

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

5 Menachem Av 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 19

July 16, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for her neshamah and may her soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,

where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Awareness of Tumah

Rabbi Eliezer uses the verse, *in it* to teach that one is not liable if he sins while he is preoccupied with something else.

And Rabbi Yochanan notes: The subtleties of the scriptural expositions are the difference between them. [*He disagrees with Chizkiyah who said that Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva differ in their interpretation of the law; he holds that they do not differ at all as to the halachah; they both hold that it is not necessary that the tamei person should know the exact source of his tumah; but they merely choose different Scriptural sources from which to deduce the halachah.*]

And so said Rav Sheishes: The subtleties of the scriptural expositions are the difference between them, for Rav Sheishes would sometimes change the words of Rabbi Eliezer for those of Rabbi Akiva, and the words of Rabbi Akiva for those of Rabbi Eliezer. [*If there would have been a halachic difference between them, he would have been more careful to state precisely who said which viewpoint.*]

Rava inquired of Rav Nachman: If he was unaware of both (*that he was tamei and that he entered the Mikdash*), what is the ruling (*according to Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva who maintain that the cause for the forgetfulness of the tumah, not the entering of the Temple*)?

He said to him: Since there is the unawareness of *tumah*, he is liable.

Rava asks: On the contrary, since there is the unawareness of entering the Temple, he should be exempt!?

Rav Ashi said: Let us see: If it was because of the *Tumah* that he left the Temple, then it is a case of unawareness of *tumah*, and he is liable; but if it was because of the Temple that he left, then, it is a case of unawareness of Temple, and he is exempt.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Does he not leave because he is aware that it is the Temple, unless it is also because of the *tumah*? And does he not leave because that he became *tamei*, unless it is also because it is the Temple? Rather, there is no difference (*and he is therefore exempt from bringing a korban*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: There were two public paths, one was *tamei* (*as there was a corpse buried there*) and one was *tahor* (*but we did not know which path contained the tumah*); and he walked along one and did not enter the Temple afterwards; then he walked along the other, and entered the Temple, he is liable to bring a *korban olah v'yoreid* (*sliding scale sacrifice*). If he walked along one, and entered the Temple, and was sprinkled upon on the third day, and again on the seventh day (*from the ashes of the parah adumah – the red heifer; which is part of the process of becoming tahor from corpse tumah*), and immersed himself in a *mikvah*, and then he walked along the other path, and then entered the Temple, he is liable to bring the *korban*. Rabbi Shimon (*ben Yochai*) exempts him (*in the latter case, for he was never aware that he was definitely tamei before entering the Temple*);

and Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah exempts him in all these cases in the name of Rabbi Shimon.

The *Gemora* asks on this last ruling: Does Rabbi Shimon exempt him in all of the cases, even in the first case? But he was definitely *tamei* before entering the Temple!?

Rava said: We are discussing the case of one who walked along the first path, and when he walked along the second path, he forgot that he had already walked along the first, so that he has a partial awareness of his *tumah*; and this is in what they differ about: The first *Tanna* holds that we say, a partial awareness is like a complete one (*and therefore he is liable for a korban*), and Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah holds that we do not say that a partial awareness is like a complete one.

The *braisa* had stated: If he walked along one, and entered the Temple, and was sprinkled upon on the third day, and again on the seventh day (*from the ashes of the parah adumah – the red heifer; which is part of the process of becoming tahor from corpse tumah*), and immersed himself in a *mikvah*, and then he walked along the other path, and then entered the Temple, he is liable to bring the *korban*. Rabbi Shimon (*ben Yochai*) exempts him.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is he liable, since it is a doubtful awareness?

Rabbi Yochanan said: Here (*with respect to a bringing a korban for tumas Mikdash*) they had made a doubtful awareness like a definite one.

And Rish Lakish said: This is in accordance with Rabbi Yishmael, who holds that we do not require awareness at the beginning.

The *Gemora* points out a contradiction between the words of Rabbi Yochanan here and the words of Rabbi Yochanan elsewhere; and points out a contradiction between the words of Rish Lakish here and the words of Rish Lakish elsewhere, for it has been taught in a *braisa*: If he ate doubtful prohibited fat, and became aware of it later, and he ate again doubtful prohibited fat, and became aware of it later; Rebbe said: Just as he would bring a *chatas* (*sin offering*) for each one, so he brings an *asham taluy* (*korban brought when one is unsure if he committed a sin that is subject to a chatas*) for a doubtful sin for each one. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah and Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Shimon said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai: He brings only one *asham taluy*; for

it is written: *And he shall bring a ram . . . for a guilt offering . . . for his inadvertency that he committed inadvertently*. The Torah includes many inadvertencies for one *asham taluy*. And Rish Lakish said: Here Rebbe taught that the awareness of uncertainty separates the acts for a *chatas*. And Rabbi Yochanan said: Rebbe meant: Just as the awareness of definite sin elsewhere separates the acts for a *chatas*, so the awareness of uncertainty here separates the acts for an *asham taluy*. Therefore, there is a contradiction between Rabbi Yochanan's statements, and between Rish Lakish's statements!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is not a contradiction between one statement of Rabbi Yochanan and his other statement, for he said: Here (*by a korban olah v'yoreid*) they made an uncertain awareness like a definite one, and not everywhere in the entire Torah did they do so; for only here where an awareness at the beginning is not explicitly written, but is deduced from, *and it was concealed from him*; therefore they made an uncertain awareness like a definite one, but not everywhere in the entire Torah did they do so, for it is written: *If his sin becomes known to him* – so we require a definite awareness. But according to Rish Lakish - why does he attribute it as being in accordance with Rabbi Yishmael's view? Let him attribute it as being in accordance with Rebbe's view!?

The *Gemora* answers: He is teaching us that Rabbi Yishmael does not require awareness in the beginning.

The *Gemora* asks: But it is obvious that he does not require awareness in the beginning, for he has no extra verse from which to derive it, since he requires *and it was concealed from him* to make him liable for unawareness of the Temple!?

The *Gemora* answers: You might have thought that he does not infer that we require awareness in the beginning from the verse, but he has it from a tradition; therefore Rish Lakish teaches us that Rabbi Yishmael definitely does not require awareness in the beginning. (19a – 19b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, YEDIOS HATUMAH