



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

***What is Essential, and what isn't?***

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that blood that is ready to be spilled at the base requires washing (*if it stains a garment*), and *piggul* intent (*when spilling it*) invalidates the sacrifice, and if one applies it outside, he is liable. However, blood that is already invalid, and must be spilled into the canal of the Courtyard, has none of these properties.

The *Gemora* asks: Can it be said that a *piggul* intention by such blood is effective (*to invalidate the sacrifice*)? But it was taught in a *braisa* that the pouring out of the remaining blood (*onto the base*) and the burning of the sacrificial parts, which are not indispensable for atonement, are excluded, in that a *piggul* intention in connection with them is of no effect?

The *Gemora* answers: The first part of the *braisa* is referring to the (*last*) three applications of a *chatas* (*which are not essential; accordingly, we have no proof that Rabbi Nechemiah maintains that the remaining blood requires washing*).

The *Gemora* asks: If so, why does the *braisa* say that the blood requires the base? Surely it is sprinkled on the horn of the Altar?

The *Gemora* answers: Say that it refers to blood which (*after its application on the Altar*) is required for the base.

The *Gemora* asks: But how can it be said that a *piggul* intention in connection with them is effective? Surely you said above that it doesn't permit (*the sacrifice's meat for consumption*), it doesn't effect *piggul* (*applying them while intending to eat the sacrifice beyond its time does not make the sacrifice piggul*), and if the blood was brought inside the *Heichal*, it does not invalidate the sacrifice – just as the remaining blood!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers, the *braisa* was taught in respect of the blood of the inner *chatas* sacrifices (*which, according to this Tanna, is regarded as essential*).

The *Gemora* asks: But in the case of the blood of outer sacrifices, what will you say? He is exempt (*from all these regulations*)!? Then, instead of teaching regarding the blood which is poured out into the canal (*that these halachos do not apply*), let the *Tanna* teach a distinction regarding “remnant blood” itself, and say as follows: This is true only in regard to the blood of the inner *chatas* sacrifices, but regarding the outer sacrifices, he is exempt?



The Gemora answers: This is in accordance with Rabbi Nechemiah, who maintains that one who offers the remnants of the blood (*from the outer sacrifices*) outside the Temple, he is liable, and so the Tanna could not count three instances of exemption corresponding to the three instances of liability (*and therefore he mentioned the blood which must be poured into the canal*). (39a)

### **Blood of the Inner Chatas**

The Mishna had stated: Regarding blood that is applied to the Inner Altar (*if any of the applications are omitted, no atonement is effected*).

The Gemora cites a braisa: He shall do (*with the communal bull for a chatas*) as he did (*with the Kohen Gadol's bull*). Why is this stated (*for all of this bull's halachos are explicitly mentioned*)? It is as a repetition of the law of sprinkling, which teaches us that if he omitted one of the applications, he has done nothing. I know this only regarding the seven applications (*on the Paroches*), which are indispensable in all cases; how do we know this regarding the four applications (*of the Inner Altar*)? It is from the verse: *So shall he do. With the bull* refers to the bull of Yom Kippur. *As he did with the bull* refers to the bull of the anointed Kohen (*that all of its blood applications are essential*). The chatas refers to the goats of idolatry (*that it requires sprinkling on the Paroches, and its blood is applied on the Inner Altar, and that its meat is burned outside of the three Camps – all like the communal-error bull*). You might think that I include the festival goats and goats of Rosh Chodesh as well (*that they should have similar laws*); therefore the Torah states: (*So shall he do*) with it. And, the braisa continues, for what reason do you include the former (*the goats of idolatry*) and excluding the latter (*the*

*festival goats and goats of Rosh Chodesh*)? The braisa answers: Since the Torah includes and excludes, I will include these (*the goats of idolatry*), which provide atonement for the known transgression of a commandment, while I will exclude those (*the festival goats and goats of Rosh Chodesh*), which do not provide atonement for the known transgression of a commandment (*but rather, on an unknown sin, for they atone for the sins of tumah in the Sanctuary when the sin is not known*). And the Kohen shall provide atonement - even though he did not perform semichah on the bull; and it shall be forgiven to them - even though he had not poured out the remnants (*on the base of the Outer Altar*). And, the braisa continues, for what reason do you invalidate the sacrifice in the case of the sprinklings (*where some were omitted*), and validate it in the case of semichah and the remnant blood (*that if they are omitted, the sacrifice is still valid*)? You can answer that I invalidate in the case of sprinklings, as they are indispensable elsewhere, whereas I validate in the case of semichah and the remnant blood, which are not indispensable in all other places. (39a - 39b)

### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

#### **When can Piggul be Effective?**

The question is asked that there are seemingly many instances where we find that a piggul intention can be effective even during a service that is not essential to atonement. Here are three examples:

1. There is a halachah that the slaughterer should attempt to catch all the blood from the neck; however, the Rishonim rule that it is preferable to do so, but if he does not, it will not prevent atonement. Nevertheless, the halachah is that a

- piggul* intention – during any part of the receiving of the blood – even after enough blood was accepted to sprinkle on the Altar, will cause an invalidation of the sacrifice.
2. Reb Chaim Ozer wonders if a *piggul* intention can take effect while he is slaughtering the last minority of the two *simanim*. Now, although this last cutting is not essential to the *shechitah*, nevertheless, he states that it is plausible that *piggul* at that time can be effective.
  3. The Rambam is of the opinion that a Kohen's *piggul* intent can be effective even during his walking with the blood away from the Altar. This certainly does not prevent atonement, and nevertheless a *piggul* intention then will be effective to disqualify the offering.

accepting the blood, and conveying the blood to the Altar. Therefore, although, this specific part of the service might be non-essential, it cannot be said that the service is insignificant, and consequently, *piggul* during such a service will be effective.

The Acharonim write that this can be explained based upon the following *chakirah*. Why is *piggul* ineffective by a non-essential service? Is it because, 1) any service that is not indispensable, a *piggul* intent cannot be effective, or, 2) any service which is not indispensable is not regarded as a significant service, and therefore, *piggul* cannot be effective.

If we say like the latter understanding, we can explain why there is a distinction between the pouring of the remnants on the base of the Altar and the burning of the sacrificial parts – that *piggul* is not effective, and the other cases mentioned above – where *piggul* is effective. For the pouring of the remnants on the base of the Altar and the burning of the sacrificial parts are services which are completely non-essential, and therefore, they are considered “insignificant services,” and *piggul* cannot take effect; however, the other three examples are all significant services, i.e., slaughtering,