



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

### Shavuos Daf Yud Daled

- **Q:** The Gemara quoted a Braisa which said that the words “asher la’am” teach that Kohanim do not achieve a kapara through the Yom Kippur chatas that is offered in the Heichal. The Gemara now asks, these words are needed to teach that the chatas goats are purchased using the communal funds!? **A:** We learn that requirement from the words “umei’eis adas Bnei Yisrael”.
  - **Q:** The Braisa says that the words “asher lo” teach that only the Kohen Gadol receives a kapara from the par that he brings. The Gemara now asks, these words are needed to teach that this par must be purchased with the Kohen Gadol’s personal funds!? **A:** The Braisa meant that since the par is purchased with the Kohen Gadol’s funds, it should only provide a kapara for him and noone else. The Braisa therefore answers that the Kohanim are considered to be his “beiso” and are therefore included in the kapara.
- **Q:** According to **R’ Shimon**, who says that the Kohanim don’t achieve any kaparah from the Azazel goat, we can understand why viduy is said twice on the par of the Kohen Gadol in addition to the offering of the blood – 3 procedures to provide 3 kaparos corresponding to the 3 kaparos achieved by the Yisraelim – one from the goat offered inside, one from the goat offered outside, and one from the Azazel goat. However, according to **R’ Yehuda** who says that the Kohanim did receive a kapara from the Azazel goat, why were three procedures needed on the par? One viduy along with the offering of the blood should suffice!? **A:** He needed one viduy for himself, and the second viduy for the other Kohanim. As **R’ Yishmael** taught, it is better for an innocent person to come and bring a kapara for a person with aveiros than have a person who himself has aveiros come and bring a kapara for others with aveiros as well.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK SHAVUOS SHTAYIM!!!**

**PEREK YEDIYOS HATUMAH -- PEREK SHEINI**

MISHNA

- The case of awareness of tumah are two cases that are really four: if he knew that he was tamei and then forgot he was tamei and ate kodashim, realizing that what he ate was kodashim, or if he remembered that he was tamei but did not realize that what he ate was kodashim, or if he did not realize that he was tamei and did not realize that what he ate was kodashim, and he later became aware of what he did, he is chayuv a korbon oleh v’yoreid. If he knew that he was tamei and then forgot he was tamei and walked into the Mikdash, realizing that he walked into the Mikdash, or if he remembered that he was tamei but did not realize that he was walking into the Mikdash, or if he did not realize that he was tamei and did not realize that he was walking into the Mikdash, and he later became aware of what he did, he is chayuv a korbon oleh v’yoreid.
  - He becomes chayuv for being tamei and walking into the Azarah or into an addition of the Azarah, because we only add onto Yerushalayim or the Azarah with the consent of the king, a navi, the Urim V’Tumim and the Great Sanhedrin of 71, and with the challos of two Todos and with song. Beis Din walks around the area that is to be added and the challos of the 2 Todos follow them, and all of Yisrael behind them. The inner challah is then eaten and the outer one is burned. If the addition was not added on in this manner, if someone walks into this area when tamei, he would not be chayuv a korbon oleh v’yoreid (if done b’shogeg) or kares (if done b’meizid).
- If a person became tamei while he was in the Azarah and he then forgot that he became tamei but realized that he was in the Mikdash, or if he remembered that he became tamei but forgot that he was in the Mikdash, or if he forgot both things, and while tamei he bowed down in the

Azarah or stayed there long enough to bow down or he left the Azarah using a longer route to the exit, he is chayuy. If he used the shorter route and didn't bow down or stay around long enough to do so, he would be patur.

- This is the mitzvas assei (the requirement to leave the Azarah when a person became tamei) regarding the Mikdash for which the Sanhedrin or the Kohen Gadol would not be chayuv a special korbon if they paskened wrongly regarding it. What is the mitzvas assei regarding niddah for which the Sanhedrin or the Kohen Gadol would be chayuv a special korbon? If a man was having bi'ah with a tahor woman and she then told him that she became tamei and he immediately separated from her, he would still be chayuv a chatas. This is because the separation gives him hana'ah just as the start of bi'ah does.
- **R' Eliezer** says, the pasuk says "sheretz..v'nelam" which teaches that one is only chayuv for forgetting that he was tamei, not for forgetting that he was in the Mikdash. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says "v'nelam mimenu v'hu tamei", which teaches that one is only chayuv for forgetting that he was tamei, not for forgetting that he was in the Mikdash. **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk says "v'nelam" twice – once to teach that he is chayuv when he forgot that he was tamei, and one to teach that he is chayuv when he forgot that he was in the Mikdash.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, why does the Mishna say there are only 4 cases involving the awareness of tumah? There are actually six cases – awareness before and after when he forgets he was tamei, awareness before and after when he forgets he was in the Mikdash, and awareness before and after when he forgets he was eating kodashim!? [The Gemara asks, if that is how you count the numbers of awareness, there should actually be 8, because forgetting he was tamei applies for the case of when he walks into the Mikdash and when he eats something of kodashim!? The Gemara says, that is not difficult to understand, because in those two cases he is forgetting about the same tumah – that he is tamei – and therefore it is counted as one.] **R' Pappa** answered, there are actually 8 cases of awareness, but the Mishna is not referring to the periods of awareness before the aveira, because those alone cannot make him chayuv. The Mishna is only referring to the awareness after the aveiros, which are four and which can lead to his bringing a korbon. **Others** say that **R' Pappa** answered, there are actually 8 cases of awareness, but the Mishna is not referring to the periods of awareness after the aveiros, because that awareness is needed for all cases of a chiyuv chatas throughout the Torah. The Mishna only refers to the awareness before the aveira, which is something that is unique to these cases of tumah.
- **R' Pappa** asked, what is the halacha if the person forgot about the entire concept of tumah (he knew he touched a sheretz, but did not realize that he was therefore considered to be tamei)? The Gemara asks, what is that case that he refers to? If he refers to a person who does not know which sheretz is tamei and which is not, that is something that any child knows, and he therefore cannot be considered as unaware!? Rather, the case is that he touched a piece of a sheretz the size of a lentil, and he does not know if that makes him tamei or not. Do we say that since he knows that sheratzim make a person tamei he is considered to be aware, or do we say that since he does not know the halacha regarding the size he is considered to be unaware?

#### TEIKU.

- **R' Yirmiya** asked, if a person of Bavel went up to EY and never knew where the place of Mikdash was, and went into that place when he was tamei, what is the halacha? The Gemara asks, who is he asking according to? If he asking according to **R' Akiva** who says that there must be an initial period of awareness, he would not be chayuv, because **R' Akiva** says a person is not chayuv when he doesn't realize that he is in the Mikdash!? If he is asking according to **R' Yishmael** who says one is chayuv for being tamei and entering the Mikdash when he is not aware that it is the Mikdash, he says that a person is chayuv even without having been aware beforehand!? Rather, we must say that he asked according to **Rebbi**, who holds that there has to be an initial awareness and says one is chayuv when he doesn't realize that he is in the Mikdash, and also holds that being aware that there is a concept of tumah is enough to be considered "aware". According to him, what would the halacha be? Do we say that since he knows there is a Mikdash somewhere in the world he is considered to have been aware, or do we say that he is unaware of the exact place and therefore is unaware? **TEIKU.**

- **Q:** How do we know that all these procedures must be followed to make an addition to Yerushalayim or the Azarah? **A: R' Simi bar Chiya** said, the pasuk regarding the Mishna says "v'chein taasu", which teaches that the procedure to build or expand the Mikdash must follow the procedure done by the Mishkan. Just as there it was done by Moshe (the king and navi), Aharon (who had the Urim V'Tumim), and the Sanhedrin, so too a later expansion must be done by them as well.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, if "v'chein taasu" teaches regarding future generations, why do we say that the keilim made by Moshe were made kadosh with the shemen hamishcha but later keilim were made kadosh by using them? We should say that "v'chein taasu" teaches that even later keilim need the shemen hamishcha!? **A:** The pasuk says "vayimshacheim vayikadesh *osam*" – which limits the anointing to those keilim.
    - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk means that later keilim can be made kadosh either through Avodah or through anointing? **A: R' Pappa** said, the pasuk says "asher yisharsu bam bakodesh", which teaches that later keilim are made kadosh through use, not anointing.
      - **Q:** If we have this pasuk, why do we need the pasuk of "osam"? **A:** Without "osam" we would think that later keilim need to be anointed *and* need to be used in the Avodah in order to make them kadosh. The pasuk of "osam" teaches that they only need to be put into use for the Avodah.