

12 Sivan 5778
May 26, 2018



Zevachim Daf 43

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

Mishna

These are the things for which one is not liable (*to kares*) on account of *piggul* (for the following things do not have anything that permit them for consumption): The *kometz*, the *levonah*, the incense, the *minchah* offering of the *Kohanim*, the *minchah* offering of the anointed *Kohen*, the blood, the libations which are brought by themselves; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The Sages say: Also those libations which come with an animal. The *log* of oil of the *metzora* (brought together with the *asham*) – Rabbi Shimon says: One is not liable on account of *piggul* (for eating it; this is because the oil can be brought days after the *asham*; this proves that it has nothing which permits it for consumption). Rabbi Meir says: One is liable on account of *piggul*, since the blood of the *asham* renders it permissible, and whatever has that which renders it permissible, whether for man or for the Altar - one is liable on its account for *piggul*.

The (*sprinkling of the*) blood of a *korban olah* permits its meat to be placed on the Altar, and permits the skin to go to the *Kohanim*. The blood of the *olah* bird permits its meat to be placed on the Altar. The blood of a *chatas* bird permits its meat to be eaten by the *Kohanim*. The blood of the bulls and goats that are burned permit their limbs to be placed on the Altar. Rabbi Shimon holds: Any sacrifices which (*its blood*) are not offered on the outer Altar, such as the *shelamim*, are not subject to the law of *piggul*. (42b – 43a)

Removal of Piggul Status

Ulla says: A *kometz* of *piggul* that was placed on the Altar loses its status of *piggul*. If it causes other things to become *piggul*, certainly it should be!

The *Gemora* asks: What is Ulla saying? [He is attempting to explain why the burning of the *kometz* removes the *piggul* status, but it seems that he is saying why the burning of the *kometz* effects *piggul*?!]

The *Gemora* answers: Ulla means that if it would not be accepted on the Altar (*because it is piggul*), how could it make other things *piggul*? [And because we know that it does render the offering *piggul*, it must be that the *kometz* is accepted upon the Altar.]

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason why Ulla must point out that it loses its *piggul* status? If his point is that one is not liable for eating the *kometz* of *piggul*, this was already stated in our *Mishna*! Our *Mishna* states: These are the things for which one is not liable (*to kares*) on account of *piggul* (for the following things do not have anything that permit them for consumption): The *kometz*, the *levonah*, the incense, the *minchah* offering of the *Kohanim*, the *minchah* offering of the anointed *Kohen*, the libations-*minchah* offering, the blood etc.

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be that he is teaching that once the *kometz* is put on the Altar, it is not taken down (*and they may complete its burning*).

But the *Gemora* asks: This was already stated in a *Mishna*! The *Mishna* states (84a): If meat was left over after the allotted time for it to be eaten, if it went out of the allotted area for it to be eaten, if it became *tamei*, or if it was slaughtered with a beyond its time intention or an outside of

its place intention, if it was put on the Altar, it should not be taken off.

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be that Ulla is teaching us that if it was taken down, it should be brought up again.

The *Gemora* asks: The *Mishna* (ibid.) taught that this is not the law (*and Ulla would not argue on the Mishna*)! The *Mishna* states: Just as we say that if they were placed on the Altar they should not be taken off, so too if they were taken down they should not be brought up again. [*This is the simple way of understanding Rashi's version of the Gemora, based on the note (#21) of the Shitah Mekubetztes.*]

The *Gemora* answers: Ulla needed to say that it may be brought up on the Altar again (*even if it was taken down*) if the fire already took hold of it.

The *Gemora* asks: Ulla already said this a different time!? He stated: The *Mishna* (84a) is only discussing a case where the fire of the Altar did not take a hold of it yet. If it did, it may be brought up on the Altar again. [*Why would he make a separate cryptic statement to this effect?*]

The *Gemora* answers: One might have thought that this only applies to a limb of an animal, as it is connected to the part that the fire had started burning. However, the flour from a *kometz* is different, as each part is not attached to the other. [*One therefore might think that only the part that was burned may be brought on again.*] This is why Ulla teaches that the entire *kometz* is put back on.

Rav Achai says: Accordingly, if half of a *kometz* that was *piggul* was on the ground and half was burned by the fire of the Altar, we put the half that is on the ground on the Altar as well.

Rabbi Yitzchak says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: *Piggul*, leftover meat, and impure meat that were put on the Altar have their prohibited status removed from them.

Rav Chisda replied: The one who said this law! Do you think the Altar is a *mikvah*?!

Rabbi Zeira answered: The case is where it already started to get burned.

Rav Yitzchak bar Bisna asked a question from the following *braisa*. Others state: The verse, *and his impurity is upon him* refers to someone who can have his impurity removed from him, as opposed to meat that cannot have its impurity removed. If Rabbi Yitzchak and Rabbi Zeira are correct, meat can have its impurity removed through the fire of the Altar! (*Others say that it cannot!*)

Rava says: Others are referring to impurity being removed by a *mikvah* (*not fire of the Altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why should they understand that this is the meaning of the verse? The verse does not explicitly say it is removed through a *mikvah*!

Rather, Rav Pappa says: The verse is discussing meat from a *shelamim* that is not supposed to go on the Altar. (*Being that it was supposed to be eaten before it became impure, it cannot have its prohibition taken off by the Altar.*)

Ravina says: The derivation is as follows. The verse, *and his impurity is upon him* refers to someone who can have his impurity removed from him when he is whole. This as opposed to meat that cannot have its impurity removed when it is whole, but only when it is cut up in pieces. (43a – 43b)

What Type of Tumah?

It was stated: *And his impurity is upon him* refers to him being impure. Do you think it refers to him being impure, or the meat of the sacrifice being impure? The verse states *his impurity* elsewhere as well (*Bamidbar 19:13*). Just as there it was referring to the impurity of his body, so too here it is

referring to the impurity of his body. Rabbi Yosi says: Being that the verse is discussing sacrifices in the plural (*i.e. shelamim*) and it says his impurity in the singular, it must be this is not referring to sacrifices, but rather the impurity of his body. Rebbe says: *And he ate (which is the very next verse)* refers to impurity of the body (*indicating that the previous verse also refers to impurity of the body*). Others state: *And his impurity is upon him* refers to someone who can have his impurity removed from him, as opposed to meat that cannot have its impurity removed.

It was stated: Rebbe says, *And he ate (which is the very next verse)* refers to impurity of the body.

The *Gemora* asks: How is this proof that the previous verse is also referring to impurity of the body?

Rava says: Any verse that is not explained by Rav Yitzchak bar Avudimi and any *braisa* that is not explained by Rav Zeiri is not considered explained. Rav Yitzchak bar Avudimi explained Rebbe's answer as follows. The (*second*) verse starts with a feminine term, ends with a feminine term, and in the middle has a masculine term. This indicates it is referring to bodily impurity. (*Rashi explains that one might have thought the verse, "and his impurity is upon him" is referring to meat because this is stated in the masculine, whereas the beginning of the verse which talks about the person talks in the feminine form. The change of forms might lead one to think that the impurity is not talking about the person, but rather is discussing the meat. This is why Rebbe points out the following verse. Although it bears the same style as the first verse, it clearly is talking about his body being impure, and not the meat. This gives us reason to say that the first verse is also discussing his body being impure.*)

The *braisa* Rava was referring to was the following *braisa (which discusses eating kodashim when impure)*. The *braisa* states: If lenient ones were said, why state stringent ones? If stringent ones were said, why state lenient ones? If light ones were said and not stringent ones, I would think that one is

punished for lenient ones with a negative prohibition (*i.e. lashes*), and stringent ones with death. This is why the stringent ones were said. If the stringent ones were said and not the lenient ones, I would say that he should be liable for the stringent ones and be exempt for the lenient ones. This is why the verse said the lenient ones.

The *Gemora* asks: What does the *braisa* mean when it says, "the lenient ones" and "the stringent ones?" If it means that the lenient ones refer to *ma'aser* and the stringent ones refer to *terumah (eating them while one is impure)*, how can the *braisa* say we would think the punishment for the stringent one is death? It indeed is punished by death! Additionally, if the Torah would not have said this, would I have said that someone who is impure when he eats *Terumah* should be killed? We cannot derive more than what is stated by *ma'aser (that he receives lashes)*! (43b)

DAILY MASHAL

Turnaround

Ulla says: A *kometz* of *piggul* that was placed on the Altar loses its status of *piggul*. Accordingly, if half of a *kometz* that was *piggul* was on the ground and half was burned by the fire of the Altar, we put the half that is on the ground on the Altar as well.

Evidently, the Altar has in its power to take a hold of something completely rejected (*piggul*) and elevates it from its prohibited status, and to turn it around that it is now permitted to offer it up on the Altar.

So too, this applies to a person, says the Sifsei Tzadik. A person possesses a spark of *kedushah* within him, and he can merit through this a complete turnaround – he can elevate his status before Hashem that he will be regarded as "bread of the Altar." This can be done through strengthening oneself in even one area, one *mitzvah*, one act of Godliness.