

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Piggul of an Inner-Chattas (cont.)

The Gemara accepts the rejection of the proposed resolution between the two Beraisos regarding the question of whether incorrect intent while dipping one's finger into the blood of an inner-chattas renders a korban piggul.

An alternative resolution to the contradiction is presented.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Clarifying R' Shimon's position

Reish Lakish asserts that R' Shimon in the Mishnah would agree that incorrect intent while transporting the blood of an inner-chattas could invalidate the korban.

This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged.

It is noted that all that was proven is that intent for beyond its time will disqualify so the Gemara asks for the source that intent for outside of the correct place will disqualify an inner-chattas as well.

Two possible sources for this halacha are presented.

Rava discusses different applications of R' Shimon's position.

3) Transporting the blood of a korban

Abaye asked about the halacha where a non-kohen transported the blood of a korban.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does R" Shimon agree that one could invalidate an inner-chattas with incorrect intent while transporting the blood?
2. What is R' Yehudah's opinion about the floor of the Azarah?
3. Is slaughtering an avodah of offering considered a korban?
4. Explain הולכה שלא ברגל.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In memory of
 Rabbi Sholom Sklar ז"ל
 A founding member of our
 Beis Medrash on the west side

Distinctive INSIGHT

Transporting the blood, but not by walking it by foot

הולכה שלא ברגל שמה הולכה או לא שמה הולכה

The daf discusses various aspects of the service of carrying the blood from where the animal was slaughtered to the altar (הולכה). One issue which the Gemara deals with is whether carrying the blood of the animal across the courtyard from where the animal was slaughtered to the altar must be done by foot.

Zevach Todah explains that the question of the Gemara is where the kohen who collected the blood took the bowl of blood and handed it to his fellow kohen. This pattern of handing the bowl continued until the bowl arrived at the altar, without any of the kohanim actually taking even one step. Sfas Emes asks why the Gemara entertains the possibility that transporting the blood in this way should not be valid. The Torah only tells us that the blood must be brought close (והקריבו) to the altar. Where is there an indication that this must be done by walking it to the altar and not handed over from one kohen to the next?

Sefer Taharas HaKodesh explains that our Sages understood that a proper manner of service is where a person takes an item and carries it himself to where it must go. It is not reasonable for a person who has the opportunity to take the blood to simply hand it over to someone else to complete the task, especially where each kohen takes the bowl and reaches over and passes it to the next person. The Gemara expresses this in terms of whether this is a proper fulfillment of the service of הולכה or not.

Or HaChama notes that the question of the Gemara does not seem to support this explanation, because the question should have been "Is carrying from hand to hand acceptable?" The wording of the question we have is "Is carrying the blood without its being done by foot acceptable?" This suggests that the problem is that it is not being done by foot at all, because the Gemara feels that walking the blood over to the altar by foot might be essential.

The next question we must ask is that if transporting the blood must be done by foot, is the movement of the blood only invalid if the entire trip was done without its being walked over, or can the kohen move it along part of the way by reaching as long as part of the distance is done by foot? There is an indication that moving by foot can be done for part of the distance from the next Gemara which tries to settle this inquiry with a Baraisa. We learn that transporting the blood while sitting is unacceptable. This suggests that standing without moving is acceptable. The Gemara rejects this proof, though, by saying that the case of sitting may be where the kohen moved a little bit, which is still invalid, while standing and moving at least a short distance is acceptable. According to this response, we see that walking a bit and then handing the blood from one kohen to another is allowed. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Taking a lulav and esrog before fulfilling the mitzvah

ואי אתי קוף רמי ליה אידיה בעי למישקל זימנא אחריתי

And if a monkey came and put [the Chatas blood] on his finger he should have to take the blood a second time

The Gemara derives from the wording of the pasuk ולקח הכהן מדם החטאת באצבעו – And the Kohen will take the blood of the Chatas with his finger, that the kohen must take the blood with his finger. If, for example, a monkey put the blood on the kohen's finger the blood could not be used for throwing on the altar. Poskim discuss the application of this to other halachos that require "taking." Is it necessary for one to take the item himself or is it equally acceptable if it was put into his hand by a monkey or came into his possession by some other means? Sdei Chemed¹ discusses the case of a person who took a lulav and esrog in his hand before *alos hashachar* and while still in his hands the sun rises. Does he fulfill the mitzvah with the items that are already in his hands or is he required to pick up the lulav and esrog during the time that the mitzvah could be fulfilled?

Chazon Ish² wrote that one who took his lulav and esrog before *alos hashachar* is not required to put them down and take them a second time after the time to fulfill the mitzvah arrives. Even though regarding lulav and esrog the Torah uses the term ולקחתם – and you should take, similar to the wording regarding the kohen dipping his finger in the blood of the Chatas, nevertheless, the true meaning of the word ולקח –lit. to take, is that it should be in one's hands (אחיזה).

(Overview...continued from page 1)

R' Chisda answered that the korban is valid.

R' Sheishes successfully challenges this ruling and the Gemara explains the verse cited by R' Chisda in an alternative manner.

Rabbah and R' Yosef assert that whether a non-kohen invalidates a korban by transporting the blood is subject to a dispute amongst Tannaim.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this assertion.

Another unsuccessful challenge to Rabbah and R' Yosef's assertion is recorded.

The Gemara inquires whether transporting the blood but not by foot fulfills the requirement to transport the blood of a korban.

Three unsuccessful attempts are made to resolve this inquiry.

Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan rules that transporting blood but not by foot does not fulfill the obligation. ■

Therefore, as long as someone has a lulav and esrog in his possession during the time the mitzvah could be fulfilled he has satisfied the prerequisite to take the lulav and esrog. The reason the kohen may not use the blood of the Chatas put on his finger by a monkey is that the Torah wants the blood to be "taken" by the kohen from a ministering utensil. When a monkey puts the blood on the kohen's finger it is lacking the prerequisite of its being taken by the kohen from the ministering utensil and that is why the blood may not be applied to the altar. ■

1. שדי חמד אסיפת דינים מערכת ד' מינים סי' ג'.

2. חזו"א אר"ח סי' קמ"ט סק"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Glory of the King

"ברוב עם הדרת מלך..."

In many locales, the custom is not to make a bris milah first thing in the morning. They reason that when it is difficult for invitees to arrive early, it must be acceptable to make the bris late. But when the S'dei Chemed, ז"ל, heard about this he was very upset.

"I am pained by the custom of certain people who make brisim late. They often wait until shortly before midday, sometimes even having the gall to delay proceedings even after that if the guests

are slow to arrive. These people do not have any halachic basis on which to rely. Although our sages teach us that ברוב עם הדרת מלך —the glory of the King is maximized when more people are there to extol Him—this does not overrule the dictum of זריזים מקדימים למצות —the zealous rush to do mitzvos right away. And the latter was also taught specifically regarding bris milah. It is better to make a bris as early as possible even with far fewer people present."¹

But the Mekor Chaim brings a limud zechus for this custom. "It is already thirty years since I heard a strong limud zechus for those who delay the bris until after chatzos hayyom when many of the guests cannot come before then.

"Although the obvious problem is that this contradicts the dictum זריזין מקדימין למצות, they do this to fulfill the general teaching that ברוב עם הדרת מלך, since it is plausible that both principles are equally important. The teaching זריזין מקדימין is clearly rabbinic even regarding milah, and the verse regarding Avraham must be an asmachta. Anyone who denies this must explain why we are not obligated to wake at daybreak and do all brisim at sunrise as Avraham undoubtedly did. Since both are rabbinic and presumably equal, we need not instruct those who wait to make the bris for רוב עם to change their custom."² ■

1. שדי חמד, מע' ו', כלל ג'

2. שו"ת מקור חיים, סי' ג' ■