



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Blood applications of the inner altar (cont.)

R' Pappa explains how we know that the seven applications to the paroches are essential.

R' Yirmiyah suggests that the necessity for the Baraisa to provide a separate exposition of the four applications to the horns of the inner altar is for R' Shimon who has a disagreement with R' Yehudah about the intent of the relevant pasuk.

The Baraisa that presents the disagreement about this pasuk is cited.

The exchange between R' Yehudah and R' Shimon about their respective expositions is tangentially recorded.

Abaye suggests that the Baraisa needed to provide a source for the four applications to the horns of the inner altar even according to R' Yehudah.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok explains why it was necessary for the Baraisa to teach that the blood applications of the Yom Kippur bull are essential.

R' Pappa rejects this explanation and offers an alternative explanation.

The Gemara elaborates on the law mentioned by R' Pappa.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Pappa's explanation.

2) Clarifying R' Yishmael's position

In the Baraisa just cited R' Yishmael referred to two korbanos being equated to teach a law. The Gemara begins to search for the intent of that statement. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Shimon and R' Yehudah?

2. When does the word חקה indicate that a particular service is essential?

3. Why is it necessary for the verse to mention וטבל as well as בדם?

4. What is the point of dispute between Rabbi and R' Yishmael?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Dedicating the inner-altar before it may be used

מזבח קטורת סמים למה לי שאם לא נתחנך המזבח בקטורת הסמים לא היה מזה

The Gemara analyzes the verse (Vayikra 4:7) regarding the bull of the Kohen Gadol, and it teaches many lessons regarding its procedure. The Gemara then proceeds to teach other lessons which are derived from some other extra words in the verse.

The blood of the bull of the Kohen Gadol is placed "before Hashem," which clearly indicates that it should be placed upon the inner-altar. Why does the verse then reiterate that it shall be placed "upon the altar of the ketores"? This teaches us that if the inner-altar had not been initiated with the ketores spices, the altar would not be able to have the blood of these Chattas offerings sprinkled upon it.

The Gemara in Menachos (49a) teaches that the only procedure which may be used to initiate the inner-altar is that of the burning of the ketores of the afternoon.

Rambam rules in accordance with these two Gemaras. In Hilchos Temidim U'Musafim (3:1) he writes that the inner-altar must only be initiated with burning the ketores of the afternoon. In Hilchos Avodas Yom HaKippurim (5:24), Rambam brings the halacha of our Gemara, that if the altar had not been initiated with the ketores, it should not yet be used for sprinkling of the blood.

Mikdash David asks that if we already know that the altar must be dedicated with the ketores, why is it necessary for the Torah to teach a special law in our Gemara that the blood should not be sprinkled if the altar had not been initiated? Would this not have been already evident? He answers that the lesson in the Mishnah of Menachos would have only taught us that when the ketores is used, it should only be done with the procedure of the afternoon and not the morning. We might have still considered the possibility that other services might be allowed to dedicate the altar instead of the ketores. This is why our Gemara teaches that we do not use any other service for the dedication of the altar.

Ba'al Halachos Gedolos (Mitzvah 35) explains that

HALACHAH Highlight

Leaning on a korban

לפי שלא למדנו לפר יוה"כ לסמיכה וכו'

Since we have not learned the requirement to lean on the Yom Kippur bull etc.

Teshuvus Eretz Tzvi¹ was asked to resolve a contradiction between two Gemaras. Our Gemara derives from the words **וכן יעשה** that the Kohen Gadol must lean on the head of the Yom Kippur bull (סמיכה). The Gemara in Yoma (39b), however, relates that the Kohen Gadol would lean on the head of the Yom Kippur bull during his confession and the Gemara there did not trace this practice back to a verse. The question is if we could determine based on logic that when confessing it is necessary to lean on the head of the animal then why was it necessary in our Gemara to derive the requirement to lean on the head of the animal from a verse? If this requirement cannot be derived from a verse then how does the Gemara in Yoma conclude that the Kohen Gadol must lean when he confesses if an exposition is not cited to prove that contention?

The Brisker Rov² suggests that the two Gemaras are addressing different obligations. Our Gemara addresses the obligation to lean on the head of a korban and since there is no logical reason one would lean his weight on the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

the halacha that the altar requires to be initiated before it may be used for the procedure of the blood is a positive mitzvah learned from the dedication of the altar in the Mishkan. It was also a service utensil, a *kli shareis*, which was dedicated with its being anointed just like all such utensils (see 27b). However, in this regard it could have been dedicated with any service, and not only with burning of the ketores. ■

head of a korban before it is slaughtered the requirement necessitates a verse. The Gemara in Yoma addresses the obligation to lean on the head of the korban when one is confessing and it is logical that one who is confessing his sins should be leaning on the head of the korban since it is a sign of submission and that man is no better than an animal—**ומותר האדם מן הבהמה אין**.³ These two requirements to lean have practical differences as well. One practical difference is the law that leaning on the head of the animal should be performed immediately before slaughtering the animal. That requirement applies only with regard to the leaning on the animal that is associated with offering the korban. Leaning on the head of the animal that is associated with one's confession would not have to be immediately before the korban is slaughtered. ■

1. שו"ת ארץ צבי ח"א סי' צ"א.
2. כתבי הגר"י לסוגייתנו ד"ה לפי שלא למדנו.
3. ע'י ביבן דעת מהגאון מקוטנא סי' י"ג. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Out of Order

”שאם הקדים מעשה לחבירו...”

Acertain person was tired on Shabbos afternoon and dozed off. When he finally awoke, after several hours, it was fully nightfall. He had missed not only the third meal of Shabbos, but also minchah on Shabbos afternoon. He davened the evening prayer twice, the first for ma'ariv and the second to make up the minchah he had missed. Unfortunately, he forgot atah chonantanu in both cases and, being hungry, he ate before havdalah.

The halachah is that one who eats before at least saying boruch hamavdil bein kodesh l'chol or atah chonantanu on motzei Shabbos has a special fine: he must repeat his ma'ariv shemonah esrei. But this hapless man wondered if he should also repeat his second shemonah esrei that he had said to make up minchah.

When he asked the Ben Ish Chai, zt"l, he explained that from the halachah brought in our daf we see that he must repeat both amidos. “We find that, according to Rabbi Yehudah, if any of the avodos in the kodesh hako-dashim done in white garments are done out of order, they do not atone.

“This is exactly the same as your

question, since one may not daven the tashlumin before the chovah. By eating before any havdalah you lost your chovah and the tashlumin is also invalid. You must therefore daven both prayers again, first the chovah and then the tashlumin.

“But since there is some indication that the Yerushalmi does not agree with the Bavli on this—although this can be explained— it is better to daven the tashlumin with a condition. You must say to yourself: ‘If I am obligated to re-daven the tashlumin I am saying this second shemonah esrei to discharge my obligation. And if not, I am saying it as a tefilas nedavah.’”¹ ■

1. שו"ת תורה לשמה, ס' י"ח. ■