

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Applying blood to the wrong location (cont.)

The Gemara concludes an unsuccessful challenge to Shmuel's position that when the blood is applied to the wrong location the owner, nevertheless, receives atonement.

In the course of this discussion Mar Zutra cites the exposition that teaches that only a throwing of the blood that permits the meat for consumption can make a korban piggul.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

Reish Lakish offers an alternative explanation for the Mishnah's statement that blood applied to the wrong place is invalid.

The same questions and answers that were presented against Shmuel are presented against Reish Lakish.

R' Yochanan has a third explanation for the Mishnah's ruling.

A challenge to R' Yochanan's position is presented and left unresolved.

Unsuccessful challenges to Shmuel and R' Yochanan are recorded.

Tangentially the Gemara mentions another explanation of the disagreement between R' Yosi and R' Shimon.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites support for R' Yochanan's position that blood applied to the wrong place is completely invalid.

### 2) Korbanos placed on the Inner Altar

R' Elazar states that korbanos placed on the Inner Altar

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that only a throwing that permits the meat for consumption can become piggul?
2. What is the point of dispute between Shmuel and R' Yochanan?
3. What korbanos do not have to be removed from the altar even though they were placed on the altar improperly
4. What is the difference between incorrect intent for time and incorrect intent regarding place?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Improper intent while slaughtering an offering*

השוחרט את הזבח לזרוק דמו בחוץ

The Mishnah teaches various details of the disqualification of an offering when the one who officiates has in mind that certain essential procedures will be performed beyond the offering's proper place or time.

The first example is that if, at the moment one slaughters an animal as an offering, he has in mind to sprinkle its blood outside of its proper domain. In this case, the offering is invalid.

Sfas Emes analyzes this halacha. Is the plan to sprinkle the blood outside of the courtyard only a problem if the thought is to do so upon the Altar, which, according to this plan, will be displaced? If this is the case, then thinking to pour the blood on the ground would not be a disqualifying thought, as the act of placing the blood anywhere other than on the Altar is not an act of sprinkling. Or, is the improper thought of sprinkling the blood capable of ruining the offering even if the thought is to sprinkle the blood upon some place other than upon the Altar?

There is a disagreement later (108a) among the Tannaim regarding a disqualifying thought to offer an animal as an offering outside the Beis HaMikdash, and whether the plan must be to do so upon an Altar or not, but it is not necessary that the opinions there must maintain their views in regard to sprinkling the blood.

The Mishnah illustrates its halacha using a double expression, where the one officiating had in mind "to sprinkle the blood of the offering outside of its domain, or to sprinkle part of the blood outside its domain." In מרומי שדה, the Netzi"v explains that the kohen is supposed to splash all of the blood against the corner of the Altar, and the spilling of the "remaining blood—שיריים" on the base of the Altar is only necessary if some blood is left in the bowl. The Mishnah illustrates cases where, at the moment of slaughter, the person has in mind to perform the mitzvah properly by splashing all of the blood in the wrong place, and it also illustrates a case where he intends to do the mitzvah in an incomplete manner (בדיעבד), by splashing only some of the blood. This is also the intent of the Mishnah in illustrating these two examples regarding improper thought to sprinkle all or part of the blood at the wrong time, and in reference to offering all or only a portion of the limbs outside the Mikdash.

(Continued on page 2)

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Improper thoughts while davening

השוטט את הזבח לזרוק דמה וכו'

One who slaughters a korban to throw the blood etc.

The Mishnah explains that while slaughtering a korban if one intends to throw the blood outside of the correct time or place, the korban becomes invalidated as *piggul*. Kol Bo<sup>1</sup> notes that according to one opinion in the Gemara tefilla corresponds to the korbanos (See Berachos 26b), therefore, just as an improper thought could invalidate a korban, so too an improper thought could invalidate a prayer. This general concept is codified in Shulchan Aruch<sup>2</sup> when he comments that tefilla stands in place of korbanos, consequently, one must be careful to have correct intent since as we know incorrect intent will invalidate a korban. Machazik Beracha<sup>3</sup> explains that the improper thought about place while davening occurs when a person is in shul davening but his thoughts are outside, meaning on his business or some other activity that takes place outside of shul.

Orach Ne'eman<sup>4</sup> cites Mishnah LaMelech who quotes Ramban that one who has a disqualifying thought while offering a korban is in violation of a Biblical prohibition. The verse says, לא תזבח לה' וגו' כל דבר רע וגו' – Do not sacrifice to Hashem ... Anything that is bad. This is the warning against having *piggul* intent while offering a korban.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Tiferes Yisroel notes that after the Mishnah teaches that improper intent for even a portion of the blood ruins the service the case of improper intent for all the blood would have been obvious. Yet, the Mishnah emphasizes that intent for all the blood to be placed in the wrong place is still not *piggul*, but only disqualified. And the case of a portion of the blood or limbs teaches that thought to do the service at the wrong time is still *piggul*, even though only a portion of the blood or limbs are affected. ■

Consequently, the same principle will apply to davening. One who has an improper thought is in violation of a prohibition. An improper thought while davening will be similar to what Magen Avrohom<sup>5</sup> writes in the name of Zohar that if one does not intend with his prayers to bring blessing to the upper and lower worlds his tefilla is thrown out. Even those who maintain that mitzvos do not require intent would agree that proper intent for tefilla is imperative. The reason is that having an improper thought while davening is akin to having intent that the tefilla should not fulfill his obligation which would also constitute a violation of a prohibition. ■

1. כל בו סי' ס"ה.
2. שו"ע או"ח סי' צ"ח סעי' ד'.
3. מחזיק ברכה שם סק"ג.
4. אורח נאמן שם ס"ק ט"ז.
5. מג"א שם בתחילת הסימן. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### A Clue for the Kohen

"השוטט את הזבח לזרוק דמו בחוץ..."

On the surface the discussion of the halachos of *piggul* seem somewhat drawn out. How often would a kohen actually ruin a korban by intending to sprinkle the blood outside the prescribed place or violate the terms of its offering in some other way?

The Yismach Moshe, zt"l, provides a penetrating answer. "As is well known, one of the main purposes of bringing sacrifices is that the sinner should contemplate his misdeeds. He must understand that if the animal is suffering due to his sin despite its having done no

wrong, he will certainly suffer if he fails to repent. He must remember that Hashem created him and owes him nothing at all. Once he internalizes this he will certainly return from his sin.

"His atonement was completed by the kohanim eating from the sacrifice. It follows that if the owner failed to do teshuvah, the kohanim were not allowed to eat the korban, since the integral point is missing. But how could they know if the owner had truly repented or not? This is the meaning behind the halachos of *piggul*. If the owner of the sacrifice did not repent, Hashem would send the kohen a thought of eating the korban on the third day or the like so as to invalidate the sacrifice.

"In this way, the kohen and the owner of the sacrifice would both know that

the teshuvah of the owner was not complete and that he was required to bring a new sacrifice after purifying his heart."

1. ישמח משה עה"ת, ויקרא, ז: י"ח ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

become sanctified so that they need not be removed.

The novelty of this statement is explained.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah categorizes which incorrect intents disqualify a korban but do not carry the punishment of *kareis* and which incorrect intents also carry the punishment of *kareis*. ■