



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Intent from one service to another (cont.)

The Gemara shows how the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish relates to another dispute of theirs.

The necessity for the dispute to be presented in two contexts is explained.

R' Dimi presents R' Yirmiyah's support for R' Yochanan.

The logic behind the support is challenged and therefore revised.

R' Ila's support for Reish Lakish is presented.

This proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

The reason they reject one another's proofs is explained.

The Gemara relates that this same issue was debated by Rabbah and R' Nachman but Rabbah gave up his position and agreed with R' Nachman that intent from one service to another disqualifies a korban.

2) Asham

A Baraisa presents the debate between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua whether an Asham becomes invalidated when slaughtered not for its own sake.

A detail about one of R' Yehoshua's responses is clarified.

The reasons why a number of possible responses of R' Yehoshua were not presented are explained.

The Gemara searches for the reason R' Eliezer did not respond to R' Yehoshua that an Asham's blood is applied above the middle line of the altar.

3) Blood brought in the Heichal

A Mishnah presents a discussion about which bloods become disqualified because they were brought into the Heichal. In that Mishnah R' Eliezer states that an Asham is similar to a Chatas in that it becomes disqualified.

The Gemara begins to explain the rationale behind Chachamim's opinion that the disqualification of bringing the blood in the Heichal is limited to a Chatas. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is פגול?
2. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua?
3. What is the common denominator between Chatas and Pesach?
4. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva, Chachamim and R' Eliezer?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Improper intentions during one service about a different service

ומה במקום שאם אמר הריני שוחט לשם פלוני שהוא כשר, לזרוק דמו לשם פלוני פסול

If an offering is slaughtered, or if any of the four critical services are done, while intending that the blood of the animal be sprinkled on the altar at a time which is beyond the proper deadline for that offering, this renders the offering as פגול. The offering is disqualified, and one who eats from it is liable for kareis. The Gemara cites a disagreement regarding the case where the animal was slaughtered properly, but the one doing שחיטה had in mind that the sprinkling of the blood would be for a person other than the owner of the offering. R' Yochanan rules that the improper intention at the moment of the slaughter regarding the later sprinkling of the blood causes the offering to be invalid, while Reish Lakish says that the offering is still valid. R' Yochanan refers to the law of פגול, and he notes that improper intentions at one point of the service affects the validity of the offering even though the thoughts are in reference to a different part of the service. Reish Lakish says that thoughts during the slaughter regarding the sprinkling of the blood cannot ruin the service.

Rav Ashi presents a קל וחומר in support of R' Yochanan. Intentions of the wrong owner of an offering are only problematic if they are expressed in regard to the moment of the sprinkling of the blood. If the slaughter of the animal is done having in mind a different owner, the offering is still valid. The offering becomes invalid, though, if while slaughtering he intends that the later sprinkling be for the wrong owner. This shows us that an improper thought regarding the sprinkling during the slaughtering is more significant than an improper thought regarding the slaughtering itself. This leads us to conclusions regarding intentions for the wrong offering. If, while slaughtering the animal, having intention to slaughter it for the wrong offering results in the offering's being disqualified, then having intention while slaughtering that the sprinkling will be for the wrong offering will definitely ruin the validity of the offering. This proves R' Yochanan's contention that improper intentions while performing one service can have an effect "from one service to another."

HALACHAH Highlight

Does one become a *mumar* after a single violation?

השוחט את הבהמה על מנת לזרוק דמה לע"ז וכ"ו

Someone who slaughters an animal with the intent to throw the blood for the sake of idolatry etc.

The Gemara presents a disagreement about the status of a korban that was slaughtered with the intent to throw the blood for the sake of idolatry or to burn the fats for the sake of idolatry. R' Yochanan maintains that the korban is invalid whereas Reish Lakish maintains that it is acceptable. The essence of the debate revolves around the question of whether intent to offer the korban for an idol or outside of the Beis Hamikdash automatically disqualifies the korban. Shitah Mekubetzes¹ asks why the korban is not disqualified according to all opinions since the one who is slaughtering the korban for the sake of idolatry is a *mumar* and a korban slaughtered by a *mumar* is automatically disqualified. From this he proves that one does not become a *mumar* until he becomes habituated in that behavior and a one-time violation does not qualify one as a *mumar*.

The issue of whether one becomes a *mumar* after a one-time violation is subject to debate between the Poskim. Shach² presents the debate amongst Rishonim about the matter and comes to the following conclusion. If a person violates the prohibition against idolatry, even once, and even if it was done in private, he is a *mumar* and is treated as a gentile for halachic matters. However, when he first slaughters the animal for idolatry (which results in his being categorized as a

(Insight...continued from page 1)

It is evident from our Gemara that a change regarding the owner of the offering only has an effect if it involves the sprinkling of the blood. Rambam (Hil. P'sulei HaMukdashim 15:1), however, explains that "change of owner" intent has an effect even if it is done during the slaughter alone. Some (Keren Orah) say that Rambam relies on the Yerushalmi (Pesachim 5:2) which does not use the kal v'chomer of our Gemara. Others (Sfas Emes) explain that Rambam learns that Rabba and R' Chisda disagree (7a), and that the halacha is according to R' Chisda that improper intent regarding the owner disqualifies if it is done at any of the services, not just sprinkling. ■

mumar) the animal is not automatically disqualified as an animal slaughtered by a *mumar*, since when he first approached the animal to slaughter it he had not yet established himself as a *mumar*.

Mishnah Berurah³ also writes in the name of Pri Megadim a qualification to a related ruling of Shulchan Aruch. Shulchan Aruch⁴ rules that someone who violates a decree of the community or commits a transgression and was not formally banned is still counted in a minyan. This ruling, however, is limited to someone who sinned out of temptation but one who sinned to anger Hashem, even in one area, or one who is a *mumar* for idolatry is treated as a gentile and is not included in the minyan. ■

1. שיטה מקובצת לסוגיין.

2. שי"ך יו"ד סי' ב' ס"יק י"ז.

3. מ"ב סי' נ"ה ס"יק מ"ו.

4. שו"ע אור"ח סי' נ"ה סעי' י"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Birthday Resolution

"השוחט את הבהמה על מנת..."

Today's daf continues to discuss hilchos kodoshim.

Many shy away from learning kodoshim since it is a very difficult area of study. Some feel that the exertion it requires is beyond them, while others may not be able to devote the time that is needed to gain more than a perfunctory familiarity with the subject. Even those who learn daf yomi can fall into the habit of learning through the material quickly and superficially. The following

story highlights that this is a serious mistake.

When Rav Isser Zalman Meltzer, zt"l, left Eretz Yisrael to visit Poland, he made it his business to make a special stop to visit the Chofetz Chaim, zt"l. He considered this only right since he had been close to the Chofetz Chaim for many years before his arrival. During their conversation, the Chofetz Chaim asked Rav Isser Zalman if he gave a shiur in seder kodoshim.

Rav Isser Zalman Meltzer answered, "I don't give such a shiur since I do not feel that I have learned this seder sufficiently to responsibly offer insight into the subject."

The Chofetz Chaim looked at him

in a marked manner and said, "A Jew who has reached sixty years of age must make time to learn kodoshim!"

Rav Isser Zalman looked astounded and blurted out, "Rebbe, today is my sixtieth birthday!"

The Chofetz Chaim did not allow this to distract him for a moment. "Nu, so take this upon yourself."

Rav Isser Zalman agreed to begin learning kodoshim regularly.

When he returned to Eretz Yisrael he began giving a regular shiur in kodoshim, eventually recording his chidushim on the subject in parts five and six of Even Ha'ezel.¹ ■

1. עץ חיים, ח"ב, ע' 468. ■