



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Rendering the frankincense piggul

The "Sharp Ones" of Pumbedisa assert that if while burning the kometz one intends to burn the frankincense the next day he has effected piggul and all opinions would agree to this ruling.

Rava suggests support for this position from a Mishnah but it is rejected.

R' Menashe bar Gada rules in the above case that he has not effected piggul and all opinions would agree to this ruling.

Abaye confirms that this teaching was said by R' Chisda in the name of Rav.

R' Yaakov bar Idi in the name of Abaye suggests support for this ruling but it is rejected.

R' Hamnuna shares a related teaching from R' Chanina.

R' Ada bar Ahava explains the novelty of this teaching.

### 2) Intent to eat the leftovers the next day

A Beraisa was cited before R' Yitzchok bar Abba related to burning the kometz with the intent to eat the leftovers the next day.

R' Yitzchok bar Abba objected to the wording of the Beraisa and consequently revised it.

This revision is unsuccessfully challenged.

### הדרן עלך הקומץ את המנחה

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses different potentially invalidating intents and whether they do indeed render the Mincha invalid.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between the sharp ones of Pumbedisa and R' Menashe bar Gada?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Why does the Torah use the double expression of האכל האכל?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. Why does R' Zeira reject R' Asi's explanation of R' Eliezer?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the effect of slaughtering a korban with the intent to drink some of the blood the following day?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Intent to eat inedible parts of the minchah or to burn the portion meant for eating*

הקומץ את המנחה לאכול דבר שאין דרכו לאכול ולהקטיר דבר שאין דרכו להקטיר כשר, ורבי אליעזר פוסל

Tosafos notes that the first halacha of the Mishnah seems to be unnecessary. We learned earlier (12a) that piggul only applies when an improper thought is expressed to eat an edible part of the minchah at the wrong time, or to burn a part of the minchah that is supposed to be burned at the wrong time. This directly indicates that if the intent was aimed to eat a non-edible part of the minchah, or to burn an edible part, that piggul would not apply, and that the minchah would be kosher in these cases. Why was it necessary for the Mishnah to state these apparently obvious conclusions?

Tosafos explains that it must be that the only insight which the Mishnah is adding is that even in these cases, R' Eliezer does disqualify the minchah, as he considers intent regarding that which is eaten by a person and that which is consumed by the Altar to have an effect upon each other. Therefore, according to R' Eliezer, piggul intent for the kometz, which is burned on the Altar, or for the remaining flour, which is to be eaten by the kohanim, can be interchanged to cause the minchah to become piggul.

Tosafos suggests another answer, that the previous Mishnah would only lead us to say that if piggul intent was expressed to eat a part of the minchah that is supposed to be burned on the Altar, while it would not be piggul, perhaps we might have assumed that the minchah is nevertheless disqualified. The Mishnah at the beginning of our perek would then teach that according to the Chachamim the minchah is actually kosher in this case. Tosafos immediately rejects this approach, though, because the Gemara (12a) understands that the minchah in this case would not only not be piggul, but also that it would be kosher.

Tosafos cites a proof that the Gemara holds that the minchah would be kosher when the piggul intent is to eat a portion which is not for eating. The Mishnah stated that if one intends to eat an edible portion or if he intends to burn a portion which should be placed on the Altar, but his stated intention is to do so outside its borders (חוץ למקומו), the minchah is disqualified. If the intent is to eat or burn the appropriate parts beyond their time limit, the minchah is piggul. If the intent is to eat a non-edible part, or to burn a non-burnable part either outside its borders or beyond its time limit, we would not have a disqualification nor piggul. Sfas Emes comments that this proof is not conclusive, as it could be that intent of "outside its borders" might not be liable for kareis, but it might be invalid even if the intent is to eat a non-edible portion. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Citing a teaching in the name of the author

עני מרי משמיה דרב

Answer me my master, was this said in the name of Rav?

The Gemara relates that R' Menashya bar Gada was sitting in front of Abaye and he related a teaching in the name of R' Chisda. Abaye inquired whether R' Chisda cited this teaching in the name of Rav and R' Menashya confirmed that R' Chisda quoted this teaching in the name of Rav. The Mishnah in Avos (6:6) relates that one who cites teachings in the name of their author brings redemption to the world. Magen Avrohom<sup>1</sup> writes that one who cites the teaching of another without attributing it to the author is in violation of a prohibition. Noda B'yehudah<sup>2</sup> suggests that the source for Magen Avrohom's ruling is the Midrash Tanchuma<sup>3</sup> where R' Chizkiya and R' Yirmiya bar Abba relate in the name of R' Yochanan that one who cites another person's teaching without attributing it to the author is in violation of the pasuk in Mishlei (22:22) that states that one should not steal from the pauper since he is poor. Therefore, when quoting the teaching of another it is necessary to give credit to the author of that statement. Rav Shlomo Kluger<sup>4</sup> cites a Gemara in Nazir (56b) that indicates that if there is a long list of people who have transmitted a particular teaching it is sufficient for one to quote the first and last names on the list without having to mention all the additional names in between.

(Overview...continued from page 1)

### 4) Clarifying R' Eliezer's opinion

R' Asi in the name of R' Yochanan explains the rationale behind R' Eliezer's position.

Rabanan's opposing position and R' Eliezer's response are recorded.

R' Zeira questions whether R' Eliezer's position is based on a pasuk.

R' Assi admits that the matter is subject to a debate between Tannaim and cites a Beraisa that according to his interpretation records this dispute between Tannaim.

The Gemara begins its rejection of this interpretation of the Beraisa. ■

Based on these principles Sefas Emes asks why R' Menashya bar Gada did not cite the teaching in the name of Rav since he was the first name on the list of authorities who taught this concept. He suggested that Rav's teaching was limited to the fact that if while burning the *kometz* one had in mind to burn the frankincense the next day he has not effected *piggul*. R' Chisda was the one who added that even R' Meir could agree with this teaching. Since that latter part was not taught by Rav it was permitted for R' Menashya bar Gada to retell the teaching only in the name of R' Chisda. ■

1. מג"א סי' קנ"ו סק"ב.
2. שו"ת נודע ביהודה תניינא או"ח סי' כ'.
3. מדרש תנחומא במדבר כ"ז.
4. חכמת שלמה לאו"ח סי' קנ"ו.
5. שפת אמת לסוגייתינו. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Body and Soul

"מה אכילה בכזית..."

On today's daf we find the well-known halachah that most food measures are a k'zayis. The Otzar HaYirah, zt"l, explains why we specifically use an olive to determine the measure of eating. "Our sages teach that olives make one forget his learning. It is certainly significant that olive oil has the opposite effect. Instead of making one forget his learning, it actually helps him remember his learning.<sup>1</sup>

"An olive is likened to the body, while olive oil is like the soul contained within. The oil alludes to the light of To-

rah and holiness. Just as an olive must be pressed to remove its oil, the body must be worked until the soul shines forth to illuminate one's life—and that of everyone he meets—with spiritual radiance. There is no way to remove oil without crushing the olive. Similarly, to remember Torah and connect to Hashem one must defeat the material aspect of his body transforming even his physical self to a vehicle for holiness.

"This is why specifically an olive is used to determine what is considered eating. One does not make an after-blessing unless he has eaten at least a k'zayis and most measurements of Torah are a k'zayis. Most mitzvos must be done with one's body as well as his soul. To allude to the importance of sanctifying one's physical self, we use a k'zayis which

alludes to both body and soul. It is only through sanctifying our physical self that we really bring holiness into our lives."

Rav Nissin Yagen, zt"l, once illustrated the importance of action with a powerful parable. "Just imagine a wife who asks her husband to purchase certain essentials. When he comes home and she asks if he bought the items he says that he really wanted to in his heart and that should suffice."

He concluded, "The husband who has the money and ability to procure what was requested but doesn't bother doesn't honor his wife's request in his heart. On the contrary, he denigrates his wife! The same is true regarding one who is spiritual in his heart but not his actions."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. אוצר היראה, אכילה
2. כן שמעתי ממנו ■