

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Combining various intents

The Gemara presents a disagreement between Rava and R' Hamnuna in the following case. Someone had in mind to consume half an olive's volume of a korban outside of the proper time, then intended to consume half an olive's volume outside of the proper place and then decided to eat another half an olive's volume outside of the proper time. According to Rava the korban is now piggul whereas according to R' Hamnuna it is not.

Rava cites a source that supports his position and R' Hamnuna explains why he rejects this proof.

R' Hamnuna cites a source to support his position but this proof is also rejected.

R' Dimi, Ravin and R' Ashi discuss variations of this case.

### 2) Intent for dogs to eat the korban outside of the proper time

R' Yannai teaches that intent that a korban will be consumed by a dog outside of the proper time renders the korban piggul.

R' Ami unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

### 3) Combining various intents (cont.)

R' Ashi inquires whether someone who has in mind that two people will eat a korban outside of the proper time renders the korban piggul.

Abaye resolves this inquiry.

Rava asks whether intent to consume the korban in more than the time required to eat a pras renders the korban piggul.

Abaye attempts to resolve this inquiry but his resolution is rejected.

### 4) Combining consumptions

A contradiction is noted between two inferences from the Mishnah regarding intent to eat a part of the korban that is inedible.

R' Yirmiyah asserts that the Mishnah follows R' Eliezer's position.

Abaye suggests that the Mishnah could even follow Rabanan. This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

הדרן עלך כל הזבחים

**5) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins by teaching about who is fit to slaughter a korban and whether their intent will invalidate the korban. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Intentions of piggul that the offering will be eaten by a dog*

אמר רבי ינאי חישב שיאכלוהו כלבים למחר פיגול

In its discussion regarding the thoughts of piggul, the Gemara notes that if the intent was that the offering would be eaten on the following day, which was at the wrong time, but that it would be eaten by dogs, this is nonetheless a disqualifying intent. The reason is that a verse teaches us that, by definition, a dog's eating is legally considered to be "eating."

Tosafos (ד"ה חישב) notes what seems to be an inconsistency from the Gemara later (36b) where we find that if the improper intent of the kohen is that the offering be eaten by people who are tamei'im at the wrong time, this is not a disqualifying thought. If a tamei person eats from an offering, this eating is not valid. Why, then, should the eating by a dog be more significant than that of a human being who is tamei? Both these acts seem to be improper, and both should have no significance in the realm of piggul.

Several approaches are suggested to deal with this question. Tosafos (36b) and Shitta Mikubetzes point out that intending that impure people will eat from an offering is not piggul because the meat of the offering will necessarily become impure and disqualified before it is eaten. Technically, the moment the offering is eaten it will be unfit, and the eating is not piggul. However, when a dog eats from the meat of the offering, the meat does not become impure and unfit until it is actually consumed. Although it is possible for an impure person to eat without having touched the meat, for example if someone else handles the meat and sticks it into his mouth, Shitta Mikubetzes notes that this is not a normal manner of eating, and the intention of the one officiating is

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Rava and R' Hamnuna?
2. What is the source that the intent to feed a korban to a dog outside of the proper time renders the korban piggul?
3. Does intent to eat an inedible part of a korban outside of the proper time or place render a korban piggul?
4. Who is allowed to slaughter a korban?

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Women slaughtering and studying Torah

שהשחיטה כשרה בזרים ובנשים וכו'

*For the slaughter of a korban is valid if performed by non-kohanim, women etc.*

The Mishnah teaches that even those who are unfit to perform the service of offering a korban may slaughter a korban. Included in that list is women and Tosafos<sup>1</sup> writes that it is evident from the Gemara that women are allowed to slaughter a korban even in the first place. Although the word ששחטו implies only בדיעבד, that language was chosen because of the category of those who are tmei'im. The rest of the categories enumerated in the Mishnah are allowed to slaughter a korban even in the first place. This is a response, Tosafos writes, to Hilchos Eretz Yisroel who writes that women should not slaughter a korban in the first place. Teshuvos Shoel U'meishiv<sup>2</sup> explains the position of Hilchos Eretz Yisroel based on Beis Yosef's comment in the name of R' Amram Gaon<sup>3</sup>. R' Amram Gaon holds that a slaughterer who does not know sefarim and numerous perakim of Shas may not slaughter. Accordingly, women who may not study the Oral Law cannot meet the prerequisite of knowing numerous perakim in Shas. In the time of the Beis HaMikdash, however, women were obligated to offer korbanos the same as men and as such were permitted to study the laws related to offering korbanos which include the laws of slaughtering the korban. Since woman would study these laws they were qualified to slaughter korbanos as well.

The assumption that women are permitted to study Torah that relates to them is found in Beis Yosef<sup>3</sup> in the name of Teshuvos Maharil. Maharil offers a number of explanations why women recite Birchos HaTorah even though they are not

(Insight...continued from page 1)

that the meat be eaten in a typical situation, not one which is abnormal. Therefore, the intent of the meat's being eaten by impure people is interpreted to be one which will not be piggul, as opposed to where it is intended to be eaten by a dog, where the disqualification is done at the moment the meat is consumed.

R"iva explains that when the one officiating intends that the meat be eaten by impure people, this thought is not significant, because the kohen cannot control whether the meat will actually be eaten by these people. He is dependent upon others for this plan to be carried out, so that the very declaration that it will be eaten improperly is meaningless, and no piggul is created. However, it is within the ability of the kohen to feed the meat to a dog, so the plan to feed it to dogs on the next day is credible at the moment the announcement is made that a dog will eat from this meat, and it is piggul.

Keren Orah points out that impure people are themselves prohibited to eat this meat. Their sinful eating is not legally referred to as eating, so it is not piggul. A dog has no such prohibition. A dog's eating is officially called "eating," so it is piggul. ■

commanded to study Torah. One of his explanations is that women recite Birchos HaTorah because they read the sections of davening that deal with the offering of korbanos. This explanation is one of the explanations recorded in Beir Hachach<sup>5</sup> to explain Shulchan Aruch's ruling that women recite Birchos HaTorah. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה כל.
2. שו"ת שואל ומשיב רביעאה ח"ג סי' מ"א.
3. בית יוסף יו"ד סי' א' ד"ה ומיהו לכתחילה.
4. בית יוסף או"ח סי' מ"ז ד"ה וכתב עוד האגור.
5. ביאור הלכה סי' מ"ז סעי' י"ד ד"ה נשים וכו'.

## STORIES Off the Daf

### The Offerings of the Stranger and the Kohen

"שהשחיטה כשרה בזרים..."

The Noam Elimelech, zt"l, taught a very powerful lesson from a statement on today's daf. "In the mishnah on Zevachim 31 we find that שחיטה כשרה בזרים. Although this literally means that even a non-kohen is kosher to slaughter a sacrifice, the word כשרה can also be understood to mean that it is fitting or

proper. In this context, the Gemara is alluding to prayer which is compared to a sacrifice, and a zar is someone who is still somewhat estranged from Hashem since he has not yet rectified the sins of his youth.

"Our sages teach that davening is compared to bringing a sacrifice. When such a person begins to pray, his sins cause him to feel confusion and they fill him with illicit thoughts. In order to daven with focus, these obstacles which have been erected due to his many sins must be overcome through self-sacrifice. This person must overcome such challenges,

thereby slaughtering his evil inclination and davening with kavanah.

"Yet there is a higher level, that of the kohein. The Gemara there explains that קבלה, receiving the blood, is only kosher if a kohein does it. This too can be understood allegorically to refer to a righteous person, since kohanim represent kindness—only they can draw down Hashem's blessing by reciting birkas kohanim. It is only a truly righteous person who can do קבלה, who can truly receive. Only a true tzaddik is worthy to draw down and receive chessed from on high."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. נועם אלימלך, נשא