

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Shimon ben Azzai's position (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its unsuccessful challenge to R' Huna's explanation of Ben Azzai's position.

An alternative explanation of R' Huna is suggested.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the disqualification of a שלא לשמה intent and presents the views of R' Shimon and R' Eliezer regarding the disqualification that may result from improper intent while transporting the blood to the altar.

3) Receiving blood

A Baraisa is cited that challenges the premise that improper intent while receiving the blood will invalidate a korban.

Rava differentiates between the improper intent of piggul and the improper intent of שלא לשמה and cites proof to support his contention.

The implication that a korban does not become invalidated by piggul intent while receiving the blood is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Baraisa's statement, that piggul intent while pouring out the leftover blood or burning the sacrificial parts does not invalidate a korban, is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Piggul of an Inner Chatas

R' Yehudah the son of R' Chiya relates that he heard that a kohen can make a korban piggul if he has incorrect intent while dipping his finger in the blood of an Inner Chatas.

Ilfa unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

A similar exchange is recorded between another set of Amoraim.

R' Mari cites proof for the assertion that a korban can be rendered piggul if the kohen has the incorrect intent while dipping his finger in the blood of an inner Chatas.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon?

2. How does R' Akiva explain the difference between receiving the blood and throwing the blood?

3. What was the point of dispute between R' Yehudah and Ilfa?

4. In a Korban Mincha, what is the parallel to the throwing of the blood of an animal korban?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Learning piggul from Shelemim

תהי בה רבי שמעון בן לקיש כלום למדנו פיגול אלא משלמים

The Gemara discusses some details of an inner-chattas and the effects of thoughts of piggul at different points of the service. R' Yehoshua b. Levi focuses on the moment the kohen dips his finger in the blood of the chattas in order to sprinkle it on the altar. If, at that moment, the kohen has thoughts of piggul to offer the limbs of the offering the next day, which is too late, this thought causes the offering to be piggul. Usually, thoughts of piggul are only critical if done during the main services of the offering (slaughter, accepting the blood, walking the blood to the altar and splashing the blood). Here, though, the kohen dipping his finger in the blood is described in the verse (Vayikra 4:17), it is also considered a service in this regard.

Reish Lakish pointed out to R' Yehoshua that laws of piggul are determined from shelamim, and we do not find regarding shelamim that the kohen's dipping of his finger is a service in this regard. Therefore, Reish Lakish contends that thoughts of piggul with an inner-chattas are not effective at the moment of the kohen's dipping of his finger into the blood.

Tosafos (ד"ה הג"ה) notes that the inner-chattas offerings require that the blood be carried from the courtyard, where the animal is slaughtered, into the inner-chamber (היכל). We find that Reish Lakish himself holds (14a) that R' Shimon agrees that because this activity cannot be omitted, thoughts of piggul can be effective during the carrying of this blood (הולכה). Yet, R' Shimon holds that for a shelamim, the source from which the laws of piggul are derived, there is no piggul possible during the carrying of its blood. If Reish Lakish contends that no piggul can be done during the dipping of the finger of the kohen because we do not find it in reference to a shelamim, he should also not allow piggul to be effective during the carrying of the blood of the inner-chattas, as the parallel situation regarding shelamim is not eligible for piggul. Tosafos leaves this question unresolved.

Several answers are given to this question. Leshem Zevach and Mayim Kedoshim point out that there is a minimal service of הולכה which is necessary even for a shelamim, as the Gemara discusses later (15a). Because we find that shelamim does have at least a minimal carrying of the blood, and during that service piggul thoughts can be effective, this is why R' Shimon applies this concept further to the inner-chattas offerings as well. This is as opposed to the dipping of the finger of the kohen into the blood, which has no application with shelamim at all.

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Earning reward for walking a greater distance to shul

במקום שאינו צריך להלך אין מחשבה פוסלת

In a place where it was not necessary to transport it, improper thought does not invalidate

Mishnah Berurah¹ writes that if there are two shuls in town it is preferable to daven at the one that is further away since one earns additional reward for walking a greater distance to get to shul. Later authorities question whether one can earn additional reward by walking to shul in a roundabout manner. Teshuvos Divrei Malkiel² addresses this question by first questioning the rationale behind this principle. Why should a person earn more reward for walking to the more distant shul? If someone sent a messenger to deliver something and the messenger took a more circuitous route would anyone entertain the possibility that he should be paid for the additional time he took to make the delivery? He explains that this principle applies in a circumstance in which a person davened regularly at a shul and then a new shul was built closer to his house. He now faces the choice between davening at the new, closer shul or continuing to walk the greater distance to his old shul. The person who continues to daven at the more distant shul will earn more reward for the additional distance he walks to reach his old shul. This understanding indicates that one does not receive additional reward simply because he walked a greater distance to go to shul. This principle

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Gri"z explains that a shelamim has the service of carrying the blood, just that it can be dispensed with by slaughtering the animal near the altar. This service cannot be dispensed with for the inner-chattas, so piggul applies at this point. However, there is no parallel for the dipping of the finger into the blood by the shelamim at all, so there is no source from which to learn piggul. ■

ple applies in this limited circumstance. Accordingly, one who purposely takes a circuitous route will not earn any additional reward.

Teshuvos B'tzeil Hachochmah³ maintains that there is a way a person could earn additional reward by taking a more circuitous route. Consider, for example, a person who lives one block from shul and rather than walking straight to shul he walked two blocks in the opposite direction from shul. From that spot, three blocks away, he walks straight to shul. Although he is not rewarded for the two blocks he walked away from shul he is rewarded for the three blocks he walked to shul which represent the distance he travelled when he actually began to head for shul. One proof for this concept he infers from our Gemara. In explaining R' Eliezer's position recorded in the Mishnah, the Gemara (15b) makes it clear that any walking that was done that was not essential is not categorized as "transporting the blood" and an improper thought at that time will not disqualify the korban. ■

1. משנה ברורה סי' צ"ט ס"ק ל"ז.
2. שו"ת דברי מלכאל ח"ד סי' י"ט.
3. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ד סי' כ'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Mixed Motives

"או לשמן ושלא לשמן..."

Acertain woman lost her husband. They had no children, so the woman was unable to remarry without chalitzah. But the brother of the deceased wondered if there was any way it would be permitted for him to do yibbum. After a bit of research he figured this was halachically acceptable and brought his case to beis din.

Before the court he presented his rationale. "Of course, the main problem is that the Shulchan Aruch rules like Abba Shaul who holds that one who does yibbum for an ulterior motive is likened to one who marries his brother's wife without a heter. Yet when I considered the Aruch

HaShulchan's view on this, I understood that there certainly is room for leniency regarding this psak. He explains that Abba Shaul is only discussing someone who does yibbum solely due to ulterior motives, but one who does yibbum for ulterior motives and also to do the mitzvah of yibbum is not the kind of person to whom Abba Shaul referred.¹ I can guarantee the beis din that I want to fulfill this mitzvah with all of my heart and I hope you will rule that I can rely on this well-reasoned psak..."

When this question was brought to the attention of the Divrei Malkiel, zt"l, he rejected the brother's proposal. "This ruling of the Aruch HaShulchan is difficult to understand and cannot be relied on, since it contradicts the Gemara on Zevachim 13. There we find that even one who slaughters a korban pesach or chattas

both l'shmah and shelo l'shmah invalidates the sacrifice. L'shmah and shelo l'shmah is explained there to mean one who also thought this was a chattas and a shelamim. If having a bad thought does not disqualify the right thought, why is this case invalid? It seems clear that have the correct intentions while also harboring incorrect intentions is called shelo l'shmah and invalidates such a union."²

1. ערוך השלחן, אבן העזר, ס' קס"ה, ס"ק ו"ח.
2. שו"ת דברי מלכאל, ח"ה, ס' קכ"ב ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

This proof is rejected.

It is suggested that there is a dispute between Tannaim whether incorrect intent while dipping one's finger into the blood of an Inner Chatas renders a korban piggul.

This suggestion is rejected. ■