

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Blood that spilled on the floor (cont.)

The Gemara continues its analysis of the first part of the Baraisa that discusses whether the kohanim would gather a cup of blood and apply it to the altar to assure that the blood from all the Korbanos Pesach would be applied to the altar.

The next part of the Baraisa is cited in which R' Yehudah questions why according to Rabanan would they plug the drain so the blood would collect in the azarah.

Additional questions related to plugging the drain so that the blood would collect are recorded.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates a number of improper intents that do not render a korban piggul.

3) Piggul

R' Elazar mentions certain parts of an animal that become piggul when the korban is piggul but intent to consume these parts outside of the proper time or place do not render the korban as piggul.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Elazar's position but the proof is rejected.

Another unsuccessful attempt to support R' Elazar's position is cited.

An unsuccessful challenge to R' Elazar is presented.

Rava cites support for R' Elazar's ruling from our Mishnah.

4) Blemished animals

A Mishnah is cited that presents a dispute whether sacrificial parts of a blemished animal are to be removed from the

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Eating from non-edible parts of an offering

ואין חייבין עליהן משום פיגול ונותר

The Mishnah on our daf clearly lists horns and hooves as parts of an animal which are not considered as food. In Chullin (117b), the Mishnah lists the horns and hooves of animals among items which can contribute towards a volume of animal product that can contract tum'ah of food, but not tum'ah of a neveilah. Yet, the Gemara in Chullin cites R' Pappa who explains that the part of the horn which has some aspect of "food" is only the part which would cause an issue of blood when cut when the animal was alive. In other words, there are places near the body where the horn and hoof are soft, and it is only this part which is referred to in the Mishnah in Chullin. The rest of the horn or hoof is like the bone, which is not food in any way.

Mishneh L'Melech to Rambam (Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 18:7) notes that we know that improper thoughts regarding items such as the hide, gravy, sediment and bones are not included in the punishment of kareis. Therefore, one who slaughters an offering having in mind to eat any of these at the wrong time is not liable for kareis. He asks though, whether these are also excluded from the negative commandment associated with having these improper intentions (see 29b), and thus there would be no lashes, or are these only excluded from kareis?

Mishneh L'Melech writes that the wording of Rambam is precise in this regard, as he writes (ibid., 18:22): "If an offering was ruined with piggul intentions, or if the meat was actually left over beyond its time limit, if one eats from the hide or gravy he is not liable for kareis. Similarly, if someone who is tamei eats from these parts of the offering, he is not liable for kareis, but he is given rabbinic lashes." It is clear that when Rambam writes that we give "them" lashes, he is referring only to the one who is tamei, but there are no lashes for eating these non-edible parts of piggul or נותר.

Keren Orah also holds that lashes are not administered for eating non-edible parts of the offering, just as there are no lashes for eating these parts of a neveilah. Even HoEzel even wonders why the Mishneh L'Melech even suggests that there should be lashes in this case. Why should it be different than any case of eating non-edible parts of prohibited foods? Rambam himself (Hilchos Ma'achalos Asuros 4:18) rules that if someone eats from a neveilah or tereifa...from the hide, bones, sinews, horns or hooves, although this is prohibited, he is not liable for lashes. These items do not even join together with the edible parts of the animal to comprise the minimum amount of a k'zayis to be punishable. Mar'eh Kohen adds that even cooking these non-edible items with milk does not constitute the prohibition against cooking milk and meat (Rambam, ibid., 9:7). ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How did the kohanim assure that the service did not become disqualified by their garments becoming soiled with blood?
2. Does intention to consume the milk of an animal offered as a korban outside of the property time render the korban piggul?
3. What are מתפגלין and מפגלין?
4. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Akiva concerning blemished animals?

HALACHAH Highlight

Is dried blood an interposition?

שבח הוא לבני אהרן שיהלכו עד ארכובותיהן בדם

It is a praise of the sons of Aharon that they walk knee deep in blood

Teshuvos Halachos Ketanos¹ was asked whether dried blood on a mohel's hands constitute an interposition when he washes his hands for bread. He answered that it is not an interposition and he based his position on our Gemara. The Gemara relates that on Erev Pesach they would plug up a hole in the wall of the *azarah* so that the blood of the Korbanos Pesach would collect in the *azarah*. This was considered a credit to the sons of Aharon who would walk knee deep in blood. The Gemara wonders why the blood is not an interposition between the feet of the kohanim and the floor of the *azarah* and the Gemara answers that since the blood was in a liquid state it does not constitute an interposition. Halachos Ketanos wrote that the fundamental reason the blood was not an interposition is due to the fact that it was a credit to them and thus they were not particular about the presence of the blood and therefore it is not an interposition.

Teshuvos Shvus Yaakov² expresses surprise how Halachos Ketanos seems to have overlooked what the Gemara actually states. After the Gemara relates that it was a credit to the kohanim that they walked knee deep in blood it asks the question that the blood should constitute an interposition. The

altar once they were placed there.

R' Chiya bar Avin qualifies R' Akiva's lenient position.

R' Chiya bar Abba suggests another qualification to R' Akiva's position.

R' Zeira unsuccessfully challenges this qualification from a Baraisa.

5) MISHNAH: R' Yehudah and Chachamim disagree about the consequence of the intent to leave the blood or sacrificial parts until the next day. The Mishnah lists other intents that do not disqualify a korban. ■

answer that the Gemara gave was that blood in liquid form is not an interposition. The obvious implication is that blood that is dried is an interposition despite the fact that it was a credit that they walked in blood. Shvus Yaakov asks a similar question on Rema's ruling that the blood on the hands of a slaughterer or a butcher is not an interposition since most people in those professions are not particular about the presence of blood on their hands. Our Gemara makes it clear that even though the kohanim were not particular about the blood on their feet it would be an interposition if not for the fact that it was liquid. Therefore, he maintains that dried blood on the hands of a mohel is, in fact, an interposition that must be removed before washing for bread. ■

1. שו"ת הלכות קטנות ח"א סי' כ"י.

2. שו"ת שבות יעקב ח"א סי' ס"ט. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A False Claim

"מוקדשין..."

Once there was a certain menaker who began to make the rounds with an outlandish claim. He was certain that the gid hanasheh that Jews had always avoided was not the real gid hanasheh. He claimed that his superior knowledge of anatomy had revealed the real gid hanasheh.

As he was touring through Germany trying to prove his claim, he made a presentation to Rav Yonasan Eybeschuetz, zt"l, and many other great scholars. Rav Yonasan began to investigate this person's case and found that the gid hanasheh he was championing was only

found in male animals.

Rav Yonasan concludes, "I showed him the language of the Smag: 'גיד הנשה' —נוהג בזכרים ובנקבות applies to both males and females.' And this immediately made him retract his words."¹

But many poskim questioned what appeared to be an erroneous proof. "The language he brings from the Smag may very well mean that both men and women are obligated to refrain from eating gid hanasheh!" Some use this to demonstrate that the trap of a mistake is spread out before every human being, both small and great.²

But eventually the Mishmeres Shalom, zt"l, explained that there was a misprint in the words of Rav Yonasan. Instead of סמ"י, it should say, סה"י, the Sefer Halachos Gedolos, which writes

explicitly that gid hanasheh applies to male and female animals alike. A first edition of כרתי ופלטתי had this correction in Rav Yonasan's own hand.³

Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank, zt"l, explained that the gid hanasheh being also forbidden in female animals is obvious from Rashi in Zevachim 35. "There we find that whenever the Mishnah uses the word מוקדשין designation, female animals are included. The Mishnah about gid hanasheh writes, 'גיד הנשה נוהג' בחולין ובמוקדשין'. Since the Mishnah uses the word מוקדשין, clearly this applies to both male and female animals."⁴ ■

1. כרתי ופלטתי, ס' ס"ה

2. מובא בפתחי תשובה, יו"ד, ס' ס"ה, ס"ק ב'

3. פרדס יוסף, פרשת וישלח

4. עלים לתרופה, תצוה תשנ"ו, ע"ד ■