



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Yuma Daf Nun Hey

NATAL ES HADAM MIMI SHEMIMARES BO...

- **Q:** What is a "matzlif"? **A: R' Yehuda** showed, it refers to one giving lashes, who begins higher up and brings each successive lash a little lower.
- A Braisa says, when he sprinkles the blood in the Kodosh Hakodashim, he does not sprinkle it so that it will touch the Aron, rather he sprinkles it towards the Aron, having it fall short of the Aron. When he sprinkles the one sprinkle "above", he turns his hand over so that the sprinkling action sends the blood up. When he sprinkles the 7 sprinkles "below", he keeps his hand straight, so that the sprinkling actions sends the blood down.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the blood is not to touch the Aron? **A: R' Acha bar Yaakov in the name of R' Zeira** said, the pasuk regarding the goat says "v'hiza oso ahl (above) hakapores v'lifnei (below) hakapores". There was no reason to write "lifnei" to teach the 7 below, because we could have learned that from the blood of the par. The reason the pasuk says it is to compare the "above" to the "below". Just like the sprinklings below are not to touch the Aron, so too the sprinkling above should not touch the Aron.
 - **Q:** Maybe the "above" part of the pasuk regarding the par should be viewed as being extra, because we can learn this out from the "above" requirement of the goat!? Maybe the reason it is written is to compare the "below" to the "above", that just like the "above" must reach the Aron, the "below" must reach the Aron as well!? **A:** If we use the first method, of darshening the "below" of the goat, we could explain that the extra words of "above" by the par are meant to darshen the drasha of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** (that whenever the Torah says "pnei" it means to the east). However, if we will darshen the "above" of the par as you suggest, the "below" of the goat will remain extra.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the blood of the goat says "v'hiza oso ahl (above) hakapores v'lifnei (below) hakapores". It says "oso" for the above, which teaches there is only one sprinkle above. We do not know how many sprinkles are to go below. We learn from the sprinkles below of the par, that he must sprinkle 7 times below by the goat as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa continues, maybe we should compare the sprinkle below of the goat to the sprinkle above, and say that just as there is only one sprinkle above, there is only one below as well? **A:** The Braisa says, it makes more sense to learn "below" from "below", rather than below from above.
 - **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe it makes more sense to learn sprinklings of the goat from the other sprinkling of the goat, rather than to learn it from the sprinklings of the par!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'asah es damo kasher asah l'dam hapar". This teaches that the sprinklings of both animals should be the same.
 - The Braisa continues, we now know how many sprinklings there are to be from each animal "below". We also know that the goat gets one sprinkle "above". We will learn that there is also only one sprinkle above with the par's blood, just like there is one sprinkle above from the goat's blood.
 - **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe we should learn the above by a par from the below by a par and say that there must be 7 sprinklings above? **A:** The Braisa says, it makes more sense to learn "above" from "above", rather than above from below.

- **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe it makes more sense to learn sprinklings of the par from the other sprinkling of the par, rather than to learn it from the sprinklings of the goat!? **A:** The pasuk says “v’asah es damo kasher asah l’dam hapar”. This teaches that the sprinklings of both animals should be the same.

ACHAS, ACHAS V’ACHAS, ACHAS U’SHTAYIM

- A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** says the “achas” for the sprinkle above is always said before the number of sprinkles below. **R’ Yehuda** says the number for the sprinkles below is said first. The Gemara says that they do not argue. Each shita follows the way counting was done is their locale.
 - **Q:** All agree that the sprinkle above is counted along with each sprinkle below. Why is this so? **A: R’ Elazar** says this is done so that he doesn’t get mixed up in his count. **R’ Yochanan** says, the extra word “yazeh” in the pasuk of “v’lifnei hakapores yazeh”, teaches that the sprinkle above must be counted along with each sprinkle below.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these reasons? **A:** If he did not count, but did not get mixed up either. According to **R’ Elazar** that is ok. According to **R’ Yochanan** he would have to sprinkle again.

YATZA V’HENICHO AHL KAN HAZAHAV SHEBAHEICHAL

- A Braisa in Shekalim says that **R’ Yehuda** holds there are no collection boxes in the Beis Hamikdash for obligatory bird korbanos, because we are afraid that the money would get mixed up with money for voluntary bird korbanos. **Abaye** asked, why can’t we just label the boxes, which would prevent them from getting mixed up!? **R’ Yosef** answered, **R’ Yehuda** holds that labeling is not a sufficient safeguard to prevent a mix-up.
 - **R’ Yosef** proves this point from our Mishna, where **R’ Yehuda** says there was only one stand in the Beis Hamikdash, presumably because he says that having 2 stands may lead to the mixing up of the blood of the par and the goat. Labeling would not have been sufficient.
 - **Q: R’ Yehuda** says in a Mishna that labeling was sufficient to prevent mixing up the different types of voluntary bird korbanos. We see labeling is sufficient. If so, why does he not allow a collection box for obligatory bird korbanos as well? **A: R’ Dimi** said, the reason he does not allow that is because he is concerned that the owner of one of the chatas may die, in which case that chatas may not be brought.
 - **Q:** We see from a Mishna that we are not concerned for death in this way!? **A:** He is concerned for the case of when he knowingly dies before the money from the collection box is used. Because the dead man’s money may not be used for a chatas, all the money will become passul.
 - **Q:** Why can’t we remove money equal to the value that the person put in, and through “breirah” say that this is the money of the man who died, in this way not having to make all the money passul!? **A: R’ Yehuda** does not hold of the concept of breirah.