

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Permissibility for kohanim (cont.)

The Gemara presents a disagreement between Chizkiyah and R' Yochanan whether "permissibility for kohanim" refers to permission to slaughter the korban or permission to eat the korban.

R' Zeira unsuccessfully challenges these two opinions.

A Mishnah is cited and explained in accordance with R' Yochanan's position that the Mishnah means permission for the kohanim to eat.

This explanation is rejected by R' Yosef.

R' Assi rejects this argument and offers another explanation of the Mishnah that does not support R' Yochanan's position.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another unsuccessful attempt to prove that the Mishnah refers to permission to throw the blood of the korban is presented. ■

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Laundering שירים blood

קמ"ל דפסול עושה שירים

It teaches that invalid blood makes שירים

The Gemara arrives at the conclusion that disqualified blood can still make the remaining blood into שירים—leftovers. Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains the significance of the fact that disqualified blood can make the remaining blood שירים. If the blood of a korban was collected in two separate vessels and someone disqualified from serving in the Beis HaMikdash applied blood from one of the vessels to the altar the blood that remains in the second vessel is considered שירים. The consequence of this designation is that even if someone who is fit to serve in the Beis HaMikdash were to apply the blood from the second utensil on the altar that application would not be valid since that blood is שירים blood which is unfit to be applied to the altar. Additionally, if the blood were to splash onto a garment it would not be necessary to launder that garment since the requirement to launder a garment with korban

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Piggul never releases the law of me'ilah

תא שמע הפיגול לעולם מועלין בו

The Gemara pursues the earlier discussion regarding the moment when an offering becomes permitted for the kohanim. This is what causes the prohibition of me'ilah to be suspended. The possibilities were either at the moment of shechita, or when the blood is sprinkled on the Altar, or perhaps the moment the offering is actually permitted to be eaten.

A Baraisa is brought to try to resolve this issue. "An offering of kodshei kodoshim for which the shechita was performed with an intent of piggul will have the law of me'ila remain with it." The Gemara offers its understanding of this statement. Are we not dealing with a case where the blood was collected properly but not sprinkled on the Altar? This indicates that me'ilah will remain because the collecting of blood of an offering which had a piggul intent is invalid, and the offering will never become permitted to eat. However, if the shechita was done without piggul intent and the blood was collected properly this would be enough to allow the me'ilah to be released. This proves that "the permitted status" is that of the collecting of the blood in order to sprinkle it later.

The Gemara answers that there is no proof from the Baraisa that the sprinkling of the blood is the point at which the me'ilah is dismissed, because the Baraisa could be referring to a case where the sprinkling actually took place. The inference is that if the sprinkling was done im-

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Chizkiya and R' Yochanan?
2. When does Chatas blood that splatters on a garment require laundering?
3. If a person disqualified from serving in the Beis HaMikdash does zerikah does the remaining blood become שירים?
4. What effect does a piggul zerikah have on me'ilah?

(Highlight...continued from page 1)

blood does not apply to שׂירִים blood.

Olas Shlomo<sup>2</sup> questions why Rashi mentions that the blood does not have to be laundered because it is שׂירִים. The Gemara earlier (5a) inferred from the pasuk (Vayikra 6:2) אֲשֶׁר יִזָּה that only blood that stands to be applied to the altar would mandate the laundering of a garment but not blood that was already applied to the altar. Since the halacha is that even an invalid application of blood to the altar that does not render the blood שׂירִים is considered blood that was applied to the altar and thus not subject to the laundering requirement, why does Rashi indicate that the blood does not require laundering because it is שׂירִים when that seems irrelevant to the halacha? He answers that the phrase אֲשֶׁר יִזָּה only excludes the blood that is leftover from the cup from which the blood was applied to the altar but does not disqualify blood from the same animal that is in another cup. Since the blood in the second cup was not excluded by the phrase אֲשֶׁר יִזָּה it was necessary to exclude it because it was rendered שׂירִים by the invalid blood in the first cup. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה אלא.

2. עולת שלמה ברש"י ד"ה אלא ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

properly, then the me'ilah is not released, but if the sprinkling is done properly and the offering is actually permitted to be eaten, then the me'ilah is released.

Sefer Me'il Yaakov asks why the Gemara uses the Baraisa to launch its question, instead of asking from the Mishnah itself. There, "an offering which does not become permitted to be eaten for the kohanim" is illustrated with a case where the animal was shechted with an intent to be eaten beyond its proper time or place constraints. This case, just as we found in the Baraisa, is apparently speaking about where the blood was not sprinkled properly. This implies that had the shechita been performed properly that me'ilah would be suspended. This would therefore indicate that the permission necessary for the kohanim is that of the shechita or collecting of the blood. Why does the Gemara only refer to the Baraisa to raise its point?

He answers that, in fact, the question could have been presented from the Mishnah, but the wording of the Baraisa is more concise, so the presentation was made using the Baraisa. In addition, the Gemara wanted incidentally to question the extra word "לעולם" in the Baraisa which emphasizes that the law of piggul never results a release of me'ilah. This is also why the Gemara asked from the Baraisa and not from the Mishnah. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Deviation from Yiddishkeit

"הפיגול לעולם מועלין בו..."

Today's daf continues discussing the laws of me'ilah. Rashi in Chumash explains that the word me'ilah signifies deviation from what should have been done, and this is a concept with broad ramifications.<sup>1</sup> Of course nobody wants to deviate from the right path, but figuring out what is a step towards invigorating Yiddishkeit and what is actually a slip that could lead to a deep spiritual fall is not always an easy matter. Gedolei Yisrael are the best consultants on such matter and have an uncanny sense of what is positive and what is not.

A certain community in America with many shuls was considering creating a single umbrella under which all of the observant shuls in the neighborhood would be joined. But some had reservations about this. Perhaps it would lead to lowering their religious standards since the spectrum of observance in that community was quite broad? After some thought, the "yeshivish" contingent of the community decided to ask Rav Aharon Leib Steinman, if they should agree to this proposal.

When they explained that the question was whether to join an organization that also included more modern congregations, Rav Steinman asked for clarification. "What do you mean by the word 'modern'? Do you mean, 'a little modern?' Or perhaps

you are referring to 'very modern'?"

When they explained that in their community certain congregations consisted of people who were not respectful of various issurei d'rabanan, Rav Steinman immediately rejected the idea of joining with them. "You must know that those who do not respect rabbinic prohibitions are always in danger of ignoring them. They figure that they understand matters just as well as our great rabbis and feel free to reject their words, either fully or partially."

Rav Steinman thumped the table and thundered, "One who cheapens the rabbinic decrees of our holy Torah uproots the foundations of Yiddishkeit! It is certainly not proper to join with such people."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. רש"י עה"ת, ויקרא, ה': ט"ו

2. מאחורי הפרגוד, ע' 135-136 ■