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's Necessary for Chatas?

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa* which provides a different source for Bais Hillel's position that a *chatas* is valid with even only one application of blood. The verse repeats *v'chiper – and he will atone* three times in the context of a *chatas*: once in the section of a *chatas* of a king, once in the section of an individual goat *chatas*, and once in the section of an individual sheep *chatas*. The *Baraisa* starts by analyzing what I may have thought about the requirements for a *chatas*, without any special verse. I may have compared it to sacrifices whose blood is applied on the lower half of the altar, which are valid with one application, but I may have compared it to the blood which is brought into the building of the Bais Hamikdash, which is only valid if all four applications are done. Although the first comparison is valid because both sacrifices are applied outside, but the second comparison is more logical, since both sacrifices are *chatas* ones, and both are supposed to be applied to four corners, as opposed to others, which are not *chatas* ones, and only need two applications on the lower half. Therefore, the verse repeats *v'chiper* three times, each time including more cases which will atone. The first one includes one who applies only three times, the second one includes one who applies only two times, and the last one includes one who applies even only once.

Rava said that bar Ada Mari explained to him that we do not need these *v'chiper* phrases to teach that the sacrifice atones, since the word *v'nislach* – and it will be forgiven, which is used in each, teaches that already. Therefore, these three phrases are extra, teaching us that only one is necessary to make the sacrifice valid. (38a1 – 38a2)

Where to Apply?

The *Gemara* asks why we do not use these phrases to include one who applied four times, but in the wrong location. The first one would include one who applied three on the corners, and one on the bottom half, the second one would include one who applied two on the corners, and two on the bottom half, and the last would include one who applied all four on the bottom half.

Rav Ada bar Yitzchak objected, saying that this would undermine the concept of applying on the corners, but the *Gemara* reject this, as if the verse says this is valid, then it is valid, leaving the corners as the correct, but not critical, way to apply the blood.

Rather, Rava says that if the verse were including one who applied all in the bottom half, it would have made four inclusions, each for one application. The three inclusions are therefore referring to one who left out an application, and is teaching that up to three can be left out. We do not assume that the three include one who applied one on the corner, and the other three below, since we do not find blood which is applied in two different places.

The *Gemara* challenges this assertion from the following cases:

1. The *Kohen Gadol* would sprinkle the blood of the goat and bull on Yom Kippur once up and seven times down. The *Gemara* deflects this, since it was in the same place, but simply aiming upwards or downwards.
2. The *Mishnah* says that the *Kohen Gadol* would sprinkle from the blood seven times on *taharo shel mizbeach – the pure place of the [inner] altar*. The *Gemara* assumes this means the middle of the altar (*like the term tihara – midday*), which would lead to some of the blood above, and some below. The *Gemara* deflects this, saying it means the revealed top (*like the term latohar – pure and clear*).

3. The leftover blood of the sacrifices was spilled at the base of the altar, a different place than the application. The *Gemara* deflects this, saying that this was not necessary to make the sacrifice valid, and we are only asserting that to make a sacrifice valid, the blood is never applied in two different places.
4. The leftover blood of sacrifices that are applied on the inner golden altar was spilled at the base of the outer altar, and some say this was necessary to make the sacrifice valid. The *Gemara* deflects this, since these were two different altars, and we are only asserting that there are never applications in two different places on the same altar which are necessary to make it valid. (38a3 – 38b1)

Strict or Lenient?

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says in a *Baraisa* that Bais Shammai holds that two applications in a *chatas* and one in other sacrifices are necessary to make the sacrifice valid, and are the minimum to make it *piggul* with improper planning, while Bais Hillel says that both sacrifices only require one, and become *piggul* with improper planning.

Rav Oshaya says that if this dispute is correctly recorded, this should be listed as an exception, where Bais Shammai is lenient, and Bais Hillel is strict, since one who improperly plans with one application of a *chatas* is *piggul* only according to Bais Hillel. Rava answers that although this follows from their dispute, their original dispute was about how many applications were necessary to make the sacrifice valid. Since Bais Shammai is strict regarding this original dispute, it is not listed as an exception. (38b1 – 38b2)

Status of Last Three Applications

Rabbi Yochanan says that the last three applications of a *chatas* may not be done at night (*like other applications*), may be done after the sacrifice's owner died (*unlike other applications*), and one is liable if he applied them outside of the Bais Hamikdash (*like other applications*).

Rav Pappa says that in some ways these applications are like the first (*i.e, a bona fide service*), but in some ways they are like the remaining blood that is spilled at the base of the altar, which is not a bona fide service.

It is like the first application in the following ways:
1. Outside – if one applied them outside of the Bais Hamikdash, he is liable for offering a sacrifice outside.
2. Non-*Kohanim* – a non-*Kohen* who applied them is liable.
3. Vessels – they must be done with a *kli shares* – a service vessel.
4. Corner – they must be applied on the corner.
5. Finger – the must be applied with the *Kohen*'s finger.
6. Washing – if the blood spilled on clothing before the last three applications, the clothing must be washed.
7. Leftover – blood leftover from these three applications must be spilled at the base.

It is like leftover blood in the following ways:
1. Death – if the owner died, they may still be applied.
2. Doesn't permit – it is not necessary to make the sacrifice's meat permitted to eat.
3. Doesn't make *piggul* – applying them while planning to eat the sacrifice improperly does not make the sacrifice *piggul*.
4. Inside the building – if the blood was brought inside the building of the Bais Hamikdash, it does not invalidate the sacrifice.

Rav Pappa proves that this blood requires clothing that it touches to be washed from a *Mishnah*. The *Mishnah* says that if the blood splashed onto clothing from the throat of the animal, from the corner where it was applied, or from the base of the altar, the clothing need not be washed. The *Mishnah* implies that if blood that was not yet on the corner, but was ready to be applied there, splashed onto it, the clothing must be washed.

The *Gemara* objects, since the same logic would imply that blood that was ready to be spilled at the base that splashed would require the clothing to be washed, but the verse says that

only blood that *will* be applied – not blood that already *was* applied – requires the clothing to be washed.

Rather, this *Mishnah* must follow the opinion of Rabbi Nechemia, who says that if one applied leftover blood outside, he is liable, and therefore he would also say that blood that has been applied still requires clothing to be washed. The *Mishnah* is therefore not a proof to Rav Pappa, who says that only the blood of the three last applications requires the clothing to be washed.

The *Gemara* attempts to deflect this, saying that perhaps Rabbi Nechemia only says that one is liable for applying it outside, but would not say that the leftover blood requires washing clothing. The *Gemara* responds that Rabbi Nechemia does say the leftover blood is bona fide blood, both for applying outside, and for washing clothing.

The *Gemara* proves this from a *Baraisa*, which says that blood that is ready to be spilled at the base is valid blood in three ways:

1. It makes clothing require washing.
2. One who planned to eat the sacrifice improperly when spilling it invalidates the sacrifice.
3. 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. This *Baraisa* must be authored by Rabbi Nechemia, since it says that one who applies leftover blood outside is liable, and it also says that clothing that it touches must be washed. (38b2 – 39a2)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Top and Bottom

The *Gemara* asserts that we never have an instance of blood, whose application is split between two levels of the altar. The *Gemara* challenges this from the applications on the inner altar on Yom Kippur, which the *Mishnah* states was on *taharo* of the altar, which the *Gemara* assumes means the middle of the altar. Rashi explains that since it is impossible to be precisely at the midpoint, and therefore some of the blood will be above, and some will be below, putting it in two places.

Tosfos (38a ma'y) offers another explanation. Before this application the blood was placed on the corners of the altar. The *Gemara* is thus saying that the blood is applied in two places – first on the corners, and then at the midpoint, which is below the corners.

One or Two for Piggul?

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says that just as Bais Shammai dispute how many applications are necessary for the *chatas* to be valid, they also dispute how many must be done with improper planning to make it *piggul*. Rashi explains that if one improperly thought with only one application, Bais Shammai say it is not *piggul*, since it is only half of the *matir* – *permitting act* of application, and *piggul* cannot be done with half a *matir*.

Tosfos (38b v'lisniyai) suggests that Bais Shammai may say that half a *matir* is enough for *piggul*, but the debate is when one applied the first one with improper planning, and then the blood spilled. In such a case, Bais Hillel would consider it *piggul*, since all the necessary blood was applied, but Bais Shammai would consider it not *piggul*, since the sacrifice invalid, since not all necessary blood was applied.

Tosfos notes that the Tosefta records the dispute about *piggul* specifically in this case, suggesting that this may be the correct understanding of Bais Shammai's position. However, Tosfos deflects that perhaps the Tosefta is only using this case to emphasize that Bais Hillel consider one application sufficient.

Tosfos notes that if Bais Shammai rule that half a *matir* can make *piggul*, Bais Shammai rule more strictly even in a *piggul* case – when the first application was done correctly, and the second one was done with improper planning. Bais Hillel will rule leniently in this case, since the sacrifice has already been technically completed with the first application. If so, the *Gemara* could have said that this dispute is not considered an exception, since even in this case of *piggul*, Bais Shammai is

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H

strict. Tosfos suggests that since this case of *piggul* is never explicitly mentioned in the Tosefta or any *Baraisa*, the *Gemara* did not consider that enough to consider this a case of Bais Shammai ruling strictly.

It's Rabbi Nechemia

Rav Pappa listed the ways that the latter applications of a *chatas* are like the first one, and the ways they are like the leftover blood. Rav Pappa cited a *Mishnah* to prove that for the purposes of having to wash clothing that it contacts, it is like the first application. The *Mishnah* stated that blood which fell from the corner or base of the altar does not necessitate washing clothing, and Rav Pappa inferred that blood destined for the corner does, thus including the latter applications. The *Gemara* challenged this inference, since the same logic would imply that blood destined for the base, i.e., leftover blood, necessitates washing, which is incorrect. The *Gemara* then states that this *Mishnah* is Rabbi Nechemia's opinion, who says that leftover blood is valid blood, so one would be liable for offering it outside of the Bais Hamikdash. Just as he would consider it valid for the prohibition of offering outside, so also he would consider it valid for washing.

Rashi explains that this statement is a continuation of the challenge to Rav Pappa's proof, and the *Gemara* is saying that this *Mishnah* cannot be used to prove Rav Pappa's position, since it is Rabbi Nechemia, who considers blood valid for much longer than anyone else. Therefore, this *Mishnah* has no bearing on Rav Pappa's statement, which follows the Sages.

Tosfos (38b Ha mani) suggests that this statement is Rav Pappa's response to the *Gemara*'s challenge. Rav Pappa is saying that indeed both inferences are correct, and this *Mishnah* follows Rabbi Nechemia. However, just as Rabbi Nechemia considers any blood which one may not offer outside to be valid blood for purposes of washing clothes, so would the Sages. This would include the blood of the latter applications as well. See Tosfos for more detailed discussion of how to read the continuation of the *Gemara* according to both approaches.

DAILY MASHAL

The Shevet Sofer explains: When the Kohen Godol sprinkled "one above and seven below," he had in mind to make a case proving Yisroel's merit before HKB"H in the Kodesh HaKodoshim on Yom HaKippurim. The Gemara (Brachos 17a) presents a prayer recited by Rabbi Alexandri: "רבון העולמים גלוי וידוע לפניך שרצוננו לעשות רצונך ומי מעכב שבעיסה שאור"—Master of the Worlds, it is revealed and known before You that our will is to perform Your will. And who prevents us from doing so? The yeast in the dough—the yetzer hora. This, too, is the message inherent in the Kohen Godol's sprinkling and counting protocol in the Kodesh HaKodoshim on Yom HaKippurim.

Thus, the Kohen Godol presented his case before HKB"H: "למעלה אחת"—he sprinkled one above, indicating that there is but one way to connect with HKB"H above--by means of the yetzer tov. Conversely, "למטה שבע"—the seven below indicated that there are seven ways by which one can fall into the spiritual abyss as a result of the yetzer hora's forces of evil. Therefore, it is appropriate for HKB"H to forgive Yisroel for all of their transgressions.