



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah concludes its list of differences between a private bamah and a communal bamah.

2) "Outside of its pit"

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan discuss the meaning of the phrase "outside of its pit" used in the Mishnah in reference to the Parah Adumah.

The Gemara suggests another interpretation that R' Yochanan could have given for the Mishnah and the Gemara's response is that he could have given that response as well.

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok notes that both opinions derived their respective positions from the same pasuk.

Reish Lakish unsuccessfully challenges R' Yochanan's position.

R' Yochanan unsuccessfully challenges Reish Lakish's position.

According to a second version, Reish Lakish unsuccessfully challenged R' Yochanan from that Mishnah.

3) The flood

The previous discussion introduced the dispute whether the flood fell in Eretz Yisroel.

A lengthy discussion related to this topic is recorded which concludes with an explanation why Bavel is also called Shinar.

4) The he-goat that is sent away

A contradiction between our Mishnah and a Baraisa is noted whether the he-goat that is sent away is considered destined to come to the Ohel Moed.

A resolution to this contradiction is proposed.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara questions why an additional verse was necessary to exclude an animal that sodomized or was sodomized when the first verse is seemingly sufficient. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish concerning the phrase חוץ מגתה?
2. Why was R' Yehoshua not concerned upon the discovery of bones in the chamber of the wood shed?
3. How was the re'eim saved from the flood (two answers)?
4. What happens when one consumes dust of Bavel?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Facing the door of the Sanctuary while performing the rite of the Parah Adumah

מה הוא אתה כנגד הפתח וכו'

We see in our Gemara that the sprinkling of the blood of the Parah Adumah must be done toward the entrance of the Mikdash. The same verse which teaches this detail (Bamidbar 19:3) begins by describing the slaughter of the Parah Adumah. Rav Ada bar Ahava notes that this close association between the slaughter of the cow and the sprinkling of its blood comes to teach us that just like the sprinkling of the blood, the slaughter of the animal should also be in the place from where the entrance to the Sanctuary can be viewed. R' Yochanan holds that the burning of the Parah Adumah must also be in this location.

The eastern wall of the Temple Mount was built lower than the walls on the other directions, and this was done specifically to allow the kohen who takes the Parah Adumah to Har HaZeisim to be able to look toward the Mikdash and to see over the wall as he faced west and into the doorway of the Sanctuary (Yoma 16a and Mishnah, Middos 2:4). The Mikdash was built on an inclined slope of a mountain, such that the level of the Sanctuary was more than twenty amos higher than the level of the Temple Mount, which was higher than the top of the entranceway from the Temple Mount into the Mikdash. The kohen could only peer toward and into the Sanctuary by standing on Har HaZeisim and looking above the top of the eastern wall, which is why the wall was built a bit lower than the other walls.

Rashi writes that the kohen had to face the direction of the Sanctuary during the sprinkling of the blood, and the Mishnah (Parah 4:2) states that if the blood was sprinkled without the kohen's looking toward the west, the sprinkling is invalid. The Gemara in Menachos (27b) notes this view, but a Baraisa is cited which says that sprinkling without facing the west is valid. Two resolutions to this inconsistency are brought.

One answer is that these sources represent two views, one being R' Yehuda who disqualifies the sprinkling of the blood if it is not done while facing the door of the Sanctuary, and the Baraisa is the view of Chachamim who say it is valid.

A second explanation is given by Rava, who says that both sources are the view of Chachamim who do not require that the kohen face the west into the doorway of the Sanctuary. The Baraisa which says that his actions are valid is speaking about a case where the kohen is facing west, toward the Mikdash, and his back is toward the east. This is the correct

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Is there a Biblical obligation to eat fish on Shabbos?

לא נגזרה גזרה על דגים שבים

The decree did not include the fish in the sea

The Gemara teaches that the decree that all creatures should die during the flood did not affect the fish. Chizkuni¹ explains that fish were saved from destruction since they did not behave in a corrupt manner. Pardes Yosef² also writes that the fish did not mate with other species and that is the reason for the custom to eat fish on Shabbos. He then relates that he heard that the Baal Shem Tov chose to live in the city of Mezhiboz because there was an abundance of fish available and it would be easy to obtain them for Shabbos.

Teshuvos Tzemach Tzedek³ was asked whether it is obligatory for one to eat fish on Shabbos in order to fulfill the obligation of having pleasure - עונג - on Shabbos. He responded that although there is a Biblical obligation to honor Shabbos nevertheless it does not have to be fulfilled specifically with fish. Although the Gemara Shabbos (118b) mentions eating fish as a means of honoring Shabbos, nevertheless, R' Chiya bar Ashi states that even eating a small amount of something for Shabbos is sufficient. This clearly indicates that fish is not a necessity and the earlier state-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

alignment of how he must stand, so the sprinkling is valid even if he does not look toward the door of the Sanctuary. The Baraisa which disqualifies this sprinkling is speaking about where the kohen is standing facing north or south, a stance which is unacceptable. ■

ment promoting the practice of eating fish on Shabbos referred to one who has the means to enhance his Shabbos meals to a higher degree.

Beis Hillel⁴ rejects Tzemach Tzedek's proof since the Gemara defines a small amount as referring to fried fish. This clearly indicates that according to all opinions one must have fish and the only question is whether one is obligated to have large fish or even small fried fish. Since eating fish is a Biblical obligation an enactment should not be made prohibiting fish as a response to an increase in the cost of fish unless it increases more than a third of what it used to cost. Machazik Beracha⁵, however, asserts that even when the Gemara cites eating fried fish as the means to honor Shabbos it was just an example but was not intended to limit the scope of the mitzvah. ■

1. חזקוני בראשית ו' י"ב.
2. פרדס יוסף שמיני י"א: ט.
3. שו"ת צמח צדק (הקדמון) סי' כ"ח ד"ה הרי.
4. בית הלל יו"ד סי' רי"ח בהגהה מבנו של המחבר.
5. מחזיק ברכה או"ח סי' רמ"ב אות ג'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Deluge

"ומר סבר לא ירד..."

Rav Yaakov Galinsky, zt"l, once gave a very inspiring talk based on a statement on today's daf. "In Zevachim 113 we find that the flood did not reach Eretz Yisrael. Tosafos asks—and the Zohar expands on this question—if so, why did Noach need to build an ark? Why didn't Hashem simply send him to Eretz Yisrael, thereby delivering him from the flood?

"The Zohar gives a very compelling answer. Although the waters of the flood did not reach Eretz Yisrael, the disruption from this disaster included vast heat and winds which carried to Eretz Yisrael

and killed everyone there. Therefore, if Noach had not had an ark he would have died.

"Just as this is true in physical matters, it is true spiritually as well. When we live in a place that is surrounded by a spiritual deluge, we must go into an ark or perish spiritually. It is sad to see this happening on a daily basis.

"Who doesn't know that the street is a spiritually unhealthy place to be? Yet we are still influenced by it. Although we do not go around like the chilonim in the street, we still emulate them in subtle ways.

"I remember that decades ago, I went to see the Steipler, zt"l. As I was speaking to him, his grandson burst into the room and exclaimed, 'Zeide; there is a good hechsher on gum!'

"The Steipler smiled at me and said,

'You see Reb Yankev? They don't ask whether it is fitting to chew gum. They only look to see if it has a hechsher. If it has a hechsher they are ecstatic. Whether they should be eating gum in the first place never crosses their mind!'

"Oy vey! We want to be street people...but with a hechsher! Instead of showing the street people how empty their lives are, we want to do like them, but with a hechsher. How sad that, although we eat kosher, we never think about being a kosher Jew! Our sages tell us that whoever sheds tears over the death of a kosher person, God counts them and puts them in His treasures. This shows us the importance of being kosher Jews. God should help us attain this goal for the sake of His Name!" ■

1. להגיד, פרשת נח, ע' 54-56 ■

