



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Chatas offered with the wrong intent (cont.)

The sources that a Chatas offered with the wrong intent disqualifies a korban even for the service of receiving and throwing the blood are presented.

The source that a Chatas is disqualified even when the incorrect intent relates to the owner is cited.

The fact that this requirement is essential rather than just a mitzvah is demonstrated.

The Gemara summarizes what has been demonstrated until this point and then inquires how we know that the remaining blood services are also essential.

R' Yona answers one part of the question and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua answers the second part of the question.

Ravina presents two challenges to this explanation.

Rava offers an alternative explanation.

A source is suggested that even a change of owner is essential to all the blood services but this source is rejected.

The reason it is not possible to derive the cases of the standard chatas, the nazir's chatas or the metzora's chatas one from the other is explained.

The last source that proves that the different blood services are essential is cited.

The sources that extend this principle to other types of Korban Chatas are presented.

2) Pesach offered with improper intent

A Baraisa discusses the halachos of a Pesach brought with or without proper intent.

The father of Shmuel suggests a source for the ruling that a Pesach offered during the rest of the year with incorrect intent is valid.

Numerous challenges and subsequent responses clarify

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Must a libation be brought together with its korban?

2. What are the three types of Chatas and what are their respective strengths?

3. When is a Pesach brought with the wrong intent valid?

4. Is it necessary for the first כָּלל and the last כָּלל to match?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The halachos which are shared by the various chattas offerings

הלכך מצוה משלמים והנך קראי לעכב

The Gemara presented a series of verses regarding intent when bringing a chattas offering. The Gemara found sources that all the standard procedures of a chattas must be performed with specific intent. The conclusion of the Gemara is that we find that the Torah associates a chattas offering and that of a shelamim in Vayikra 7:37. This teaches that a chattas will share the halacha we find regarding a shelamim. Just as a shelamim offering must be brought for its sake, both in regard to its being a shelamim (and not a different offering) and that it be for the sake of its owner, so too must a chattas be brought for its sake, both in terms of its being the correct offering and for the sake of the correct owner. This is learned from the verse which associates the two offering one with the other. Now, however, the verses which the Gemara presented regarding chattas itself come to teach me that the necessity of proper intent is not just a mitzvah, but it is essential for the chattas to be valid. Improper intent regarding the type of offering or regarding the correct owner would render the chattas offering invalid. The proper intent must be in place during the slaughter of the animal as well as during the sprinkling of its blood on the altar.

Regarding the intent that it be for the owner of the offering, the verse only emphasizes that this is essential during the sprinkling of the blood, Rashi explains that we learn from the association to shelamim that this applies during the other services of the offering as well.

The Gemara cites verses to prove that these guidelines apply to the chattas of a nazir as well. Tosafos notes that we have a verse (Vayikra 7:37) which associates all types of chattas with each other. "This is the Torah for the olah, for the minchah, for the chattas and the asham." Why, asks Tosafos, do we need additional sources for each chattas to teach that it is not valid if it is not performed for its sake? Tosafos answers that according to the conclusion of the Gemara, this verse only teaches that all chattas offerings share the halacha discussed directly in reference to that verse, i.e., the halacha of laundering a garment on which blood of a chattas splattered.

The Yerushalmi (Pesachim 5:2) does say that after we learn the law of slaughtering a chattas for its sake from the verse "it shall be slaughtered for a chattas" (Vayikra 7:33), and we learn regarding chattas nazir that other actions must be done for its sake from the verse (Bemidbar 6:16), we then use the הִיקֵשׁ to equate all chattas offerings to each other. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Reciting Shir Shel Yom in Minchah

ההוא מבעי ליה מנחתם ונסכיהם בלילה

That is needed to teach that their Minchah and libations can be brought even at night

The Gemara, based on an exposition of the words **מנחתם ונסכיהם**, teaches that libations can be done at night. Magen Avrohom¹ cites Orchos Chaim who explains that the Shir Shel Yom is not recited at Mincha since the mitzvah of singing a song while the Tamid was offered is only in the morning. Maharam Alshich² challenges this explanation from the Gemara Rosh Hashanah (30b) which recounts how one time they mistakenly sang the wrong song while the Afternoon Tamid was being offered and as a result enacted that witnesses coming to testify about the new moon had to come in the morning in order for their testimony to be accepted. This Gemara clearly indicates that they would sing a song even in the afternoon. Maharam Alshich answers that although the Afternoon Tamid was accompanied by a song it was not essential to the offering of the korban as it was for the Morning Tamid and thus we do not recite Shir Shel Yom in the afternoon. Magen Avrohom answers that since the libations could be performed at night it is evident that the Afternoon

(Overview...continued from page 1)

the scope of this exposition.

The Gemara challenges the validity of the **כלל ופרט וכלל** that was mentioned.

The Gemara completes its exposition.

This exposition is also challenged. ■

Tamid could be offered without a song. Therefore, we are not particular to recite Shir Shel Yom in the afternoon. In contrast, the libations of the Morning Tamid could not be offered at night, therefore it never happened that it was not accompanied with a song and as a result we recite Shir Shel Yom in the morning.

Chikrei Lev³ questions this explanation of Magen Avrohom. The halacha that allows libations to be offered at night or even the following day applies even to the Morning Tamid the same way it applies to the Afternoon Tamid. Therefore, just as Magen Avrohom reasons that we do not recite Shir Shel Yom at Mincha since the libations of the Afternoon Tamid could be brought at night without a song, so too, we should not have to recite Shir Shel Yom in the morning since the libations of the Morning Tamid could be brought at night without a song. ■

1. מגי"א סי' קל"ב סק"ד.

2. שו"ת מהר"ם אלשיך סי' קל"ח.

3. חקרי לב או"ח סי' נ'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"Woe to the Children"

"וואזאת התורה לעולה ולמנחה..."

Today's daf discusses halachos of korbanos.

Once there were terrible decrees against the klal. When things began getting more and more pressured, an additional decree was passed that made things even harder. The Chasam Sofer, ז"ל, was very upset by this final decree and was heard to say, "I have no choice but to complain on high."

He gathered all the Jews of the city and gave a fiery discourse, "Our sages teach that when the Jewish people enter shul and recite **אמן יהא שמיה רבא מברך**, a heavenly voice emerges and says, 'Fortunate is the King who is praised in His house. What is it to the father whose

children have been exiled? Woe to the children who have been exiled from their Father's table.'¹

"Hashem doesn't need the beis hamikdash or our sacrifices. Does He eat meat? Surely His entire pleasure is that He commanded us and we do what He said to fulfill His will. It follows that when we are in exile and still do Hashem's will, He has the same pleasure from us as He did when the holy temple stood. It is even possible to give Hashem greater pleasure when we do His will despite the hardships of bitter exile. As our sages teach, the Jewish people are likened to a date palm which has only one heart. We too have only one heart for our Father in heaven.

"We see that He loses nothing from our exile. It is we who lose while in exile, since when we offered sacrifices on the altar, Hashem's presence shined on us and we could easily attain ruach hako-

desh. Due to our many sins we were exiled from our land, and we cannot ascend three times a year to fulfill our duty. This is the meaning of the heavenly voice. Hashem says, 'What is it to the father whose children have been exiled? What does He lack when we are in exile? Nothing at all. He still gets at least the same pleasure when we do His will as He did before. But, 'Woe to the children who have been exiled from their Father's table,' completely bereft of all spiritual good..."

Shortly after this the decrees were nullified, but the Chasam Sofer's feet began to hurt him. He attributed it to having resorted to a sharp tone in his plea as we find in the Gemara in Sukkah regarding Levi.² ■

1. ברכות, דף ג ע"א

2. בית סופריהם, תשרי, תשס"ד, ע' 57 ■