



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Offering the loaves without alone (cont.)

A Baraisa discusses the circumstances that cause the slaughter of the lambs to sanctify the loaves and presents a related dispute between Rebbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon about this.

Rebbi presents the source for his position and the exchange between Rebbi and R' Shimon regarding their respective expositions is recorded

Abaye and Rava disagree about the meaning of Rebbi's statement that if the lambs were slaughtered with the proper intention but the blood was not thrown with the proper intention that it is "sanctified but not sanctified."

The practical difference between their explanations is identified.

Rava's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchok asks in a case that the lambs were slaughtered for their own sake but the blood was not thrown with the proper intention whether the loaves could be eaten.

The inquiry is clarified.

R' Pappa challenges R' Sheishess' understanding of the Baraisa that was the basis of R' Shmuel bar Yitzchok's inquiry.

R' Pappa's explanation of the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) Eating the lambs if the loaves are lost

R' Yirmiyah asks whether it is possible to sprinkle the blood of the lambs without proper intention to permit the meat if the lamb was slaughtered with the proper intention and then the loaves were lost.

R' Zeira questions the premise that doing something without proper intention is better than if it was done with proper intention.

R' Zeira's assertion goes through numerous revisions as a result of challenges by the Gemara. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Rebbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon?
2. What is the status of the loaves of the Shavuot korban when the lambs were slaughtered with the proper intention but the blood was thrown without proper intention?
3. Explain פייגול אינה מביאה לידי מעילה?
4. How does R' Zeira finally explain his inquiry?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Kodshei kodoshim limbs taken beyond their boundary*

דתני אימורי קדשים קלים שיצאו לפני זריקת דמים, ר' אליעזר אומר אין מועלין בהן ואין חייבין עליהן משום פיגול ונותר וטמא, ר"ע אומר מועלין בהן

In general, the sprinkling of the blood of an offering is the last of the four services of an offering. This service achieves atonement for the owner. If it is a chattas, it atones for a kareis violation, and if it is an olah, it atones for failure to fulfill a positive commandment. Sprinkling of the blood also serves to permit the meat of the offering to be eaten. Kodshei kodoshim become permitted for the kohanim, and kodoshim kalim become permitted for their owners, as the verse states (Devarim 12:27), "the blood of your offering shall be placed (spilled), and the meat shall be eaten." The rule is, however, that only blood that atones can then permit the meat to be eaten.

The laws of me'ilah and piggul are in effect for a kodshei kodoshim offering from the moment it is consecrated until the sprinkling of the blood. The limbs of kodoshim kalim are eligible for me'ilah only after the blood is sprinkled. In a situation of piggul, it is only when the sprinkling of the blood is completed that the law of piggul applies, provided that there is no other technical invalidating issue regarding the offering, known as יתיר המתיר כמצותו.

Our Gemara refers to the disagreement in Me'ila (12a) between Rebbe Eliezer and R' Akiva, in reference to a case where meat from kodshei kodoshim was removed outside the courtyard of the Mikdash, which is beyond its boundary, before the sprinkling of its blood. R' Eliezer holds that the sprinkling no longer has an effect upon meat of an offering that was brought beyond its boundary, and the meat remains with its status of me'ilah. R' Akiva holds that the sprinkling does have an effect, and the meat is released from the law of me'ilah.

Another practical difference between these opinions would be regarding the law of piggul. One is liable for kareis if he eats from the meat of a piggul offering after the sprinkling of its blood. If intention of piggul had been expressed

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לע"נ מרת יהודית בת הרב שמואל אלחנן, ע"ה קירשנבוים

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Alan Matten  
In memory of their mother  
מרת חי' מאשה בת ר' דוד, ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Offering the Korban Pesach with mundane intent

והרי פסח קודם חצות דאינו כשר לשמו וכשר שלא לשמו

What about the Korban Pesach before midday that it is not valid if it is offered with proper intent but is valid if offered without proper intent.

The Gemara mentions the case of one who slaughters a Korban Pesach before midday without proper intent. In Rambam's codification of this halacha<sup>1</sup> he discusses one who slaughters a Korban Pesach after midday with mundane intent and he declares that the korban is invalid. The basis of this ruling, he explains, is the verse which states (Shemos 12:27), "You shall say, 'It is a Korban Pesach for Hashem.'" Many commentators wonder why the Korban Pesach is treated differently than other korbanos. Generally, when korbanos are brought with mundane intent the korban remains valid; it is just that the owner does not discharge his obligation. What is the reason that the Korban Pesach is invalid altogether when offered with mundane intent and how is this halacha derived from the pasuk? Kesef Mishnah<sup>2</sup> suggests that it is based on the fact that the pasuk says, "For Hashem," thereby indicating that it is essential to the validity of the korban that it be brought with the correct intent.

Tzitz Eliezer<sup>3</sup> offers the following explanation for this halacha. Generally, the reason why a korban does not become invalidated when it is offered with mundane intent is that

(Insight...continued from page 1)  
for this offering which has now been removed from its boundary, according to R' Eliezer the sprinkling of its blood would not be a kareis violation, because the added complication of being taken out of its boundary is an added technical invalidating factor. Similarly, if the meat was left beyond its time limit or if it was eaten by one who was impure, there would be no kareis.

According to R' Akiva the sprinkling of the blood does advance this offering to a piggul condition, and one who eats from it would be liable for kareis. Also, the liability of kareis would be in effect regarding eating the meat of this offering that was left over, or if it was eaten by someone who was impure. ■

mundane intent does not have the strength to negatively impact a korban (אין חולין מחללין קדשים). That same principle applies to the Korban Pesach; however, when eating the Korban Pesach there is an obligation to declare, "It is a Korban Pesach for Hashem." One who slaughtered the Korban Pesach with mundane intent cannot honestly make this declaration. This declaration is considered so essential to the validity of the korban that one who cannot make the declaration has invalidated the korban. The requirement for this declaration is unique to the Korban Pesach and that is why only the Korban Pesach becomes invalidated when it is slaughtered with mundane intent. ■

1. רמב"ם פט"ו מהל' פסולי המוקדשין הי"א.

2. כסף משנה שם.

3. שו"ת ציץ אליעזר ח"ד סי' כ"ט פ"ד אות ב'. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## To say "Thank you" - or at least call

"שאני תודה.."

Today's daf discusses the korban todah. Perhaps the most obvious lesson from this korban is that we are required to have hakoras hatov to those who help us.

Rav Yankel Galisky, zt"l, is known for his biting humor and down-to-earth way of giving over musar. Once he regaled his listeners with a lesson about hakoras hatov. "I am in charge of a smallish gemach which lends sums of money to people who need to borrow. There is a very long line of names waiting to receive a loan and you have a long

wait until your turn.

"'Why is there a wait?' you may wonder. The simple answer is that people do not pay back on time. As many have likely noticed it is somewhat difficult to be mechanech the new generation. I have started working on one young man but haven't yet completed the job.

"Failing to pay back a loan is nothing less than a moral sickness, as the verse states, 'לוה רשע ואינו משלם.'<sup>1</sup> The Tiferes Yisrael, zt"l, explains that this refers to one who borrows with no means to repay.<sup>2</sup>

"I must admit first thing that most people do pay on time. Of those who don't manage it, one would expect a telephone call at the very least the day be-

fore explaining that payment will not be made on time and working out a payment plan.

"It is strange to recount that some people have a very strange attitude. They admit that repaying a loan is a mitzvah yet they know that they are already filled with mitzvos like a pomegranate is filled with seeds and feel fine managing without this mitzvah.

"This is an act of k'fias tovah. It is obviously incumbent upon each of us to do whatever we can, even if we are truly unable to repay as is fitting. At the very least we must inform the gemach and pay back whatever we can, as soon as we can."<sup>3</sup> ■

1. תהלים, ל"ז: כ"א.

2. תפארת ישראל, אבות, ג' ט.

3. הגדה של פסח והגדת, ע' 259-258. ■

