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

The *Mishnah* had stated: Whatever has that which renders it permissible, whether for man or for the Altar - one is liable on its account for *piggul*.

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa*: Our Rabbis taught: . . . Or perhaps it includes only that which is similar to a shelamim: as a shelamim- is distinguished in that it is eaten two days and one night, so all that may be eaten two days and one night [are included]. How do we know that that which is eaten a day and a night [only, is also included]? Because Scripture said: [And if any] of the flesh [of the sacrifice of his shelamim-offerings etc.], [which includes] all whose remainder is eaten. How do we know [that] an olah, whose remainder is not eaten, [is included]? Because Scripture says 'the sacrifice'. From where do we know to include the bird-offerings and minchah-offerings, until I can include a metzora's log of oil? From the text: 'which they sanctify to Me'.

The Gemara explains: Nossar is then learned from tumah, because 'desecration' is written in connection with both; and piggul is learned from nossar, because 'sin' is written in connection with both.

The Baraisa continues: Now, since it [Scripture] ultimately includes all things, why then are shelamim specified? To teach you: as a shelamim is distinguished in that it has something which permits it both for man and for the altar, so everything which has something which permits it both for man and for the altar involves liability on account of piggul.

The Gemara quotes our Mishnah: [The sprinkling of] the blood of an olah offering permits its flesh for [burning on] the altar, and its skin to the Kohanim. The blood of a bird olah offering permits its flesh for the altar. The blood of a bird chatas permits its flesh to the Kohanim. The blood of the bullocks that are burnt and the goats that are burnt permits their sacrificial parts to be offered [on the altar].

The Baraisa continues: And I exclude the kometz, the levonah, the incense, the Kohanim' Minchah offering, the anointed Kohen's Minchah offering, and the blood. Rabbi Shimon said: As a shelamim is distinguished in that it comes on the outer altar [for sprinkling], and it involves liability; so all that come on the outer altar involve liability on account of piggul; thus the bullocks which are burnt and the goats which are burnt are excluded; since they do not come on the outer altar, like the shelamim, they do not involve liability.

The master said: 'That which is similar to a shelamim'. What [sacrifice] is it? The bechor, which is eaten two days and one night! But how is this learned? If by analogy (mah matzinu)? it can be refuted: as for a shelamim, [it is subject to the law of piggul] because it requires laying [of hands - semichah], [the accompaniment of] drink-offerings [libations - nesachim], and the waving of the breast and the shoulder (tenufah)? Again if [it is learned] from [the

text]: And if eaten, it will be eaten [any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his shelamim on the third day[1]], these are two generalizations which immediately follow each other[2]?

Ravina said: It is as they say in the West: Wherever you find two generalizations close to each other, insert the specific proposition between them, and interpret them as a case of a generalization followed by a specific proposition [and followed again by a generalization]. (44a1 – 44a3)

'Until I include a metzora's log of oil'. With whom does that agree? With Rabbi Meir. For it was taught: A metzora's log of oil involves liability on account of piggul: that is the opinion of Rabbi Meir. Then consider the next clause: And I exclude the Minchah offering of libations and the blood. This agrees with the Rabbis. For it was taught: The nesachim which accompanies an animal [sacrifice] involves liability on account of piggul, because the blood of the sacrifice permits it to be offered [on the altar]: that is Rabbi Meir's view. They said to him: But a man can bring his sacrifice to-day and the nesachim even ten days later! I too, he answered them, ruled [thus] only when they come together with the sacrifice!

Rav Yosef said: The author of this is Rebbe, who maintained [that] the applications of the metzora's log of oil permit it, and since its sprinklings permit it, its sprinklings render it piggul. For it was taught: One commits me'ilah in respect of a metzora's log of oil until the blood is sprinkled; once the blood is sprinkled, you may not use it, and you do not commit me'ilah. Rebbe said: You commit me'ilah until its sprinklings are made. And both agree that it may not be eaten until its seven sprinklings and the applications on the thumbs are made.

This was reported before Rabbi Yirmiyah, [whereupon] he exclaimed: That a great man like Rav Yosef should say such a thing! For, all agree that when the log comes separately, its sprinklings permit it, and yet they do not render it piggul. For it was taught: A metzora's log of oil involves liability on account of piggul, because the blood permits it for [sprinkling on] the thumbs: that is Rabbi Meir's view. They said to Rabbi Meir: But a man can bring his asham offering now, and his log even ten days later! I too, he answered them, ruled [thus] only when it comes with the asham!

Rather said Rabbi Yirmiyah: In truth it agrees with Rabbi Meir, but delete 'nesachims' from this passage.

Abaye said: After all, you need not delete [it]. But he [first] teaches about the log which comes with the asham, and the same applies to the nesachim which comes with the sacrifice. And then he teaches about the nesachim which comes separately, and the same applies to the log which comes separately. (44a3 – 44b1)

The Mishnah had stated: The blood of the bird chatas permits its flesh to the kohanim.

From where do we know it? — For Levi taught: [This shall be — the Kohen's . . .] every offering of theirs: that is to include a metzora's log of oil. I might think that the Merciful One wrote: from the fire, whereas this is not from the fire; therefore it informs us [that it is not so]. Even every minchah of theirs includes the minchah of the omer

[1] The Gemora now interprets the two forms as two generalizations (and if eaten, it will be eaten), while 'shelamim' is a specific proposition. In that case it is a rule of exegesis that the generalization includes everything which is similar in its general features (even if not in every detail) to the specific proposition. Hence the bechor is included, as generally speaking it is similar to the shelamim, in spite of differing from it in several details.

[2] Whereas the exegetical rule applies to two generalizations which are separated by the specific proposition.

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

and the minchah of jealousy. I might think [that it is written:] And they shall eat these things where atonement was made, [whereas] the minchah of the omer comes to permit [the new grain], while the minchah of jealousy comes to establish guilt; therefore [the text] informs us [that it is not so]. And every chatas of theirs includes the chatas of a bird. I might think that it is neveilah[3]; therefore [the text] informs us [that it is not so]. And every asham offering of theirs includes a nazir's asham offering and a metzora's asham offering. I might think that these come to qualify [them]; therefore [the text] informs us [that it is not so].

The Gemara asks: But it is explicitly written that a metzora's asham offering [is eaten]? Rather it is to include a nazir's asham offering [teaching that it is like] a metzora's asham offering.

The Baraisa concludes: 'Which they return to me' includes what is taken by robbery from a convert. 'Shall be for you'; it shall be yours, even for betrothing a woman. (44b1 – 44b3)

It was taught: Rabbi Elazar said in the name of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili: If [the Kohen] declared a piggul intention in respect of something which is performed outside (the Sanctuary), he renders it piggul; in respect of something which is performed inside, he does not render it piggul. How so? If he stood outside and declared, "I hereby slaughter [this sacrifice intending] to sprinkle its blood tomorrow," he does not render it piggul because it is an intention [expressed] outside concerning something which is performed inside. If he stood inside and declared, "I hereby sprinkle [the blood], intending to burn the sacrificial parts and pour out the residue tomorrow," he does not render it piggul, because it is an intention [expressed] inside concerning something which is performed outside. If he stood outside and declared, "I hereby slaughter [this sacrifice intending] to pour out the residue tomorrow, or 'to burn the sacrificial parts tomorrow," he renders it piggul, because it is an intention [expressed] outside concerning something which is performed outside.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Which text [teaches this]? As is taken from the ox of the sacrifice of shelamim. What then do we learn from the ox of the sacrifice of shelamim? [Scripture] however likens the anointed Kohen's bullock to the ox of the sacrifice of shelamim: as the ox of the sacrifice of shelamim [does not become piggul] unless its actions and its intentions are [done] on the outer altar, so the anointed Kohen's bullock [does not become piggul] unless its intentions and its actions are [done] in connection with the outer altar. Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in Rav's name: The halachah is as Rabbi Elazar's ruling in the name of Rabbi Yosi. (44b3 – 44b4)

DAILY MASHAL

It states at the beginning of parashas Metzora: on the day of his purification. The Divrei Shmuel zt'l explains that the passuk instructs us to focus on this day, and that will help us attain taharah. He writes, "Don't think about your aveiros of the past [which will make you distressed and lose hope] and don't think about what will be in the future [which will make you feel that it is impossible to maintain your teshuvah for a long time]. Think about this day alone. Today I can make a nachas ruach for Hashem with Torah and mitzvos." Focus on this day alone, and you will become tahor.

[3] The bird-offering was killed by melikah, and not through ordinary shechitah; neveilah of course may not be eaten.