



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

Shavuos Daf Zayin

ES SHEYEISH BAH YEDIYA BAT'CHILA...

- A Braisa says, how do we know that the pasuk that requires a korbon oleh v'yoreid refers to a tamei person who went into the Mikdash or eats kodashim? We can derive it as follows. The pasuk warns and tells of a punishment for tumah b'meidid, and tells of a chiyuv for a korbon oleh v'yoreid for tumah. Just as the warning and punishment is for a tamei person who went into the Mikdash or ate kodashim, the same must be for the korbon oleh v'yoreid.
 - **Q:** Maybe the korbon is for a tamei person who ate terumah, which is also warned against and punished in a pasuk? **A:** Eating terumah when tamei is chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven, and we don't find that something that is punished with misah at the Hands of Heaven should be associated with a chiyuv korbon.
 - **Q:** Maybe that is true regarding a regular chatas (which obligation only comes when there is a chiyuv kares), but something that is chayuv misah at the Hands of Heaven maybe can be chayuv a korbon oleh v'yoreid, as we find regarding oaths, that are not chayuv kares and are still chayuv in a korbon oleh v'yoreid!? **A:** The pasuk says "bah" which excludes terumah.
 - **Q:** Maybe "bah" should exclude a tamei person who went into the Mikdash, and the reason would be because a korbon oleh v'yoreid would not be enough to bring a kapara, and he would need a regular chatas like he needs for other aveiros that have a chiyuv kares!? **A:** **Rava** praised **Rebbi**, who says in a Braisa that we learn a gezeira shava from a korbon Shelamim to teach that the pasuk of korbon oleh v'yoreid is referring to tumas kodashim. We then learn tumas mikdash from a hekesh from tumas kodashim.
 - **Q:** The hekesh can also be made to compare terumah as well, and should therefore be included in the oleh v'yoreid obligation!? **A:** The word "bah" excludes terumah.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that "bah" excludes tumas Mikdash, not terumah? **A:** Tumas Mikdash is like tumas kodashim in that they are both chayuv kares, so it is more logical to say that it is not excluded.
 - **Q:** We should say that terumah is eaten like kodashim are eaten, and in that way it is more logical to say that terumah is included and Mikdash should be excluded!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the Torah writes the chiyuv kares regarding a Shelamim three times – once for the klal that includes all korbanos in the chiyuv kares (if they are eaten by a person who is tamei), once to teach that just as a Shelamim is brought on the Mizbe'ach, so too only things that are brought on the Mizbe'ach and are eaten when the person is tamei will create a chiyuv kares, and once is to teach that when the Torah discusses an unspecified tumah situation elsewhere, it refers to tumas kodashim. Now, since we already learned from **Rebbi's** gezeira shava regarding tumas kodashim, we say that it teaches regarding tumas Mikdash.
 - **Q:** This third mention of kares by Shelamim is needed for the drasha of **R' Avahu**, who says that it teaches a chiyuv kares for a tamei person who eats the inedible items (like the wood of the Mizbe'ach, the levonah, or the ketores), and according to **R' Shimon** it is needed to teach a chiyuv kares for eating a chatas that is offered on the inside Mizbe'ach!? **A:** Rather, **Nehardai** in

the name of Rava said, the Torah writes the concept of the person being tamei regarding a Shelamim three times – once for the klal that includes all korbanos in the chiyuv kares (if they are eaten by a person who is tamei), once to teach that just as Shelamim is brought on the Mizbe'ach, so too only things that are brought on the mizbe'ach and are eaten when the person is tamei will create a chiyuv kares, and once is to teach that when the Torah discusses an unspecified tumah situation elsewhere, it refers to tumas kodashim. Now, since we already learned from **Rebbi's** gezeira shava regarding tumas kodashim, we say that it teaches regarding tumas Mikdash.

- **Q:** This third mention of tumah by Shelamim is also needed for the drasha of **R' Avahu**, because once we need to mention the chiyuv kares, we also need to mention that the penalty is coming for a tamei person having eaten the kodashim!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** says we learn a gezeira shava on the word "tumaso" from the pasuk of a person who is tamei and enters the Mikdash to the pasuk that obligates in the korbon oleh v'yoreid, which teaches that this obligation comes for tumas Mikdash.
 - **Q:** If it is based on the gezeira shava, we don't need to exclude terumah, so what does the word "bah" come to exclude? **A:** It comes to *include* a person who became tamei from eating the neveila of a kosher bird, and teaches that this tumah can also be the basis for a korbon oleh v'yoreid.
 - **Q:** We said that "bah" is an exclusionary term, not an inclusionary term!? **A:** The pasuk of "oy ki yigah" is exclusionary and the word "bah" is exclusionary. This makes an exclusion followed by an exclusion, which therefore comes to include something.

YEISH BAH YEDIYA BAT'CHILA V'EIN BAH YEDIYA BASOF...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the chatas goat that is offered inside the Heichal on Yom Kippur says "v'chiper ahl hakodesh mitumos Bnei Yisrael". We can say this refers to any of the following three tumos – avodah zara, giluy arayos, or murder – because a pasuk regarding each of these refers to them as tumah. The pasuk therefore says "*mitumos* Bnei Yisrael" – it brings a kapara for some, but not all the aveiros of tumah. Just as we find that the Torah separates tumas Mikdash and tumas kodashim from other tumos, here too the pasuk is referring to a kaparah for tumas Mikdash and tumos kodashim. These are the words of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Shimon** says, we can learn this from the pasuk itself, which says "v'chiper ahl hakodesh mitumos" – it refers to tumah associated with kodesh. The Braisa continues and says, we would think that this korbon brings a kapara for all tumah associated with kodesh. The pasuk therefore says "umipisheyhem l'chol chatosam", which teaches that the shogeg it brings a kapara for must be like the meizid that it brings a kapara for – just as there is no korbon for the sinner to bring when he is a meizid, this Yom Kippur chatas only brings a kapara for a shogeg for which there is no korbon for the sinner to bring (i.e. it will not bring a kapara when there was awareness before, awareness after, and unawareness at the time of the aveira). How do we know that if there was awareness in the beginning, but there was no awareness at the end, that this Yom Kippur chatas accomplishes to suspend punishment? The pasuk says "l'chol chatosam", which refers to a case which can eventually lead to a chiyuv chatas (i.e. there is awareness in the beginning, but not at the end at this point in time).
 - **Q:** What case of avodah zara did the Braisa say we would think would get a kapara from the Yom Kippur chatas? If it was done b'meizid, he is subject to the death penalty!? If it was done b'shogeg, he must bring his own korbon chatas!? **A:** It would either be a case of meizid where he was not warned, and so would not receive the death penalty, or it could refer to a case of shogeg where he did not become aware of the aveira yet.

- **Q:** What case of giluy arayos did the Braisa say we would think would get a kapara from the Yom Kippur chatas? If it was done b'meizid, he is subject to the death penalty!? If it was done b'shogeg, he must bring his own korbon chatas!? **A:** It would either be a case of meizid where he was not warned, and so would not receive the death penalty, or it could refer to a case of shogeg where he did not become aware of the aveira yet.
- **Q:** What case of murder did the Braisa say we would think would get a kapara from the Yom Kippur chatas? If it was done b'meizid, he is subject to the death penalty!? If it was done b'shogeg, he must go into galus!? **A:** It would either be a case of meizid where he was not warned, and so would not receive the death penalty, or it could refer to a case of shogeg where he did not become aware of the aveira yet, or it can be referring to a case of shogeg for which he is not chayuv to go into galus.