hashem. After bringing a sacrifice, we pour what remains of the blood on the foundation of the altar to symbolize a change of direction. We go from kareis, chas v'shalom, to restoring our connection through teshuvah and resolving to change our ways in the future.”<sup>2</sup> ■

1. אור החיים הקדוש, ויקרא, י"ט:ט.
2. ז"ר רש"י הירש על החומש, ויקרא, א' ה' ■