



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

Sprinkling for the Hide

The *Gemara* cites the *Baraisa* which teaches us the dispute between Rebbe and Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Shimon: Rebbe said: The blood effects acceptance on behalf of the hide by itself. [*If the hide is not attached to the meat and the meat becomes disqualified, the hide is permitted to the Kohanim.*] However, when it is together with the meat and a disqualification occurs in it, whether it occurred before or after the sprinkling, it is the same as the meat. Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Shimon maintained: The blood does not effect acceptance on behalf of the hide by itself. And when it is together with the meat and a disqualification occurs in it before sprinkling, it is the same as the meat; if it occurs after the sprinkling, the meat has been permitted for a short amount of time, and so it may be skinned and the hide belongs to the *Kohanim*.

The *Gemara* asks: Shall we say that they differ on the same matter as Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua? For it was taught in a *Baraisa*: *And you shall offer your olah offerings, the meat and the blood*: Rabbi Yehoshua said: If there is no (*qualified*) blood (*to be thrown on the altar*) there is no meat, and if there is no meat there is no blood. Rabbi Eliezer said: The blood is eligible (*to be thrown*) even if there is no meat, because it is written: *And the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured*. If so, why is it written: *And you shall offer your olah offerings, the meat and the blood*? This is to teach us that just as the blood requires throwing (*to be applied on the altar*), so does the meat require throwing; and from here we learn that there is a space between the ramp and the altar. Shall we say that he who maintains that it (*the hide by itself*) effects acceptance agrees with Rabbi Eliezer (*that the blood*

can be applied even if there is no meat), while he who maintains that it does not effect acceptance agrees with Rabbi Yehoshua?

The *Gemara* disagrees: According to the view of Rabbi Eliezer there is no dispute at all (*for the throwing of the blood will permit the hide to the Kohanim even though the meat has been disqualified*). They disagree according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua. He who maintains that it does not effect acceptance holds like Rabbi Yehoshua; while he (*Rebbe*) who maintains that it (*the hide*) effects acceptance can argue as follows: Rabbi Yehoshua rules like that only there by the meat, where there is no loss to the *Kohanim*, but as for the hide, which would involve a loss to the *Kohanim*, even Rabbi Yehoshua admits (*that the application of the blood will permit the hide to the Kohanim*). For this is similar to that which Rabbi Yehoshua taught in a *Mishna* regarding the throwing of the blood after the fact: If the meat became *tamei*, or disqualified, or it went out of the curtains, Rabbi Eliezer said: He must throw the blood (*even though the meat will not become permitted*). Rabbi Yehoshua maintained: He should not throw the blood] However, Rabbi Yehoshua admits that if he does throw it, the *korban* is accepted. [*Just as the throwing of the blood effects acceptance of the korban when the meat is disqualified, so it permits the hide to the Kohanim.*] (104a1 – 104a2)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Rabbi Chanina the administrator of the *Kohanim* says: I never saw a hide that was burned.



The *Gemara* asks: Did he not? Surely there are the bulls which are burned and the goats which are burned (*outside of Yerushalayim – along with their hides*)!?

The *Gemara* answers: He was not speaking about what is burned in accordance with their prescribed procedure.

The *Gemara* asks: But what about the sacrifice which was disqualified before it was skinned and before it was sprinkled (*which is burned along with its hide*)!?

The *Gemara* answers: He was speaking about a skinned hide.

The *Gemara* asks: But there are cases where the offering becomes disqualified after skinning and before sprinkling, according to Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Shimon who maintained that the blood does not effect acceptance on behalf of the hide by itself!?

The *Gemara* answers: Rabbi Chanina agrees with Rebbe.

Alternatively, you may even answer that he holds like Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Shimon, but even Rebbe admits that usually, there was no skinning before sprinkling (*and that is why he did not see a skinned hide taken out to be burned*).

But, the *Gemara* asks, there is the case where the offering was discovered to be a *tereifah* in its internal organs. [*This was found after it was skinned and after the sprinkling; and since it obviously was disqualified beforehand, everyone should agree that its hide should be taken out to be burned!*?]

The *Gemara* answer: He holds that where it was found to be a *tereifah* in its internal organs, the blood nevertheless, provides acceptance for the hide. This may be proven from the *Mishnah* which states: Rabbi Akiva said: We learn from his words that if one skins a *bechor* and it is found to be *tereifah*, the *Kohanim* may benefit from its hide. This indeed proves it.

The *Gemara* explains that Rabbi Akiva is informing us that this is so even outside the Temple (that the *Kohanim* may benefit from the hide of a slaughtered blemished *bechor* – as long as it was not discovered that it was a *tereifah* until after it was skinned).

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The *halachah* is according to Rabbi Akiva. But even Rabbi Akiva only ruled this way where an expert had permitted it (that it had a blemish which disqualifies it from being offered as a sacrifice, and permits it to be slaughtered outside of the Temple), but not if an expert had not permitted it. The *Gemara* notes, however that the law follows the *Chachamim*. (104a3 – 104a4)

Mishnah

The bulls which are burned and goats which are burned – when they are burned according to their prescribed procedure, they are burned in the *beis hadeshen* (the place of ashes – outside of the three camps), and they cause *tumah* to the garments (of those who were involved in its burning), but when they are not burned according to their prescribed procedure, they are burned in the *birah* (a place that was at times in the Courtyard, and at times it was outside the Courtyard – on the Temple Mount), and they do not cause garments to become *tamei*. They would carry them on staves. When those in front had passed outside of the wall of the Courtyard while those in the rear had not yet gone out, those in front cause their garments to become *tamei*, while those in the rear do not cause their garments to become *tamei*, until they go out. When they both go out, both of them cause their garments to become *tamei*. Rabbi Shimon said: They do not cause their garments to become *tamei* until the fire has caught on the greater part of them. When the meat has decomposed, he who burns it does not cause his garments to become *tamei*. (104a5 – 104b1)

Burning of the Bulls and the Goats

Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that *birah* was an area on the Temple Mount. Rish Lakish,

however, maintains that the entire Temple complex was referred to as *birah*, because it is said *the "birah" that I have prepared*. (104b1)

Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuhah: There were three places of ashes. There was the large ash-pit in the Courtyard; there they burned the *kodshei kodashim* and the sacrificial parts of *kodshei kalim* which had become disqualified, and the bulls and the goats which were burned - which had become disqualified before the sprinkling of the blood. There was a second ash-pit on the Temple Mount; there they burned the bulls and the goats which were burned - which had become disqualified after the sprinkling of the blood. And those which were burned in accordance of their proper procedure were burned outside of the three camps. (104b1 – 104b2)

Levi taught a *Baraisa* as follows: There was the large ash-pit in the Courtyard; there they burned the *kodshei kodashim* and the sacrificial parts of *kodshei kalim* which had become disqualified, and the bulls and the goats which were burned - which had become disqualified, whether before or after the sprinkling of the blood. There was a second ash-pit on the Temple Mount; there they burned the bulls and the goats which were burned - which had become disqualified after they left the Courtyard. And those which were burned in accordance of their proper procedure were burned outside of the three camps. (104b2)

Rabbi Yirmiyah inquired: Is *linah* (*keeping the meat overnight*) effective (*for disqualification*) in the case of the bulls and the goats which are burned? Do we say that *linah* is effective only in respect of meat which can be eaten, but not in respect of these which cannot be eaten; or perhaps there is no difference?

Rava said: This inquiry was raised by Abaye, and I resolved it for him from the following *Baraisa*: And they both agree that if the *Kohen* expressed a *piggul* intention in connection with the eating of the bulls or their burning, he has done nothing.

Surely then, since intention does not disqualify it, *linah* too does not disqualify it either!

The *Gemara* deflects the proof by saying that although intention does not disqualify it, *linah* would disqualify it.

The *Gemara* attempts to resolve it from the following *Mishnah*: The bulls which are to be burned and the goats which are to be burned are subject to the law of *me'ilah* (*one who has unintentionally benefited from hekdesch or removed it from the ownership of the Beis Hamikdosh has committed the transgression of me'ilah, and as a penalty, he would be required to pay the value of the object plus an additional fifth of the value; he also brings a korban asham*) from the time they are consecrated. Once they were slaughtered, they are susceptible to become disqualified through contact with a *tevil yom* (*one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah; he is considered a tevil yom until nightfall*) and a *mechusar kippurim* (*one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah, and has waited until nightfall; he is just lacking atonement until he brings his offerings the next day*) and through *linah*. Is this not referring to the meat being kept overnight!

The *Gemara* deflects the poof by saying that it refers to keeping the sacrificial parts overnight; and although the latter part of the *Mishnah* refers to its meat, the first part may refer to the sacrificial parts.

The *Gemara* attempts to resolve it from that which Levi taught: which had become disqualified after they left the Courtyard. Does that not mean disqualification through *linah*?

The *Gemara* deflects the poof by saying that it refers to disqualification through *tumah* or through leaving the Courtyard. (104b2 – 104b3)

Rabbi Elazar inquired: Is leaving the Courtyard (*before sprinkling*) effective (*for disqualification*) in the case of the

bulls and the goats which are burned? Do we say that the ruling that “its time to leave has not yet arrived” (*and therefore, it’s disqualified*) applies only to meat where there is no obligation to take it out; but not to these, which must eventually be taken out; or perhaps here too we say that it was not yet time for them to be taken out?

The *Gemara* attempts to resolve it from that which Levi taught: which had become disqualified after they left the Courtyard. Does that not mean disqualification through taking it out?

The *Gemara* deflects the poof by saying that it refers to disqualification through *tumah* or through leaving it overnight. (104b3 – 104b4)

Rabbi Elazar inquired: What of the bulls which were burned and the goats which were burned, if the greater part of them went out through the inclusion of the smaller part of a limb?¹ Do we cast this lesser part of the limb after its greater part, and that indeed has not gone out; or perhaps we cast it after the greater part of the animal? — It is obvious that we do not disregard the greater part of the animal and regard the greater part of the limb! Rather [the question arises] where half of it went out, through the inclusion of the greater part of the limb. Do we cast this lesser part of the limb after its greater part and that indeed has gone out; or perhaps we cast it after the animal? The question was left unresolved.

Rabbah bar Rav Huna recited [this passage] in reference to men. Thus: five men were engaged on it, three had gone out and two were left [inside]. What [is the law]? Do we follow the majority of those engaged with it; or perhaps we go by the animal? The question was left unresolved. (104b4 – 105a1)

DAILY MASHAL

¹ The greater part of the carcass was carried out, but it was the greater part only because it included the lesser part of a limb, the greater part of which was still within. Rashi explains that the

R’ Yehoshua says: if there is no blood, the meat may not be offered, and if there is no meat, the blood may not be offered.

We know that sacrifices achieve atonement primarily with the blood offerings of the sacrifice. While it therefore is very reasonable that if the blood is not available, the meat may also not be offered, why is the reverse also true? If the blood is available, why does the missing meat prevent the blood offerings?

The *Vayaged Yaakov* explains this based on a concept found in *sifrei mussar* that it is easier to fulfill a mitzvah in a purer manner if it does not involve physical pleasure than a mitzvah that does involve physical pleasure. This is because Hashem desires mitzvos to be performed out of an inner desire to connect to Him, and that altruism is harder to achieve when there is a tangible enjoyment received at the same time.

A sacrifice has two components – the blood offering that effects the primary atonement but is easier to perform altruistically, and the eating of the meat by the Kohen in holiness and purity. Since it involves a physical pleasure, it is harder to achieve, and is in its own way more precious, and therefore its absence will interfere with the blood offerings.

question is whether that counts as going out, so that the men in front, who had carried that portion out (for the purpose of burning) contaminate their garments.