



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Yishmael's position (cont.)

The Gemara continues to clarify R' Yishmael's statement.

R' Pappa explains R' Yishmael's exposition.

The Gemara begins to explain the second half of R' Yishmael's statement.

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

The Baraisa utilizes the term **חטאתם** to teach that the diaphragm and kidneys of the Communal-Idolatry-He-Goat are burned on the altar. This exposition is challenged since another phrase teaches that same concept.

R' Pappa explains the need for both expositions.

2) Clarifying the Baraisa

R' Huna the son of R' Nosson questions R' Pappa's earlier interpretation of a Baraisa (Cited on 39a).

R' Pappa responds by noting that there is a disagreement amongst Tannaim about the matter.

D'vei R' Yishmael offers explanations accompanied by parables to explain why two concepts are mentioned in the context of the Kohen Gadol's bull rather than in the context of the Communal-Error bull.

3) Part of the permitter

A Mishnah is cited that presents a dispute whether piggul

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does the Torah make an allusion to the Communal-Error bull in the parsha that discusses the bull for the error of the Anointed-Kohen?

2. Why is an extra hekeish necessary to equate the Communal-Error bull and the Communal-Idolatry he-goat?

3. What is the point of dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim?

4. Explain **כל העושה על דעת ראשונה הוא עושה**.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 The Bider families
 in memory of their mother and grandmother
מרת חנה בת ר' זאב וואלף, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

The King whose close confidant sinned against him

משל למלך בשר ודם שזעם על אוהבו ומיעט בסרחונו מפני חביבו

The Gemara brings two Baraisos which note details of the differences in the verses regarding the halacha of the Kohen Gadol who sins and the episode of the Sanhedrin which rules mistakenly (Vayikra 4:6,9). The first Baraisa notes that the requirement to place the diaphragm with the liver and the two kidneys upon the altar is only written explicitly in regard to the offering of the Kohen Gadol (Vayikra 4:9). This law is then applied to the law of the offering of the Sanhedrin only through an association to the law of the Kohen Gadol (**היקש**). The Baraisa explains that this can be illustrating by a parable. A mortal king was angered by his beloved friend. Yet, he minimized the sin due to his love for him. Rashi explains that the resolution of this parable is that God has a great love for the Jewish nation, so the description of the sin and the atonement for the Sanhedrin and the community is written concisely, so as to scale back the magnitude of their sin.

A second Baraisa is brought which notes another difference between the verses of the bull of the Kohen Gadol and that of the Sanhedrin. In the depiction of the sin and atonement of the Kohen Gadol the Torah states that the blood should be sprinkled upon the paroches, the Holy Curtain, but not in the verses of the sin and atonement of the Sanhedrin. The reason is given in the form of a parable. There was a king of flesh and blood whose subjects rebelled against him. If it would be only a minority of his subjects who sinned against him, his royal court of advisors remains intact. If, however, the sinners represent a majority of his subjects, his advisors and confidants must be reconstituted.

The symbolism of this parable is that when the Torah discusses the mistake of the Sanhedrin and the sin of the majority of the people, the precious bond between the people and God is elusive, and the holiness of the Mishkan and its furnishings is diminished. This is why the description of the special Curtain and its holy nature is not mentioned in this context.

Maharsha notes that in the second parable, the sin of the community is portrayed as being worse than the sin of the Kohen Gadol. This is why their sin results in the holy aspect of the Mishkan being diminished. Yet, Rashi explained that in the first parable, the community is considered the beloved and close friend of the king, so the description of their sin is minimized. Why is the sin of the community treated in one case as something which is to be minimized, while in the second case their sin is accentuated? Maharsha therefore suggests that in the first parable, the Kohen is the close friend of the king, and it is his sin which features the diaphragm and kidneys, because his offering should be full and complete to minimize his transgression. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Working with one's original mindset

כל העושה על דעת ראשונה הוא עושה

One continues to behave according to his initial mindset

One of the issues that is discussed in our Gemara is the principle כל העושה על דעת ראשונה הוא עושה – One continues to behave according to his initial mindset. This principle has numerous applications. Beir Halacha¹ relates that he recalls from his youth that when baking matzos someone would continually remind the people who were working that they are working to make matzos to be used for the mitzvah. He then decries the fact that it is no longer practiced. Authorities discuss whether it is, in fact, necessary for adults to be reminded during the course of the preparation and baking that they are working to make matzos for the mitzvah. Shulchan Aruch² writes that before one begins to spin thread for tzitzis he should declare that he is doing so for the sake of the mitzvah. Mishnah Berurah³ writes that it is sufficient for the person to make the declaration before he begins this activity even if the activity continues over the course of many days. The rationale for this ruling is based on the notion that once he declared his intent at the outset it is assumed that he continues to work with that mindset. Similarly, Beir Halacha⁴ writes that one could declare before he starts making matzos that all the matzos that he will make will be for the sake of the mitzvah and that is sufficient.

Sefer Matzos Mitzvah⁵ contends that these types of decla-

intent for part of the permitter renders the korban piggul.

Reish Lakish clarifies R' Meir's position and then cites proof for his position.

R' Shmuel bar Yitzchok rejects this proof by presenting an alternative explanation of the Baraisa.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

An inference is drawn from this Baraisa but it is rejected.

The Gemara begins a challenge against Reish Lakish's understanding of R' Meir. ■

rations are effective only for the material that is present at the time of the declaration. The declaration is not effective for the material that is not currently present. Teshuvos L'horos Nossan also subscribes to this position. He writes that the principle that one continues to act in accordance with his initial mindset is limited to the task that is in front of him. An example of this is the Gemara's application of this principle to a korban where the Gemara teaches that a person's initial mindset carries through the duration of the process of offering the korban. There is no source that indicates that one's mindset for one object continues as one works with a second object that was not initially present. Consequently, it is necessary to make a declaration as one begins working with each new object. ■

1. ביאור הלכה סי' ת"ס סעי' א' ד"ה וקטן.
2. שו"ע או"ח סי' י"א סעי' א'.
3. מ"ב שם סק"ה.
4. ביאור הלכה סי' ת"ס ד"ה שיאמר.
5. ספר מצות מצוה פ"י העי' ל"ז.
6. שו"ת להורות נתן ח"א סי' כ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Power of the Community

"מיעט בסרחונו מפני חברו..."

On today's daf we find a parable: "A king was angry at his beloved friend. Because of his love, he minimized his friend's wrongdoing." Rashi explains that this beloved friend is the tzibbur. The Maharal explains that a tzibbur is not rendered unworthy by sin of Hashem's regard in the same way that an individual is.¹ One reason a tzibbur is cherished is that when they work together, they can perfect themselves with relative ease. The bigger the tzibbur, the easier the change—if there is a sincere desire and unity

among them.

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, stressed the advantage of working on one's defects together with a tzibbur over working alone. "The foundation of working on our middos is to repair our congenital moral weaknesses. To do this, we must know the truth of how our negative traits fool us and influence our actions. Since by nature we all tend to overlook our inherent weaknesses, we are much better off working together with like-minded friends, who can offer objective views of our challenges and responses. Without friends to help us see the truth, we could easily declare a sherez ritually pure. Left to our own devices, we can invent endless rationalizations."²

"Just as Hashem imbued the world

with the principle of interdependence—every person both contributes and receives from others materially—the same is true in spiritual matters. It is impossible to truly rectify our middos without help from our friends.³ Here in Kelm everyone works with a friend to help rectify their collective faults. I am very moved and amazed by the vast progress the students have made over time due to this seder. This is exactly what Rav Yisrael Salanter, zt"l, told us to do when we were with him in Kovno. What a pity that it took us so long to follow his instructions and develop a practical program so that we could all work together!"⁴ ■

1. דרכי חיים, פ"ב
2. פנקס הקבלות, ע' קנ"ט
3. חכמה ומוסר, ח"ב, ע' שכ"ו
4. פנקס הקבלות ■

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center for Torah and Chesed, under the leadership of HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"o

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HoRav 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.