

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah summarizes the laws of invalidating thoughts and then elaborates on the condition that the permitter was offered as required. A case in which piggul does not take effect is presented. The Mishnah concludes with a disagreement concerning a kohen who had two invalidating intents.

2) Leftovers that become deficient

The Gemara inquires about leftovers that become deficient before the burning of the kometz according to the opinion that the kometz may be burned but the leftovers may not be consumed. Does burning the kometz establish the leftovers as piggul and remove the me'ilah prohibition?

R' Huna answers that burning the kometz in this circumstance does not remove the me'ilah prohibition nor establish it as piggul.

Rava disagrees with this conclusion and cites a Baraisa to support his position by citing and explaining a Mishnah.

Abaye rejects this interpretation of the Mishnah and offers an alternative explanation.

Abaye's alternative explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava retracts his original ruling due to his interpretation of a Baraisa.

Abaye rejects the assumption that the Baraisa reflects R' Akiva's position.

3) **MISHNAH:** A case where improper intent does not invalidate is presented.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. When is the permitter considered to have been offered as required?
.....
2. If the leftovers become deficient before burning the kometz, may the remaining leftovers be consumed?
.....
3. What happens if one of the loaves of the lechem hapanim breaks?
.....
4. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

At what point does the halacha of piggul apply to a minchah?
זה הכלל כל הקומץ או נותן בכלי המוליד המקטיר לאכול דבר שדרכו לאכול ולהקטיר דבר שדרכו להקטיר...ובלבד שיקריב המתיר כמצותו

The Gemara in Zevachim (42b) establishes the rule that the law of piggul does not apply to a procedure that does not have a permitter. For example, the minchah of a kohen and the minchah of the olah and shelamim offerings (מנחת נסכים) are completely burned on the Altar. These do not have a kemitzah removed from them which is what functions to permit the remaining flour of a minchah of a commoner. These minchah offerings do not become permitted, so the law of piggul does not apply to their procedures.

Keren Orah analyzes the minchah of a kohen and the minchas nesachim to determine where the piggul would have taken place, and why we even need to say that we do not apply piggul. There is no procedure of kemitzah at all, as the minchah is placed on the Altar in its entirety, and not just a representative handful of flour. For this same reason, there is no placement of a kemitzah of these menachos into a service utensil. Furthermore, there is an opinion (17a) which holds that piggul does not apply at the time of burning, so a declaration to burn part of the minchah at the wrong time while burning part of the minchah would not be valid. He concludes that possibly piggul would only apply during the transfer of the minchah from where it was placed in the original utensil until it is brought to the Altar (הולכה). Tosafos (Yoma 48a) concurs with this view. Nevertheless, there is no piggul here, because these menachos have no permitter.

Accordingly, R' Shimon holds that no piggul can occur during the transfer to the Altar, because he notes that this procedure can be dispensed with.

Mikdash David asks when the service of transferring begins for these menachos. For a regular minchah, it is after the kemitzah is placed into its service vessel. These menachos do not have a kemitzah taken from them. He explains that the time of transferring begins from the moment a minchah is ready to be placed on the Altar. For a baked minchah, it is after it is baked. For the minchah of the kohen it is when the oil and levonah are placed upon them, and for a sinner's minchah, it is from when the flour is placed in the utensil.

Tiferes Yisroel (to Mishnah Zevachim 4:3) writes that the piggul in these cases might have been when the flour is placed into the original utensil. Although normally it is only after the removal of the kemitzah and its placement into the service vessel (כלי שרת) where piggul can occur, these menachos are different, because they are designated to be burned in their entirety upon the Altar. Therefore, when the minchah itself is put into a utensil, this parallels the placement of the kemitzah into its service vessel. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

May one use a broken loaf for lechem mishnah?

שאם נפרסה אחת מהן חלותיה כולן פסולות

If one of its loaves became broken they are all invalid.

Teshuvus Meishiv Davar¹ suggests that even a part of a loaf of bread is considered לחם. Proof to this is the pasuk (Bamidbar 15:19) that obligates one to take חלה from לחם הארץ – bread of the land – and one must take חלה even from a part of a loaf. Consequently, on Shabbos when there is an obligation to recite לחם משנה on המוציא – two loaves of bread – one could take even two partial loaves and fulfill his obligation. He then raises a difficulty with this approach from our Gemara. The Gemara teaches that if one of the loaves of the לחם הפנים became broken all of the loaves become invalid. Why should the Baraisa rule that the loaves become invalid if even the broken loaf should be considered a loaf and thus usable for the mitzvah?

He answers that the status of a broken loaf will depend upon how it was originally presented. If one began with a whole loaf or even a broken loaf that became further deficient it is invalid since it lost some of the volume it had when it was first presented. However, if one was presented with a broken loaf but it remained as is, it may be considered לחם since as far as our perspective is concerned it is still intact. For this reason if one of the loaves of the לחם

4) Intent to eat the kometz

The Gemara infers from the Mishnah that if one had intent to eat the kometz, which is inedible, outside of the proper time, the korban would be invalid. The Gemara inquires about who would be the author of this position.

R' Yirmiyah asserts that it is R' Eliezer.

Abaye explains how the Mishnah could even fit with Rabanan.

Abaye's interpretation is challenged. ■

הפנים became broken they are invalid since it became deficient from what it was when it first presented itself. On the other hand, if one begins with two broken loaves they may be used for לחם משנה.

Teshuvus L'horos Nosson² suggests that when the Torah specifies a certain number of loaves the intent is that each of those loaves must be whole and complete. On the other hand if the Torah merely makes reference to לחם the intent includes even a broken loaf. Therefore, since the Torah specifies that the לחם הפנים must be twelve loaves the intent is that they should be whole and if one became broken they are invalid. On the other hand, the term לחם includes even a broken loaf and for that reason the beracha of המוציא לחם מן הארץ is recited even on a broken loaf. ■

1. שו"ת משיב דבר סי' כ"א.

2. שו"ת להורות נתן ח"א סי' י"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Thoughts of Space and Time

כל שמחשבת הזמן קדמה למחשבת המקום פגול

The Aryeh Sha'ag brings a very important lesson based on a statement on today's daf. "In Menachos 12 Rav Yehudah gives a general rule regarding korbanos. Wherever one had the intent of chutz lizmano before chutz limkomo it is piggul and he is liable for kareis. But if he had the thought of chutz l'mikomo before chutz lizmano, it is not piggul and he is not liable for kareis.

"This statement can be read a bit

differently to teach the proper attitude towards avodas Hashem. We must always focus on Hashem, known as Makom because He contains all places and therefore transcends all place. We must all focus on what the Makom, Hashem, wants, and never on the demands of zeman, the new styles and attitudes of the generation.

"If one places the demands of the zeman first, if he gives such transitory considerations precedence, this thought is piggul and brings one to kareis—he has removed himself from the kelal. Due his poisonous attitude, his connection to the next world will be uprooted.

"If at the very least one ascribes more importance to the Makom than

the foolish styles of the times, he will not be uprooted. But this attitude is still pasul, defiled. Nevertheless, since his entire purpose is to serve Hashem, and this worldly matters are a mere necessity, this does not uproot him from the next world. Although this attitude defiles him since he needs to have his entire thoughts on coming close to Hashem and give no regard to the foolish attitudes of the times, it is still possible for him to improve and elevate his avodah. Someone in this state can still fulfill the verse, ואהבת את ה' אלקך... and serve Him with every iota of his body and soul."¹ ■

1. אריה שאג, מבוא האהבה, אות תתתמ"ז