



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Intent to eat the kometz (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its unsuccessful challenge to Abaye's assertion that our Mishnah could reflect Rabanan's position.

הדרן עלך כל המנחות

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that although R' Yosi agrees that intent to eat the leftovers or burn the kometz the next day renders the Mincha piggul, there is a disagreement whether intent to burn the frankincense the next day renders the Mincha piggul. An exchange between R' Yosi and Chachamim about this is recorded.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason the Mishnah began with the case in which R' Yosi agrees is explained.

4) Clarifying R' Yosi's position

Reish Lakish explains that R' Yosi's rationale is that one permitter cannot effect piggul in another permitter.

Part of Reish Lakish's statement is clarified.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The rationale of Rabanan who disagree with R' Yosi is explained.

5) Gathering frankincense by a non-kohen

R' Yannai rules that if a non-kohen gathers the frankincense it is invalid.

R' Yirmiyah offers a rationale for this ruling.

R' Mari suggests support for this ruling from a Mishnah.

This proof is rejected.

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a dispute when one has
(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yosi and Chachamim?
2. Why does the Mishnah begin with the case to which R' Yosi agrees?
3. How does Reish Lakish explain R' Yosi's position?
4. Does piggul intent regarding a single limb render the entire animal piggul?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Burning the kometz and levonah separately or together

אי בעי האי מקטיר ברישא ואי בעי האי מקטיר ברישא

The Gemara seems to say that either the kometz or the levonah may be burned first, which indicates that they may be burned separately. This is also clear from Rashi (ד"ה ליקוט), who says that the kometz was burned first, and only then was the levonah burned.

Sefer Chok Nossan notes that this description of the levonah and kometz being burned separately seems inconsistent with the Gemara in Sotah (14b) where a Baraisa states that when the minchah portions were placed on the Altar, the levonah was placed on top of the kometz and they were both burned together. This procedural difference is also noted by Mishne l'Melech (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 13:12), and Rashash (to Rashi) here. Several approaches are suggested to resolve this issue.

Chok Nossan writes that the Baraisa in Sotah describes the manner in which the minchah should best be done, burning the levonah and kometz together. Our Gemara, however, notes that if they were burned separately, the mitzvah is fulfilled.

Alternatively, Chok Nossan explains that this may be a dispute between the two Gemaras. It does seem that our Gemara allows the levonah and kometz to be burned separately even as a first resort, while the Gemara in Sotah is of the opinion that they must be burned together. Perhaps the issue upon which this disagreement hinges is whether the levonah is sanctified in a service utensil. The Baraisa in Sotah holds that the levonah is sanctified in a utensil, and it has its own series of four procedures, culminating in its being placed upon the Altar and being burned in its own right. The Gemara in Menachos holds that it is possible for piggul thoughts to be in effect when handling the kometz, and this is not considered to be a "half permitter". The levonah seems to be ancillary, yet essential, to the minchah procedure. It does not need four services, and it does not need to be placed into a utensil to be sanctified. It can be placed on the Altar and burned on its own.

R' Chaim HaLevi (to Rambam, Hilchos P'sulei HaMukdashim 18:12) explains that the Baraisa in Sotah that says that the levonah is placed on top of the kometz does not mean to say that these items need to be burned together. Rather, the point is that the levonah is to be placed in the service utensil with the kometz, as is indicated in the verse (Vayikra 6:8), "and the levonah which is on the minchah." The burning of these substances, however, may be done separately, as we find in our Gemara.

Chazon Ish writes that placing the levonah on the kometz of the minchah in the same utensil is in order to burn them together. This is a convenient way of burning them. They may, however, be placed in separate vessels and burned separately. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 The family of
 מרת חנה בת ר' דוד, ע"ה רובין
 Mrs. Ann Ruben o.b.m.

HALACHAH Highlight

The timeframe in which to eat the lechem hapanim

To eat one of the columns the next day

The Mishnah teaches that it was possible to render the lechem hapanim piggul if while burning the frankincense one intends to eat the loaves “למחר -the next day.” Commentators disagree about the meaning of the word למחר and its implication as far as the timeframe in which one is obligated to eat the loaves. Rambam¹ writes that the loaves may only be eaten on Shabbos itself. As such, when the Mishnah discusses the intent to eat the loaves למחר it does not only refer to the intent to eat the loaves on Sunday but even if one intends to eat the loaves on Motzai Shabbos they would be rendered piggul. Accordingly, the term מחר is not literal but it means after its permitted time for consumption. Tosafos Yom Tov² contends that the term מחר should be understood literally that the intent was to eat the loaves on Sunday because he maintains that the loaves may be eaten the day of Shabbos as well as Motzai Shabbos. He equates the loaves with other kodshei kodoshim korbanos that are eaten for a day and a night.

Rabbeinu Yonah³ elaborates on the miracles of the Beis HaMikdash, one of which was that the lechem hapanim did not become disqualified. Rabbeinu Yonah explains that the loaves could be eaten for the week that followed their removal from the Shulchan and it never happened that some of the loaves remained beyond that time which would render them disqualified.

(Overview...continued from page 1)

piggul intent for one of the two loaves brought on Shavuos or one of the two columns of lechem hapanim.

7) Clarifying R' Yosi's position

R' Huna states that according to R' Yosi if one has piggul intent for the right leg the left leg is also piggul and he explains this with a verse as well as a logical explanation for this ruling. R' Nachman challenges this understanding of R' Yosi's position. ■

This disagreement regarding the time in which the lechem hapanim may be consumed also leads to different interpretations of the song *לכי אשמרה שבת*.⁴ In one of the stanzas we read that due to the arranging of the lechem hapanim it is Rabbinically prohibited for one to fast. According to Rambam the meaning is simple. Since the lechem hapanim may only be eaten on Shabbos fasting would preclude the possibility of eating them, thus there is an enactment against fasting. According to Tosafos Yom Tov although the loaves may be eaten at night the primary time for their consumption is during the day and Chazal did not want kohanim to fast during the primary time in which the loaves are to be consumed. Even according to Rabbeinu Yonah we could explain that although the loaves may be eaten for the entire week Chazal did not want kohanim to fast since it is preferable for the loaves to be consumed upon being removed from the Shulchan. ■

1. פירוש למשניות.
2. תי"ט שם.
3. פירושו לפרקי אבות ה:ה.
4. ע' פניני הלכה במהד' מתיבתא אריכות דברים ע"ז. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Man's House is His Castle

”שהוא פיגול...”

Today's daf discusses the prohibition of piggul, a product of inappropriate thoughts. It is no surprise that the Alter of Kelm, zt”l, calls illicit thoughts piggul. But many who are assailed by negative thoughts wonder what they can do to rectify the situation.

A certain ba'al habayis went to the Maggid of Mezeritch, zt”l, with this very problem. He cried, “Rebbe, please help me find a way to conquer the negative thoughts that are so hard for me to overcome!”

The Maggid sent this man to Rav Zev of Zhitomir, the author of the Ohr HaMeir, zt”l, saying, “Since you are a ba'al habayis, it would be better if a ba'al habayis showed you how he overcomes such challenges...”

Despite the freezing cold and difficult conditions for travel, this man rented a wagon and rode all the way to Zhitomir where the Ohr Hameir served as the town's shochet.

When the man finally arrived at the front door, he knocked loudly. Strangely, although he could see from the light, that Rav Zev was awake, no one came to open the door.

He knocked again but the door remained shut. It was very cold and the ba'al habayis didn't wish to wait until morning so he began to knock with all of his remaining strength.

Finally Rav Zev came to the door and asked, “Who is knocking at my door so late at night?”

“I have been sent by the Maggid to ask how to overcome the negative thoughts that plague me,” he replied.

“But you are obviously a ba'al habayis,”

answered Rav Zev.

“So?”

“As I have just demonstrated by letting you stand outside here, one who is a ba'al habayis can refuse entry to anyone knocking at his door. The same is true for illicit thoughts. If you keep the door of your mind closed by thinking in Torah, such thoughts have no choice but to remain outside. It is only if we let them in that they can gain entry even when we prefer they remain outside.

“This is the meaning of the Mishnah: *אם בטלת מן התורה, יש לך הרבה בטלים כנגדך*. This means that if one does not occupy himself with Torah, even if he wishes to guard his thoughts, he will be beset with negative thoughts chas v'shalom.”

Rav Zev blessed the man with success and sent him on his way. ■

1. בן לאשרי, ח"ד, ע' י"ט ■