



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

Rabbi Meir – Is *piggul* effective because one can effect *piggul* in part of a permitter, or is it because one performs a second act on the basis of his original intent?

The *Gemora* asks on Rish Lakish (who maintains that Rabbi Meir’s opinion is that one who does something is doing it based on his original intent) from the following *braisa*: When are these words (that one can effect *piggul* with one application) true? It is only by blood that is applied on the Outer Altar (for one application provides atonement; and even the Sages would agree that *piggul* is effective); however, blood that is applied on the Inner Altar, such as the forty-three applications performed on *Yom Kippur* (from the bull and the goat), or the eleven applications from the anointed *Kohen*’s bull, or the eleven applications of the communal-error bull, if the *Kohen* had a *piggul* intention whether during the first set of applications (in the *Holy of Holies*), the second set (on the *Paroches*), or the third set (on the Altar), Rabbi Meir maintains that it is *piggul* and one incurs *kares*; while the Sages say that one does not incur *kares* unless he has a *piggul* intention during the entire matter (*permitter*). Now the *braisa* had stated that if the *Kohen* had a *piggul* intention whether during the first set of applications, the second set, or the third set, and yet Rabbi Meir disagrees (and if he applied the first applications in silence and the latter ones with a *piggul* intent, if this effects a *piggul* disqualification, it is

evidently because he holds that one can effect *piggul* in part of a permitter)!?

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Avin answers: The circumstances here are where (after he finished applying the blood in the *Holy of Holies*, the blood spilled; the *halachah* is that he brings another animal and begins the blood-applications at the place where he left off from the first animal) he had a *piggul* intention at the slaughtering of the animal, this being one complete *mattir*. [He had a *piggul* intention about the blood which will be used for any of the blood-application sets.]

The *Gemora* asks: If so, what is the reason of the Sages (who maintain that there is no *kares*; everyone agrees that *shechitah* is a complete *mattir*)?

Rava answers: the *Mishna* is in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer, for we learned in a *Mishna*: With regard to the *kometz*, the *levonah*, the incense, the *minchah* of *Kohanim*, the *minchah* of the anointed *Kohen*, and the libation *minchah* offering, if one offered up as much as an olive’s volume of one of these outside the Temple, he is liable. But Rabbi Eliezer exempts him unless he offers them up in their entirety. [Rabbi Eliezer holds that he is not liable, since it was done with a portion of the *mattir* only, which proves that it is not regarded as a service unless he completes the entire service. So here too, although *shechitah* is a service complete in itself,

yet since this particular shechitah was merely needed for only part of the Yom Kippur applications, it is incomplete, and cannot effect piggul.]

The Gemora asks: But surely Rava said that Rabbi Eliezer admits in the case of blood (*that one will be liable for offering up an olive's volume outside the Temple*), for we learned in a Mishna: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon maintain that from where he left off (in the blood-application procedure – before the remaining blood spilled out) there he convenes (*to apply the blood from the second animal; that is why he is liable for offering up any blood outside, and it stands to reason that this would apply by a piggul intent as well – for it is regarded as a service; and certainly piggul should be effective when his intention was at the time of the shechitah*)!?

Rather, Rava answers: The braisa is referring to a case where he had a piggul intention during the first set of applications, and he was silent during the second, and again had a piggul intention during the third. [*Only then does Rabbi Meir rule it to be piggul, as he maintains that the second applications in silence were done with the original intention of the first.*] [*The question may be asked: If you claim that he acts with his original intention, why should he repeat his piggul intention during the third set?*] I might have thought that by the fact that he performed the third set of applications with a piggul intent, this indicates that the second set was not done with such intention, the text teaches us that this is not so.

Rav Ashi asked: Does the Mishna state that he was silent (*by the second set*)?

Rather, Rav Ashi answers: The circumstances here are where he had a piggul intention during the first, second, and third sets (*but he was silent during the fourth set – when he was applying the blood to the top of the Altar; Rabbi Meir holds that he effects piggul, for this was also being performed on the basis of his original intent*). [*The question may be asked: If you claim that he acts with his original intention, why should he repeat his piggul intention during the second and third set?*] I might have thought that by the fact that he performed the second and third set of applications with a piggul intent, this indicates that the fourth set was not done with such intention, the text teaches us that this is not so.

The Gemora asks: But the Mishna states: whether . . . or (*and not that every set was done with a piggul intention*)?

The Gemora notes: That is indeed a difficulty.

[*The Gemora challenges those who maintain that Rabbi Meir holds that piggul can be effective in part of a permitter.*] The braisa states: Rabbi Meir said: It is piggul, and one incurs kares on its account. [*But why is he subject to kares if only part of the sprinklings were sprinkled with a piggul intent?*] Let us see: one is not liable to kares until all the mattirin are offered, for a master said: As the acceptance of a valid korban, so is the acceptance of an invalid one. As the acceptance of the valid one necessitates that all its mattirin (*all the sprinklings*) be offered, so does the acceptance of the invalid necessitate that all its mattirin be offered. Now here, where he had a piggul intention in the Holy of Holies, he has already invalidated it, so that it is as though he had not sprinkled the blood at all; when he then sprinkles again in the Heichal, he is merely

sprinkling water? [It emerges that he has not completed the sprinkling of the blood, so why does Rabbi Meir maintain that he renders the sacrifice piggul?]

Rabbah answers: It is possible in the case of four bulls and four goats. [The blood spilled after each and every set from the bull and the goat; there are four altogether, i.e., the Holy of Holies, the Paroches, the horns of the Inner Altar and the top of the Inner Altar. He had a piggul intention during all the applications of the blood, and since each set is a complete unit by itself, it renders the sacrifice piggul.]

Rava answers: You may even say that it is rendered piggul in the case of one bull and one goat; for although the sacrifice was invalidated at the first set, it effects acceptance in respect of its piggul status (just as it would in the case where he had a piggul intention at the slaughtering, though he thereby invalidates the sacrifice, the following sprinklings are nevertheless considered as the offering of its mattirin).

The Gemora asks: Do you say that there are forty-three applications? Surely it was taught that there are forty-seven?

The Gemora answers: This depends on the dispute regarding the mingling of the blood of the bull and of the goat for sprinkling on the horns.

The Gemora asks: But it was taught that there are forty-eight applications?

The Gemora answers: That is following the view that the pouring out the remnants at the base of the Altar is essential.

The Gemora asks on Rish Lakish from the following braisa: When is it said (that a minchah offering becomes piggul when only the kometz was performed with a piggul intention but not the levonah)? It is in the case when he was making the kemitzah, when he was placing the kometz in the sacred vessel, and when he was bringing the kometz to the Altar (for these services apply only to the kometz and not to the levonah); however, during the burning of the kometz and the levonah, if he offers the kometz with a piggul intention and the levonah in silence, or if he offers the kometz in silence and the levonah with a piggul intention, Rabbi Meir maintains that it is piggul, and it is subject to kares; while the Sages rule that it is not subject to kares unless he has a piggul intention in respect of the whole mattir. Now it states that Rabbi Meir disagrees in the case where he offered the kometz in silence and the levonah with a piggul intention (and this can only be because he holds that piggul can be effective even during part of a permitter)!?

The Gemora answers: The braisa means that he already offered the levonah with a piggul intention (and then he offered the kometz in silence; it is piggul, for we say that he performed the service with the kometz based on his original intent that he had when he offered the levonah).

The Gemora rejects this for two reasons: One because that would be identical to the first case, and secondly – because a different braisa clearly states that afterwards, he placed the levonah in silence!

The Gemora notes: That is indeed a difficulty. (41b – 42b)